

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 15, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**THE CASE OF NORMAN THOMAS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES**

... page 6

**It's 'Bread and Guns' for Europe, Says Marshall Plan Chief**

... page 3

**Too Late for U. S. Imperialism?**

... page 4

## Love Big Brother!

There is an organization with headquarters in Philadelphia which calls itself "Big Brothers Inc." It seeks to prevent and correct delinquency among boys, and as part of its program celebrates a Big Brother Week each year.

The name of this organization is a bit unfortunate, even though it was founded some time before George Orwell chose the name "Big Brother" for the dictator in his novel "1984."

This year, however, the organization has designated as "Big Brother of the Year" a man who can bear the title in Orwell's sense with some degree of fitness. The man is none other than J. Edgar Hoover.

We wonder whether they will placard the country with posters reading: "Love Big Brother!"



## Truman Message Means: The Fair Deal Is Dead, Cold-War Deal to Rule

By L. G. SMITH

Leaving only a few bubbles of hot air to mark her former position, the Fair Deal sank out of sight last week beneath the rising flood-waters of the armament program. Her disappearance was marked by no ceremony. The captain, President Truman, simply walked off the bridge without as much as a word of regret for the craft which had carried him to political power.

The Fair Deal was sunk in the president's State of the Union message.

The program which had been the bait by which labor was held in support of the Democratic machine was not explicitly rejected. It was simply not mentioned. After speaking at length about foreign policy, and outlining a ten-point program for legislative action which deals almost solely with the problems of rearmament, Truman just mentioned in passing that we must also improve social security, abolish racial discrimination, and do something about universal medical care. So offhand was the reference to these matters that no one believes any legislation will be pushed on their behalf. These were the bubbles of hot air calculated to keep the one-time Fair Dealers happy. . . .

For the rest—

### REPLIES TO HOOVER

President Truman's State of the Union message to Congress delivered on January 8 was a restatement in very vague and general terms of the foreign and domestic policy of his administration, dressed up for public consumption. Very little can be found in it from which a concrete idea can be formed on what the government has in store for us during the next year. That will develop only as the legislative program of the 82nd Congress develops.

The president plumped strongly for the foreign policy of arming all probable allies against the ex-

pansion of Stalinism. He pointed out that Stalinism expands both through "subversion," that is, the development of Stalinist political movements inside capitalist countries, and through armed aggression. As usual, the program which is designed to stop the political growth of Stalinism was the most vague and general of all. The program for arming the non-Stalinist world is now the real basis of American foreign policy.

Actually, the most interesting part of the State of the Union message was the portion in which Truman outlined the reasoning which lies behind the government's contention that the United States must be defended in Europe, Africa and Asia. This was a reply to the policy recently advocated by Herbert Hoover, and toward which Senator Taft seems to be moving. The passage is worth quoting as a whole:

"If Western Europe were to fall to Soviet Russia, it would double the Soviet supply of coal and triple the Soviet supply of steel. If the free countries of Asia and Africa should fall to Soviet Russia, we would lose the sources of many of our most vital raw materials, including uranium, which is the basis of atomic power. [In the whole of Africa all the countries which by the wildest stretch of the imagination, could be called "free" comprise a total of 15 per cent of the

(Turn to last page)

## Political Strike by German Steel Union Looms over Issue of Co-Determination

By GORDON HASKELL

On the 29th and 30th of last November over 200,000 workers in the German iron and steel industry voted to strike, if necessary, to secure the right of "co-determination" in their industry.

Despite a vigorous campaign by the Christian Democratic Party and in the whole bourgeois press against the strike vote, the workers turned out in force and voted overwhelmingly for a strike. 92 per cent of all those eligible to vote took part in the referendum. Of these, 193,183 or about 95.9 per cent voted for a strike; 6,321 or 4 per cent voted against, and less than one per cent of the ballots were declared invalid.

The strike deadline has now been set for February 1. The workers' resolution to strike for co-determination was strengthened by the fact that Chancellor Konrad Adenauer addressed a letter to the head of the West German trade unions in which he stated that the workers do not have the right to strike over any issue but wages and conditions. Instead of bowing to this attempt to make law by administrative ukase, the union went ahead with strike preparations at full speed.

There is also some indication that the strike movement may spread to other West German unions.

### READY TO STRIKE

Although the full meaning of "co-determination" in present-day Germany is not clear to us, it seems that this demand is being

served at least as much on the Western German government as on the employers. Three bills laying the legal basis for co-determination have been buried in parliamentary committees at Bonn. And since the determination of the unions to strike despite the government's opposition has become evident, Adenauer has retreated from his former position and is now preparing to meet with some of the trade-union leaders to work out some kind of a deal on legislative action.

Co-determination can mean much or little, depending on how it is interpreted and put into effect by the workers. In the United States there were all kinds of schemes for labor-management committees during the last war, but militant trade unionists and independent socialists opposed them on the ground that their sole function would be to make the unions responsible for disciplining workers without giving them any real control over the major decisions affecting the workers which were considered "prerogatives of management." The Stalinists were the main boosters of the labor-management committees in their effort to drag on the workers behind the war effort.

Even if it is not fully clear to us what co-determination means in West Germany today, there is no doubt that to the workers it means much more than the labor-management committees ever meant to the American labor movement.

This is demonstrated by the fact

that the steel workers are ready to go out on an industry-wide strike to secure it, in the teeth of opposition by the government and the occupation authorities. No section of the American labor movement has ever considered labor-management committees important enough to urge a major strike in their behalf.

From the press reports it appears that the unions are demanding

(Turn to last page)

## 'Anti-Red' Purge at Bell Hits SP

BUFFALO, Jan. 6—The 1949 strike of the United Auto Workers against the Bell Aircraft Company here was followed by a purge of the plant, as has been reported in LABOR ACTION; this purge linked the strikebreaking and union-busting aims of the company with the witchhunt activities of the government; and now this purge has extended to a leading member of the Socialist Party—which is not even on the "subversive list."

At the end of the strike at Bell, the company failed to break the UAW local but it did get its pound of flesh. Six leading unionists were fired, all on the basis of restrictions imposed by army authorities. Five of these were high union officers or former leaders of the union: one an ex-president, three ex-members of the negotiating committee and

one a current member of the negotiating committee. All of these were charged with membership in the Socialist Workers Party even though all the people involved were in opposing factions of the local! All had been members of the strike committee.

Following this period, after unsuccessful attempts the newly elected chairman of the negotiating committee was first restricted by the army and then fired for "sympathetic association with known members of the SWP." He was later cleared and reinstated; the UAW won that round.

Now comes the topper. One of the leaders of the local is a well-known member of the Socialist Party, the Norman Thomas group. He was recently restricted by the army and discharged by the company.

He could not be charged with

membership in or "sympathetic association with" any organization on the infamous "subversive list" of the attorney general. The reason given for the army restriction was, therefore, "lack of sufficient integrity to work on classified contracts."

The fact is that, some time before this, the corporation's Larry Bell himself had told members of the local: "We got rid of the Trotskyites. Next is that Socialist!" (The unionists answered: "Who's next—Democrats?")

In all of these cases there was not the slightest question of real security, nor of Stalinists. All of the workers involved in the cases were well-known anti-Stalinists. Yet we can still find liberals talking of the attacks on civil liberties being, after all, only measures for protection against the CP.

# Cardinal Tries to Foist Censorship on Films

Cardinal Spellman, the leading figure in the Catholic hierarchy of this country, has once again opened a public scandal by attempting to foist his sectarian religious views upon the civil law, this time by seeking a governmental ban on the imported Italian film "The Miracle."

Spellman has made himself notorious on at least two previous occasions along the same lines: as a self-avowed strikebreaker against a strike of Catholic gravediggers in Calvary cemetery; and by vicious denunciation of public figures, Mrs. Roosevelt for example, who opposed his demand that federal aid to education go also to parochial schools solely controlled by the Catholic Church.

"The Miracle" is one of three films being shown in a New York theatre under the over-all title of "Ways of Love." Made by Roberto Rossellini, it was shown all over Italy before coming to the U. S. Although Spellman's statement asserts that it was there "condemned by the Pontifical Film Commission," there is no report that the Vatican attempted to organize the kind of public and legislative campaign against it in that country that Spellman is whipping up here.

Spellman's blast follows the quashing of the attack on the film by New York City License Commissioner McCaffrey. The latter recently tried to use his official powers to stop the showing of the film by informing the theatre that its license would be removed. It was taken off the bill for a few days until, on January 5, Supreme Court Justice Aron Steiner acted to enjoin him from his purpose.

The church hierarchy thereupon moved to its next line of attack with the statement by Spellman read at all masses in New York's St. Patrick's Cathedral, on Sunday, January 7. The same day, a couple of Catholic organizations began picketing of the theater.

### "BLASPHEMY" CHARGED

The cardinal's statement went further than merely calling upon Catholics to boycott the picture. This is the usual recourse of the "Legion of Decency," the hier-

archy's mass-pressure group to enforce its private censorship index. Spellman's statement, however, appealed that "all right-thinking citizens should unite to change and strengthen the federal and state statutes so as to make it impossible for anyone to profit financially by blasphemy, immorality and sacrilege."

With this demand that the hierarchy's concepts and standards of art censorship be written into the law and enforced by the government, Spellman once again tries to swing the church's strength to dominate secular politics.

The attack on the film singles out and stresses the fact that it deals with "the seduction of an idiotic Italian woman." With this as his sole reference to the content of the picture, plus the fact that it is entitled "The Miracle," Spellman denounces it on two grounds: it is "blasphemous," "sacrilegious," a "mockery of Christian religious truth," "revolting," "diabolical deception," "vile," "immoral"; and secondly, it "is a vicious insult to Italian womanhood."

The first judgment presumably stems from Catholic dogma, but the second is an appeal to more general criteria, and as such is doubly demagogic. The picture, says Spellman, "presents the Italian woman as morose and neurotic, and in matters of religion, fanatical." This claim that Rossellini intended the character of the idiot woman to stand for "the Italian woman" can hardly be believed even by Spellman.

The cardinal's appeal for government intervention is based characteristically on the cold war: "the greatest enemy of civilization, atheistic communism" seeks to divide Americans, and the film does so also by upsetting "domestic tranquility" in this country, "offending and insulting millions of people." Even assuming that "The Miracle" is incompatible with Catholic dogma—which is highly doubtful even in the opinion of a critic so concerned with Christian morality as the New York Times' Bosley Crowther—the conclusion that it should therefore be banned by the state is compatible only with the censorship practices of the Russian tyranny and its similars, which also insist that art remain within the "line."

# Point 4 Head Has a 'Plan': 'Capitalist-Type Farming'

By PHILIP COBEN

The newly appointed head of Washington's Point Four program for the development of backward countries, Dr. Henry G. Bennett, has given out his first press interview to announce some of his plans. These plans should have been properly described as "eagerly awaited," in view of the touting that Point Four has received; in actuality, Dr. Bennett's announcement is likely to resound with all the impact of a wet firecracker.

The Point Four chief's plan is to "urge backward countries to carry out a capitalist-type land reform" in opposition to the "Communist-type land reform" (collectivization by the state).

The press report (N. Y. Times, January 8)—or perhaps Dr. Bennett himself—is rather unclear as to just what this capitalist-type land reform is. One aspect of it stressed in the interview seems to be the sending of "agents into 36 countries to teach underdeveloped peoples the latest methods of public health, education and agriculture . . . to teach these people how to get more per acre through better planting, better seeds or better livestock strains."

This is surely laudable, but scarcely "capitalistic" in any sense whatsoever—unless Bennett is adopting the Russian habit of claiming that everything good in the world has a necessary connection with his favorite social system. Certainly, Lyenko or no Lyenko, even the Russians have shown no lack of enthusiasm about developing "better planting, better seeds and better livestock strains." More to the point, a socialist (not capitalist, nor Stalinist) organization of agriculture could not fail to give immense impetus to such technological development.

### THE QUIET URGE

The agrarian problem in the backward countries is in the first place usually political in nature—and only secondarily technological. That is, the first question is with regard to the ownership of the land, in countries like, say, South Korea which are saddled with feudalistic landlord economies.

On this point, Dr. Bennett's in-

terview seems to be vague: Point Four agents will "quietly urge" backward governments "to try to give the farm workers a better chance . . . helping tenant farmers or the lowest-class farm workers who often are exploited." Said Dr. Bennett: "The more a man gets for himself from his own production, the more incentive he has. If a tenant farmer, for instance, has to give up three-fourths of his production as rent, he won't work as hard as if he has to give up only one-fourth. That is the philosophy that will guide our suggestions to local authorities."

Presumably, then, Point Four "suggestions" made "quietly" (lest the tenant farmers themselves eavesdrop and get excited) will be not for a change in land-tenure system but for an easing of the exorbitant tribute levied on peasants by semi-feudal landlords. Again, why this is "capitalistic" is mysterious. For that matter, in line with the charitable nature of Point Four, it could even begin at home with some quiet suggestions to U. S. plantation owners in the South and Southwest who mercilessly exploit their sharecroppers.

At any rate, it is not specifically "capitalistic," and we stress the point because the whole question that Bennett raises is indeed that of the ability of U. S. foreign economic policy to offer any kind of alternative social solution as against the Stalinists' totalitarian collectivization.

### DEMOCRATIC REFORM

The press interview does not indicate that Point Four agents will—quietly or otherwise—advocate the simple democratic (also not specifically capitalistic) program of giving the land to those who till it and chasing the blood-sucking landlords off the scene entirely (this would be too much to expect in practice from a government in Washington which, because it is capitalist, allies itself with every variety of reactionary in the backward countries, even pre-capitalist types of reaction).

Such a democratic reform would not, of itself, be either capitalistic or authentically communist, let alone Stalinist, although in practice it can be effectively advocated and put

through only by an anti-capitalist movement; the Stalinists seek to put it through in favor of their totalitarian bureaucratic reorganization of agriculture, and socialists seek to put it through in favor of their democratic collectivization of the land by the peasants.

There is indeed a capitalistic-type organization of agriculture, but not even a Washington windbag would dare to talk about it in connection with the backward countries. This is the organization of agriculture, widespread in many sections of the U. S. where huge farms are run as "factories in the fields" by absentee corporations employing wage workers and mechanization in a fashion similar to an industrial plant. Point Four would not, however, get very far in trying to convince the exploited peasants or tenant farmers to go for this system, even if the mechanized apparatus to make it possible were there, which it isn't.

Mechanization—therefore industrialization—is indeed a basic agrarian problem even in those backward countries which are not characterized by landlordism and where most of the peasants do own their own strips. Instruction in better seeds and livestock strains is no doubt useful but only scratches the surface.

The alternative to both the totalitarian collectivization of Stalinism and Fordization of agriculture, as well as to the feudal-landlord system, is democratic collectivization voluntarily entered into by the tillers of the soil. This includes not only the organization of collectives under the control of the central state, but also cooperatives entered into by the peasants themselves in association. In either case, such a democratic aim will not be achieved by making quiet suggestions to men like Syngman Rhee (it was tried without Point Four), but by stimulating and organizing the landless peasants and farm workers to take their fate into their own hands—to take the land and set up their own anti-landlord, anti-capitalist governments. A peasantry surging in self-movement is best able to guard itself from Stalinist usurpation as well as from landlord control.

"I am all in favor of saying definitely to the Russians 'If you attack Western Europe, you will find yourself at war with us.'"

We may soon see a narrowing of the gap between the administration and its chief critic, who has indicated that he is prepared to move closer to it, at the same time that he asserts his role as the leader of the Republican forces, cocking his eye quite definitely to 1952.

"The UAW and Walter Reuther" by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick

A brilliant study of the labor movement— A vivid insight into a great union—

Even the liberal pundit of the New York Post, Max Lerner, strong administration supporter, apologetically endorsed Taft's demand for the rights of Congress. The point is a strong one, for a democratic issue is involved. And though, as independent socialists we are against the imperidist-militarist policies and proposals of the administration and its critics, as we are against Stalinist imperialism, we are fully cognizant of the threat to democracy in presidential rule by decree. We have seen it operate now for more than a decade to the detriment of the labor movement and the political organization of the working class, most notably in the case of the presidential order to the attorney general setting up his arbitrary list of "subversive organizations."

Up to this point, Taft had criticized administrative rule by decree, demanding that the president consult Congress on all commitments of a military nature. This struck home. It was his assertion that Congress alone

has the right to declare war or to decide to send troops to Europe or anywhere else that brought a response from such a large section of the population, perhaps a majority.

But Taft does not pursue this point in his latest speech. Now he offers to meet with the administration and its several parts in order to see if a common course cannot be agreed upon. In any

# It's 'Bread and Guns' for Europe, Says ECA

By SAM FELIKS

What would have been taken yesterday as an indication of a more or less normally operating capitalist world economy, the closing of the dollar gap, today is the signal for an impending disaster of far greater magnitude. The achievement of a rough balance in trade between the U. S. and the rest of the world has indeed been a hollow victory, and a portent of danger for people all over the world.

The Western world was riding along on the crest of a boom during the early part of 1950, and the war in Korea really shifted the boom into high gear. But the results of this boom bring greater dangers than these governments can handle.

As a result of this war-accelerated boom, production has been maintained in Western Europe and even increased. In the first half of 1950, industrial production in the Marshall Plan nations was about 24 per cent above 1936-

38 averages, though there is no indication that agricultural production has been raised to the pre-war levels, and consequently in Western Europe as a whole living standards have not exceeded pre-war, if it has even reached it.

### BRITAIN'S POSITION

This narrowing of the dollar gap has been caused by the drop of American exports to Western Europe and the increase of imports, due primarily to the stepped up pace of the war economy in the U. S. But more important than this has been the increased American imports from Latin America and the sterling area which are essentially suppliers of raw materials. This American effort to buy up existing and future stocks of foreign-produced raw materials has led to a sharp rise in these prices which endangers the operation of the economy of Western Europe.

It was primarily because of this American buying from the sterling area which enabled Britain temporarily to suspend Marshall Plan payments. But temporarily—because it is likely that the increase of these raw-material prices from which Britain has benefited will in turn raise the cost of British imports far more than exports. In the last year Britain has had to pay 25 per cent more for her essential imports while her export prices have gone up only 7 per cent.

Britain's improved position has been to a great extent due to the rubber and tin of Malaya which the U. S. has been buying. In Malaya, Britain has been fighting its own little-publicized "dirty war" to protect the rubber plantations and tin mines. The British have been unable to crush the Stalinist resistance movement, and in turn have instituted a campaign of terror on their own.

The general problem for all of Western Europe, including Britain—and Britain is in the most

favorable position—is how to increase exports in order to offset the rise in import prices. But here is where the difficulty comes in, for Western Europe is being forced to increase military expenditures. The goods that might normally have gone into exports have to go into ships, planes and tanks. Therefore the plight of the European people is bound to get worse even without the outbreak of a war.

### ECA'S ROLE

However, the real effect of this squeezing of the European economy is only beginning and has not been felt yet. The military plans of the North Atlantic Pact are still primarily on paper and it is with reluctance that even the most reactionary of Western European governments starts a full-scale rearmament.

The United States for its part is taking the role of prodding Western Europe to assume greater military burdens. The "great debate" on foreign policy in this country has revolved about this attitude in Western Europe. The Marshall Plan has been completely dovetailed into the military program, ending the fiction of the distinction between the two.

The role of the new Marshall Plan administrator William Foster is to try to convince Western Europe that it should rearm, and that the problem is not one of guns or butter. On this he recently said, "If the choice in Europe today were between guns and butter, the choice might well be guns. But Europe has little butter. Europe has bread, and between bread and guns there can be no choice. . . . There must be bread and guns. . . . This should certainly sound like a convincing argument to the Europeans when they look at the "rich Americans!"

NOT INSPIRING

The debate on American foreign policy has made the job of Foster immeasurably more difficult. William Foster, speaking the language of the businessman, the only one he knows, enters into the debate by counseling that the United States should have an understanding of the problems of Europe while insisting on the return from their Marshall Plan investment. This is not "do-goodism," he adds, but a matter of "survival of the free enterprise system."

It has been the job of the ECA to lay down the line that since there is going to be rearmament of Western Europe to one degree or another there is going to be a weakening effect on their economies. And the U. S. is ready to step in to "help" them if they acquiesce to U. S. military plans. This is undoubtedly called "winning the confidence" of your allies.

Last item: Ford Facts, official organ of Ford Local 600 of the United Auto Workers, reports all the above information without comment. We wonder what its opinions are.

This, would seem irritating

# New Coast Guard Regulations Impose 'Security Cards' on Merchant Seamen

By BEN HALL

Wherever American merchant vessels sail into the ports of the world they will carry the flag of democracy for all to gaze at in admiration. But a tattered, raggedly banner it will be. Everyone of its freedom-loving, independent U. S. seamen will be compelled to carry a newly printed "security card," required under recently devised regulations of the Coast Guard.

The new rules are typical of our developing "classified democracy" which bases the fate of democratic rights in general and of the right to a job as a free citizen on the tender mercies of government bureaucrats. No seaman can hold a "security card" or a job under the following conditions:

- (1) If he has committed sedition, treason, or acts of espionage. (But half a thought reminds us that if such charges can be proved against anyone he would be in jail and would find it very difficult to sail a ship from behind bars. These provisions and all like them are designed exclusively to horrify and frighten us into forgetting the real intent of these measures and others like them.)
- (2) If he has "knowingly associated with persons committing such acts." (Here is the first little joker. A seaman need be

guilty of no crime at all except knowing a "criminal" and out he goes. What a delightful stimulation to the imagination of zealous withhunters!)

We omit several provisions especially worded to make us angry at saboteurs and "subversives" and to scare us out of the ability to think straight, and quote from the last section which states:

Security cards will be denied workers if there are "reasonable grounds for the belief that the individual . . . is or recently has been a member of, or affiliated, or sympathetically associated with, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement or combination of persons (1) which is or which has been designated by the attorney general as being totalitarian, Fascist, Communist or subversive . . ." and so forth, all along the same lines.

Note this well: the Coast Guard regulations take over look, stock, and barrel the entire attorney general's list as it is now and as it may be in the future, without qualification, and without investigation. And on the basis of this list, it will deny men the right to work at their trade. This list is the product of pure, unrestrained executive decree. It is checked by no one but the attorney general and is subject to modification only by him. The legislator becomes the cop, the judge, the jury, and the filing clerk.

### Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

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.

# Taft: 10-Year Plan for Garrison State

Senator Robert A. Taft, GOP leader of the Senate and candidate for the presidential nomination in 1952, made another speech last week on foreign policy before the National Press Club. Although there was no fundamental change in his views, he modified them in part and offered the administration an opportunity to consult with him on perfecting international policy in preparation for a new world war.

There are, no doubt, points in common between Hoover and Taft, but it would be a mistake to regard their views as identical. Taft now proposes an integrated 10-year plan that would give this country a "military status" for a decade and which would call for universal and unlimited sacrifices from the people. He estimates this 10-year plan will cost between 15 and 25 million dollars a year in new taxes which would have to come out of the pockets of the population of large and small cities by ten per cent at least!

This war program is necessary, says Taft, even if Russia does not start a major war within the period of time, for the preparation for such a war must be made nevertheless.

In a prior speech, Taft doubted that Russia wanted a new major world war and opined that it was a mistake for the administration to proceed upon such a basis. Now, his view is somewhat altered and his criticisms of the orientation of American policy upon Western Europe is based upon "military" considerations in which he believes the military views of the administration to be mistaken, since it counts upon the necessity of a large land force for the Continent.

### ON RULE BY DECREE

Like Herbert Hoover, this orator also believes in a concentration on naval and air forces, and although he does not quite propose the creation of a "Western Hemisphere Gibraltar," desiring strong European allies, Taft fears that Russia would feel provoked by sending a mass army into Europe which could not defend itself against superior manpower.

Up to this point, Taft had criticized administrative rule by decree, demanding that the president consult Congress on all commitments of a military nature. This struck home. It was his assertion that Congress alone

has the right to declare war or to decide to send troops to Europe or anywhere else that brought a response from such a large section of the population, perhaps a majority.

Even the liberal pundit of the New York Post, Max Lerner, strong administration supporter, apologetically endorsed Taft's demand for the rights of Congress. The point is a strong one, for a democratic issue is involved. And though, as independent socialists we are against the imperidist-militarist policies and proposals of the administration and its critics, as we are against Stalinist imperialism, we are fully cognizant of the threat to democracy in presidential rule by decree. We have seen it operate now for more than a decade to the detriment of the labor movement and the political organization of the working class, most notably in the case of the presidential order to the attorney general setting up his arbitrary list of "subversive organizations."

Up to this point, Taft had criticized administrative rule by decree, demanding that the president consult Congress on all commitments of a military nature. This struck home. It was his assertion that Congress alone

case he is ready to meet it half-way for, their differences aside, their main interests are common: a defense of American capitalism.

Taft emphasizes that his differences with the president might be located more in the field of operations than in the field of principles. He acknowledged that the U. S. would have to go to war if any of the signatories to the North Atlantic Pact were attacked by Russia by adding:

"I am all in favor of saying definitely to the Russians 'If you attack Western Europe, you will find yourself at war with us.'"

We may soon see a narrowing of the gap between the administration and its chief critic, who has indicated that he is prepared to move closer to it, at the same time that he asserts his role as the leader of the Republican forces, cocking his eye quite definitely to 1952.

"The UAW and Walter Reuther" by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick

A Random House book Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street, New York

# Hearing Held on Slave Labor in Stalinland

NEW YORK, Jan. 10—A public hearing for the presentation of first-hand testimony on slave labor in Stalinland was held last night by the Commission of Inquiry into Forced Labor, a group sponsored by but independent of the Workers Defense League.

Both the WDL and the commission have previously publicized forced labor in the U. S. in the form of peonage. The new hearing was devoted to forced labor in Eastern Europe, both Russia and its satellite.

A full report on the most interesting, and especially the new, details in the testimony will appear in LABOR ACTION next week. In its own pre-hearing summary of the testimony to be presented by the refugees from the Iron Curtain, the commission's announcement stated:

All of the witnesses from Russia itself were in forced labor camps and concentration camps

during the purge years of 1937-38. Most significantly they individually testified in pre-hearing sessions that in those years the purge terror hit the camps and that thousands were executed in the camps during that period.

It seems apparent that these thousands were slaughtered whether or not any connection existed between them and those tried in the Moscow trials. Many, if not most, of those executed during the purges, had been in the camps for many years and had been sent there under administrative sentence for alleged crimes bearing no relationship to the charges made in Moscow at the time.

### SLAVE ECONOMY

The witnesses from the satellite countries present conclusive evidence that the pattern of forced labor, so well established in Russia, is slavishly followed in these countries. The development

of these camps in the satellites has diminished somewhat the sending of these peoples to camps in Russia, but it is certain that the determination of the numbers to be kept in domestic camps and those to be sent abroad to the USSR is established by the needs of the MVD (GPU), now the basic and most important economic agency in Russia.

It is also possible from the testimony of these witnesses from the satellite countries to see how the plans for industrialization are intimately tied up with the forced labor setup. This dependence upon forced labor is as much a political measure as it is an economic one.

While it is obvious that the labor performed by a slave laborer is most inefficient, it is equally obvious that lack of proper clothing and equipment keeps down the capital cost of the project—needless to say the lack of wages and the minimum of food and medical help (this latter is almost totally lacking in most camps) goes even further to lower the cost. Thus it is possible to embark upon the grandiose "plans" with the resulting economic benefit and the simultaneous destruction of the human elements in the country who are real or imagined foes of the regime.

Get it EVERY week! A sub to LABOR ACTION is only \$2 for 1 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 has power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

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

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

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

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

**INTERESTED?**  
Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

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

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

I want to join the ISL.

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

## Youth Student Corner

### The Gideonse Terror at Brooklyn College

By EUGENE MARTEL

The running struggle between the organized student body at Brooklyn College and the administration of Harry D. Gideonse has come to an abrupt—but only temporary—halt with the discontinuance of the publication of *Campus News*. The *Campus News*, sponsored by the leading political student organizations at the school, was launched on October 20 as a protest when the college authorities arbitrarily revoked the charter of the then official student newspaper *Vanguard*.

The discontinuance of *Campus News* followed eight weeks of publication highlighted by constant editorial criticism and condemnation of the autocratic policies of the school administration, a persistent demand for the reinstatement of *Vanguard* and an objective coverage of school news.

The dissolution of the paper followed two weeks after the dissolution of its creator and original sponsor, the Campus Coalition to Reinstatement *Vanguard*. The reason for the dissolution of both was primarily administration pressure and terrorization directed on both the student and organization levels. The demise of *Campus News* was further hastened by financial and technical difficulties which, however, can be traced indirectly to administration pressure.

This pressure was exerted in many ways. One method was the employment of the hostage system, whereby Gideonse personally threatened to hold Bill Taylor, *Vanguard* editor in chief, responsible for the appearance of any opposition paper, regardless of whether or not he actually participated in its publication.

The threat of suspension was used liberally by Gideonse time and again, against both students and organizations. This was a potent factor especially when applied to draft-age male students who were not yet in the army only by virtue of their active student status.

A number of students actually were suspended; others had official reprimands put on their permanent record cards, and all the clubs affiliated with the Campus Coalition were specifically and officially threatened several times with suspensions or revocation of their charters. Needless to say, all student leaders involved were under constant threat of suspension.

Students nominated by the Student Council for inclusion in *Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities* were rejected because of their activity in the Campus Coalition.

### Positive Results Won

Other methods were employed, such as the rejection of elected student representatives to faculty-student committees because of bad "campus citizenship." (The "campus citizen" is a new concept originated by Gideonse which will undoubtedly be more extensively used in the future. To supply for honorary membership in this category, a student must have a minimum of gray matter, a not too sturdy and rather yellow-tinted spine, plus a passionate need to rationalize away every blow which Gideonse strikes against democracy as being in the interests of democracy.)

Legal devices were also concocted to "dissuade" the faculty. It is now necessary for every leaflet handed out on campus to have at the end of it the following statement: "Authorized by \_\_\_\_\_, faculty adviser," with the name of the club's faculty adviser inserted. One can imagine the pressure on faculty advisers when their clubs produce leaflets critical of the administration.

It is necessary to say that *Campus News* failed in its avowed task of publishing until *Vanguard* or a paper like it was reinstated. The dissolution of *Campus News* and of the Campus Coalition is a defeat for the student body and a victory for Gideonse. But it is also necessary to say that what was lost was a battle and not the entire war, and that this setback will prove to be only temporary.

The struggle for student rights at Brooklyn College will undoubtedly continue. New forms will be adopted for this purpose. But in any case a number of excellent results developed in the campaign to reinstate *Vanguard*:

(1) The Stalinists on campus are more isolated today than ever before from the mass of students and those liberals who tended to be pro-Stalinist, as a result of the campaign. Because the Campus Coalition was not allied with the Stalinists in the campaign, its condemnation of Gideonse for using totalitarian methods was immensely more effective. From the beginning a correct analysis of the reactionary role of Stalinism with respect to civil liberties was pushed by the militant socialists and adopted by the coalition.

(2) The socialist and liberal forces at Brooklyn College are now more united than ever in the struggle for student rights and academic freedom. The role of Gideonse and the role of the Stalinists have destroyed many illusions about both of them. The trend which began with the Conference on Democracy in Education was concretized in Brooklyn College: the formation of a force which, while including various political tendencies, is able to unite around a program to preserve and extend student rights and academic freedom—a force that could do this with such consistency that it has taken the initiative out of the hands of the Stalinists.



## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 3 January 15, 1951

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

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

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

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

# WORLD POLITICS

## IS THE HOUR TOO LATE FOR AMERICAN IMPERIALISM?

By JAMES M. FENWICK

The full-scale debate on foreign policy which began with the opening of the new Congress results from the heavy military—and therefore political—defeats which the United States has experienced in Korea.

Had the day-to-day improvisations of the Truman administration—beginning with the initial light-minded commitment of United States forces by the president without the approval of either Congress or the people—not reflected such a gross underestimation of Stalinist capabilities and intentions, the necessity for the present debate would not have been so acutely felt. As things now stand the United States is being forced to work out a long-range plan for war against Russia under conditions much less advantageous than they were prior to June 1950.

In Korea a basically United States force with total command of the air and sea, overwhelming superiority in artillery, armor, transport, personal equipment, rations, and medical service is being administered defeats by Chinese and North Korean troops whose advantage consists solely of numbers (a superiority, incidentally, apparently not so decisive as a MacArthur has attempted to have the public believe), tactical doctrine, and morale.

### CZAR'S DREAM

It takes no profound flair for politics to know that as a consequence the Stalinist star is in the ascendant in the East. If the United Nations forces are run out altogether, its rise will be even more swift. The maintenance of the remaining European holdings on the Asia continent under such conditions would indeed be difficult. Then the dream of subjugating India which haunted the crazed Czar Paul could become a reality for the Stalinists.

In the face of these eventualities the wisdom of the United States leaders does not extend very far. At the moment it consists of a probable evacuation of Korea. The rest is more vague, but currently it consists of limited assistance to Indo-China and other areas, and the arming of Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and other key spots in the Far East.

But this is an expensive and long process. Nobody at this date envisages a large-scale action in the Orient (unless John G. Wright is still finding customers inside the SWP for his Marxist-folklore to the effect that since finance capital bases itself on colonial exploitation it plans an all-out effort in Asia). At best, limited harassing actions are planned—but even these are being opposed, by England in particular. The appalling prospect offered by a war in the Orient is not the least of the reasons for the shift in emphasis to Europe. Such debate as takes place in congress will no longer center on this question. It is a point of contention which has been superseded by others.

### CLAMMY FACTS

But in analyzing European perspectives some cold, clammy facts are becoming evident. The United States has, it seems, only one reliable ally in Europe, and that is England. England possesses the advantage of an industrial plant, it has a population which is not undermined by Stalinism, and because of her island position it is not vulnerable to a quick sweep across Europe by Russian forces. It is, however, deficient in manpower. France has a useful, if out-

moded, industrial plant, but the working population is heavily Stalinized and could prove unreliable to the capitalist imperialists in time of war. Further, France is relatively easily subject to invasion if a Russian attack is mounted before there are adequate forces to oppose it in central Europe. Italy suffers doubly from most of France's disabilities. Spain has little industry, a population that hates the regime it would be asked to support in time of war, and an army that would have to be built from the ground up. That all suggests a long-term operation in a period when history hasn't been conspicuously prodigal with time for the capitalists.

### EYES ON GERMANY

With the glassy-eyed fervor which comes from articulating a new line of the masters, the commentators—the same commentators who five years ago were slandering for a Carthaginian peace—are now howling that Germany is the key to the defense of the West. The difficulty is that the German people have unequivocally stated that they have had enough of slaughter and destruction and that they do not wish to rearm and to engage in another war in which Germany has every possibility of being a main battlefield.

In general there is in Western Europe apathy and fear in the face of the war crisis. This manifests itself in opposition to United States actions which might precipitate moves by the Russians—especially at a time when the United States is totally unable to back up its commitments in Korea, not to speak of Europe, Yugoslavia, were it to fight Russia, would be of no direct aid to the West since she would be by-passed in any Russian assault. The Middle East is very vulnerable to Russian attack. To resist, it would have to be armed by the United States.

To weld all this into a Western army will take something more than the warm effulgence of the Eisenhower personality. Most notably it will mean an enormous production effort on the part of Europe and the United States. But assuming that at some point in the future this is well on the way to being achieved—that is to prevent the Russians from overrunning Europe before the West is able to establish the critical minimal military establishment? This is the fear which gnaws at the mind of those analysts who think beyond the bare tomorrow.

There is this much truth veiled in the apprehensions of both Taft and Hoover: the United States stands glowering at a world power which is exceptionally strong not only in a military sense but also in possessing a political program which has an attractive power for the world masses which the United States cannot hope to duplicate. This is not a simple war against Hitler, to be won on the level of military production. A feeling is obviously beginning to insinuate itself in the minds of some capitalist ideologists that the United States can lose this war.

### FOUR TRENDS

The current debate on foreign policy receives its character from differing solutions to the foregoing problems. There are roughly four schools of thought, two of them inside the administration and two of them outside it.

The most extreme school (in which W. Stuart Symington is reportedly a leading figure) is for an immediate all-out mobilization. The argumentation of this tendency is that war is inevitable, that persons who think that Russia would be provoked into bellicose actions through such total arming do not understand Russian dynamism, and that the passage of time would permit Russia to close the gap created by United States production efficiency. This school would not boggle at preventive war.

The second school of thought within the administration advocates the course which is actually being pursued: moderate arming that does not rudely upset the economy and aims at avoiding a permanent high degree of mobilization which, given no major war, would bankrupt the country. The administration policy is de-

signed to facilitate the transition to a full war economy. The political accompaniment is a policy of reasonable non-provocation of Stalinism, particularly in non-Russian areas, and a careful military and political preparation abroad.

### TAFT AND HOOVER

The third tendency is that represented by the Republican Senator Taft. He is opposed to the present commitment of large United States land forces in Europe. To commit them, says Taft, would be not only to provoke Russia but would be to contest her on a plane on which Korean events have demonstrated that we can only come out the loser. Before the United States commits land forces there, Europe must demonstrate its willingness to establish its own armies. Congress, says Taft, should have the right to decide whether troops should be sent abroad or not.

The fourth tendency is that represented by Hoover. "The foundation of our national policies," he says, "must be to preserve for the world this Western Hemisphere Gibraltar of Western civilization. . . . To do this we should arm our air and naval forces to the teeth. We have little need for large armies unless we are going to Europe and China."

It is probable that a variant of the Truman policy, one oriented toward the program of all-out mobilization, will win out. Despite the inevitable Stalinist diplomatic maneuvering designed to inspire hope of some sort of peaceful settlement, each successive Stalinist victory throughout the world will make the sense of urgency more frenetic.

The Taft opposition is an opportunist one governed by the narrow vision of a small-time political hack, an opposition which seems particularly ignoble in a period of crisis like the present. His main point will be easily answered by pointing out that Europe will not arm precisely until it is convinced that United States troops will aid in fending off the Russians.

### HISTORY'S IRONY

The Hoover point of view is more principled. For the capitalist class it is, however, a counsel of suicide. Every argument of his against the difficulties confronting the present policy can be applied with redoubled force against his own. At best his policy would stave off the grand dénouement to a time when the United States would be forced to attack a militarily immensely fortified Europe or attempt to live under a crushing permanent military establishment isolated in a Stalinist world which would be pounding the United States to pieces with atom bombs and laying the basis for an internal Stalinist victory within the U. S.

There is this much truth veiled in the apprehensions of both Taft and Hoover: the United States stands glowering at a world power which is exceptionally strong not only in a military sense but also in possessing a political program which has an attractive power for the world masses which the United States cannot hope to duplicate. This is not a simple war against Hitler, to be won on the level of military production. A feeling is obviously beginning to insinuate itself in the minds of some capitalist ideologists that the United States can lose this war.

The situation is not without its irony. United States capitalism, which has given its people the highest standard of living the world has ever enjoyed, is at the height of its power. The opportunity for world leadership is being thrust upon it. And already it hears an insistent voice whispering: Too late! Too late!

## BOOKS and Ideas THE NEW BOOK ON THE FBI—4

# How Hoover Organized Palmer Raids

By SAM ADAMS

If up to this writing we have not said a great deal about the role of Congress in the creation and development of the FBI, it was not due to oversight. The mass of material dealing directly with the FBI demands most of the limited space reserved for a review of Max Lowenthal's "The Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Although Congress was ever fearful of the bureau and questioned its activities periodically, the bulk of the criticism came from a militant minority in the two houses. For the most part, Congress acted the pliant assistant to the Department of Justice and its bureau. One of the critics of the book, therefore, was right in saying that Lowenthal did this aspect of the question little or no justice and that Congress should have come in for its share of responsibility, which is heavy indeed.

Although there is frequent reference in the book to congressional investigations of the FBI with pointed quotations from some of its outstanding critics, Congress was anything but courageous in its examination of the dangerous and illegal activities of the bureau. It had, when all verbal fireworks ended in the repeated investigations of the FBI, reasserted its support of the bureau, voted it continually larger funds, and endorsed its work. Moreover, it passed measures against radical and non-conformist thought that made possible the tremendously widening activity of the bureau.

In passing the alien sedition law of October 1918, Congress laid the groundwork for the "Palmer Raids," one of the most infamous periods in American social life. So many books and articles have been written about this period that it remains a well-known and remembered event. Given this law, the General Intelligence Division, under J. Edgar Hoover, proceeded with plans for mass raids and mass deportations. We trust our readers will understand that all of this was under the general supervision of the Department of Justice (mark you, justice!) and Attorney General Palmer. Hoover executed the general policy, but with his division and under his plans and directions.

In testifying before the House Appropriations Committee, Palmer described the plans of his department:

"We laid our plans with great care throughout the entire country. . . . It is a Herculean task, because they [the foreign-born] live in sections which are not often visited by ordinary Americans; their haunts are hard to find [sic], and their meeting places are secret [so secret that all their meetings swarmed with agents of Palmer's department!]. . . . These people lived from Maine to California. However, we finally overcame all obstacles. . . ."

Indeed! Agents of the bureau were advised through instructions of December 27, 1919 sent by the GID:

"If possible, you should arrange with your undercover informants to have meetings of the Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party held on the night set [by the bureau]."

"I have been informed by some of the bureau officers that such arrangements will be made. This, of course, would facilitate the making of arrests."

### Mass Arrests

It certainly facilitated the arrests. It also avoided conflicts with local authorities, where these authorities wanted fame and credit for this war on radicalism for themselves, such as in Chicago. But for the most part, the local and state authorities cooperated with the bureau.

These arrests ran into the thousands. They took place simultaneously on January 2, 1920 on the basis of the above-quoted instructions. These thousands were lodged in local jails or federal buildings. No provisions were made for feeding the prisoners or providing heat, toilet facilities or medical care. They were held incommunicado, were refused counsel or bail, or advice as to their legal rights. And, as was customary with the FBI, no prior warrants were issued for the arrest of those taken in the mass arrests.

It is true, in several instances where local difficulties were created by the intervention of the press or some conscientious judge, the Washington office issued post-arrest warrants. But even these were few.

The effects of these raids upon the prisoners were indescribable. Fear of deportation was least of their worries, for few indeed were

# MURDER IN MEXICO

## The Assassination of Leon Trotsky

by General Sanchez Salazar  
in collaboration with Julian Gorkin

The story of the assassination of Trotsky written by the ex-Chief of the Secret Service of the Mexican police who was in charge of the investigation.

235 pages \$2.50

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.  
(Orders must be accompanied by payment)

### Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

Only \$2.00 a Year

deported. But the miserable conditions of their incarceration, the brutality of the "learned and idealistic" detectives (men fully versed, if you well remember, in the law and the "rights" of prisoners), and the general atmosphere created by their state of incommunicado, gave a hideous turn to their arrests.

When the cases began to reach trial, the perfidy of the bureau and the GID loomed even larger. That the legal rights of all prisoners were violated, few questioned even at that time. But in almost all cases, the bureau's demands for excessive bail only emphasized the mean and petty approach of the "democratic" directors in Washington who, having already been unmasked in their Gestapo work, tried to prevent due legal process from being exercised. The bureau and the GID painted the dangers of radicalism in lurid terms, hoping to inflate the fears of the nation and thereby rally support to it for the rape of its own laws.

To overcome the effects of Federal Judge George W. Anderson's ruling in the Boston trial for the introduction of the bureau's instructions of December 1919 to its agents, a new instruction was issued on April 21, 1920, the aim of which was to deny that the FBI employed spies and provocateurs, or that it had employed them for arranging the mass meetings necessary to carry out the mass raids, or that all of it was part of a master plan laid in Washington.

But the bureau took a bad beating from Senator Walsh in the Senate Judiciary Committee, where most of the facts brought out in the book were revealed. The whole story of the department's dragnet was made public. The Washington bureau was to remain open from seven in the evening to seven in the morning. All special problems were to be taken up with Hoover direct and all reports were to be sent to him special-delivery.

### Anticipating the GPU

And that is the way it went: night arrests at home, followed the mass arrests of whole meetings. People were dragged out of bed at all hours between the aforementioned times. It did not make any difference as to the state of dress of the men and women. The lumbering agents stayed in the bedrooms while women tried to clothe themselves; they opened cabinets, bureau drawers, boxes and other conveyances and seized all kinds of materials, books, pamphlets and papers.

It was the first big political reign of terror the country had known, and the general incompetence of the bureau's agents aside, the method employed predated the more efficient Gestapo and Stalin's GPU. But there is no doubt that the methods employed by the American Department of Justice served as a model for Hitler's and Stalin's secret police.

The post-raid period saw the tactics of the bureau running into difficulties. Court trials ended badly for the department. Most important of all, the Department of Labor, which had charge of deportation cases, examining the results of deportation hearings and judging the decisions sent to it, rejected, with some exceptions of course, most of the cases it reviewed. Fortunately for the hundreds of cases that came to it, the Department had a conscientious examiner in Louis F. Post and he ruled against the bureau and the immigration inspectors in the majority of cases.

As in all other cases of criticism made of it, the Department of Justice and its FBI lashed out against the Interchurch World Movement and the Lawyers' Committee for their "unfair" criticism. And while no charge made against the bureau is refuted on its merits, the abuse of the critics abounds.

The change of administration and the appointment of Harry M. Daugherty as attorney general by the new President Harding did not, however, change anything in the Department of Justice, for justice was now administered by the key figure in the Teapot Dome scandal. To cover up his own malfeasance, the new attorney general yelled loudly about "reds." He was ably assisted by his colleagues in the department.

### Service for Union-Busters

As his head of the bureau, Daugherty named William J. Burns, former head of the notorious detective agency which served so well the big corporations as an anti-labor and strikebreaking private army on the industrial front. J. Edgar Hoover received recognition for his services and was appointed assistant chief of the bureau. This was the year 1921.

The war against radicalism began to die down and in a couple of years some of the responsibility for policing the Communists of the Twenties, socialists, radicals, unionists and labor organizations was taken up by local agencies. The bureau, however, kept its activity at a high, but another, level.

This was the decade of prohibition and the bureau now had a new nation-wide job. It was to police the new dry law, at the same time that it kept a close surveillance over labor disputes. Prohibition being one of our minor interests, we are largely concerned with the bureau's activities in the labor field.

It took an active part in the fight against organized labor. Wherever attempts were made to unionize the millions of unorganized and unskilled workers, the bureau's agents could be found assisting industry and its army of private police and company thugs. It provided information it had collected on union "agitators" to the companies.

Not the least of its activities in these years was the assistance it gave to the local police in the Sacco-Vanzetti frameup; its theory was that if they were not convicted for murder, the bureau could deport them as undesirable aliens because they were anarchists.

And thus for some years, after its reign of terror had served some purpose in dispersing for a time a variety of workers' movements, the FBI functioned largely in enforcing the 18th Amendment and serving industry on the labor front.

During the years of the New Deal, the bureau's activities were largely determined by the atmosphere of Rooseveltian reformism. If it did not participate in any grandiose activities, except to catch a few daring interstate criminals, it did under its new director, Hoover, prepare for days to come. Hoover went ahead with his favorite plan to card-index and fingerprint the whole population. Here again, the fight against crime was given as the pretext for his effort to build a police identity system like that of European countries, a vicious method of maintaining police control over the population.

In twenty-six years of building a fingerprint and dossier collection, Hoover's zealotry produced phenomenal results. From 1924 to 1939 he had 10 million sets of fingerprints; in the next ten years, this grew to 111 million, and by December 1949 it grew by two million more. Some variation of this figure is given, but it is too slight to make any difference. In addition, there is the FBI's file of radicals of unknown number, since no figure has ever been disclosed by its director.

(Continued next week)

Neither Reformism nor Liberalism Can Defend Democracy

Norman Thomas and Civil Liberties: The Case of a Sincere Liberal

By HAL DRAPER

Norman Thomas today can be called a socialist only in a historical sense, but this article is not concerned with him in his capacity as America's best-known ex-socialist nor with what has happened to his socialist views. Socialist or no for all his six times as the Socialist Party's presidential candidate, he is surely one of this country's public figures sincerely concerned with the preservation of civil liberties and democratic rights against with-hunting hysteria. If his previous brand of socialism as a compound of ethical eloquence and reformist zeal is now merely, at best, a muted personal predilection and not a fighting program, he at least has earned the right to be called a liberal and civil-libertarian.

But one has also the right to have some doubts on this score on the basis of his current re-examinations of what civil liberties mean, particularly his article in the N. Y. Times magazine for January 7. And these doubts have to arise without in the least impugning the sincerity of his subjective concern for democratic rights.

In fact, that is necessary to the point here. It is easy enough to scorn those hypocritical characters who have never given anything but lip service to the concept of democracy of ideas in the full competition of the marketplace, however much they have used the Jeffersonian phrases in Fourth-of-July speeches. The openness of the attack on civil liberties today which characterizes such characters requires no analysis. They were for civil liberties when it caused them, their beloved capitalist system and their cherished wars for imperialist interests, no inconvenience—and it is to get rid of democratic inconveniences now.

The case of a Norman Thomas is different and more enlightening precisely because of the subjective sincerity of his impulses toward civil liberties and not away from them. Not a J. Edgar Hoover or a McCarthy but a Norman Thomas best illustrates the inescapable contradiction between hanging on to capitalism (whether as a lesser evil or for any other reason) and hanging on to civil liberties and the traditional rights of bourgeois democracy itself, let alone expanding democracy into new regions and planes through socialism.

With Heart-Burning . . .

It would be an understatement to say that Thomas is wobbling like a dying top on some of the most elementary notions of civil liberties that characterize the liberal tradition. He is not alone in that, of course. He writes: "I am not unfairly telling tales out of school when I admit that in recent times there has been an unprecedented confusion in the counsels of the board of the [American] Civil Liberties Union as it faced the problems presented by Communist tactics."

And even without any reference to what is happening in the inner counsels of the ACLU, which we cannot know, one need only ask: How loudly has the voice of the once-forthright ACLU been raised today when the most sinister attacks on civil liberties in our whole history are going on?

But Thomas is a leading member of the ACLU's board, and it is perfectly clear that the unprecedented confusion exists not, or not only, between conflicting views on the board but exists within the thinking of such would-be liberals as Thomas himself, who is far from being the most muddleheaded in that body.

At the very beginning of his article, Thomas makes the slogan to Thomas Jefferson, quoting the powerful words from the latter's first inaugural address:

"If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

And certainly, in the United States today where the Stalinist movement is a tiny minority, the pro-capitalists or Thomas-type reformists have free enough exercise of "reason" to combat it. Furthermore, in addition, all the channels and mouthpieces of propaganda and publicity are at their disposal, including the N. Y. Times magazine.

The monument that has been erected, however, is not

that advocated by Jefferson but that advocated by McCarran and McCarthy and Truman. Thomas is opposed to the McCarran Law—though he specifically criticizes only the alien and registration provisions of that law and not the concentration-camp feature which was inserted in it by Fair-Deal "liberals." But he is opposed to it. Yet he is for going part of the way down the same road—reluctantly, with heart-burnings, in dire soreness of spirit that he should have been brought to this pass, and above all not at all sure himself just how far he is willing to go now or eventually.

What's New?

Insofar as he presents a rationale for his abandonment of the traditional liberal point of view, let alone the socialist, it is contained in the following train of thought:

"The new thing which the Communists have injected into the discussion of civil liberties in America is not their advocacy of force or violence." He makes a reference to Emma Goldman, the anarchists and Thomas Jefferson himself. The invidious might say that this disclaimer is necessary for Thomas because it is difficult for a man to spit upon his whole past and still expect others, or himself, to retain any respect for his present views. Something brand-new must be found:

"The new element which the Communists have injected into the picture is their assertion of a right to the protection of laws which in power they would abolish, a right to do in the American community that which they would punish by slavery or death if they should come to power."

It is not a very good try at finding a brand-new element. In fact, consideration of this question figures implicitly in the same quotation from Jefferson which Thomas included at the beginning of his article. Can an enemy of republican institutions claim the right to use republican institutions? Jefferson asked in effect.

More than that, the American Civil Liberties Union, which is now in a state of "unprecedented confusion" on the question of democratic rights for Stalinists, we are told, has had from its beginning a very clear and very consistent answer to the question which Thomas now poses as new. It was the ACLU which made itself the advocate on the left of the concept that fascists too must be accorded equal democratic rights for their speeches and propaganda, often going so far as to disapprove of mass-picketing and mass demonstrations against their operations by the people, let alone vigorously opposing any governmental interdiction—and those two are not the same thing.

For the rest, the poser which Thomas presents is the very basis for the "totalitarian" joker in the Stalinist constitutions," on which see the article of that title in last week's issue of LABOR ACTION.

Argument from Conspiracy

Thomas continues: "They challenge the community as an organized conspiratorial group under disciplined control of Stalin, the head both of the mighty Soviet Union and of a world-wide movement intent upon achieving universal power over the bodies, minds and souls of men."

Thomas is a loose-thinker and therefore a loose writer, and one cannot be sure whether he thinks that a movement of the character described ("intent upon achieving, etc.") is to be proscribed by law. His words, for example, describe the Catholic Church to a T. In a sense—of course, in a sense which he does not intend—they even describe his own Socialist Party's aims, or that of any movement with broad governmental aims. . . .

But the Stalinists are a "conspiratorial group," he says. Yet, in a quite different place (arguing against the Smith Act), he notes that the CP "to a large extent operates like other political parties," and that "if the FBI is on the job, it must know the people whom it needs to watch. . . ."

Leaving aside what may be Thomas' illusions as to what "job" the FBI is on, exactly, the defender of civil liberties should find it easy to point out that whatever Stalinists, Stalinist groups, or sections of the CP apparatus or personnel are engaged in "conspiracy" on behalf of Russian espionage is a problem for the enforcement of an already existing variety of laws designed to take care of this, and that this is the concern of the government and not of defenders of civil liberty; and to ask why any abandonment of the liberal view is necessary if it is the threat of sabotage, espionage or any like danger that is involved.

Or is Thomas referring to those "conspiratorial" activities of the CP which it resorts to as the result of government persecution? It would be possible to remind Thomas that his own Socialist Party, in the not-far-off days when the witchhunt was unleashed against it following World War I, did not hesitate to defend itself by proper precautions. We do not mention this in order to pretend that Stalinist "conspiracies" are only defense mechanisms against persecution; but because the two are deliberately confused by the McCarran and court prosecutors of the government who seek to make out that the one implies the other. Thomas uses the same broad terms.

Espionage is espionage, sabotage is sabotage, and no change in the liberal or socialist point of view on civil liberties is necessary to take care of the right of a government to punish them. This simple idea can be muddled up, and Thomas does so.

One other "new" element which Thomas addresses: "These Communists are the first dissenting group in

American history to make a virtue of lies and deceit. . . . This is so transparently false and naive, in view of the long American historical record, that to bring it forth as a "new" element justifying an abandonment of liberalism is a pathetic measure of intellectual desperation.

What follows for Thomas? It is not at all clear, except negatively. He plainly repudiates, however, the "clear and present danger" test for the Stalinist "menace," or rather implies that the CP is now a clear and present danger and must be dealt with as such. He gives two pitiful motivations: one is the Communist Party coup in . . . Czechoslovakia, and the other is the Hiss case!

On the first: the U. S. anti-red hysterics in the days of the Palmer raids were based on the same theory—the radicals in this country were a menace because look what they did in Russia. . . . And on the second: Thomas' refusal to distinguish between Stalinist spies and the Stalinist political movement could not be better exemplified. Since Hiss acted as a spy for Russia and Fuchs was arrested, "these things made it forever impossible to say that the Communist menace to our freedom had only an imaginary or at most a theoretical basis."

Jefferson's Mantle

What else follows? He clearly endorses the actions of the trade-union movement, the CIO in the first place we suppose, in bureaucratically ousting the Stalinists. He objects to ousting them from membership, especially where it means the job, but "in some cases, it may be" necessary to bar them constitutionally from office.

"What should believers in the Jeffersonian doctrine of civil liberties do when confronted with these facts? Jefferson himself had acted vigorously enough against Aaron Burr, whom he regarded as a traitor. Would he have expected us to apply his faith in the power of truth in the face not of flamboyantly honest rebels of the older pattern but of a conspiratorial party?"

That Burr's conspiracy was "flamboyantly honest" is news, but in any case this muddling of action against provable treason with action against a movement of political ideas—without any discussion of the distinction—presumes even on Thomas' democratic right to be unprecedentedly confused.

This is not all about the current direction of Thomas' libertarianism, but it is enough.

We must also remember that the same Thomas is one of those who has most indignantly inveighed against the sinister birth of Stalinist totalitarianism in the early days of the Russian revolution, when the new state headed by Lenin and Trotsky had to take firm measures to maintain the regime in the midst of civil war and intervention and against openly declared intents of armed opposition and open sabotage by right-wing socialists and Mensheviks.

We shudder to think of what the revolutionary government would have done in those days if it had been, not under the direction of Marxists like Lenin and Trotsky, but of "liberals" and "socialists" like Thomas!—who is willing to go miles further with not one-thousandth of the reason, and, most important, not in defense of a vast workers' revolution but in defense of a capitalist government!

To return to the point made at the beginning: it is the case of Norman Thomas which shows most clearly that the struggle for socialism as a fighting faith is not only the only road to building a truly democratic society in the world, but is also the only basis on which existing civil liberties can be consistently defended. We are the consistent democrats, because we are not bourgeois democrats.

However, I have no malice against the rank and file of the party's members. I believe my two years in the party were valuable because of the contact with sincere workers for socialism.

For some time, the lengths to which the official leadership has been willing to go to achieve a certain respectability in high labor and liberal circles forced me to re-examine the party's basic program, both the earlier one and the confused one emerging now, as well as my own beliefs.

I find myself in sharp disagreement with all of the principal program, its objectives as defined and the strategy it advocates. In practice the SP today is at best another political reform group that cannot justify its existence and at worst a timid, opportunistic "critical" supporter of imperialism, the labor bureaucracy, state controls without workers' control. The Call testifies to all these charges and many more, because since the so-called "left group" took office the same policies prevail.

Lewis Corey, right-wing even by Social-Democratic Federation standards and Tucker Smith, the SP's own child, use the party's paper to advocate class collaboration in the shop, the mixed econ-

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own labor and socialist library. . . . Write for free book list. And remember: we also supply books of ALL publishers. Get ALL your books from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 W. 14th St. New York 17, N. Y.

"VPERED"

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

For Ukrainian friends, Vpered is a must. Others will find the English page of extreme interest—and can help the movement by subscribing. One dollar for 5 issues. Order through: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Resigns from SP

To the Editor: The SP is today torn with doubts, confusion, and a creeping paralysis in regard to projected activity. This crisis, engendered directly by the national office's position on the war but with stronger historic roots in at least a decade of official compromise with capitalistic elements, political sophistry, juggling with socialist principles, etc., affects both the "right" and "left" groups. Members of both broad tendencies have deserted the SP in increasing numbers during 1949-50. The short SDF-SP honeymoon, the division into "electoral" versus "educational" (Fabian) factions before the 1950 convention, the desertion of the more "left" electoral faction by the opportunist McLevy Connecticut SP organization, and the war position since the Korean war have driven several "rightists" into the ADA-Democratic Liberal crowd (they want an "effective" liberal home) and the "left" either remains passively or joins the ranks of the non-political. Some of the younger elements try to fight, to win the SP for socialist positions, but with less and less enthusiasm. The Call is their biggest embarrassment, not to mention Thomas' speeches and columns. My letter of resignation, sent last November, may reach your SP members and affiliates if you care to publish it.

George R. CLARK

CP Crime

To the Editor: I have been requested to ask you to give publicity to the following event in your paper.

On the morning of November 11, 1950 the economist and high school teacher Alfred Weiland was kidnapped in the West sector of Berlin by the Bolsheviks [The writer means the Stalinists—Ed.] and their stooges, and dragged into the East Zone. At the time he was on his way to the post office. He was dragged into an automobile, despite desperate resistance. The car was last seen a short distance from the zone boundary with men struggling inside it, and the police later found a blood-stained windowpane which had been pressed out of it. Since then every trace of the victim has been lost.

Alfred Weiland was an old socialist and under Hitler had been imprisoned in a concentration camp because of his participation in the resistance movement. He had never been a member of the Communist Party, and in his work always opposed every form of totalitarianism.

This political assault can only be understood by the fact that a man who consciously and consistently fought against totalitarianism is more dangerous to the Stalinists than any capitalist, with whom they have always been ready to form an alliance (as with Hitler).

We are concerned here not only with the methods employed by the Stalinists. It is important to emphasize the fact that honest socialists, who combat every form of totalitarianism and who struggle for the rights of mankind, are regarded and treated as arch-enemies by a movement which carries the name of socialism on its banners and with this propaganda tries to recruit the innocent.

The enclosed leaflet was circulated in Berlin with the aim of mobilizing the masses with the hope that through vigilance the handiwork of the kidnappers may be made more difficult if not stopped altogether.

We appeal to the international solidarity of the working class in this struggle, and to this end we request you to take up this case in your paper.

With socialist greetings, Lieselotte BECK Berlin, Dec. 26

[Following is the leaflet enclosed with the above letter—Ed.]

WHO ARE THE KIDNAPPERS?

All circles of the population condemn with deep revulsion the abduction of the high school teacher Alfred Weiland from Schöneberg into the sector of the Russian tyrants.

How could this crime against humanity have taken place? One thing is at least certain: The kidnapping carried out in broad daylight in true bandit style could only have been possible with help of the SED [East Zone Stalinist party]! This party no longer has the recruiting power of a social idea, and therefore attempts repeatedly to silence inconvenient political opponents through the application of violence. This party which can only stay in power through the barbaric methods of the NKVD and refined election frauds bears the major guilt for the terrorist attack on Weiland.

For years the German bolshevik [Stalinist] party hacks have conducted an infamous slander campaign against Weiland, and now they have succeeded in their plot against him.

The crime of November 11 demonstrates again: The SED is an agent of Russian banditry, has nothing in common with all political groups who fight for democracy and respect for elementary human rights, and has become an enemy of socialism.

Every member of the SED may therefore take note: Whoever justifies, let alone assists, in the preparation of criminal attacks on political opponents must also understand the unavoidable consequences of their actions. At this time it is not possible to lay hands on the organizers of the Russian kidnappings. Thus the justified measures of defense imposed on us can only be directed immediately against their West Berlin stooges.

Those SED members who reject the criminal practices of their unscrupulous leaders as methods of political struggle had better understand that they can no longer remain in this party if their human decency is not to go to the dogs. Every socialist must now make a clear decision. What attitude do you take towards the Russian crime of kidnapping—one way or the other!

German Left Group of International Socialists

To the Editor: I can't agree with the parallel drawn by you in reply to S. Green's letter "On the Withdrawal of Troops from Korea" (Jan. 1 issue).

We fight against the McCarran Law in order to retain civil liberties. This is obvious. Our victory would benefit the labor movement and all the freedom-loving groups. This being the main consideration, regardless of what the Stalinists do we fight for it.

But in the case of the slogan "Withdraw the troops from Korea," who would benefit from the carrying out of the slogan? Even if it be admitted (for the sake of argument) that this "enterprise can only push the Asian people more firmly into the snare of Stalinist demagoguery," what will the withdrawal of troops do? Liberate the people of Asia from the Stalinist demagoguery? I hope it does not need to be proved that the Stalin-Mao combine and all their stooges would benefit. For them a tremendous victory! But how would the labor movement, the free forces of the world, benefit? I can't see it.

As against the withdrawal of troops, I like the slogan of "negotiated peace." However good your intentions, the "withdrawal of troops" slogan would have the practical result of connecting you with the Stalinists. But the slogan of negotiated peace, worked out concretely from a socialist point of view, would impress the masses of Asia, and might act as a ferment for a new movement.

A READER

The "parallel" we drew had to

do specifically with the argument (which "A Reader" himself repeats) that since the Stalinists are also for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Korea, we "connect" ourselves with the Stalinists if we call for it ourselves. But "A Reader" does not mind "connecting" himself with the Stalinists who unfortunately are the most vocal force attacking the McCarran Law since in that case he has a "main consideration" which overrides that fear. We trust he understands that we too have a "main consideration"—our whole position on the war in opposition to both war camps—which dictates that we come out for what we believe regardless of the Stalinist position.

It is therefore in order for him to criticize, if he wishes, our "main consideration"—our position on the war—but to attempt to scare us with the boy of "you will connect yourself with the Stalinists" is a waste of time and a muddling of the issue.

As we pointed out in our reply to Comrade Green on the same futile point, our view on the withdrawal of troops is one plank which is an integral part of a rounded Third Camp policy. It does not follow from our correspondent's total position on the war, which he communicated to us when the Korean war broke out. It does follow from ours. To isolate it from the rounded policy of which it is a part and thus "connect" with the Stalinists would be possible only for one who does not know what we say or wishes to falsify it. Since "A Reader" falls under neither head, we suggest that he permit us to take the same approach to the withdrawal of troops that he takes to the McCarran Law.

Now that Taft and Tito (others will follow shortly, no doubt) are also for withdrawing the troops for their own reasons, we presume we are now "connected" up with the Republican Party, the Yugoslav foreign office as well as the Stalinists. If we were to be swung from our "main consideration" for one moment by our two correspondents' hobgoblin, the working out of a policy would become a very puzzling matter indeed. After all, how is "A Reader" going to feel if Taft, Hoover, the Stalinists or the NAM come out for a "negotiated peace"—as so many Stalinist fellow travelers do right now? No, withdrawal of troops will not "liberate the people of Asia"

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor . . .

from Stalinism, as our correspondent asks quite irrelevantly. He knows, we are sure, that we propose a very definite program to do that. But he admits (for the sake of argument) that the Korean war has pushed and is pushing the Asian people more firmly into the Stalinists' hands. That is enough reason for the U. S. to get out. Naturally, from the point of view of one who thinks that it is war by the U. S. which can "liberate the people of Asia," this does not follow; such a one should then argue his own case and not try to combat a Third Camp policy with bogymen.

The slogan of negotiated peace, right now and in real life, means a proposal for the working out of a horse-trading deal between the present governments. It could not in fact be made to mean anything else no matter what socialistic verbiage went along with it. If the socialist movement were a stronger power in the land, it might be able to link it up with their bid for power. Right now, to work it out "from a socialist point of view" would be a useless literary exercise and, worse, misleading.—Ed.

Korea Was Fingered

To the Editor: One of the advantages in belonging to the radical movement—as opposed to the many obvious disadvantages—is that sometimes you can get a better look at the future.

Let me quote, with a perverse delight—given the seriousness of the international situation, from an article appearing in the March 1947 issue of The New Internationalist called "Korea Under Occupation" by A. Kimbary:

"An evaluation of Russian and American designs upon Korea must take into account the strategic importance of Korea against the background of present political realities. Korea has a common border with Russia, the boundary of which is distressingly close (accessible?) to the key Russian port of Vladivostok. Fusan (Fusan) in South Korea is less than a hundred miles from the Japanese mainland. The eventual conflict, for which Russian and American imperialisms are today preparing, will find Korea in a position of geographical importance. This in itself would tend to focus the attention of the great powers on Korea. . . ."

J. WALKER

Labor's Own Party

The column "Inside Illinois Labor" in the Chicago Sun-Times for December 2 led off with the news that the head of an important CIO local in the area was for a labor party. It wrote:

"Now comes Evron McGreer, president of Local 719, CIO United Auto Workers, with a plea for the establishment of an independent labor party. One of the larger UAW units here, the local represents 10,000 at Electro-Motive Division plants of General Motors Corporation. . . . McGreer's stand is at sharp variance with that of the national CIO, which prefers to support—at least for the present—"progressive forces in the two major parties." And it doesn't altogether jibe with policies of the international union on political action, which generally follows those of the CIO.

"Policies of the CIO Political Action Committee were 'wrong' in the last election, McGreer charged, because PAC had little or nothing to say about the selection of the candidates it backed. "Labor is big enough and ma-

ture enough to stand on its own two feet and it's time that it did," he said.

Biographical Note

As can be seen from the following item in the Hungarian (Budapest) Magyar Nemzet, the satellite Stalinists there know all about the Jolson Story:

"Information has come from America that the celebrated Negro singer Al Jolson has died. Jolson was known and loved as an interpreter of Negro spirituals who, however, once he had attained fame . . . succumbed to the dollar lure of Broadway and became untrue to his part and his race. But American Negroes soon found a greater son of their race who fought against its inhuman, barbaric repression in other fields besides that of art—Paul Robeson." (Quoted in News week.)

They forgot to mention that everybody knows Paul Robeson's real name is Larry Parks, who precipitated the Peekskill riot by singing "Mammy," the famous Negro hymn of praise to Ana Pauker.

They Need Your Help!

Local New York of the Independent Socialist League has been regularly mailing packages of food and clothing to needy workers in Europe. The relief committee has especially urgent need for clean, wearable clothing for children of school age, particularly in the 12-14 age group. Please bring or send your contributions to the city center of the ISL, at 114 West 14 Street, 3rd floor, New York City.

Not in the Headlines

As can be seen from the following item in the Hungarian (Budapest) Magyar Nemzet, the satellite Stalinists there know all about the Jolson Story:

"Information has come from America that the celebrated Negro singer Al Jolson has died. Jolson was known and loved as an interpreter of Negro spirituals who, however, once he had attained fame . . . succumbed to the dollar lure of Broadway and became untrue to his part and his race. But American Negroes soon found a greater son of their race who fought against its inhuman, barbaric repression in other fields besides that of art—Paul Robeson." (Quoted in News week.)

They forgot to mention that everybody knows Paul Robeson's real name is Larry Parks, who precipitated the Peekskill riot by singing "Mammy," the famous Negro hymn of praise to Ana Pauker.

They forgot to mention that everybody knows Paul Robeson's real name is Larry Parks, who precipitated the Peekskill riot by singing "Mammy," the famous Negro hymn of praise to Ana Pauker.

They forgot to mention that everybody knows Paul Robeson's real name is Larry Parks, who precipitated the Peekskill riot by singing "Mammy," the famous Negro hymn of praise to Ana Pauker.

They forgot to mention that everybody knows Paul Robeson's real name is Larry Parks, who precipitated the Peekskill riot by singing "Mammy," the famous Negro hymn of praise to Ana Pauker.

They forgot to mention that everybody knows Paul Robeson's real name is Larry Parks, who precipitated the Peekskill riot by singing "Mammy," the famous Negro hymn of praise to Ana Pauker.

They forgot to mention that everybody knows Paul Robeson's real name is Larry Parks, who precipitated the Peekskill riot by singing "Mammy," the famous Negro hymn of praise to Ana Pauker.

# Truman: Fair Deal Is Dead --

(Continued from page 1)  
territory of that continent—L. G. S.] The Soviet command of the manpower of the free nations of Europe and Asia would confront us with military forces which we could never hope to equal.

"In such a situation, the Soviet Union could impose its demands on the world, without resort to conflict, simply through the preponderance of its economic and military power. The Soviet Union does not have to attack the United States to secure domination of the world. It can achieve its ends by isolating us and swallowing up

all our allies. Therefore, even if we were craven enough to abandon our ideals, it would be disastrous for us to withdraw from the community of free nations."

In a world of imperialist rivalry, the above statement, shorn of its false lumping of all the nations of Africa and Asia together as "free" nations, is fairly accurate. Yet it would be just as accurate if stated by Stalin with regard to the prospects of Russia if all these vast territories with their resources and manpower are mobilized and armed to the teeth by the United States.

Further, it is a fact that Stalin uses exactly the same arguments in his efforts to convince the Russian people and the peoples of the other nations over which Stalinism had extended its totalitarian sway that they must be prepared to make all sacrifices in order to break the power of the United States throughout the rest of the world.

Aside from that, the argument is imperialist to the core. Under a thin moral cover of phrases about "freedom" lies the struggle for resources, manpower and strategic territory. Stalin speaks of "freedom" and "democracy"

and imposes on the peoples as harsh a totalitarianism as the world has known. Truman uses the same words and with them proposes to prop up the colonialism of France, Portugal, Belgium, Spain and Great Britain.

Toward the end of the message, President Truman outlined ten points as the major legislative objectives for this session of Congress. The first three deal with increasing military appropriations, extending the draft, and arming the allies. Their place at the head of the list is significant. Points 4 and 5 deal with extending the government's control over production, prices, wages, rents and agricultural production.

Point 6 reads: "improvement of our labor laws to help provide stable labor-management relations and to make sure that we have steady production in this emergency."

## NO SOFT SOAP

It will be interesting to watch the legislation which will be proposed under point 6. Labor laws could be improved by repealing the Taft-Hartley Act and passing legislation which would free the hands of the unions to bargain effectively with employers. Or they could be "improved" by tying the hands of labor even more firmly, and the last phrase could easily mean that some sort of anti-strike law is now contemplated.

The next three points deal with housing and training of workers for the war industries, training medical personnel, and federal aid to elementary and secondary schools—though from the wording of this point there is good reason to believe that the aid will be cut instead of increased.

Point 10 read: "a major increase in taxes to meet the cost of the defense effort."

The message does not propose immediate total mobilization. The administration is looking forward

to a long pull of constant increase in the militarization of the nation, rather than to a short all-out drive. It appears that the idea is to lay the legislative as well as the industrial groundwork for such a drive. The government is well aware of the fact that to go all-out now might well prove politically disastrous if Stalin should make a turn towards some sort of over-all deal which would keep the cold war dragging along for many years ahead.

It is noteworthy that although the president called for national unity, he did not even make the gestures toward the labor leaders which are customary when trying to get labor to support measures which are bound to reduce the standard of living of the workers. The whole message was directed toward the Republican opposition and toward whatever general sentiment there is in the country for Hoover's ideas.

It is a well-known fact that many of the top labor leaders have been bitterly disappointed at the president's failure to give them any important role in the mobilization program. Yet it appears that Truman is confident that their policy of supporting the Democratic Party has so tied them to his political apron strings that he does not even have to dish out the usual softsoap to keep them in line.

The State of the Union message was a political speech designed to answer the attacks of Hoover and Taft. We will have to wait for the economic report and the budget message before we can get a concrete idea of just how much the common people will be expected to sacrifice this year for the dangerous and, in all probability, futile policy of trying to contain Stalinism by military force which is mounted to keep social relations in the world as they are.

# German Steel Strike --

(Continued from page 1)

ing the right to share not only in decisions concerning wages and welfare, but on problems of production and sales as well. Such decisions are not to rest only with a top union-employer committee, but with the factory councils in each plant. Our closest equivalent to these factory councils are shop steward committees, but factory councils are much broader in scope. They are elected by all workers in the plant, regardless of what union they belong to, or whether they belong to any union.

**WORKERS' CONTROL?**  
Pressed to its full potentiality, co-determination can mean workers' control of production. The overwhelming strike vote for co-determination gives good reason to hope that the workers of Western Germany are resolved to press for such control, regardless of the intentions of their leaders. It certainly demonstrates that the labor movement of Western Germany has now recovered to a great de-

gree from its devastation by fascism and the war, and is moving toward its former position at the head of the working class of Europe.

On the same day in which the American newspapers carried the story on the strike threat in Western Germany, they also reported that the CIO is preparing to send to Europe a three-man committee to advise the trade unions there. Jacob S. Potofsky, chairman of the CIO's international affairs committee, announced that this delegation is to take whatever steps are necessary to build unity and to demonstrate the advantages of the democratic way of life.

It would be a good first step if this committee were to announce its full backing for the West German steel workers' demand for co-determination, and for any strike that still may come out of it. Of course, it is very doubtful that they will do so. In the United States, far from pressing demands for effective workers' control of industry, the labor leaders are endorsing the whole militarization

program of the administration. They are making proposals of their own, but these do not take the form of demands of the labor movement and much less of proposals which would mobilize the workers themselves to take industrial controls into their own hands.

As socialists we welcome the resurgence of the West German labor movement, and hope that the workers will march ahead over all opposition to fill the form of co-determination councils with the content of effective workers' control of industry. This would strike a telling blow against Stalinism throughout Europe, as it would demonstrate that the working class is capable of winning battles on its own behalf, and not only of fighting in the interest of Stalinist or capitalist masters.

It would do much to revive the self-confidence and combativity of the working class throughout Western Europe, which has tended either to fall under the sway of the Stalinists or to sink into apathetic acceptance of support to American capitalism.

## Subscribers — Attention!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

15-3

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

**RENEW NOW!**

The BEST recent book on the labor movement—

## "The UAW and Walter Reuther"

by

Irving Howe and B. J. Widick  
\$3.00 Random House

Order from:

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

## SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER!

Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

- The Permanent Revolution ..... \$3.50
- The Lesson of Spain ..... .25
- Marxism in the U. S. .... .35
- The New Course ..... 1.50
- Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay ..... .25
- Fascism, What It Is, How to Fight It ..... .15

**ALL FOR ONLY \$5.00**

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

# SWP Sees 'Progressive' Monroe Doctrine In Chinese Stalinism's Imperialist Drive

By JAMES M. FENWICK

In the present period the political behavior of the Socialist Workers Party (official Trotskyists) resembles nothing so much as that of an adolescent falling in and out of love. There is the same long period of unawareness of the love object, the same sudden incandescence, and—all too soon, alas—the same disenchantment.

Such was their recent long dismissal of Yugoslavia as a simple capitalist state, the sudden transfiguration of Yugoslavia into a workers' state, and, finally, the almost immediately succeeding chagrin at finding that this workers' state was playing the imperialist game of the United Nations.

If a person could feel that the theoretical wanderings of the SWP were simply a product of duplicity there would be room for hope. But it is impossible to escape the gloomy conclusion that the SWP, having lost its theoretical bearings, has become so confused as to be unable to think its way through almost any aspect of the current political situation without getting itself lost in a maze of contradictions.

This confusion reflects itself in all fields, including one which is a specialty of the SWP—dialectical illuminations of the current world scene in the light of United States history. An exceptionally spongy article by George Lavan in a recent issue of the *Militant*, for example, begins by noting that "Indian diplomats in the UN have stated that China is moving toward the formulation of a Monroe Doctrine for Asia!" and concludes by asserting that such

a doctrine "is completely on the side of progress."

## IDEALIZING MONROE

"If the U. S.," says Lavan, "had the right then [in 1823] to tell the European powers that colonial restoration attempts or empire-carrying adventures in the Western hemisphere meant war, then China today has the right to do the same for Asia."

The first point to be noted is that Lavan idealizes the struggles for national liberation in South America and the relations between South America and the United States which led to the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine. "The people of the U. S.," he says, for example, "remembering with pride their own Revolution for Independence and a Republic, felt a strong bond of solidarity with the new independence fighters to the south." He makes no mention of the economic realities which, without excluding the republican sympathies which animated the United States, underlay the action by President Monroe.

Of this period Edward C. Kirkland in his *A History of American Economic Life* points out: "The United States, enthusiastic at this multiplication of republics, recognized their independence and promulgated the Monroe Doctrine, gestures of friendship and protection accompanied by a healthy interest in the trade of these new nations. Consular agents were at once dispatched, and the negotiations of commercial treaties undertaken."

However, let us assume that the Monroe Doctrine was prompted by all the idealistic consider-

ations which Lavan says it was. Is the Asiatic Monroe Doctrine which he eulogizes a comparable phenomenon?

## TINKERING WITH HISTORY

The Asiatic Monroe Doctrine is, of course, directed against reactionary Western capitalism. But here any similarity ends. It is, in the first instance, a foreign policy whose origins are not Chinese but fundamentally Russian. And Russia is today the most reactionary state in the world. In 1823 young United States capitalism was, in the aggregate, playing a progressive role in world development. Its foreign policy, it should be noted parenthetically, also was its own—not that of a reactionary foreign power.

The Asiatic Monroe Doctrine, is, in the second instance, a product of Chinese Stalinism. Internally this means a totalitarian collectivist regime (in Asian terms) operating for the benefit of a bureaucratic class. Externally it means a policy of Chinese imperialist expansion whose initial stages are already well developed in the case of such Asian countries as Korea, Indo-China, and Tibet. In 1823, it is almost unnecessary to point out, the United States was engaged in no comparable activities.

In any event, current Chinese policy is something more than a simple warning to the capitalist West to get out of Asia. It is plainly the beginning of an attempt to establish Chinese domination over the enormous Asian land mass. Nehru is already beginning to voice such fears. That

the aspirations of the Chinese Stalinists may in the course of this development collide with those of the Russian Stalinists in no wise changes its reactionary character.

All this Lavan finds "completely on the side of progress." Not just "on the side of progress," it should be noted, but "completely on the side of progress." Without, at this moment analyzing the reactionary character of the policy we would like to address just one question to Lavan: If this is true, just what independent role does orthodox Trotskyism have to play in the Orient? We venture the answer: NONE!

By his somewhat casual tinkering with historical analogies Lavan has once more, if unexpectedly, proved that the SWP's acceptance of the nationalization of the means of production as the basic criterion of a workers' state (degenerated or not) constantly places it in the position of whitewashing Stalinism and national forms of Stalinism such as is represented by Titoism and Chinese Stalinism.

"Today," says Lavan, "a revolutionary wave is sweeping the Orient." We suggest that Lavan could well take another fier into historical research using that assertion as a starting point. As an elemental step of clarification he could begin by comparing Trotsky's analysis in *Problems of the Chinese Revolution* as to what constitutes a revolutionary wave with what is going on now in China. We have our differences with Trotsky on the colonial question but on the matter at hand we stand with him against Lavan.