

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 12, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**CZECH PURGE: GOTTWALD NEXT?**  
... page 3

**ACTU Cries 'Marxism' in UAW**  
... page 4

**Universal Military Training — for War**  
... page 3

**GIVE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE!**  
... page 2

## An Open Letter to Dean Acheson: THE MARINE CORPORAL IS RIGHT!

Sir:

You have seen fit to make public your letter to Mr. Clarence E. Moullette, his letter to you about the views of his son Marine Corporal John Moullette, and the letter of the son to the father. It may not, then, be considered inappropriate if I write a letter to you on the same subject of foreign policy and if I too make it public.

Frankly, I would rather address myself to Corporal Moullette. It is his letter which says what millions of others are thinking and saying, and your reply as much as acknowledges it.

But I must refrain, as you know, from discussing with John Moullette. Your police and prosecutors have made it clear that they regard it as "subversive" for a socialist to talk about peace and freedom to an American soldier who has been called upon "to take up again the defense of freedom," as you say; while it is regarded as the highest patriotism to talk to him about renouncing his future and laying down his young life in a war "we were tricked into," a "needless waste of life in Korea, on both sides [which], is shameful to the human race," as the marine says. So you will understand why I address myself not to him but to you.

### Generalities Are Not Enough

You consider it important that the marine feel, "and that all our young people feel, a strong faith in the validity and the reality of the ideals on which this country was founded and on which it now endeavors to guide its actions." So far as the letter of John Moullette reveals, he does not lack faith in the ideals of peace and freedom which you proclaim. It is you and your administration he has no faith in.

If you had planned it deliberately, you could hardly have undermined his faith in you more surely than you have in the past few years. Your letter does nothing to restore it. Corporal Moullette makes specific charges and proposals, and asks specific questions. You reply in eloquent generalities.

The soldier is not speaking for himself but for his comrades, "not one or two, but the majority." He is telling his father—and you—what has long ceased to be a secret: "The morale of the fighting man is very low." Did you expect it to be otherwise? Do you expect to change it by repeating the generalities he has already heard a thousand times from Washington? Do you think that saying it just once more will really change the views which millions share with these soldiers, who "aren't afraid to fight, it's just that they have no cause to fight!"

### No Faith in—YOU

They have no faith in you, in your administration, in the management of the fate of the country you were chosen to preside over, because they believe, to quote again the strong and righteous words of the soldier, "we were tricked into this."

What do you say in your letter to alter his convictions? What can you say? It was you yourself, Mr. Secretary, who announced to Corporal Moullette and the rest of the world a year ago last January that Korea did not lie within the sphere of defense interests of the United States gov-

By  
**MAX SHACHTMAN**

On Sunday, March 4, the press carried the unusual documents discussed in the accompanying Open Letter to Dean Acheson. A corporal in the U. S. marines fighting in Korea, John Moullette, had written a letter to his father, in which the soldier gave voice to the bitterness which (as so many correspondents have testified) has been increasingly welling up in the minds of the men as they ask themselves: "What are we fighting for?" Moullette's father wrote to Secretary of State Acheson requesting aid in answering his son. He got it from the highest quarter: Acheson himself. The State Department, presumably considering Acheson's reply of propaganda value, made the whole correspondence public. —Ed.

ernment. Nobody then contradicted your statement, and nobody who heard you then has forgotten it.

It was the President himself who, a few months afterward, announced, in order to justify his purely personal decision to send troops to Korea, that only a "police action" was involved. Nobody who heard him then has forgotten it.

### Let The People Decide

Now, even every child and above all the soldiers themselves know that the United States is engaged in a full-scale war in Korea and has been from the very first day. Only the Administration spokesmen try to maintain the pretense that it is not a war. "The leaders (including Truman) are afraid to admit they are wrong and are ashamed to admit it for fear they will lose face." The marine knows why you maintain the pretense, you see.

Your letter ignores the matter which outrages the people. It speaks instead of fighting and preparing to fight for "the principles of freedom and justice." Even if that is what you are doing—and I deny it in full—do you think you can get the people to fight for such exalted principles by trickery and deception?

The people are tired of that, not only here but everywhere else. They feel that their wishes, their opinions, are being circumvented and thwarted. Their feelings, so authentically voiced by John Moullette, are all too justified.

They feel that even the Congress—your own Congress—is being circumvented and thwarted. "I thought that only Congress could declare war," writes the marine corporal bitterly. That is what he was taught in school. Now he sees how war can be declared by presidential dictum alone, and can be continued in the face of wide-



spread unpopularity not only among the people of this country but even among the Congressmen.

You are a champion of popular sovereignty, Mr. Secretary, are you not? Take an official poll of the American people on their will with regard to the war in Korea so that we may all see whether it is you or Corporal Moullette who speaks for the majority!

I know you will not take or sponsor such a poll. A French statesman once said that war is too serious a business to entrust to the decision of generals. Do you believe that war is too important a business to entrust to the decision of the people? Do you believe that the question of war or peace is best left in the hands of the government authorities and its "military experts"?

### The War Was Futile

Why should any sane person agree to let the power to decide this question rest in the hands of those who have made such disastrous contributions to the state in which this and all other countries find themselves today? What are their qualifications for the exercise of this power—the whole government staff, the Democratic administration and the Republican opposition, military chiefs and diplomats, including yourself, Mr. Secretary? What is the record of recent times, according to your own letter?

You write: "For our country, and for most of us as individuals, the period which has passed since V-E and V-J Days has been one of cruel disappointment, slowly forming resolution, and, finally, great determination and effort. The high hopes, for which great sacrifices were made during the war, did not come to ready fruition."

(Continued on page 8)

## The ISL Fund Drive Starts Rolling — GIVE!

Auto Workers

# Storm Signals Up for Reuther

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, March 4—Now that the United Auto Workers (CIO) has been allowed the "wooden nickel" raise under its escalator clauses, covering nearly 700,000 auto workers, the likelihood that Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, may eventually take a major job in the war-mobilization program has increased.

Although any such action before the UAW convention in April is not probable, it is being worked on for a later date. One of Detroit's ablest Washington correspondents, Blair Moody, wrote the following in today's Detroit News:

"Wilson once offered the Detroit labor leader a job as vice-chairman of the War Production Board when he headed WPB in World War II. He said that Reuther would be his first choice as labor advisor in the present situation, but he doubted the UAW president would accept it.

"Reuther, it is known, would accept only if he has full authority to fight for a much stiffer program from the inside without anyone resenting it.

"This may happen yet," said Charles S. Murphy, the president's counsel, discussing a "Wilson-Reuther" solution for the current dispute."

Such a move on Reuther's part would greatly increase the bitterness and deep dissatisfaction in the shops. A UAW estimate that the cost-of-living index may hit 195 by July indicates how quickly the present nickel raise will disappear and how much more the auto workers are going to be agitated in the coming months.

Without the influence and restraining hand of Reuther, the latent factional frictions may erupt far more sharply, and a new and different period develop in the UAW. Already some of

the top leaders are jockeying around carefully for the throne, when the king is away.

### STORM SIGNAL

Ford Local 600 of the UAW voted 23,000 to 8,000, approximately, against any dues increase, in a secret rank-and-file referendum. Carl Stellato, incumbent president who is assured of election in a runoff, won only 39 out of the 78 delegates to the forthcoming convention. And at Dodge Local 3, the opposition, while losing the election of officers, won 15 out of 32 delegate spots for the convention.

This suggests that there will be more floor opposition to the Reuther leadership than earlier reports indicated. Of course, no major opposition to Reuther's regime exists, but the convention will be quite turbulent on many issues.

Even Emil Mazey's own local union delegation from Briggs 212 have publicly stated they are against a dues increase. They ran on that program during the recent elections. And everyone in Detroit is asking, "If Mazey's local is against a dues increase, who is for it?"

In that area at least, there seems to be no sentiment for it. Chrysler Local 7's 18 delegates are also publicly pledged to fight against a dues increase. Ditto for Dodge 3, Hudson's delegation, Local 155 and Plymouth Local 51.

### MUTED FIGHT

A bitter behind-the-scenes fight is raging in the Democratic Party in Michigan over the question of whom Governor Williams will appoint as senator to replace the very sick Senator Vandenberg, whose days seem numbered.

The Michigan CIO Council and many UAW politicians are strongly

# We S-T-R-E-T-C-H Dollars... YOU Send Them In!

By L. G. SMITH

The financial operation of the Independent Socialist League constitutes one of the greater miracles of our time. Its complexities and inter-relationships would tax the capacities of one of our more highly developed mechanical brains.

Of course, one aspect of our financing is completely simple and clear: the source of our income. Every penny we get comes from the members and friends of the ISL in donations, from the readers of LABOR ACTION and The New Internationalist in subscriptions, and from the purchasers of our books and pamphlets.

But once the money comes in, each dollar is squeezed, shifted, passed back and forth, stretched, expanded, and multiplied.

The wages of our staff are turned into fixed capital, and as often as not our functionaries are paid with the bills which we receive with admirable regularity from our creditors. Our printer maintains that we have mistaken him for a banker, and that in any event the federal government's restrictions on loan capital prohibit him from extending further credit to us.

The post office claims that it is contrary to regulations to accept old LABOR ACTIONS in lieu of postage, and the Treasury Department can find no clause in the laws which permits payment of taxes in promissory notes.

### ISL MATH: ONE EQUALS FIVE

The Keynesian economists claim that every dollar spent by the government has a "multiplier effect" in the economy, creating at least double its own value in purchasing power. Of course, this modest expansion is due to the inefficiency of capitalism.

In the ISL, every dollar which comes in is made to do the work of four or five dollars.

If it didn't we would have perished from fiduciary atrophy a long time ago.

It is said that the operations of some of the noted financiers of our time, like Ponzi, Insull and Kreuger, became so involved that even

these giants could no longer remember or understand the total ramifications of their enterprises. But as it must to all men, the day came even for them when promissory notes, bank loans, and other obligations became payable in such volume and with such simultaneity that it was no longer possible to keep from the world the fact that they were bankrupt.

For the ISL, that day will never come. After a fund drive, things get tougher and more complicated month by month. The pressure builds up, the juggling takes on a brisker pace. Whatever the state of affairs may be, LABOR ACTION comes out every week and The New Internationalist within its allotted time. More and more time is spent in devising emergency measures. But relief is always in sight.

### CREDITORS AT THE DOOR

Unlike Ponzi and his peers, we are not cheating people. We know that our financial base, though narrow for our superstructure, is sound and solid. We know that before our operations become too expanded to be sustained, the FUND DRIVE will come... and our friends will come through.

And it is not only we who know this. Our creditors, from years of experience, know it too. That is the reason, above all others, why they are willing, grumblingly and sometimes irately to be sure, to put up with our delayed payments.

We are confident that this fund drive will put us back on a currently solid foundation, as the drives of the past have done. However, we know that inflation and the political atmosphere in the country are going to make the achievement of the drive's goal no easy matter. Every friend of the ISL should take this into account, and make his or her contribution more generous than in the past.

We in the office will juggle the dollars all next year, as we have done in the past. It is up to our friends now in the drive, to give us a lot of dollars to juggle.

ly urging the selection of George Edwards, prominent ADAer and former UAW official. This suggestion is rejected by Paul Weber, Governor Williams' secretary, and former ACTU leader in Detroit. He is backed by many UAW politicians who are working with conservative Democrats. They want a "regular Democrat" appointed.

Walter Reuther, as usual, has kept silent on the issue.

## Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Per Cent
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$12,500</b>	<b>\$1279.00</b>	<b>10.2</b>
Boston	50	\$ 25.00	50
Oakland	650	146.00	22.5
Chicago	1800	475.00	20.6
New York City	4200	677.50	16.1
Soc. Youth League	500	55.00	11
Cleveland	300	31.50	10.5
Newark	300	15.00	5
Akron	100	0	0
Baltimore	50	0	0
Buffalo	850	0	0
Connecticut	50	0	0
Detroit	800	0	0
Indiana	100	0	0
Los Angeles	550	0	0
Minnesota	10	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Philadelphia	450	0	0
Pittsburgh	150	0	0
Reading	100	0	0
St. Louis	50	0	0
Seattle	300	0	0
Streator	25	0	0
Youngstown	100	0	0
General	975	0	0

### CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

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

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1951 Fund Drive.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

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

(Make checks payable to Independent Socialist League or Albert Gates.)

Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Help Support Independent Socialism!

### ISL FUND DRIVE

# FIRST RETURNS ROLLING IN

By ALBERT GATES, Fund Drive Director

The Independent Socialist League's organizational and press Fund Drive of 1951, opened officially on March 1, is well on its way. Although it is too early for responses from the country as a whole to roll in, several branches of the ISL have already stolen a march on others by sending in the first money collected, without waiting for larger sums.

Boston tops the list in the first week of the drive by sending in one half of its quota of \$50 or 25 per cent of the goal. From Oakland we received a first installment of \$146 or 22.5 per cent of its quota.

Those who recall the excellent

showing made by the Socialist Youth League in the 1950 campaign will not be surprised to see that even before its units have had the opportunity to plan their own local drives, the Chicago SYL has sent in \$55 as its initial payment. That gives the SYL 11 per cent of its goal. This challenges all other units of the Youth organization.

We have already been advised by other branches that we can expect to hear from them with substantial payments in the next weeks. All we can say is: GET GOING!

Just in case any of you readers and sympathizers think this drive is confined to the ISL, we are taking this opportunity of inviting you to participate. We need your help—all the help we can get. Join in with us to put our fund drive over the top.

Now, let's hear from Detroit, Buffalo, Los Angeles, Philadelphia—and all other branches! Your task is to get in the scoring column. If you want to make a race of it, send in substantial sums on your quotas!

The box score for the end of the first week is elsewhere on this page.

Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

# Universal Military Training Being Put Over On People as Part of Drive to War

By MARY BELL

The public controversy over the 18-year-old draft and "The Great Debate" on the sending of troops to Europe have completely overshadowed another issue that in its way is of far greater significance. This issue is the virtually guaranteed enactment of legislation which, while it has been proposed innumerable times in the past and has always failed of passage, will soon make universal military training the law of the land. In the past the great force of American tradition has withstood recurrent proposals of this kind. American national origins, which reacted against the European feudal past, accounted for the general repugnance toward such measures.

### Universal military training in the United States!

Whether it begins at 18, 18½ or 19 is of secondary moment. Every male youth may now look forward to the inescapable compulsory "active military service" for two years plus four months of "basic military training." Then, according to bills currently being debated, all young males will belong to the reserve for a period of six years during which time they may be called to active duty immediately. For a total of eight years, they would either be in uniform or required at any moment to put one on.

Actually the Universal Military Service and Training bill under consideration by the House Armed Service Committee and on the floor of the Senate, with strong bipartisan support, goes further than conscription for military service. It would "provide a continuing flow of personnel to fill the military AND CIVILIAN needs of the nation." (Our emphasis.)

### CLASS DISTINCTION

As the publication of the railway unions Labor, writes: "The bill also gives the brass hats power to conscript your boy as a private, or 'select' him for training as an officer, in college, at West Point, Annapolis, or otherwise.

"Can anyone doubt what would happen? Many boys with rich and influential fathers would go to college and become officers or 'students'—while poor boys without influential parents would be conscripted and have to serve as privates."

"That's what always happens under militarism. Millions of men who served in the last war fought about the 'cellphone commissions' which were given to sons of the rich and influential, to make them officers and keep them in safe spots."

Today, with the first peacetime draft in this country now more than five years old, with the feverish preparation for War III beginning at the end of War II, with no peace in sight; with no mass political movement with a program for peace, UMST is being slipped across. The human, humane and humanitarian ideals of peace which all mankind needs, become submerged, stifled and devious.

There have been sideline controversies every step of the way on the draft. Who shall be deferred? Students, industrial workers, farm labor, professional persons? The 18-year-olds have become the strongest focus of argument. We have no doubt from the letters swelling congressional mailbags and the comments made publicly how the parents of to-be-conscripted youth feel. They're opposed to it.

Major General Lewis B. Hershey, director of Selective Service, reflected the complete lack of voluntary sentiment and patriotic fervor when he recently remarked: "What I have to do is to figure out how to raise an armed force of 3,500,000 without taking anybody." (N. Y. Times, Feb. 25.)

This aspect is not so much Prussian or Russian as American. There is a correspondence between American culture, its high-pressure, get-ahead-quick ethic, and its army. USMT is being "packaged" and "sold" to the American people by modern advertising, radio jingles, movie-star tie-ins, colored neon lights and promotion.

Such is the back-handed tribute paid to the basic hatred of militarism and the prospects of a meaningless death on the part of today's youth.

### "PREPAREDNESS" FIGHT

Underlying "The Great Debate," the controversy between the isolationist remnants of the Republicans on the one side and the Democrats and the Dewey-Eisenhower wing of the Republicans on the other, over presidential powers in the dispatch of U. S. troops abroad, is at the grass roots level on opposition and fear of war. It has been conceded by some important political spokesmen that if an election were held today, Truman, as the leading spokesman for the "internationalists," could not win. If this is true, it is so for the reason that there exists the widespread primitive opposition to war which is identified with "foreign entanglements."

And there is no other important means for the expression of this primitive hostility.

The crowning argument and

the crowning tribute to the unvoiced and grass-roots opposition to universal military training is the same one that is offered for every step towards war. It is all designed, says its supporters, for peace. Mobilization is for peace, stockpiles of munitions are for peace, atom bombs are for peace, cutting down of consumer goods is for peace—and universal military training is for peace, too. "If our side is strong," runs this argument, "then the enemy will not be so quick to strike. If we build up our armed forces, our stockpiles of weapons, introduce universal military service, we help preserve the peace and postpone the war. Peace—through preparedness."

But it is precisely the preparedness of the "enemy"—the existence of big standing armies, production geared to all-out mobilization—that produces the move towards preparedness in one's own country. This striking logical contradiction lies at the bases of all arms races. In the current international disputes between the U. S. and its Western allies and the Russians and their satellites, the Western leaders argue for their own rearmament, the strengthening of the Atlantic defenses and the rearmament of Germany because of the existence of vast armaments of Russia. They call for a "cease" of international arms to prove their case, namely that their mobilization

and militarization is simply a counter-strategy to that of the East. The Russians argue similarly.

In some respects, the situation is the same as holds in all armaments races preceding all wars. The introduction of UMST into the U. S. is a signal that the trend toward total war, begun in World War II, has become reinforced. Whereas the Prussian system was a holdover from feudalism at the daybreak of the capitalist era, and the Russian the result of a new totalitarian society, the introduction of universal service in the U. S. in the twilight of an epoch is more like the first pall of night.

Plain and simple opposition to universal peacetime conscription is laudable. It betokens an awareness of the reactionary trends and an opposition to these trends within our social order. But opposition to conscription is not enough. It does not go to the root of the problem of the war that threatens, the war between the old and the new exploiting systems: Capitalism and Stalinism.

The connection between militarism and the nature of the social order, and between anti-militarism and the necessity of a new, non-exploitive, peaceful society of socialism, must be understood in order to make the good fight.

# Is Gottwald Next to Go?

By JAN CERNY

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is undergoing a drastic bloodletting. Key to the purge is last week's statement by Czech President and CP (official) head Klement Gottwald that "Czechoslovakia would not be a second Yugoslavia."

Actually two purges are going on at once, one in the Czech half of the country, or more particularly in the Moravia region, and the other in Slovakia.

Most prominent victim of the purge thus far is Gottwald's old friend and ally, ex-Foreign Minister Vladimir Clementis. Clementis, a Slovak Stalinist since before the war, is known to have been bitter about the Stalin-Hitler Pact and even about Russia's recent waning of Germany. Further, during the war, he fled to Paris and then London, not to Moscow. He is, accordingly, accused of having been a "French spy" for years.

Along with Clementis into disgrace, prison and eventually the hangman's noose go several Slovak CP leaders and members of the Slovak government. Chief among these are Gustav Husek, former chairman of the Slovak Council of Commissars, and the poet Laco Novomesky, former commissar for education. They are accused of leading a conspiracy to struggle for Slovak independence—of course "in collaboration with Western imperialism."

### GOTTWALD'S ALLY

The purge in the other half of Czechoslovakia has hit a whole series of regional party leaders, accused of plotting a Tito-style break with Moscow and of "plotting to assassinate President Gottwald." These people include Otto Sling, secretary of the Brno district of the CP; Viteslav Fuks, secretary of the Ostrava mining region; and Hanus Lomsky, secretary of the Pilsen district. Also involved and arrested are Marie Svernova, member of the top Politburo and widow of Jan Sverna, outstanding wartime resistance hero, and Mrs. Kuzena Du-

bova, organizational secretariat member for Brno.

Mrs. Svernova, who was deputy secretary-general of the Czechoslovak CP, was expelled from her posts and from the CP at a meeting of the central committee. She was ordered out of the meeting and into the arms of the secret police who were waiting to drag her off to prison.

The arrest of Clementis had been expected for quite a while. The ex-foreign minister, who took over that post when his predecessor Jan Masaryk "went" out of a window of the Czermin Palace to his death three years ago, was an ally of Gottwald in the fierce fight within the Czech Stalinist movement between the latter and the group led by Prime Minister Antonin Zapotocky, who is also trade-union boss.

The Gottwald group, including Clementis, was the so-called "soft" group, favoring the use of smoother measures to take over the country as opposed to the more roughshod Zapotocky. The scrap went so far that before the Stalinist coup in 1948 each faction even had its own puppet fraction within the Social-Democratic Party. Gottwald had former Ambassador and Vice-Premier Zdenek Fierlinger, while Zapotocky had as his key man, Minister of Social Welfare Evzen Erban.

### "TROTSKYIST PLOT"

The outlook is not too good for Gottwald. He, who has never been known for strength of character, was made to deliver the public denunciation of his former friends as "traitors and conspirators." The statement that the victim's death indicates a good chance that the president may soon follow Bulgarian Prime Minister Dimitrov on a trip for his health to Russia, a trip from which he too might well return only for his state funeral.

The only sad feature of such an event for the Czech people will be that they will have to find a new target for the excellent and

irrepressible jokes now floating all over the country about the bovine Mrs. Gottwaldova.

Last year a whole series of arrests removed from the scene a number of people who were, or were suspected of being, in some way connected with Clementis.

Among those arrested was Clementis' press attaché Klinger, accused of having been a Trotskyist. Another who was arrested—and hung—on that charge was the historian and former editor of the Czech CP paper Rude Pravo, Kalandra. (Actually, the so-called "Trotskyist" movement in Czechoslovakia was Trotskyist only in the most elastic sense of the word, since they disagreed very strongly with the official Trotskyist position—particularly that part of it which regards Russia as some kind of a "workers' state.")

In fact, although some attempt may be made to create another Stalinist amalgam ("Titoist-Trotskyist-imperialist" plot, via Klinger and Kalandra, neither of them were members of whatever even partly Trotskyist group existed at the time. Klinger years ago gave up every vestige of independent thinking and integrity and crawled back into the Stalinist officialdom on his belly. He even went out of his way to be nasty to his former friends, though that of course did not save him when a victim was needed. As to Kalandra, tired and somewhat broken by the Nazis' treatment, he had long given up any active political role, and though he knew what awaited him, was not up to the effort of jumping the frontier.

One favorable result of these latest purges is the undoubted effect on the surprising number of people in Europe who enter, or stay in, the Stalinist movement while knowing it to be corrupt and wrong, because they feel that only that way can they influence the course of events in their country. These purges show that such people will not only be unable to exert any influence, but they will not even be permitted to stay alive.

# 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 and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

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

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

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

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

### 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

### NEW SEATTLE SYL SHOWS ITS METTLE

SEATTLE, Feb. 25—Climaxing a four-day visit to the Seattle area, Bob Martinson of the Berkeley (Calif.) Socialist Youth League and author of *Cold War on the Campus* assisted in formally inaugurating a University of Washington unit of the SYL.

During his visit, Martinson spoke to a group of students and friends on Friday, February 23, at Independence Hall on "Youth Against War." He pointed out the necessity for the youth of the United States to organize to oppose the coming war. Painting a word picture of the nature of American capitalism and Russian Stalinism, he stated that the only hope for youth and humanity was the democratic fight for and the establishment of socialism.

On Sunday, February 25, Martinson spoke to a forum sponsored by the Church of the People, a non-sectarian group headed by Fred W. Shorter. His Subject: "Spotlight on the Campus." Reviewing the fight against the loyalty oath on the University of California campus and pointing out how the same pattern is taking its toll on other campuses throughout the U. S., he showed that the fight against this threat to civil liberties can be initiated only through a thorough understanding of capitalism and Stalinism. Only through this understanding can the youth and the people as a whole be organized to defeat the drive toward war. He showed that the attack on academic freedom and suppression of civil liberties is a part of the current drive toward the third world war.

Also assisting Martinson and the Seattle Socialist youth were several students from the campus at Berkeley.

### The Taming of the Disrupters

The meeting on Friday mentioned above also saw an interesting episode. The SYL, effectively using both argumentation and defense preparations, successfully protected the meeting from disruption by a group of students advocating the "mailed fist," as Martinson spoke on the war question.

After speaking for approximately 15 minutes, the speaker was rudely interrupted by the noisy entrance into the hall of eight students obviously sent to break up the meeting with physical violence if necessary. Sensing the mood of the disrupters, which Martinson felt to be anti-Stalinist, he showed the role of the Stalinists in the world today; getting the newcomers to agree with him on this point he went on to show that the only solution to the world problem was the fight for socialism and the Third Camp position.

While Martinson was using argument, other members of the SYL took pictures of the group of would-be disrupters and placed a tape recorder in full view so that all could see that the proceedings were being made a matter of record.

Seeing that this was a democratic meeting and that if they wished they could have the floor to speak, this group stayed and asked questions of the speaker and other members of the SYL as to the role of the socialists and how we proposed to change society.

Some members of this group stayed and helped clean up the hall.

### Get Acquainted!

#### SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

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

- I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.
- I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME .....  
ADDRESS .....  
CITY ..... ZONE ..... STATE .....  
SCHOOL (IF STUDENT) .....

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
Vol. 15, No. 11 March 12, 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.

### BOOKS and Ideas

## Evolution: Social and Biological

THE MEANING OF EVOLUTION, a Study of the History of Life and Its Significance for Man, by George Gaylord Simpson. Yale University Press, 1950, 348 pages, \$3.75.

By FRANK HARPER

There are two types of evolution: the old natural (organic, biological) and the new (societal). The new evolution is the history of the community of man. Professor Simpson does not let his readers forget these two distinct types—related but distinct. He contrasts their differences and compares their common aspects both very interestingly and very well.

"The new evolution is itself the result of organic evolution, but it is something essentially different in kind. Although it is semantically correct and scientifically enlightening to call both 'evolution,' it is extremely important to recognize that the difference in kind makes this in large part an analogy and not a straight equivalence. . . . it is invalid and indeed dangerous to assume that equivalent evolutionary principles operate throughout the two and that principles discovered, regarding one may forthwith be applied to interpretation of the other. Since we know much more about organic evolution than about societal evolution, this fallacious sort of transfer is usually attempted from the field of biology to that of sociology. . . . The confusion of analogy and equivalence between the old evolution and the new lies at the root of the

difficulty of that search and of some of the downright vicious outgrowths."

If other writers took equal pains to separate organic evolution and societal evolution, we would have no more muddledheaded schemes for organizing human society to imitate that of the ants or the vultures.

The theory of evolution has had quite an evolution of its own since the days of Charles Darwin. The "synthetic theory" which Simpson, together with many other paleontologists, geneticists, and biologists, holds today, borrows heavily from the Darwinians and the mutationists.

In continued sexual reproduction through the generations, new combinations of genes and chromosomes produce new variants in organisms. But basic new types can arise only through mutations—the production of new sorts of gene and chromosome sets. Mutations are entirely random; they have no evident relationship to the adaptive status, needs, or general way of life of the organism involved. Natural selection is today not described in terms of "the struggle for existence" and "survival of the fittest" but rather as a process of differential reproduction. Those mutations which are favorable "will tend under the influence of selection to spread through the population increasingly in successive generations."

In holding to the materialist (causalist) theory of evolution outlined above, Simpson rejects vitalism (a living driving force) and the finalism (progression toward a goal or end).

# LABOR SCOPE

## ACTU Raises Cry of 'Marxism' In Attack on Auto Union Militants

By BEN HALL

About six months ago, LABOR ACTION reported the bitter reply of the Michigan CIO to the attacks of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists upon Reutherites and other militants in the UAW. For some time now, behind-the-scenes jockeying and maneuvering has seen the ACTU pitted against the more radical wing of the Reuther administration and lining up with the conservative sections.

A frank admission of the trend toward a conservative ACTU coalition is expressed in the December 12 issue of the *Labor Leader*, bimonthly publication of the ACTU in New York City.

An editorial in this issue entitled "Those 'Mild' Marxists" aims at giving guidance to "the materialistic-minded business unionist," the old-fashioned labor leader who focuses his attention only on the humdrum tedium of narrow routine, oblivious of the rush of social and political events. These naive souls, the editor writes, have "in all probability never read a book—or even a pamphlet—on Marx's theories" and are easily duped by a "non-

Communist 'parlor-pink' Marxist."

These non-Communist, pink Marxists (we emphasize that the reference is not to Stalinists), the ACTU editor warns, are boring into the labor movement, placing their supporters in positions of strategic importance in the union movement. And what's worse, they are infiltrating into "various government labor departments"; they sneak into decisive advisory positions as Marshall Plan aides, as State Department labor advisers, labor information press agents, "etc." "This informal 'pushing,'" we read, "takes place within and without the labor movement."

### FLANK ATTACK

Who are these "Marxists"—pink "Marxists," that is? The number of anti-Stalinists who are really Marxists is reduced to a very tiny band inside and outside of the union movement. This is a regrettably annoying but indisputably true fact. Whom then does ACTU see lurking in every hidden corner? It is obvious that the term "Marxist" has become for the ACTU a pseudonym for the Fair-Dealish, mili-

tant pro-Reuther wing of the labor movement who fit ACTU's description down to the last fine line. ACTU intends to fight it with side attacks on "Marxism."

And against this more militant wing of the labor movement ACTU hopes to form an alliance with conservative union officials. "Even a business unionist," the *Labor Leader* editorial concludes, "might be preferred in the role of representative as the lesser of two evils." This merging together of ACTU and business unionism to fight "Reutherism" will explain many apparently causeless conflicts among the anti-Stalinist labor officialdom.

### 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.

### Get ALL your books

from Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.  
We can supply you!

### NEW YORK

#### For Your Calendar:

#### SPRING SOCIAL & DANCE

Saturday evening, March 17

Dancing, Refreshments, and a gala evening, all under the pretense of anticipating the arrival of Spring by four days.

#### Labor Action Hall

114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

# NAACP Warns: We Won't Bargain With South on Jim Crow Schools!

By KATE LEONARD

Immediately after the last convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People last June, the association held a strategy conference in New York City. First importance was given to the organization's campaign against segregation in education.

Thurgood Marshall, special counsel for the NAACP, in reporting this meeting to the press, made two significant statements which throw light upon the Atlanta and Clarendon County cases which were discussed in last week's LABOR ACTION. The N. Y. Times (June 28) reported Marshall as saying: "We are going to insist on non-segregation in American public education from top to bottom—from law school to kindergarten."

The Pittsburgh Courier of July 8, quoting Marshall somewhat more fully, reporting that he stressed that all educational suits were to be aimed "at obtaining education on a non-segregated basis and that no relief other than that will be acceptable as such."

The NAACP in this manner was making an advance announcement that it planned to extend its campaign against segregation in education to include legal action involving lower-school education in the South. It seems to us, that in addition to this preview of next steps in the campaign, Marshall's talk revealed what the organization is up against in these suits, and gave some inkling of the outcome anticipated by the NAACP.

The NAACP is to be commended for this reiteration of its

stated and traditional opposition to segregation in any form, made at a time and around a problem where such opposition will be effective and telling. The Atlanta and Clarendon County cases do more than state this opposition once again. That they place before the federal courts the issue of the legality of segregation in the elementary schools of the South places the whole campaign and the whole battle on a higher plane.

This will remain true regardless of the outcome of these particular cases. The NAACP, in attacking the separated school system of the South, has touched near the hub of the white-supremacy system.

Moreover, the association gives forewarning—to those whom the shoe fits—that neither the NAACP nor its clients, Negro children and their parents, are in a bargaining mood on this issue: "No relief other than non-segregated schools will be acceptable as such." The NAACP rules out in advance participation in compromising this issue. The ground they have taken is unassailable, and full credit goes to them.

### "Equalization" Suits Won't Do It

One of the excellent things about these new cases is that they begin with an urgent, pressing, and immediate problem—the crying need for better schools for Negro children—and link this with principled opposition to segregation. This is both fitting and proper, since it is in segregation that the problem both begins and thrives. The cases are planned on solid ground.

It would probably have been easier for the NAACP to have brought yet another, or another dozen "equalization" suits, but this would not have resulted in very many more pencils, books, labs and gyms or teachers; nor would this have even posed for the public and the nation the problem involved. Throughout the South during the last years and today innumerable equalization suits have been brought with highly unsatisfactory results.

### "It Is Time for a Showdown . . ."

Georgia is as good a state as any to illustrate that, for 1951. Almost simultaneously with the Atlanta suit, Negro parents in Irwin County filed an equalization suit. Their brief charges that repeated petitions for improvement have been ignored. Among the conditions against which they ask injunction are the following: (1) The county operates 7 modern white schools and 17 antiquated Negro schools. Eleven of the Negro schools are one-teacher schools; 3 are two-teacher schools. Five are located in Negro churches and others are held in Negro lodge halls.

(2) The value of the white schools is \$344,723. The value of the Negro schools is \$13,175. (3) There are 5 books for each white child and less than two-thirds of a book for each Negro child.

(4) White schools average 175 teaching days; Negro schools 143 days.

Likewise without exhausting Georgia, it is possible to show out of the mouths of its prom-

inent citizens just who is ready to bargain—or to use a more appropriate word, to haggle: "You can't give them [Negroes] equal facilities in one year, or even five or ten. With some counties having 70 per cent Negro population, to build enough school houses would 'bust' the county and the state, too." The Southern states are poor, but nevertheless my grandmother would comment, "My, doesn't Governor Talmadge have a poor mouth!"

Nor is this all. Here is Roy V. Harris, Talmadge stalwart, announcing that he would oppose the financing of Georgia's proposed minimum foundation program for education "until we have an understanding with the Negroes."

"Why should we be willing to pay \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000 every year to destroy the white race of Georgia? The time has come to have an understanding with the Negroes. The time has come to know what their attitude is and what their attitude will be in the future. This should

be determined before the minimum foundation program is financed. It is time for a showdown. If the Negro is not willing to live with us under the traditions of the people of the South and under the pattern of segregation, then we should change our plan for levying millions of dollars of taxes to be used as an instrumentality for destroying everything on earth the white man holds sacred in race relations."

The governors of the two states in which these cases are brought have fundamentally the same attitude. What differences there have been in their utterances might be explained in part by saying that Governor Byrnes seems not to be running for anything, while Governor Talmadge hankers to be the next U. S. senator from Georgia. Governor Byrnes remarked: "We will find a lawful way of educating all of South Carolina's children, and at the same time provide separate schools for the races." He also added that what the Reconstruction governments could not do, politicians in Washington and Negro agitators in South Carolina cannot do today.

### Talmadge Proposes a Dodge

Governor Talmadge, with a cavalier lack of respect for the sovereignty of his "sovereign" state of Georgia, introduced a constitutional amendment designed to preserve racial segregation by turning all Georgia schools and the university system over to private individuals if the need arises. This is so patently unconstitutional that the Georgia legislature thought they would play safe by also voting that all common school funds will be withheld in the event a Negro is admitted to any one or more schools, and that all college and university funds will be stopped if any unit within the university system admits a Negro.

This is also patently unconstitutional, but it may enable Talmadge to run for the Senate on the platform: "Well, boys, it didn't happen while I was governor—not in kindergarten and not in law school." In the last analysis all of this means that, faced with the threat

of a Supreme Court decision similar to the Sweatt ruling, South Carolina and Georgia, and of course the whole South, will proceed a little faster to improve the Negro schools.

We do not believe that the NAACP, in bringing these cases, anticipated a favorable decision on the segregation aspects of the suits at this time. The probability of this happening is of course not zero—in that case the suits could not have been brought. But it is highly unlikely.

In recent cases involving higher education, the NAACP succeeded in securing a widening of the interpretation of the "substantially equal" conditions which must prevail for segregated schools to be permissible. It is obviously hoped that this will have its bearing in these lower-school cases, where facilities are not equal by any stretching of the word, but admittedly unequal.

### Long War of Attrition?

However, it is more probable that this condition will provide just the legal loophole needed for the avoidance of a decision on the segregation aspects of the suits. Also, while it is remembered that in 1950 in the Henderson case—a travel case—the U. S. government filed a brief for the first time taking the position that the Constitution itself outlawed all forms of segregation, this brief was not acted upon, but the case decided favorably on another basis.

The details of the decision cannot be known in advance. The cases can be buried between courts. In a lower court, or in the Supreme Court if either or both of the cases reach it, Georgia and South Carolina may be ordered to improve, or to make sub-

stantially equal, or to proceed to "equalize" Negro schools, under the hoary legal principle that the courts, especially the Supreme Court, do not decide the constitutional validity of questions which "are not necessarily presented and need not be determined to expedite the case."

Any of the alternatives given above—that the states involved might be ordered to improve, make substantially equal, or proceed to "equalize" the Negro schools—calls forth visions of long litigation in this war of attrition of government officials against Negro children and youth. It is good to know that "no relief other than non-segregated schools will be acceptable as such."

## The FIGHT for SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00 Cloth-bound \$2.00  
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS  
114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION A Dissenting View on the War Question

The Choice Is Between U. S.-UN or Stalinism

By E. R. McKINNEY

The following piece is a condensation of a much longer article which I wrote in the middle of January but which was too long for publication in LABOR ACTION. This will explain the sketchy treatment given the questions with which the article deals—E. R. McK.

The Third World War has begun. The first phase is being carried on today in Korea by the armed forces of the UN and the armed forces of Russian China. The so-called "police action" of the U. S. was ended when the army of Stalinist China entered Korea. This entry of China into Korea followed on the formal Stalinization of that country and its addition to the new Russian Empire. One difference between the present Stalinist empire and old-fashioned imperialism is that the Russian "colonies" are contiguous to the "mother country" and make possible a closely knit group which can enclose itself not only for defense and offense, but such contiguity promotes political integration, particularly by facilitating the work of the Stalinist propaganda machine and the GPU.

This geographically and politically integrated Russian imperialism is of the first importance in understanding what is going on. Stalin pursued a similar policy in China to that of other countries in giving birth to another "peoples' democracy." Here was a relatively large Chinese Communist Party, a most corrupt and inefficient native government and millions of miserable human beings with a standard of living so low that any political change whatsoever would be welcomed. The Stalinists could also use, with telling effect, the bloody imperialist record of the Western nations in China. And too they do not doubt have some notions about "Asia for the Asians." The Kremlin can be counted on to whip up the more reactionary aspects of this position.

The Chinese did not undertake the Korean adventure themselves. They are there at the initiative of the Russian bureaucracy, under its direction and in the imperialist interests of the Russian bureaucracy. China is an integral part of a Stalinist empire and there is no significant difference between Moscow's use of Chinese or Czech or Rumanian or native Russian troops. To argue differently because of certain formal considerations like the formal independence or juridical and national separateness of China is a failure to understand Stalinist imperialism and how it functions.

No Neutrals

The pattern of the Third World War is a new pattern. Stalin will fight to the last Chinese, Czech, Pole, Rumanian, and perhaps Indian. And later, to the last Russian. Any cessation of the Korean fighting can only be a lull or truce. If the UN is run out, the following period will be only a thin breathing spell in which rearmament goes forward as never before. They will then resume the Third World War, which will continue until the U. S. or Russia is vanquished.

The most suspicious aspect of the whole war situation today was the reaction of the European governments and Nehru to Truman's facts-of-life remark about the atom bomb. According to these statements, particularly Attlee and Nehru, the bomb should not be used because that would start World War Three. They and others were for withdrawing and barricading themselves in Europe. It is pertinent to ask, however: "How about the white man's burden in Asia?" Or do Attlee and the other European statesmen have in mind to confine the "white man's burden" to Africa in the future?

Attlee and the rest don't seem to know that the Russians are in Europe. What is to hinder Stalin from organizing a European army of invasion? What would be so difficult about transporting hundreds of thousands of Chinese into Europe for conquest? That is, after these statesmen with the jitters and the itching palm have abandoned the "white man's burden in Asia."

The reality of the situation exposes Nehru's alleged independence or neutrality. He ought to know that there will be no neutrals except those who are prone or prostrate. I am not primarily concerned at this point with the question as to whether or not the U. S. "is hated in Asia." I add, however, that it has been a truism since the days of the Roman Empire that colonial and oppressed nations have never had any love for their oppressors.

Which Chopping-Block?

If the statesmen of Europe and India don't know what time it is, or what manner of political force they are contending with, it is imperative that the masses of Europe and the rest of the world rub the sleep from their eyes and look at the clock. I say that Europe and the rest of the world will line up under a UN dominated by the U. S. or it will capitulate to Stalin. It's just that simple. A million words of analysis, if based on any earthly reality, cannot say anything which adds anything significant to that one sentence.

I hope that the peoples of the world will rouse themselves so that they will at least have a hint as to which chopping-block they are likely to find their necks on. They might want to have some say whether to die in a Stalinist totalitarian concentration camp, a Truman "garrison state," or an Attlee brand of bureaucratic state.

The Asians, including India, have three roads: Join with the UN dominated by the U. S.; go over peacefully to Stalin; or be included in the Stalinist empire by force. This, all means that the struggle will go on by military means. The only substitute for armed force is capitulation to Stalin. Or are there those who think that Stalin will capitulate? He can't. Totalitarianism and bourgeois democracy can no more live together in peace for long, than could socialism and bourgeois democracy. And that is the nature of the conflict that is taking place today. The differences between the two systems are profound and significant. It is imperative that this distinction be made by Marxists. It is a tragedy today that revolutionary socialists leave this emphasis to be made by the bourgeoisie.

I am against the demand for the withdrawal of U. S. troops from Korea. I am impressed by the fact that NOBODY demands the withdrawal of the U. S. troops when they are advancing. I hear no demand now for withdrawal. In the larger article, I wrote that I was "and remain opposed to all the foreign invaders in Korea. But to advance the demand that they get out while the battle is raging is, it seems to me, a little bit silly. I don't know who will be able to hear the demand above the din of battle. Also it seems to me that to demand the withdrawal of an army, even an imperialist army, right at the moment it is being chased, is not using good judgment. An army is not all imperialist generals nor is it merely the personification of imperialist aims and objectives. It is composed of human beings from back home who have friends, relatives and fellow-workers in the mines, mills, factories and offices."

It was said a while back that the U. S. was brought up short in its intended use of the atom bomb by "peace" sentiment and by some kind of "third camp" headed by Attlee and Nehru. But it is queer that this "peace" sentiment did not make itself heard at the time the UN troops were making their victorious march to the north in Korea. And where is this "peace" sentiment today? And what is the relationship between opposition to use of the atom bomb and the question of war? Is it all right to be for the war but against using the atom bomb? It's all right to use liquid fire against the Chinese. Certainly, since the Chinese or Russians cannot throw liquid fire in return all the way to London, Paris, Washington or New York. They might sneak in with an atom bomb, however.

Attitude on A-Bomb

The attitude of the masses against use of the atom bomb bordered on the reactionary. At least it was not a progressive objective. As for Attlee and Nehru, their objections were those of the common garden variety of "statesman." The basis of the objection to the use of the atom bomb is not even humanitarian: it is rather that "if we use it, Russia will too." If Russia did not have the bomb the "peace" demand would be to use the bomb, get the war over in the interests of peace and to save lives. At the time the atom bomb was used to destroy thousands of non-combatant Japanese I remember no complaints from the "masses" or from Attlee or Nehru or from any of the great new crop of lovers of peace.

The attitude of the Asians toward the UN and the U. S. has most progressive features. These are well known and do not need elaboration. What needs to be discussed is the reactionary aspect of some Asian thinking. The Asian masses have not been nurtured in any kind of democracy. There is some very reactionary economic thinking in some Asian areas. Many of the Asian leaders are no more friendly to democracy than is Stalin. In fact, Russian totalitarianism might be more attractive to many of them than capitalist democracy with its mass organizations, mass strikes, mass education of sorts, the existence of wages and a standard of living above starvation level. These masses have decisions made for them by leaders, some of whom are of the stripe of Chiang Kai-shek.

The attitude of the masses against use of the atom bomb bordered on the reactionary. At least it was not a progressive objective. As for Attlee and Nehru, their objections were those of the common garden variety of "statesman." The basis of the objection to the use of the atom bomb is not even humanitarian: it is rather that "if we use it, Russia will too." If Russia did not have the bomb the "peace" demand would be to use the bomb, get the war over in the interests of peace and to save lives. At the time the atom bomb was used to destroy thousands of non-combatant Japanese I remember no complaints from the "masses" or from Attlee or Nehru or from any of the great new crop of lovers of peace.

No Workers' Third Camp

In view of the real situation in Asia and in the world I submit that the Asians can do worse than to cast their lot with the UN nations, that is with bourgeois democracy: they can cast their lot with Stalinist Russia. I say again they will have to choose one or the other. We will not add much light if we proclaim that they did this because they hated the U. S. or because capitalism is imperialist or because capitalism "can't fight Stalinism." Here again is a brute fact: the only people who can give anything tangible to the Asian masses, or any other masses, are the bourgeois-democratic nations or Stalinist Russia. I say nothing tangible because I have my doubts that the Bolshevik Party for example could ever have won the peasants by periodic reminders that "the Mensheviks and the SRs cannot fight kulakism."

There is no "third camp" in the working-class sense. There are Attlee, Nehru and their kind who can only drone "Cease fire," "Don't cross the 38th parallel," "Don't use the atom bomb." This third camp at the proper moment will be calling just as loud for the atom bomb as they are now against its use.

Right now the UN (U. S.) is engaging in a military struggle for the defeat of what is called some "Chinese Communists." It seems reasonable to predict that should the UN nations be successful in this undertaking, totalitarianism will not be set up in the U. S. and other UN countries where it does not now exist. To propagate any other view is implicitly reactionary. It smacks of the position that bourgeois democracy has degenerated to such degree that it and totalitarianism are "twins."

The military defeat of Russia will not guarantee that the U. S. will not go totalitarian. But this consummation is not even on the horizon today. The great pity of the present is that there is no force to go against Stalinism except bourgeois-democratic imperialism. This is a fact and no amount of childish prediction about "police states" and "garrison states" in the U. S. will wean the

working class away from support of Washington. The working class knows that labor is not equipped or organized to oppose Stalinism. Out of their experience in the class struggle they know that Stalinism cannot be defeated in the office of the union's newspaper.

If the present allegiance of the masses to their own imperialists continues, accompanied by the present impotence of revolutionary socialism, Stalinism will surely take over the world unless stopped by the UN nations in military combat. At the moment there are two alternatives: Stalinist totalitarianism or bourgeois-democratic imperialism. Who will deny this? Let him step forward and be heard. This means the forced labor camp tomorrow or the trials and tribulations of existence in a capitalist world that may later develop its own brand of Stalinism. The only group which can guarantee that this will not happen is the proletariat. Right now the working class cannot give that guarantee. The lead would have to be taken by the working class in the U. S. Our working class is politically unorganized and without working-class political leadership.

Bourgeois democracy can defeat Stalinism politically. This is what a military defeat of Russia by the UN would mean. What else could it mean? Unless someone says that bourgeois democracy cannot defeat Russia of Stalinism, that it would be transformed into something else in the course of the struggle. I say that the only way for the UN to defeat Russia and Stalinism is by becoming more bourgeois-democratic. If the defeat of Russia does not result in the extension of bourgeois democracy, that is capitalist democracy, then what will be the political result—fascism?

Need a Breathing Spell

Capitalism has not reached its ninth month yet. I am glad that this, I am glad that in the U. S. we are not about to witness the birth of a political and social monster. This is a breathing spell. The working class needs a breathing spell. We had one warning, the Hitler interlude; but the proletariat did not grasp that event. Now Stalin is giving another warning. What is happening in Washington and Paris and China and Africa is also a warning. I refuse to underestimate the value of this breathing spell or to relegate it to the comic pages.

The masses, including the proletariat, are correct in what they are talking about when they say, "democracy . . . is better than Stalinism." It is excellent that they have this attitude relative to totalitarianism. Unless revolutionary socialism starts exactly at this point with the masses, we will have no opportunity to contribute to the political education of the masses. We must stand with the masses in their struggle for democracy. How can they fight for Marxian workers' democracy when they have no knowledge at all about this really recondit notion?

As the worker fights for bourgeois democracy we must explain to him, in all manner of ways, that the capitalist ruling class has no absolute interest even in bourgeois democracy. We must seek to win the proletariat away from Washington by explaining that the working class cannot guarantee for the nation the continuation of bourgeois democracy. The reasons for this are known to every politically educated person.

The greatest tragedy of this epoch, as Trotsky wrote over a decade ago, is the lack of a proletarian leadership that can organize and lead the working class in a socialist direction. This is the chief danger in the world—not Stalin or Truman or Attlee, but the fact that the working class has no political leadership except the capitalist politician and his labor lieutenants.

I said that capitalism had not reached its ninth month. Revolutionists should be busy using this period for drawing closer to the proletariat to aid them in their struggle for democracy and to show the workers how to seize on every democratic gesture of the bourgeoisie, to fight for its adoption, to give it greater working-class content. This is not being done at present, despite the fact that this way is the only way to train the masses politically and give them a socialist orientation. We must do this or somebody might get the idea that we are people who believe that "after the police state we come."

Read

The NEW INTERNATIONAL

'FORUM'

Discussion and Information Bulletin of the Independent Socialist League

A new issue dated March 1950 is now out with the following contents:

Summing Up the Discussion on the Korean Statement, by Susan Green.

The New Labor Action, by R. Fahan and Henry Judd.

Discussion on the War Question, by Henry Coleman and Mary Bell.

The Cleveland Workers Defense Council.

On the Abner Campaign—a report and editorial reply.

Copies are 15 cents • Order from ISL,

114 West 14 Street, New York City

THE INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST VIEW A Reply to E. R. McKinney

There Is a Third Road: Against the War!

By LARRY O'CONNOR

Comrade McKinney believes that World War III has started. He places this belief at the center of his whole analysis. From it he seems to derive the conclusion that there is no time in which to work for a major political reorientation of the workers of Europe and the United States and the peoples of Asia toward a third-camp position, or at least that any such reorientation must take place within a context of military and political support of capitalist imperialism against Stalinism.

It is true that Comrade McKinney nowhere in his article states directly that the masses of the peoples everywhere should give political and military support to the United States in the struggle for the world. But he says a number of times that they have only two alternatives: either to join the UN-U. S. camp or to line up peacefully with Stalin or be conquered by him.

He finds "suspect" and condemns the passionate anti-war feeling of the masses which was reflected in the frantic efforts of Attlee to restrain the impetuosity of the American government in the Korean war and in Nehru's effort to find a road to a negotiated settlement of that war.

The war has begun, he seems to be saying, and there is no time for shilly-shallying about . . . the masses should find out what time it is, and line up with the lesser evil of bourgeois democracy against Stalinist totalitarianism . . . the Asians may hate American imperialism, but they had better realize that this is the only force which stands between them and conquest by Stalin.

The whole of Comrade McKinney's article is permeated with the idea that the struggle against Stalinism can only be won by a military victory of the United Nations dominated by the United States; politics plays its role, but now that the war has started, this role is definitely a subordinate one. As a matter of fact, the role of politics is mentioned only once and even this mention serves to emphasize the point: "Bourgeois democracy can defeat Stalinism politically. This is what a military defeat of Russia by the UN would mean."

The People Want a 3rd Road

This assertion is very interesting. The Korean experience would certainly not seem to bear it out.

It is pretty well agreed by all competent observers that a military victory of the UN of the U. S. forces in Korea cannot possibly mean a victory for bourgeois democracy in that country. As a matter of fact, the lack of a political appeal which could succeed among the masses of Korea and China has given this war its particularly horrible aspect on the U. S.-UN side of a purely technological-military struggle which is most brutally expressed in the official designation of the present UN offensive as "Operation Homicide." The bombed, dynamited and napalmed towns and villages of that unhappy country will hardly be the seed beds of bourgeois democracy.

When we cast our eyes across the whole expanse of Asia, it appears that the peoples of that continent do not share Comrade McKinney's conviction that THE Third World War has started and that for them the choice is between bourgeois democracy and Stalinism. They want democracy, but they also want an end to what "bourgeois democracy" has meant for them. It has meant, aside from imperialist domination, feudal-Asiatic land-owning relationships, tax burdens, and very little democracy.

This means that for them the choice between Stalinism and "bourgeois democracy"—more accurately, the insufferable status quo—is not nearly as simple as it seems to be for Comrade McKinney. This is, of course,

the chief reason for the existence of widespread Stalinist illusions among the masses. It is the reason for the failure of pro-American propaganda and, by the same token, for the fact that among these masses the encroachments of Stalinist ideology can be combated most effectively by proposing to them a struggle for democracy, both political and economic, which must be directed both against Stalinism and against the U. S.-supported status quo.

But, Comrade McKinney seems to be saying, why kid ourselves or others about the possibility of such a struggle? "The only people who can give anything tangible to the Asian masses, or any other masses, are the bourgeois-democratic nations or Stalinist Russia. . . . The great pity of the present is that there is no force to go against Stalinism except bourgeois-democratic imperialism."

It is true that there is no organized force with a clear ideology which shows a practical effect in organizing the masses or giving them "something tangible." But what contribution can be made toward bringing such a force into being by politicians who start out by committing themselves to the military and political support of American capitalism? Who, in effect, state that the development of the military situation is such that support to one side must be a starting point for all rational politics?

Stalinism and Bourgeois Democracy

That this is, in fact, the position put forward in Comrade McKinney's article is highlighted by his discussion of the atom bomb and the political reaction to it.

He denounces much more by fear of retaliation than by humanitarian considerations. This may very well be true, and in any event is not too important. But the interesting thing about McKinney's discussion is that at no point does he indicate what his attitude is toward the use of the A-bomb against Stalinist China.

Would it be correct to conclude that, since for him World War III is in full swing, the use or non-use of the A-bomb has only military-technical significance, and should be judged on the basis of its contribution to the military victory of "bourgeois democracy" over Stalinism?

LABOR ACTION and spokesmen for the Independent Socialist League considered the intervention of Attlee on the A-bomb (which meant in reality on an attempt to keep the Korean war localized) as a reflection of the anti-war sentiment of the masses. We saw in this sentiment an expression of some abstract philosophy of pacifism, but rather a clear sign that they have not committed themselves to irrevocable support of one side in the war for the world. For us this means that there is still a basis for realistic hope that these masses—the masses behind Attlee and Nehru, no matter what these gentlemen themselves do—can be won for a third-camp position, for a struggle for democracy for themselves rather than a struggle for the military victory of one side in the imperialist struggle.

Comrade McKinney spends much space in describing the superiority of bourgeois democracy over Stalinism, and in insisting that there is no reason to believe that World War III will mean the end to democracy in the capitalist nations. In fact, he seems to be carried away by this thought when he states that "the only way for the UN to defeat Russia and Stalinism is by becoming more bourgeois-democratic."

We have made clear before this—in the 1948 ISL resolution, for example—that bourgeois democracy is preferable to Stalinism (or fascism), that it is indeed the "lesser evil," if the question is limited to a choice be-

tween these two alone. (The whole point of our anti-war position is precisely that it is suicidal to base our politics on this lesser evil.) And we do not contend that fascism is around the corner in the U. S. Nor do we assuredly predict that some form of bureaucratic totalitarianism in the U. S. will inevitably be imposed in the U. S. in World War III. There is no need to break in the open door.

But everything happening in the real world indicates that the tendency of the capitalist world is toward less democracy, and that war will accentuate this tendency. And it is precisely because of this tendency that we are convinced that if the fight against Stalinism is left under the control of the American capitalist class and its satellites, the net result is bound to be less democracy in the world . . . and much less in the way of economic resources on the basis of which democracy of any kind can be maintained or developed in the future.

This brings us to Comrade McKinney's last point: his program for Marxist socialists. First, it is only fair to point out that in discussing this point he confines himself to what should be done in the United States. This is worth mention only because in his whole previous discussion Comrade McKinney gives the impression that in the rest of the world the masses might as well confine themselves to supporting their only defender against Stalinism: the U. S.-dominated UN.

No Program for Defeat

In the U. S., he states, we must explain to the workers that the capitalist class "has no absolute interest even in bourgeois democracy. We must seek to win the proletariat away from Washington by explaining that the working class cannot guarantee for the nation the continuation of bourgeois democracy." Further, we should use the breathing spell given us by the military defense of bourgeois democracy to draw closer to the masses "and to show the workers how to seize on every democratic gesture of the bourgeoisie, to fight for its adoption, to give it greater working-class content."

This is a very modest program indeed. If we take it at face value, we should not even tell the American workers that throughout the world the American ruling class is supporting capitalism, with or without democracy, and that this policy dooms the American workers to carry the burden of the fight against Stalinism with a minimum of popular support in the rest of the world. In the United States, with its powerfully organized labor movement, we are not to urge the workers to put forward a program of their own for a complete, radical democracy regardless of its effect on the bourgeoisie, but are to confine ourselves to urging them to seize on the "democratic gestures" of the bourgeoisie in their own interests.

What Comrade McKinney is proposing is a program which might be proper for an utterly defeated and demoralized working class in the United States, and for the masses in Europe and Asia if they had lost all historical initiative and had no prospect of regaining it now or in the foreseeable future.

Bad as the world situation is from the standpoint of the organized socialist movement, we do not think that the third camp has disappeared as a force which has the present power to restrain the warmongers on both sides of the world conflict, and the potential power to strike decisive blows in its own interest. To claim that it does not exist, and to devise a program adequate for a world in which it does not exist, is to contribute not to its development but to its demoralization. That is hardly the proper function of the independent socialist movement.

CP's Fur Union: Fake Militancy & Wage Cuts

The New York Fur Workers Union is just about one of the solidest possessions which the Communist Party in this country still enjoys, as far as we know.

And any militants who react against the sins of their leaders by getting sympathetic to the Stalinists ought to know something about that union. They'll stand up and be counted for militancy—but not at the side of the CP.

The Stalinists' "militancy" is a fake. It's turned on like a faucet when they want to control a union. When they control it, it produces only a fine spray of eye-wash.

The February issue of the United Automobile Worker publishes a facsimile of the front

page of the Furriers' union publication announcing a "wage pact for 1951." From this one learns that in the past two years—during which time workers in other well-organized industries like auto, steel and rubber have been winning increases, and during which time the cost of living has been rocketing up—the Stalinist leadership of the Furriers sold the membership on one cut in wages of up to 11 per cent and agreed to a contract that would have permitted a second cut in January of this year.

Which is why the "wage pact for 1951" hit the Furriers' front page. It was a "victory" for the union. The well-known Stalinists who head the union, International President Ben Gold and New York head Irving Potash, convinced the bosses not to impose a second cut. They also got another "achievement": the right to reopen negotiations in the course of the year.

And what is the Stalinist re-

action to union militants who want to fight for a raise, when they bring out a deal like this? Their paper writes, in the best traditions of their GPU educators:

"Only a small group of stool-pigeons were disappointed [when the members voted for the deal]. These characters who have been sending unsigned and slanderous leaflets to some of our members, have been hoping and wishing to provoke a strike at all costs. They figure that a strike would give them the opportunity to do their dirty work for the bosses. The wage settlement was a blow to their plans. A couple of these stool-pigeons spoke against approving the wage settlement. . . ."

The United Automobile Worker reminds us further:

"This action of the Fur Workers' leadership is the same kind of leadership exhibited by Communist Party liner Harry Bridges, who tied the wages of certain of his members to the price of raw sugar. It is the same as that

The Standard Biographical Work—

"KARL MARX"

by Franz Mehring

British edition, cloth-bound—\$3.00—while they last

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street

New York 11, N. Y.

By LEON TROTSKY

Marxism in the United States

35 Cents . . . . . Order from Independent Socialist Press 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

# An Open Letter to Dean Acheson: THE MARINE CORPORAL IS RIGHT!

(Continued from page 1)

If it was for these high hopes that this country was taken into the Second World War, and if it ended without these hopes being realized, the only conclusion possible is that all the blood spilled, the suffering endured and the wealth destroyed went for nothing. The problem of peace and freedom remains unresolved; the high hopes remain unfulfilled; the Second World War was futile. It is you who say it. Do you expect that to encourage confidence in you and yours?

You admit that the aspiration for world peace was not realized, even though "we came very close" to it. "However, as it became clear that the rulers of the Soviet Union not only were not interested in cooperating with us, but were challenging the survival of our free institutions, and the independence of all nations, we have been obliged to build up our strength again, all of us. . . . It has fallen to us—to your son's generation and to ours—to take up again the defense of freedom against the challenge of tyranny."

## "Shameful" to Humanity

The memory of the people is notoriously short, but not so short as to forget that you and your colleagues and predecessors in office wrote and said virtually the same words only a few years ago, in 1940 and 1941. In those days too, you begged the Corporal Moullettes and the rest of the people to have a "strong faith," for you had to lead them through fields of blood and destruction never before known, because it "became clear" that "we have been called to build up our strength again . . . to take up again the defense of freedom against the challenge of tyranny." You took up the challenge, but it appears that you made a miscalculation somewhere, an error.

Little matter! You are ready to try all over again. You are ready, but the people are not—not your way and not under your leadership. They are antagonistic, or suspicious, or doubtful, or at best perplexed. Why shouldn't they be? You and those like you led them into the Second World War which, you tell them now, did not solve a single one of the fundamental problems—above all the problem of peace and freedom—which, they were assured just as eloquently and solemnly then, the war and the American victory would solve. It is you who say it—not in 1939 and 1941, when we said it, but today, in 1951. Is that your warrant for confidence and support?

You and those like you have led and are now keeping this country in a dreadful war in Korea, which is as futile as it is reactionary. You do not understand it or you refuse to, but Marine Moullette does understand when he writes that "The needless waste of life in Korea, on both sides, is shameful to the human race. Fighting won't settle anything."

## What Have You Offered?

What does it matter who "wins" the war in Korea now, if indeed either of the two invaders, you or the Stalinists, can ever win it? I know very well what the Stalinists offer Korea and her people: the yoke of totalitarian slavery, the role of helpless pawn in the international struggle for imperialist power.

But what have you offered? First, the detestable regime of Syngman Rhee, killer of the aspirations of his own people. Now, a war symbolized by the sadistic horror of "Operation Killer," which is turning every field and mountainside of Korea into a cemetery and every town and village into a burning ruin. What does the war or its outcome matter now to the martyred Korean people, whose land and homes and industry and sons and families you have so callously helped destroy?

You reply to the marine, who is sick at the futility of the war you are conducting, by saying that Korea "has already proved a great deal." "By standing firm against aggression in Korea, we are doing our best to prevent the world from following the road which led us, twice in recent times, to world war."

One thing is true: Korea is the best you can show. That "best" is a small-scale anticipation of the bloody world chaos, the pointless and hopeless chaos, that is in store for all of us. Corporal Moullette is only one of the countless millions who feel and fear that, and there is no comfort, not an iota of it, to be drawn from your ringing and hollow phrases about peace and freedom and justice.

## Why Are We Fighting?

That is not because I cherish these ideals less than you. It is not because I do not think they are imperiled by dangers of all sorts. Stalinism is not the least or the least important of these dangers. I think I know what it represents and signifies. I do not want to see it in power over the slave empire it rules today, part of which you handed over to the Kremlin before "it became clear." I do not want to see its power extended to other lands and other peoples.

I am a socialist, which means I love freedom as much as I hate injustice. I am not a pacifist, which means I am ready to fight against injustice with every means appropriate to my ideals and principles. I am no less ready to fight against the Stalinist despotism today as I have been for the past quarter of a century.

But it is not enough for me to know whom I am fighting against; I must know whom I am fighting with. Not enough to know what I am fighting against; I must also know what I am fighting for. I must know why I am fighting so that I may also know how to fight. Corporal Moullette writes

about his comrades that "These men aren't afraid to fight, it's just that they have no cause to fight." They are not the only ones.

All you know and understand about Stalinism, Mr. Secretary, is summed up in your statement that the peace and security of the people is now threatened "because some distant and shadowy figures in the Kremlin, controlling millions of people far from them, are setting out to make impossible such lives as they have every right and hope to have. . . ." You regard yourself a Christian.

## It Is Not Witchcraft

You must be one of the very earliest types who believed in witchcraft and evil spirits that can be banished by flames, much as you are doing with "Operation Killer." There is nothing distant and shadowy about Stalinism. It is a mystery to you for the same reason that some things are always mysterious: you do not understand it. I venture to add that you cannot and will not understand it—without ceasing to be what you are and where you are.

Stalinism is no more the product of an evil spirit than it is a conspiracy of evil men. It is a profoundly important social phenomenon and, for those capable of learning, the most instructive one of the twentieth century.

That is the century of the death of capitalism, which you represent and defend, the century which shows more and more plainly and painfully that your social system has outlived its historical usefulness and progressiveness and is now an obstacle to social progress, an infinite source of social empoisonment.

For all the apparent wealth and power of this country, you, Mr. Secretary, are one of the representatives of a decaying social order. Progress, and the realization of all those noble ideals you proclaim—these are now attainable only by means of that full achievement of democracy which is socialism.

## Why Stalinism Thrives

For reasons which will not interest you, the working class of the world has, thus far, not yet accomplished its task of establishing its control over society and solving its problems on a socialist basis. But that failure coincides with an increasing inability of capitalism, inherent and ever more sharply marked, to solve the problems of society on a capitalist basis.

I repeat: you cannot even resolve the social problems on a capitalist basis, you can less and less establish that capitalist stability which the world once knew. That is true all over the capitalist world, and it is different in the United States only in so far as it is less visible or obvious.

That is the reason for the continued decay of society today, one of the most outstanding of the signs and proofs being your monstrously destructive wars which lead to no social advancement but only to more monstrous and more futile wars.

And Stalinism? That is precisely one of the products of the decay of your social order, your capitalism, when the working class fails to take its destiny out of your hands and into its own!

Because Stalinism "solves" the social problems that capitalism cannot solve. It "solves" them in its own way, to be sure. Its "solution" is the new totalitarian barbarism it represents and establishes. Its solution agonizes society with a hundred new and no less oppressive problems. Anti-socialist to its marrow, it subjects the working classes to the cruelest exploitation and terror in history, which is why I am its irreconcilable enemy. But it does crush capitalism.

Above all, it thrives on all the iniquities of capitalism, on its increasing social and political helplessness upon its rot and disintegration. It is your social order that has whelped and nurtured this foul beast, Mr. Secretary!

## Look at Your Allies!

That is why you cannot and will not understand it. That is why you will not be able to give the marine corporal a "cause" to fight for—not him and not the tens of millions throughout the world who are summoning to your banner. That is why you lash out blindly against the "mystery" of Stalinism with a policy of purely military force which is the unfulfilling hallmark of your reactionary political policy.

Yes, reactionary! You, the New Dealer, the Fair Dealer, have a fundamentally reactionary political policy. The only policy you have—not the fine one you talk about from time to time but do no more than talk about, but the one you actually have—to combat the Stalinist barbarism is military power built up by uniting with reaction throughout the world.

Do you think it an accident that your closest allies in the world are the certified bearers of reaction? How is it that your only friend in China is Chiang Kai-shek, whom your own State Department's White Paper excoriated so incisively not so long ago? And in Korea, Chiang's replica, Rhee? And in Europe, the Vatican and the German, French, Italian, Portuguese, Belgian and now the Spanish parties of the Vatican—the parties of clerical obscurantism and demagoguery?

How is it that even though Britain and India are your allies, you do not have the support of the British or Indian people who are saturated with a democratic spirit but are suspicious if not antagonistic to your government? How

is it that you cannot count as your supporters a single democratic people's movement anywhere in the world?

You cannot understand all this, because the only "cause" you have to offer them is the defense of a social order which has brought the peoples of the world such unspeakable wretchedness and suffering, two world wars, and now the threat of a third. They do not want to take up its defense. They are finished with it.

It is not true, as the bigoted American chauvinists say, that they are indifferent to the fight for freedom and democracy. They have fought bravely for it before and will fight for it again and again. But they do not want to fight for you and under your leadership, the leadership of American capitalism.

It is not true either that they want to fight for a totalitarian Stalinist dictatorship. Even the vast majority of those European workers who follow the Stalinist parties, misguided as they are, simply want an end to capitalist exploitation and wars and the inauguration of socialism, just as the vast majority of the Chinese people who supported the Stalinists simply wanted an end to imperialism and their own landlords and the establishment of a sovereign nation.

## "I May Be a Rebel . . ."

To win them for your fight against Stalinism, you dangle before them the spectacle of the aristocratic position which the United States still enjoys in the world but which they cannot share, plus Adenauer and Franco and Chiang and Rhee. To win them for your fight against Stalinism, you offer them "Operation Killer" in Korea, with the promise of its reproduction in their own countries, and the reactionary witchhunt against Stalinists and other non-conformists here at home.

That is all you offer them; that is all you will offer them; because that is all that American capitalism can offer them. That is your "best" indeed, and anyone who expects better from you is wasting your time as well as his own.

That is why, in my opinion, Mr. Secretary, the peoples of Europe and Asia and Africa and the rest of the world, each in their own ways and to a different degree, have no real confidence in you and your government and its policies and its wars and its war preparations. That is why they do not want to join in your fight against Stalinism, why they will join that fight only if they are dragged into it by you or the reluctant governments beholden to you.

That is why you have, in this country too, such problems as are represented by Corporal John Moullette and by millions of others who are as obscure as he was up to yesterday—obscure but far from negligible. Like others the world over, these millions are beginning to think along the lines of the corporal who says that "I may be a rebel but these are my own thoughts and convictions."

## "Operation Killer" for the World?

Like him, many are saying to themselves: "Our only hope is that our age throughout the world feel the same way and will state so to their leaders. By rebellion or other ways. After the loss of life, and property from the last war, everyone should want only peace."

That peace the Kremlin cannot give. Neither can Washington. You can only drift or drive toward the Third World War.

It may be that in such a war, even decaying capitalism may concentrate enough of its last forces to inflict a military defeat upon Russia, after a universally exhausting struggle, after such killing as the world has never seen, after such piling up of ruins as will tower above our highest peaks, after such a destruction of the economy of the world as may take generations to set in good order again. "Operation Killer" on a global scale would then probably be the last abomination of capitalism.

It is all you have left to give, for the only way you have of combating the Stalinist barbarism is by your own. Millions everywhere already feel that in their bones.

That you do not understand this, because you cannot, is bad, but not yet fatal. But it would be tragic and disastrous if the people of this country, in particular the working class of the United States, fails to understand in the time left to it to act.

You are, after all, only doing your best to perform your duty to a dying social order. The working class has no such duty. It is therefore not upon you, but upon it that rests a tremendous historic responsibility and magnificent historic opportunity to lift society out of the quagmire into which it is being sucked by the useless conflict between capitalism and Stalinism.

It seizes this opportunity and discharges the responsibility in time—then and only then will the hope so fervently expressed in the letter of John Moullette, so strongly imbedded in the hearts of all the people, cease to be vain and become the great reality.

Max SHACHTMAN  
National Chairman,  
Independent Socialist League

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION  
Get it EVERY week!