

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 22, 1951

FIVE CENTS

The Foreign Policy of the A-Bomb

... page 4

In this issue—

STUDENT SOCIALIST

A Four-Page Section of LABOR ACTION

THE STUDENT-FEDERALIST CONVENTION . . . page 1-5

U. of CALIF.: Free Speech at Sather Gate . . . page 1-5

U. of CHICAGO: The Battle Over the Maroon . . . page 2-5

BROOKLYN COLLEGE: Gideonse Rides Again . . . page 2-5

Western Policy in the Near East Crisis: Can the U. S. Take Over the Pieces of the British Empire?

By HAL DRAPER

It certainly is not news that the British Empire has disintegrated before the very eyes of our own generation. The news in the last two weeks has been that a couple more chunks have fallen off the already ruined edifice.

The moves by Egypt and Iraq, on top of Iran's lion-bearding, have produced almost as much alarm in this country as in Britain itself. And it is true that they raise several other questions besides the simple right of a people to its national sovereignty. But reading the American press, one would scarcely be aware that national independence is involved at all.

The people of Iran, Egypt and Iraq (and there are others who will follow suit) *want their own lands back under their own sole control, all of their land.* They want national sovereignty, without buts or ifs. They do not want foreign troops imposed upon them and quartered on their territory because of the demands of foreign powers to which they must yield for fear of reprisals. They want to get rid of every last vestige of imperialist control.

In these desires they are 100 per cent justified. Not a single one of the other issues involved can even be approached on a democratic—let alone, socialist—basis until this is established.

It is these aspirations for full national independence which are being snidely referred to in the press as "Near East chauvinism," "fanaticism," "a nationalist malady," and other derogatory terms typical of imperialist minds. It is an index to American chauvinism.

It is legitimate to raise the question of Near Eastern defense against Russian aggression—but only on the basis of full Near Eastern independence from the U. S. bloc, *not as a pretext for denying that independence.*

It is legitimate and necessary to point out the reactionary character of the governments which are tweaking the British lion's tail—but not as a pretext for denying that

the peoples involved have the right to full independence even if they are also so unfortunate as to be saddled with reactionary governments at home.

Thus, a statement by Herbert Morrison, British foreign minister, slyly refers to Egypt as "a country . . . whose government foments international disputes in order to divert popular attention from much needed reforms at home."

YES, IT'S POPULAR!

This may indeed be true of the Egyptian government, which is reactionary and corrupt. But:

(1) Morrison makes this point not because his heart is bleeding for the Egyptian people but in the course of his threat to use force if necessary to keep British troops stationed over the Egyptian people's land!

(2) We hope to see the Egyptian people themselves settle with their reactionary government—without foreign troops on their soil to get in their way.

(3) If the Egyptian government has moved against the British to "divert popular attention" at home, it is precisely because this move is fervently desired by the PEOPLE, and not just by the reactionary government. In fact, it is because of the reactionary and corrupt character of the Egyptian ruling class that such steps have not been taken before this. Morrison's sneer is misplaced.

The picture is: *Even* the ruling class which has so long been corrupted and controlled by British imperialism, *even* the reactionary

ruling class without whom British power would long ago have been more aggressively attacked before this, even this class no longer wants Britain there. *They* are turning on the former master like jackals in the days of the old lion's weakness, but that is as nothing compared with their previous crimes as collaborators and compradores of the imperialist power.

The same can be said for the governments of Iran and Iraq.

WHOSE "LEGALITY"?

The noise raised about Egypt's unilateral denunciation of its treaty with Britain "is considered silly by the Egyptians," reports a correspondent. It is at any rate the sheerest legalistic hypocrisy. Egypt has been asking Britain to get its troops out since the end of the war, and four years ago it requested the UN Security Council to do something about it. The UN did nothing as usual. Egypt is now supposed to submit to the "legality" of a treaty which, like the original occupation by Britain in its heyday of power, was imposed on it at bottom by force.

It remains to be added that the outcries from either the British or the Americans about the reactionary nature of the Egyptian government come with poor grace from states that are backing Syngman Rhee, Bao Dai, Quirino and other paladins of democracy.

All this may be true, it may be said (unfortunately, by would-be liberals among others), but isn't it true that if Egypt ousts the British troops, it leaves the vital
(Continued on page 4)

AS THE IRANIANS SEE IT



Ghajar, Teheran

"A third thief came and made off with the prize."

Reuther in Bureaucratic Move Against Stellato Opposition

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Oct. 12—The action today of the Reuther leadership of the United Auto Workers (CIO) in calling Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, before the entire international union executive board, and charging him with "publishing material detrimental to the interests of the UAW," raises certain basic issues important to the future of this union.

Is the Reuther leadership determined to crack down on Stellato and smash him, as an example to other opposition and to all critics, before the groundswell of anti-Reutherism becomes a major problem of concern?

Pressed by the spectre of increasing unemployment, speedup, and other factors making for discontent, the auto workers are certainly in an anti-administration mood such as preceded the disposal of the Thomas-Addes-Leonard leadership. Reuther's experiences at the various conferences in recent weeks must have come as quite a shock to him. Is he becoming a bit panicky, and is this behind the bureaucratic action against Stellato?

How hard-pressed the Reutherites in Ford Local 600 are for supporters was illustrated recently by the hiring of Tommy Thompson, bitter anti-Reutherite of past days, by the Reuther regime. He is now in the Ford department of the UAW.

The UAW leaders did not furnish Stellato a bill of particulars on the charges placed against him. He refused to answer questions until this was done. Stellato also utilized the occasion to blast Reuther's policies. He ridiculed the five-year contracts; he renewed his demand for a 30-hour week with 40-hour pay.

Is the Reuther regime now preparing to censor all local union papers, whether or not they are published in connection with the international union paper? And does this become a major fight for freedom of the press? These and many other questions remain to be answered by the action of the Reuther regime.

Very frankly, we are quite sus-

picious of this latest move because we have seen far too many examples where Reuther leaders identify themselves as the union, and where they take any criticism of themselves as a "blow at the union."

THE BIGGEST BLOW

As a matter of fact, the biggest blow given the prestige of the UAW as a union, as well as a blow at the prestige of the Reuther regime, was the results of the NLRB election at the Burroughs Adding Machine Company last Thursday. This company, with a long record of paternalism, has resisted unionism successfully since the advent of the CIO.

The UAW petitioned for an election, after an organizing campaign, and was defeated by something like 5,000 votes to 800 for the union. The UE received around 300. This is the talk of Detroit. In the heart of the UAW, the UAW leaders were unable to organize a plant that large!

Who kidded whom about this campaign, and how much of a porkchopping expedition it was, instead of a properly organized campaign, are subjects that should occupy the attention of the top leadership as much at least as the attacks by Stellato.

'He Hasn't Got the Answers,' Say Delegates As Reuther Trips Up Before Chrysler Men

DETROIT, Oct. 11—Scheduled as a routine one-day affair, the national Chrysler delegate conference held here last week by the United Auto Workers (CIO) turned into a full two-day session which provided some surprises and shocks to the Reuther regime.

For it was the first major conference in recent times at which the shop union leaders dominated the agenda and the discussion, and dictated the tone and atmosphere of the entire event.

No sooner did the conference open than union leaders from the shop added important items like transfers to war plants, a Chrysler council-setup proposal, etc., to the agenda. These were accepted by unanimous action of the delegates.

After Norman Mathews, Chrysler UAW department director, reported on special negotiations with Chrysler on the speedup and other burning issues—from which no results were obtained—delegates took the floor to criticize and above all to discuss the problems in the shop which must be handled.

A vigorous speech by Jesse Cundiff, chairman of the shop committee of Local 7, posed all the speedup issues which confront the Chrysler workers. His report on the bitter fight against speedup at the Chrysler Jefferson and Kercheval plants, and his insistence that the union fight on all Chrysler fronts as a unified force, made a big impression on the conference.

BLUNDER AT START

Backed by the entire Local 7 delegation, Cundiff demanded a report on the case of Jimmy Solomon, the discharged chairman of the Dodge local shop committee, and made a strong plea for an all-out effort of the UAW to get him reinstated, since the union had lost much prestige by letting this discharge remain unsettled.

A lengthy report by Mathews on the details of the Solomon case was interrupted by Delegate Al Nash of Local 7 to make a privileged motion for a two-day conference to take enough time fully to discuss the issues before the Chrysler workers, and this carried unanimously after Nash spoke on the subject.

Before Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, made his report, many delegates from the shops told the story of their speedup problems, and Jimmy Solomon of the Dodge local described in an effective speech the situation that had led up to his discharge. The Dodge local leaders in the shop had tried to compromise the speedup issue, even to the extent of agreeing to extra work, but the company was out for blood and got it.

In this serious and sombre atmosphere, Walter Reuther began his speech with a major blunder. He started his usual factional defense of the leadership with a blast at John L. Lewis' dictatorship in the United Mine Workers Union. Reuther was stopped cold by the delegates. With shouts, boos and yells, they demanded that he stick to the speedup issue and other subjects agitating the minds of the Chrysler workers. This, from a conference whose composition was overwhelmingly Reutherite!

Reuther retreated, even to the extent of not mentioning his pet

theme that the "speedup issue is a political one." Nor did he claim it was exaggerated by factional opponents. For the reports from the shops came from men who had been supporting him for a long time.

The essence of Reuther's speech was that there are two sets of rules which the ranks must go by, in dealing with speedup. "No minority is going to decide to shut down the plant on what they think is a speedup issue. Only by following the constitution can we, and will we, authorize a strike on speedup," Reuther declared. The other set of rules was the contract, "which the last Chrysler conference unanimously adopted, when they voted to approve the contract," Reuther added.

Reuther repeated the answers he gave to other meetings on the speedup: The UAW in 1949 passed a special resolution on the subject. Look at the Ford strike in 1949 to see that the UAW is willing to fight the speedup by strikes. The UAW is a militant union. Look at all the strikes it has on now. We'll authorize a strike at Chrysler if you want one! We'll never compromise on speedup.

FEELING IN RANKS

Taking issue with Reuther, Delegate Nash of Local 7 reviewed the attitude of the top leadership in recent months toward the speedup issue and pointed out that the whole emphasis of the union was directed against the men who were provoked by the company, while the union leadership was strangely silent in attacking the corporations.

Nash explained how the trend toward making the UAW a service union like any AFL union made the ranks feel, "We pay our dues, we want results," and the failure of the union to encourage rank-and-file participation in its activities had weakened it in the struggle against speedup. The wildcat strikes themselves were a testimonial that the ranks were losing confidence in the union, Nash added.

Nash reported on the sentiment in the shops toward the union leadership and the cynicism which had developed in the whole union, when the biggest wildcatter of them all, the man who made his reputation as a militant, Emil Mazey, goes around denouncing wildcats, when everyone knows he became second in command of the union because of his militant reputation!"

Continuing his analysis of the UAW leadership, Nash reviewed

the failure of the education program to develop any new leaders or educate the ranks in unionism, and he gave examples of the status-quo mentality which prevailed on the international union staff.

It was a hard-hitting speech, delivered in a sober tone, and it was well received by the delegates. Reuther, as usual, rolled with the punch, using his standard "I can agree with much of what the brother says, but . . ." and then repeated his claim that the UAW was the most militant union in America, as if that were the subject in dispute.

For the next hour, Reuther was questioned from the floor on the speedup issue and on the second set of rules, the contract, which Nash had also explained did not permit a genuine settling of the speedup issue. The discussion on this point was embarrassing to Reuther, and to the international union representatives present, for it soon became evident that Reuther simply didn't know the Chrysler contract, and his suggestions were just not possible under the agreement.

Of course, when the routine motion to accept Reuther's report and to issue a press release blasting Chrysler, was made, the delegates voted unanimously for it. The subsequent press release gives the impression that Reuther had the solid backing of the

Chrysler conference for his views. This is far from true.

HOT POTATOES

In fact, the outstanding result of the Chrysler conference is the fact that the shop leaders now feel they are better than Reuther when it comes to knowing and solving shop problems. "Hell, he hasn't got the answers," was a frequent comment during Reuther's discussion. This is something new in the UAW in the Reutherite circles.

The conference demanded action, and it was promised by Reuther on the question of transfers into new war plants. In the last war older seniority workers, by their very seniority, were kept on auto production until the end. Younger men were laid off and got the first and good jobs at war plants. Then the older seniority men were unemployed for a long while in the gap between auto production and war production. The union ranks want job opportunities in Chrysler war plants, for example, to go by seniority as openings and promotions do now.

Perhaps the hottest potato in the UAW basket of problems right now, along with speedup, is the plight of the skilled trades. Workers in unorganized shops in Detroit make from 25 cents an hour to 75 cents an hour more than the men covered by UAW

contracts. And knowing how scarce skilled workers are, the skilled men are burned up at this situation. Furthermore, in many cases, the companies like Chrysler sent work elsewhere, to job shops, which apparently are owned by corporation big shots, rather than doing the work in the major plants, and this had cut out much overtime of the skilled workers. The latter are irritated.

Sometimes Chrysler brings in AFL men to do work which Chrysler maintenance men can do and have done, and this is a source of friction which almost caused a strike at the Jefferson plant last weekend.

Efforts to get a Chrysler council setup such as the UAW constitution mandates for local unions bargaining with a company with different plants failed at this conference because the issue had not been presented early enough to many of the delegates, and because one very effective argument was used against it: "If it's anything like the General Motors setup I wouldn't touch it. Look at the conditions of the GM workers!"

This argument, made by Art Grudzen, president of Dodge Local 3, a strong Reuther man, was very well received. It shows, however, even if the speaker didn't intend it, what the UAW secondary leaders think of Reuther's own creation, the GM setup.

LABOR SCOPE

PRESSURE IS BUILDING UP TO BREAK-THROUGH ON WAGES

By BEN HALL

When big labor struggles hit the front pages, the abruptness with which they are reported often gives a false impression. Steel workers or coal miners seem seized with a sudden, unpredictable, or even arbitrary militancy. For a second, everyone is terribly concerned and disturbed; editors of our daily press are again amazed and somewhat disappointed at that lack of "responsibility" which leads good American workmen to upset the public and the nation, in a capricious fit of anger.

What they cannot seem to understand is that behind every strike lie months and sometimes years of accumulated irritations and injustices, important or not so important, grievances which cannot be solved in any other way. The big mass strike which flares up suddenly is not the beginning of the fight but usually its culmination.

For the moment, labor news is squeezed into the inside pages. But the unions' grievances have not been smoothed away. The apparent lull reveals what is in the making.

ROLE OF THE WILDCAT

Radio operators finally saw their wages increases authorized by the Wage Stabilization Board. But the weeks of stalling were ended only when a gathering strike movement which had already tied up several ships on the East Coast threatened to precipitate a general walkout. This week brings reports of the first large-scale wildcat strike movement in an important industry. New York longshoremen, in Brooklyn and West Side Manhattan, stopped work on October 15 in protest against the contract signed by their union, the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA).

This contract provided for a wage increase of 10 cents an hour, all that was possible under wage board rulings. All the efforts of Joe Ryan, lifetime president of the union, and of army officials

have been of no avail. In effect, this strike expresses the discontent of the men with their union officials, with the wage board and with the shipping companies.

Wildcat strikes (not authorized by the union) are always a danger sign for union officials; they know that the rank and file use such methods to prod them into action and they feel uneasy.

PRESSURE BUILDING UP

Labor leaders are building up a big pressure to break through the ceilings of the Wage Stabilization Board. The New York Times reports: "Shutdowns have occurred or are now going on in aluminum, copper, freight-car building, atomic-plant construction, aircraft, machine tools, and automotive parts." The UAW alone has four important cases pending before the board. And

soon the steel workers go into negotiations. Board rulings would only allow them a 4 cent hourly wage increase. It is doubtful that Phil Murray can accept such a meager sum.

The UE (Independent Socialist electrical workers' union) has threatened to strike General Electric if it does not agree to a wage increase above the ceilings set by the wage board. Perhaps it is bluffing. But if the UE begins to fight, it will inevitably push its CIO rivals toward greater boldness.

If it should win, other unions would have to follow suit. And if it loses, under pressure from the wage board and the Truman administration, the CIO unions would become more restive and uneasy under the overhanging threats from an administration which they support.

Readers Take the Floor . . .

Inspired

To the Editor:

Have just read your article [the article by Max Shachtman on the joint anti-war declaration of the Indian and Japanese Socialists—Ed.] in the October 8 issue of LABOR ACTION; it was, to me, a very inspired one. Also the news of the meeting between the Japanese and Indian Socialist groups was most encouraging.

I must admit that I read your article with some feelings of guilt, for in it you mentioned those people who are the "skeptics, the tired and retired people," etc., who won't do anything to form a Third Camp but would join it once it was already formed and the hard work done (by others) to form it.

My position has not been one of skepticism, rather it has been one of lethargy. After reading

your article, which showed a freshness of spirit as well as a proper humility toward the "backward peoples," as opposed to the chauvinism of the more "modern" and "civilized" countries of Europe, I felt my own tiredness and apathy to be unforgivable. I realize now that merely subscribing to LABOR ACTION periodically is not nearly enough. Henceforth I will join the activities of the Independent Socialist League, participate more fully in carrying out whatever duties are to be done and give as much money as I can to the League.

This rending of clothes and breast-beating was a long time in coming, and now that it has come, this once "tired and retired" individual will "lend the eye a more terrible aspect" (to quote Shakespeare) and plunge into the fray. If you wish, this letter may be published in LABOR ACTION.

H.

Next-A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the
Need for an Independent Labor Party

25 cents a copy

Order from:
Independent Socialist Press, 114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Western Policy in Near East — —

(Continued from page 1)

Suez Canal area defenseless against Russian aggression? Let us then reassure Egypt that we theoretically recognize her right to independence, but convince her that in practice she cannot change the de-facto situation without benefiting Russia alone. This is the line of U. S. policy, in effect. This line might have some meaning for the Egyptian people if there were honesty behind it—that is, if these powers who now protest their non-imperialist intentions had not shown themselves up before this and even during their very protestations. As it is, "No remark is more common [in Egypt] than this: 'The West always has some excuse for maintaining its dominance, and now Russia is the excuse.'" (N. Y. Times.)

THE IMPERIALIST MIND

Behind this common remark is a truth: the Western powers are not, to be sure, merely using Russia as an excuse to dominate Egypt; but they are socially unable and unwilling to "defend the Near East against Russia" without also dominating the Near Eastern countries for the benefit of their own imperialism.

—But still, wouldn't the ouster of the British be a help to Russian plans of aggression?

This is an open-and-shut question only to those who think of "defense of the free world" solely in terms of where the West station troops (as Washington does), who think of the Near Eastern countries themselves only as military bases. But it is this imperialist mentality of the West which above all infuriates the peoples.

It is this imperialist approach of the West—including its ultimistic "Submit to us or else you will be helping the Russians," all of which assumes that the people have to submit to someone—which greases the road for Stalinist in-

fluence in these countries and makes them a ripe field for Stalinist expansion, not a bulwark against it.

An Egypt garrisoned by British (or American) troops against the will of the people is no bastion against Russian expansion but an easier prey for it.

What this illustrates is the inability of the Western capitalist powers—demonstrated in country after country since the end of the war to—mobilize the "free world" against Stalinist expansionism on a democratic basis, and its ability to do so only on the basis of an overload-vassal relationship.

It is an overlord-vassal relationship in so close a sense as almost to parody the social structure of feudalism, in which the serf served his lord in exchange for the latter's obligation to defend him. The Egyptians are told in almost so many words: You cannot insist on your national sovereignty, you must in fact yield at least part of your national freedom, so that we, the Power Lords of the world, may defend you against other bandits.

EQUAL PARTNER?

Neither Washington nor London could hope to take their stand simply on the "silly" business of treaty legality. They came up with a "compromise." This was: to maintain the status quo in Egypt with one change, the replacement of the British troops by a five-power arrangement (U. S., Britain, France, and Turkey plus Egypt). Egypt would be an "equal partner."

"Equal partner" sounds very nice and fair and above all democratic—if one forgets that it means that Egypt is to be an "equal partner" with four other powers in controlling its own country. That is, the "fair" arrangement that is proposed is that it accept one-fifth sovereignty in the area under dispute rather than full control of its own country.

In addition: "The particular point of the proposals, about which the opposition [in Egypt] is centered, is that they are regarded as turning Egypt into a full ally of the West, pledged even to fight outside her own borders. This is referred to as worse, if anything, than the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty."

Anyone who argues that Egypt should be willing to become a full ally of the West would not be to the point, even if his faith in the Western imperialist war camp were justified. For the point is that the West has not shown its willingness to give Egypt its independence without strings and then discuss alliances. It is pointing a pistol. And it is, in turn, this very proof that the West has not changed its imperialist spots which rightly convinces the Egyptian people that they do not want the war alliance!

CAN U. S. STEP IN?

In all of this, Washington is under several pulls, although the direction of its own aspirations is pretty clear. Its aim, in the course of the present inevitable disintegration of the British Empire, is double: to keep the former imperial subjects out of the orbit of the Kremlin—and to replace the weakened British power with its own overlordship.

The United States does not, and does not need to, substitute its own political control directly. For one thing, it has its economic and financial leading-strings. For another, it has its predominant power in the UN.

In the case of Iran, for example, there was a tug on Washington at the very start of that dispute to step into Britain's shoes directly, replacing the British oilmen with American oilmen while accepting the nationalization set-

up. There were American oilmen ready for the job and the consequent profits to be made. If the State Department put its foot down on this plan, it was in order not to drive the British into a frenzy of anti-U. S. hatred.

The proposed plan whereby a UN corporation or other body would take over Iranian oil would give the United States a bigger finger in the pie, at any rate, than the previous exclusively British control. The U. S. would not then consider the Iranian blowup a total loss—it would come out as the gainer. The same in general would be true for the proposed multi-power setup for the Suez area.

DANGER OF CONTAGION

Another pull on the U. S. in the case of Iran, and no doubt to some extent in the case of Egypt, is the fear of the example of revolt. If a chunk falls out of the British empire, that is no skin off Washington's back—if it can step into Britain's place. But there is always the danger of "bad examples."

The Times' James Reston reports, for example, that the U. S. has been trying to "support the British in such a way that Iranian developments would not set a dangerous precedent in Venezuela, Saudi Arabia and other countries where our own oil concessions might be damaged."

He adds: "To reconcile Iran's nationalistic tendencies with her international commitments to the British, however, is almost as difficult as arranging a settlement in Iran that will not immediately lead the Venezuelans and others to demand concessions that we do not wish to approve."

Another Times dispatch indicates how this applies in the

Egyptian case: "It is certain that Western diplomacy will have to hold firm in Cairo and stick by a legalistic solution of the Suez impasse. It cannot allow ferment to seethe in Libya and French Africa." (Raymond Daniell, Oct. 14.) And then there are also Morocco, Algeria and points east.

On the one hand, as one must never forget, the inter-imperialist rivalries in the West go on in the midst of (even if subordinated to) the cold war—for example, the French accuse the British of stirring up nationalist feeling in France's North African colonies—while, at the same time, in the face of the demands from the colonies and semi-colonies for national independence, it is a case of "we imperialists must stick together."

This is the background on which Egypt raises its demand for national sovereignty, and it is in this welter of imperialist considerations—dominated above all by the capitalist-Stalinist rivalry—that the democratic demand for national independence becomes "chauvinism," "fanaticism" and a "nationalist malady" in the eyes of the West's policy-makers.

But in Egypt's anti-British measures—as in Iran's and Iraq's—we see not only the interplay of rivalries and antagonisms among the forces represented by the Western governments, the Kremlin and the reactionary landlord regimes of the Near East, but also the aspirations of the peoples for freedom from all their oppressors. If, as Herbert Morrison has said, these measures are popular diversions to placate the people, the exit of the foreign masters and their troops will leave these regimes face to face with their own people.

Then there will be another Power on the stage.

The Handy Way To Subscribe!

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

Please enter my subscription:
 NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME
(please print)

ADDRESS

ZONE APT.

CITY

STATE

Bill me.
 Payment enclosed.

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER!

Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

The Permanent Revolution \$3.50
The Lesson of Spain25
Marxism in the U. S.35
Fascism, What It Is, How to Fight It15
The New Course 1.50
Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay25

ALL FOR ONLY \$5.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 W. 14th St.
New York 11, N. Y.

The Fight for Democracy ON THE HOME FRONT

University of North Carolina officials have refused to allow any of its six Negro students to sit in student sections at football games. The officials ruled that the Supreme Court order giving Negroes educational facilities equal to those of white students did not include football game seats.

Attorney General McGrath has ordered a federal grand jury investigation of the Cicero riots. The NAACP, in a telegram to the Justice Department termed the local county grand jury proceedings "a grave threat to law and order" and warned that "if this perversion of justice is not corrected, anti-discrimination and anti-segregation laws will become meaningless and violence will be encouraged."

American Airlines was charged with violating New York State's civil-rights law by practicing seating discrimination against Negro passengers at LaGuardia Airfield. The American Jewish Congress, on behalf of Gabriel Gladstone, Brooklyn College graduate and former American Airlines ticket agent, is the complainant in this case.

As a result American Airlines has agreed to discontinue the practice of marking reservations with a code number designating passengers as Negro.

The senate Rules Committee continues its hearings on four closure rulings designed to help prevent the filibusters by which so much civil-rights legislation has been blocked in Congress.

Part of the McCarran Act has been declared unconstitutional by a state court.

The southern District Court of California had before it a case in which the defendant, Frank Spector, had been indicated for violating a clause of the act which makes it an offense for "any alien against whom an order of deportation is outstanding . . . [to] willfully fail or refuse to depart from the United States" within the time set, or to "willfully fail or refuse to make timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to his departure."

The decision by Judge Mathes held the second part void—that is, the clause on applying for travel documents. He argued that it was too vague and does not specifically declare what action is required for compliance.

The first part—failure to depart, etc.—was upheld by the judge but is again under attack in an Iowa case, on the ground that it hinges on the "travel documents" requirement.

The American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California is fighting the case of Alexander Lobanov, a Russian seaman who came to the U. S. in 1943 and briefly worked for the Russian Purchasing Commission. In 1944 he was ordered back to Russia but refused to go, choosing to become a political refugee.

Lobanov shipped out on American vessels from 1945-50. Most of the time he was refused shore leave in the U. S. for lack of a passport. Not until late in 1948 did he get a continuing waiver of passport from the State Department.

Last January the Immigration Department picked him up and has kept him in a detention barracks since then. He has never been told why he is detained or what the agency intends to do with him. He has never found out why his entry into the country has been declared "prejudicial to the interests of the country."

Early next year, Doubleday will publish in book form the report by the ACLU on blacklisting in radio and television and loyalty-security problems in these fields. It deals with the methods of the notorious Red Channels and Counterattack (example: the Jean Muir case not long ago).

The study was made over the course of a year by ACLU board member and novelist Merle Miller, together with a team of investigators.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, published October 24:

THE MEANING OF EVOLUTION, by George Gaylord Simpson. Revised and abridged. A Mentor book, 192 pages, 35 cents.

A STREETCAR NAMED DESIRE, by Tennessee Williams. The text of the play. A Signet book, 144 pages, 25 cents.

THE HUMOROUS SIDE OF ERSKINE CALDWELL, edited by Robert Cantwell. A Signet book, 224 pages, 25 cents.

CORBREAD ARISTOCRAT, by Claud Garner. A Signet book, 240 pages, 25 cents.

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 43 October 22, 1951

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

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Assf. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIKS

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.

Editorials

The Foreign Policy of the A-Bomb

More bluntly than ever, in his speech at Wake Forest College on October 15, President Truman made clear that the foreign policy of the administration based its aim of "peace" on arming to the teeth and on that virtually alone. It could not have been put more plainly:

"Our policy is based on the hope that it will be possible to live, without a war, in the same world as the Soviet Union—if the free nations have adequate defenses. As our defenses improve, the chance of negotiating successfully with the Soviet Union will increase. The growth of our defenses will help to convince the leaders of the Soviet Union that peaceful arrangements are in their own self-interest. And as our strength increases, we should be able to negotiate settlements that the Soviet Union will respect and live up to."

It is an open statement of "peace" through an armaments race, an open confession that the foreign policy of the country is basically its military policy. It is the theory—if it may still be called such—which has preceded and led to every major war of our time.

We do not subscribe to the view that wars are caused by armaments races, to be sure. The third world war which looms ahead will be basically the result of the rivalry for world power of two antagonistic exploiting systems, Western capitalism and Russian Stalinism, and the cold war and its arms race are the instruments of this rivalry. But it is the latter which Truman paints as the road to peace!

The real meaning of the arms race was more truthfully pointed up during the last two weeks by a couple of other developments. While Truman talks of a "negotiated settlement" with the Kremlin on the basis of bigger and more destructive armaments, and the Kremlin continues with its usual demagoguery about its own dove-like intentions, both countries made more of an impression on the world by once again and simultaneously brandishing their atom bombs in each other's faces.

Stalin, casting aside (momentarily at least) Moscow's double-talk about its interest in atomic energy for peaceful purposes only like moving mountains and such, boasted of the new A-bomb which his slave-scientists have put together.

Gordon Dean, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, waved "tactical" A-bombs about in the international atmosphere, presumably to give America's allies more faith in this country's ability to

wipe opposition off the map—and to reassure them that the atom need not be used only to destroy cities.

Truman's road to peace—that is, the basis for his foreign policy—boils down to his faith in the "fantastic new weapons." Whatever these may be, they mean the ability to devastate the world. There is no other way out proposed either in Truman's speech or, more important, in the actual policies being pursued by the United States.

This picture should be kept in mind as we read the laments in the press about the unwillingness of countries like Egypt to become military bases for U. S. power. No one is idiot enough to suspect the reactionary ruling circles of a country like Egypt of pro-RUSSIAN sympathies; but the Near East peoples have no wish to be the proving grounds for either Washington's or Moscow's A-bombs.

You must permit your country to become our military base in order to defend yourselves against Russian aggression—this is what the Egyptians are told from the West. But the peoples have seen what it means to be "defended" by the Western protectors; they have seen it in Korea, and what they have seen there is that whichever side wins, the Korean people have already lost. Their land is ravaged; their country is torn up; their fields will be a No Man's Land even after the armies have departed.

American policy offers only the prospective of atomic-war-to-the-bitter-end. It is socially and politically incapable of fighting the dynamic Stalinist system by any other means—by countering its political and social appeal to the masses of the world who are through with capitalism and its imperialism, which they have known on their own backs for generations while they have not known the horrors of Stalinist totalitarianism.

These peoples will never become enthusiastic about fighting the Stalinist threat merely because they are told that the Russians want to enslave them, however true this is. The "free world" cannot be mobilized in defense of capitalism any longer.

We socialists do not want to live in peace with Stalinism—we want to destroy this scourge of the world working class. This cannot be done through an atomic war, except with the direst reactionary consequences both for the working class and the world. It can be done by building the forces of the Third Camp, by the organization of the socialist struggle against both war blocs.

ISL Program — in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

YOU and SCIENCE

"BW"—SCIENCE UPSIDE DOWN

By CARL DARTON

The small city of Frederick, Md., was recently in the news with a bit of whimsy: it had just paid off its Civil War ransom note. This indebtedness was encountered as a result of payment to a Confederate general to prevent the razing of the city.

Not as whimsical and not as frequently publicized is the fact that Frederick is the site of Camp Detrick, the headquarters for military research on biological warfare. Many of the "fantastic new weapons" of the past few years have originated in research in bacteriology and other biological sciences in this quiet town in the foothills of the Blue Mountains.

The center of civic activity in Frederick is the Francis Scott Key Hotel; and as one sits in its charming pine-paneled dining room he is inclined to play a game. It is a guessing game of endeavoring to pick out the scientists who have taken an hour or two off from the more deadly game of originating ghastly biological means of death.

Even though one may be familiar with the appearances, habits and idiosyncrasies of bacteriologists it is impossible to tell the scientists from the businessmen or even tourists who pass through en route to Washington. All appear to be highly civilized and respected members of polite society. There is no evidence of personality and emotional conflicts such as would be expected to occur in the professional descendants of Pasteur, Ehrlich and Walter Reed now engaged in applying their scientific heritage to destruction.

Dr. Theodore Rosebury, in his popular but informative book on biological warfare, *Peace or Pestilence* [McGraw-Hill, 1949, \$2.75] aptly calls it bacteriology upside down. "BW is an upside-down science, an inversion of nature. Normally we study disease in order to prevent it or cure it. This is bacteriology right-side up. But BW sets out to produce disease. It is not normal or natural but abnormal and artificial."

THE "ORGANIZED IRRESPONSIBILITY" OF THE SYSTEM

We can add that BW is not only an inversion of nature but also a perversion of man. One asks himself: How can this be? One hundred or even fifty years ago it would have been unthinkable for normal people trained in scientific ethics to apply their talents directly to evil purposes. The emotional conflicts would have tended to unbalance them. However, such are the characteristics of our times that while society itself is going crazy its inhabitants appear to act perfectly normal. The individual survives, at least some do, temporarily, while society as a whole dies.

C. Wright Mills in his book *White Collar* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1951, \$5.00) speaks of the organized irresponsibility of the individual in present-day culture. Though he uses this in reference to the managers of society it can just as well be applied to the scientists.

To quote Mills, "In a world dominated by a vast system of abstractions, managers may become cold with principle and do what local and immediate masters of men could never do. Their social insulation results in deadened feelings in the face of the impoverishment of life in the lower orders and its stultification in the upper circles . . . the social control of the system is such that irresponsibility is organized into it." Like most others, scientists are caught in the web of organized irresponsibility.

As might be expected, however, scientists have not so entirely adjusted themselves to the contradictions of organized irrationalism as have the businessmen and the managers. As a result, realizing that the individual reaction of a Fuchs, or a simple renunciation of all military research is not the answer, some scientists have attempted to find the social-way out. This is the method of building responsibility back into society.

We have written of the efforts of the Federation of American Scientists and the Association of Scientific Workers, and even of faint rumblings of social responsibility in such staid organizations as the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Some day the scientists may learn from the labor unionists that the group can do what the individual can never hope to achieve. If labor and science both can reach the common goal of a rational, democratically organized society, then scientists, all workers and humanity as a whole will truly be walking erect instead of "upside down."

WORLD POLITICS

NEHRU PUSHES THROUGH GAG LAW ON INDIAN PRESS

By PHILIP COBEN

American official opinion has been intensely grieved with Nehru especially since the Indian leader shot a gaping hole in the Japanese treaty conference by refusing to attend. The press started lamenting (more than ever, at any rate) that Nehru was not the able and idealistic statesman he was cracked up to be, and one might have expected that it would be only to glad to take another fall out of him in connection with his new press-gag law. Such was not the case. Few things better exemplify the hypocrisy of our Lords of the Press.

They editorially kicked the stuffings out of him when he took a step which (everybody knew and even admitted) reflected the desires of his people for an anti-war foreign policy. But they apologize for him when he takes a step which is as gross a violation of elementary democracy as can be found in any non-Stalinist country. It is clear that their sole criterion is neither democracy nor even views on foreign policy, but the extent to which he toes the Washington line.

At least the N. Y. Times virtually apologizes for and whitewashes his press gag.

This measure, which Nehru personally pushed through his parliament, is an atrocity. It forbids publication of "any words, signs or visible representations which are likely to incite or encourage" overthrow of the government, commission of a crime or sabotage, prejudice recruiting to or discipline in the police or armed forces, or promote "feelings of enmity or hatred" between different sections of the community, and it bans matter which is "grossly indecent, scurrilous or obscene or intended for blackmail."

It is plain, as the widespread opposition to the law in India contended with the support of virtually the whole Indian press, that the terms of this act are so broad as to give the government power to suppress any inconvenient criticism.

Both Nehru and the N. Y. Times have attempted to cite the blackmail provision as the main butt of the law. This is hypocrisy on the face of it. There are undoubtedly laws on the Indian books against blackmail already.

WHAT IS IT AIMED AT?

Not the least heinous provision of the law is the section which makes liable also the owners and operators of the press plant upon which the offending publication is printed. The effect of such a provision is to make it difficult for opposition publications even to get their stuff printed in the first place.

The Indian Stalinist movement is cited as another butt, in justification of the gag. It would be enough to point out that, even if the Indian Stalinists really menaced the country, the suppression of freedom of the press is a method of dealing with the danger which Nehru borrows from the witch-hunters of the United States. As a matter of fact, however, the Indian Stalinists are not even strong and influential, let alone in a position to present a "clear and present danger."

While "deploring" the over-all repressive character of the act, the Times finds that Nehru has acted "under heavy provocation." Its last point under this head is significant: "it could be pointed out with justice that one of the prime minister's objectives is to prevent scurrilous attacks on friendly nations such as ourselves." This gives the gag a plus-mark, in the editorialist's opinion!

In point of fact, the main opposition to Nehru in India comes not from the Stalinists but from the mass Socialist Party of the country. The press gag is not the first repressive act of the great democrat Nehru against this workers' and peasants' movement.

READ ABOUT
INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM!

THE FIGHT FOR
SOCIALISM
by MAX SHACHTMAN

A basic primer on the principles and
program of the socialist movement
\$1 paper . . . \$2 clothbound

THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF
INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM & the WAR
10 cents each

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS
114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.