

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MAY 21, 1951

FIVE CENTS

THE SECOND SOCIALIST YOUTH CONFERENCE AGAINST WAR

... page 2

Europe United Against MacArthur

... page 3

The Pall of Fear in the Colleges

... page 7

Israel's Arab Policy: A Scandal

... page 4

MAY DAY IN SPAIN

The Pamplona strike in Spain, reported in last week's LABOR ACTION, ended with triumph for the 30,000 strikers. The workers did not go back to their shops until they intended to, and when they did it was on condition that all the strikers arrested by the local authorities would be released. "Now that the strike is over," reports the London Times correspondent, "the first vague reference to it in the press reveals an official desire to minimize the scope and gravity of the dispute. . . ."

Report From the POUM

May Day in Spain also saw the working class in motion. We quote from the latest issue of *La Batalla*, the newspaper published by the POUM:

"As we go to press, we have received the first news of developments in Spain on the Worker's Day, the first of May.

"The Franco government, frightened by the spirit reigning among the working classes of the whole country, has brought to bear an imposing display of police forces. In Catalonia, in Euzkadi, in Asturias and in Andalusia, the armed police and the Civil Guard were on patrol throughout the entire day and made numerous arrests.

"In Barcelona and its province, millions of workers left their jobs in spite of the threats. Contrary to what was said in the press, the strikes that have occurred in Pueblo Nuevo, Clot, Sans, Mataro and other places, were in response to the call of the underground workers' organization. The Stalinists have limited themselves—for the first time in many years—to distributing some leaflets calling on the people of Barcelona to assemble at seven in the evening in the Plaza de Catalunya.

"For the rest, the general climate of protest continues everywhere. The means of repression—such as the arrests made by the governor of Guiposcoa—far from quelling the fighting spirit of the popular masses, intensified it. We are on the eve of new struggles."

What Anti-Stalin Russians Think Of Voice of America Propaganda

(Special to LABOR ACTION)

WESTERN GERMANY, April 1—What do the people of Russia who hate the Stalin regime think of the propaganda directed behind the Iron Curtain by the Voice of America?

We are in a position to quote two documents which can be considered as giving the first authentic answers to this question—authentic in the sense that they come from informed sources behind the Iron Curtain itself.

Both have reached the West through a new arrival of couriers from the Ukrainian resistance movement against the Stalin regime, the UPA, who recently broke through to their comrades in West Germany. They brought with them new issues of underground UPA publications, magazines, pamphlets and leaflets, as well as photographs. [Some of the photos are reproduced elsewhere in this issue—Ed.]

NEXT WEEK —

With the nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, Iran has become front page news and all eyes are on the Middle East. Reports are in the air of possible clashes between British and Iranian troops.

What is the story behind these startling events? What developments in post-war Iran led to this mounting crisis? For a full analysis of these questions see next week's LABOR ACTION.

Marshall Testimony Shows Truman Line on Korea: 'Peace' Through Slaughter

By GORDON HASKELL

Secretary of Defense Marshall's seven days of testimony before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees have cast as much light as we are likely to get on the administration's foreign policy in the cold war. And the light serves the valuable purpose of once more revealing the emptiness, the sterility, the fundamentally reactionary character of that policy.

Throughout the sessions of the combined committees, the Republicans have pursued their objective of attempting to discredit the administration. They have played on the most reactionary American sentiments by attempting to force Marshall to "admit" that United States policy in Korea has been "dictated" by the British and other allies, by the State Department rather than by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by an attitude of "appeasement" to the Russian and Chinese Stalinist governments.

Without really committing themselves to MacArthur's policies, they have tried to play off his military prestige against the administration, and to put Marshall in a position of admitting that the policy of military "restraint" in Korea which is designed to prevent Russia from entering the war is in contradiction to the policy of building up the military forces of the nations in the North Atlantic Pact.

In all these respects, Marshall put up a relatively competent defense of the policies of the administration against those advocated by MacArthur and (by insinuation) by the Republicans in the committees. Against their constant needling and demagoguery he steadfastly defended the principle of the supremacy of the civilian government over the military in a capitalist democracy, and of "collective security" as against a policy which would isolate the United States in the cold war and in the Third World War if and when it comes.

But by bit Marshall tore to pieces the power-drunk, completely irresponsible and adventuristic policies advocated by MacArthur. But in doing so he made it clear that the argument does not revolve around a fundamental difference in long-range strategy.

It revolves primarily around a question of timing and inter-Ally relations. It revolves around differences in the estimation of the ability of the United States to fight an all-out war with Russia at the present time, and hence in how far this country should go in risking such a war now.

But in the long run, the administration has nothing to offer except a military force-in-being which will be able to meet the military force of Russia in the initial phases of a war on an equal basis, or even a superior one. Once this force is established, the administration

(Turn to last page)



The Artful (Tax) Dodgers

Beardsley Ruml is a Patriot. During the war he pushed the famous Ruml Plan, a pay-as-you-go tax plan engineered to save a maximum amount for the rich. It was a huge success, as the skyscraping corporation-profit figures show today.

Now he breaks into the news again with a speech urging businessmen to hold (admitted) profits below the level on which an excess-profits tax would apply—by spending the money they would otherwise have to pay. For example, by "institutional" (propaganda) advertising, big salaries for executives, etc. Money thus spent is "cheap dollars" and he says that any corporation which pays excess-profits taxes is guilty of "poor management" and its managers ought to be fired.

You see how important it is to get workers enthusiastic about the war in Korea—then they'll be willing to pay for it. . . .

As a matter of fact, business periodicals report that "advertising budgets are swelling to the largest dimensions ever." "Record spending of 1950 will be surpassed in 1951!" "Advertisers indicate they'll spend more this year"—and an NYU speaker at a recent convention of the Association of National Advertisers felt it necessary to warn against "excessive spending on advertising as a means to reduce taxes."

Three Socialist Youth Groups Hold Second Conference on Coast to Rally Against War

LOS ANGELES, May 2—The anti-war socialist youth movement on the West Coast advanced another step with the successful convening of a second joint conference in less than six months.

The three initiating organizations—the Socialist Youth League, the Young Peoples Socialist League, the Libertarian Socialist League—sent out a call for all anti-war socialists, pacifists, groups, and individuals to meet (at the Case Hotel in Los Angeles) to discuss their mutual problems, aims, and methods in the struggle against war and reaction in America. Over fifty delegates and individuals from Northern and Southern California attended the two-day conference, April 25 and 26.

The first conference, which took place last year in Berkeley on November 25, had been planned as merely an exploratory meeting to discuss areas of agreement and difference, to break down traditional antagonisms and to plan joint actions and activities. The political accord there was so excellent, however, that it was possible actually to draw up and sign a joint anti-war declaration, which has since been printed and distributed to students all over the country. A second conference was then planned and a general agreement on the need for united-front activity was recorded.

The period since this Thanksgiving conference saw a series of fruitful united-front activities in Los Angeles and Berkeley. In the Berkeley city election of April 3, the Independent Socialist League cooperated actively with the East Bay Socialist Party in supporting SP member Durward DuRant, who received 3,000 votes on the basis of an anti-war program. The Berkeley Socialist Youth League and the Berkeley Socialist Club jointly campaigned for DuRant on campus and also held a united-front Sather Gate street meeting against Franco, during which they had to defend themselves from physical attack and collected money from the students to aid the Spanish socialist underground (POUM). In Los Angeles a highly successful anti-Franco picket line was planned and executed jointly by the various socialist groups and a similar action

joint socialist activity and both expressed disapproval of the "separatist" views of the YPSL. As far as future planned activity is concerned, then, the conference did not fulfill its possibilities. But it did a great deal.

For all the students and young workers who participated in its sessions, the conference was truly a school of socialist politics. Every vital question of the movement was discussed and debated during the two days of unflagging activity. This was no meeting of detached academicians but a serious conference of political youth preparing for anti-war activity. The vigorous but comradely debate stimulated all present to real thought and participation.

The agenda itself included educational talks on Stalinism, the American scene, the British Labor Party and the war, and ended with a lively discussion on Socialists and the war. On many of these points there were minority reports but the discussion proved once again that the areas of agreement were deep and important.

Most of the debate revolved around secondary questions such as Bolshevism, cooperation with pacifism, the nature of Britain, etc., but the Third Camp orientation remained secure. Except for one right-wing Socialist Party member, no one spoke out in defense of American imperialism, critically or otherwise.

Many of the youth had a chance for the first time to see the views of the Socialist Workers Party brought into the open and publicly debated before an intelligent and politically conscious student audience. Although not one of the sponsors of the conference, the SWP had sent a spokesman, who rose to inform the group that their meeting was not a "united front" (presumably because it did not include the SWP) and that the groups were merely

"creating another political organization." When reminded that similar socialist conferences were held at Zimmerwald and Kienthal during the First World War, the speaker became confused and the talk finally shifted to the real reason for the SWP's non-participation: the fact that it could not agree to sign the anti-war statement.

The discussion then proceeded to an analysis and debate of the theory of Russia as a "degenerated workers' state" and the policy of "unconditional defense of the Soviet Union." The ultra-radical phraseology of the Cannonite spokesman could not conceal the inadequacy of his replies. This discussion was continued at great length during dinner, and again and again the inflexibility and dogmatism of the Cannonite made him a laughing-stock until even he became silent and "friendly." It was a far wiser and soberer Cannonite who left the conference that evening!

The question of absolute pacifism and socialism again came up for debate, and this time a real socialist-pacifist spokesman was present to put his views forward. The general orientation of the new type of "revolutionary pacifism" was admirably presented but the speaker ran into a wall on the question of how to carry on the class struggle under totalitarian conditions. The YPSL acted in this discussion as a semi-defender of the pacifist view and attempted to gloss over the obvious differences in approach, while the SYL pushed the criticism of pacifism. The pacifist finally said that he "might shoot Franco" but that he was duty-bound "not to hate him." This "small" admission, of course, negates absolute pacifism as a principle.

It was around the question of anti-war activity and orientation that the liveliest discussion took place. This point not only in-

volved controversy among the youth groups but also for a while among the representatives of the SYL present. The draft resolution on war which is now being discussed by the Independent Socialist League and SYL in preparation for the coming ISL convention was—mistakenly, as he later agreed—brought into the discussion by the SYL spokesman as if it were the adopted position.

The most dramatic action of the conference was its organization of the joint free-speech street meeting at Los Angeles City College on April 26 [reported in detail in last week's LABOR ACTION—Ed.] which unexpectedly hit four-inch headlines in the Los Angeles press. Whatever else may be the outcome of the episode, it also induced a more favorable attitude on the part of the YPSL for socialist anti-war cooperation. The conference issued a press statement giving a true picture of the event and announcing that future meetings would be held at LACC.

In summary, while it is disappointing that no real future cooperative socialist anti-war activity was agreed on, the groups did agree to work together in the newly formed Southern California Federation Against War, and this cooperation may open the way to other ventures in the next period.

Of course, the positive educational value of the conference would alone be sufficient to make it of immense value; in addition, the realization of the tremendous areas of political agreement which exist should ripen into a conscious desire for joint activity and future unity.

To fail to go forward would be to choke off a socialist youth anti-war movement with significant possibilities. In any case, the second socialist youth conference against war has done a great deal to advance the prospects of a West Coast anti-war movement.

U. S. Congress Twists Nehru's Arm

By RICHARD TROY

The United States has given India another arm-twisting "lesson" on the inadvisability of talking back to U. S. imperialism—while meanwhile the Indian famine grows worse and the aid-to-India bill is still a congressional football of power politics.

It has been common knowledge that the chief reason Congress has stalled the aid-to-India bill is resentment over India's failure to follow the American lead in its policy toward China. And there is no doubt that Washington leaders hoped that, by holding the grain over the heads of India for several months, they might force a change in Indian foreign policy.

However, no change in this respect has appeared, and, if anything at all has happened, Indians have become more insistent than ever on retaining their political independence. Nehru, in a speech delivered on May 1 remarked that India, though "grateful" for help, would not accept food from any country if it had "any political strings attached to it."

"We would be unworthy of the high responsibilities with which we have been charged if we bartered away in the slightest degree our country's self-respect or freedom of action even for something we need so badly," he added.

Reporters noted that these remarks received a warm welcome in the Indian press and among the people in general. Anti-American sentiment has been mounting in India and it was not unusual to see cartoons in the newspapers bitterly attacking the United States.

Nehru's remarks referred to the conditions in the Senate aid-to-India bill: First, that India had to distribute supplies without discrimination as to caste, color or creed. Secondly, that full publicity be given in India to the fact that the United States was sending the grain. Thirdly, that the U. S. be permitted unrestricted observation of the distribution.

NEHRU EATS CROW
It was stated by Indians that, of course, these conditions would be observed anyway, but their inclusion in the bill made it so offensive as to be unacceptable. This was, apparently, the stand on May 1.

The immediate reaction in the United States was that Congress, which was at least considering action on the bills in the near future, dropped the whole matter entirely. And this, in turn, evidently caused another serious reaction in India itself, especially for Nehru. But he was not certain how to counter the effects of his

original statement of defiance. The famine days were fast approaching; something had to be done.

Some kind of token capitulation to the U. S. Congress—which didn't want "to be dictated to" by an "undependable Asiatic"—was evidently felt necessary. The occasion chosen was the speech which he delivered on May 10 in which he announced that Russia had agreed to send India 50,000 tons of grain as part of a trade agreement.

It is a measure of America's extreme unpopularity in India that the Parliament broke into enthusiastic applause at the announcement of the grain shipment from Russia. (For, it must be noted, 50,000 tons is not very much, and that, in fact, in regular commercial channels, the U. S. sends India 50,000 tons a month.) But it is well-known that the U. S. has a reserve of wheat sufficient to satisfy the present Indian requirements. Thus the applause was, in a sense, anti-American rather than pro-

While Nehru was being slapped down by U. S. power, with its line of "Knuckle under or starve," the Indian leader was himself playing an unsavory role at home. He introduced a bill into Parliament to alter the Indian constitution so that sweeping restrictions were clamped on freedom of speech and press. Press reports do not make clear the exact nature of the restrictions, but Nehru has had to hold them up in the face of mounting opposition.

It is known that opposition to the rule of Nehru's Congress Party is growing from the left. The Socialist Party of India is widely expected to make substantial gains in the forthcoming elections. The Nehru government wants new powers which will help it to stay in office. As the N. Y. Post ended a stinging editorial: "Nehru in jail was a more inspiring world figure than Nehru as jailer."

In that speech Nehru, as if to pacify irate American congressmen, told the Parliament that he was quite sure that there were no "political conditions" attached to the two food-aid bills pending before the U. S. Congress and that the Indian government had "no objection to accepting either of the bills."

"GRATITUDE"?
The fact that he had to "pacify" American congressmen indicates the use to which America's wealth is being put in the world today. If the "big stick" in Teddy Roosevelt's day was the navy and the marines, here it is the threat of starvation.

As if to prove that Nehru still was irritated with the three conditions contained in the Senate bill he said that "While the form in which assistance is given to India is a matter for the United States of America to decide, we would prefer the terms embodied in the House Bill, which are simpler." And then, to further smooth over congressional fire, he said that "We would like to express our gratitude to the U. S. government for the efforts they have made to send food grains to India."

If this sentence is read with the proper sarcasm it would undoubtedly express the real feelings of India.

But in dealing with the U. S. Congress—which is determined to dictate but not be "dictated to"—one must speak with proper respect and humility. The lord of the Western world tolerates no "insolence."

All Groups United in Opposition to MacArthur As Europe Fears Rise of "Caesarism" in U. S.

By HENRY JUDD

PARIS, May 8—Some weeks have passed since the Great General stormed ashore and firmly planted his banner of naked militarism and imperialism. Politically wise Europeans have had a good chance to look the gentleman over. The press, popular magazine, newsreels, radio, etc., have perhaps run a close second to the United States in the amount of space devoted to them to history's most drawn-out fade-out. Here, however, the viewpoint is slightly different!

Serious people of all types and tendencies in Western Europe have at last found one issue on which they have joined together in unanimous, common and loud-voiced accord: a deep and heartfelt opposition to General Douglas

MacArthur. Long years of experience and training, with a far more refined sense and development of political understanding, plus the absence of the apparently hysterical atmosphere of America, made it comparatively easy for all to recognize the type and grasp his essence. If MacArthur fails to sense the popular hostility to him throughout Western Europe, may we—a humble civilian—call to his attention the unquestioned fact that he couldn't be elected dog-catcher in Great Britain (50 million population); France (42 million); Western Germany (40 million); Italy (45 million), etc.

His stage-actor's face on the newsreel screen, accompanied by the ham gestures, do not arouse laughter (and who laughs easier than a Frenchman?). They arouse

murmurs of disgust, displeasure and a kind of tremor of fear. In the press, he has been unanimously condemned; even the familiar phrases about his great ability as a general which are found in the rightist press have a hypocritical ring, a damning-with-faint-praise.

(In mentioning the press and for the amusement of LABOR ACTION readers, who probably could use something to laugh over these days, we may mention the headline in the self-styled Trotskyist paper, *La Vérité*, "MacArthur Kicked Out of the Revolution." What "revolution"? In Korea, imbecile!)

Now, how explain this universal gesture of rejection of MacArthur? Does it not prove, perhaps, that he is right in spitting with contempt upon the "allies" in Western Europe, who are all "communists" anyway? Of course not. The decline of Stalinism and pro-Russianism in Western Europe is something we often tend to underestimate. Naturally, the Stalinists (with their "Trotskyist" allies) support MacArthur's removal from the Russian standpoint. But these forces represent a distinct minority today in Western Europe.

No, rejection of MacArthurism is based on far more healthy, correct and substantial grounds. Politically wise Western Europe understands what it means: the sharpening of the war danger through the launching of ever more dangerous and fresh military adventures; the screwing-up of war preparations, both economically and politically, to the exploding point; the speed-up of mobilization itself. In a word, MacArthurism is understood in Europe as virtually equivalent to the launching of the Third World War now.

As for the man himself, how shall we expect Europe—which has known its Boulangers and De-

Gaulles, its Hitlers and Mussolinis, its Francos and Pilsudskis, its military dictators and Bonapartists, in a word—to react when it sees the tragic emergence of such a candidate in the New World? The man is familiar because the type is familiar; his words, acts, gestures—everything from his sneering contempt for the civilian "little man" to his megalomaniac fashion of expression—are known over here. No one believes in "him" any more, nor in his pat and phony solutions. Too much blood has been spilled by his predecessors in Europe. One of the most effective attacks on MacArthur was the editorial pub-

lished by the Catholic *Figaro* analyzing his emergence as a potential "Caesarist" tendency in American life.

So the people of Western Europe have unanimously rejected MacArthur and all he stands for or proposes. True, all their problems remain. The danger of Stalinism is still present. But perhaps this unanimous rejection has already had a restraining influence and helped in the task of preventing the growth of a movement and a leader whose coming to power could only bring further disaster and a complete isolation upon the American people.

U. S. Protege: Liberia

There are usually few references in the American press to Liberia, the one country in Africa in which the U. S. has directly had a finger in the pie. Apropos of the May elections in that country, the *Nation* (May 5) notes:

"Except for a brief interval in the 1870s, the government has been in the hands of the same party, the True Whigs, since the republic was established. The True Whigs represent the 12,000 or so American Liberians who run the country for the benefit of important American interests and also for their private gain."

"Friends of Mr. T. We say that both the United States and the United Nations have refused to intervene or to send observers, although the United States has a large development mission in Liberia now. Sooner or later a serious struggle for power between the Afro-Liberians and the American Liberians is bound to take place. If this struggle is to be settled without violence, elements of the democratic process must be gradually introduced and consistently respected."

The 1,000,000 or more Afro-Liberians have never had anything to say about the government, which until only a few years ago sanctioned slavery. Free and fair elections are unknown in Liberia, and the government, as might be expected, is notoriously inefficient, with a long record of corruption. In November 1950, a group of Afro-Liber-

ians induced Didwo T. We to become the candidate of the Reform Political Party. Mr. T. We was born in Liberia but educated in this country; he is supported by both Afro-Liberians and progressive American Liberians. It is now reported that the True Whigs, true to their tradition of one-party rule, have printed ballots on which only the name of President W. V. S. Tubman appears, despite the fact that T. We was legally nominated.

"The 1,000,000 or more Afro-Liberians have never had anything to say about the government, which until only a few years ago sanctioned slavery. Free and fair elections are unknown in Liberia, and the government, as might be expected, is notoriously inefficient, with a long record of corruption. In November 1950, a group of Afro-Liber-

ISL FUND DRIVE

We'll Make It—3 1/2 Per Cent to Go

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

The 1951 Fund Drive of the Independent Socialist League ended on May 12, and while all returns are not yet received or entered, indications are that the final accounting will show the campaign over the 100 per cent mark.

A total of \$948.06 received at the time of this writing raised the total sum received to \$12,078.41. To complete the campaign we need a total of \$421.59. Can it be done? We think so. Examining the figures in this week's box score, one finds this is easily possible if the branches now below 100 per cent complete their contributions.

Considerable changes have taken place in the standings in the stretch part of the campaign. Although the Socialist Youth League, led by its Chicago unit still holds first place—we doubt that it will be replaced—other cities have come across the 100 per cent mark. Minnesota and St. Paul follow next in line, but the number now over 100 per cent is eleven.

Oakland, New York and Seattle made it. It was a real job that they did, Oakland and New York just coming under the wire with sizable payments in the final week.

The Chicago branch, running in a near tie with Detroit, pushed ahead just a little, but both branches, now over 90 per cent, can easily pass their goals. We are awaiting their final returns to see which of them comes out first.

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Per Cent
TOTAL	\$12,500	\$12,078.41	96.6
Soc. Youth League..	500	861.95	172
Chicago 400.50, New York 227.95, Detroit 95.00, Berkeley 95.50, St. Louis 31.00, Buffalo 25.00, Oberlin 8.00, General 15.00			
Minnesota	10	15.00	150
Streator	25	34.00	136
Oregon	50	60.00	120
General	975	1168.50	119
Boston	50	55.00	110
Oakland	650	675.00	103.8
New York City	4200	4215.00	100.3
Buffalo	850	850.00	100
Reading	100	100.00	100
Seattle	300	300.00	100
Chicago	1800	1680.00	93.3
Cleveland	300	276.55	92.1
Detroit	800	727.51	90.9
Youngstown	100	85.00	85
Newark	300	249.50	83.1
Indiana	100	75.00	75
Los Angeles	550	407.25	74
Pittsburgh	150	92.00	61.3
St. Louis	50	30.00	60
Philadelphia	450	208.00	46.2
Baltimore	50	15.00	30
Akron	100	0	0
Connecticut	50	0	0

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.

Interested? For information

about the

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

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

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

YOU and SCIENCE

A ROLE FOR ORGANIZED SCIENTISTS?

By CARL DARTON

Several months ago this column cited editorial statements by the Federation of American Scientists and the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists which indicated that the leaders of these groups felt the outbreak of the Korean hostilities had ended their period of fruitful work. Despite these gloomy predictions both the FAS and the Bulletin have remained in operation. One gets the impression, however, that they are just muddling along since there has been, in the interim, no open discussion of the organizations' past nor tentative programs for their future.

The FAS and the Bulletin were founded at the end of World War II by scientists intent upon bringing to the public's eye the economic, social, and political implications of modern science, particularly of atomic energy. Three great events had just taken place: the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the ending of the war in Europe and in Japan, and the founding of the United Nations. The time was ripe to impress the public with the fact that the world could either live together peacefully and make great material progress or could obliterate civilization in a series of vast atomic explosions.

It has always been true that most scientists wish to see their achievements used to provide more goods for more people at less cost and with the least expenditure of human effort. In 1946 these long-range hopes seemed to coincide with contemporary events.

Believed in the United Nations

No one can honestly say that the FAS and the Bulletin failed to make the public much more conscious of the implications of modern science. Their means were limited, but they did a good job of publicity and education. However, they appear to have made two rather fundamental mistakes:

(1) They believed that people could be scared into peace. They thought that if the horrors of atomic warfare were only presented realistically enough, no one would want war. The "fear of the bomb" would succeed where the "fear of God" had failed.

(2) Peace could be secured within the present framework of society. The United Nations, or some improved version of world federation, would be the key to the orderly processing of international disputes. There was no serious examination of possible radical changes of political structure.

Socialist observers were aware that these organizations of scientists working alone could not guarantee peace. They regretted that there was no real rank-and-file membership among scientific and technical workers and that there were not firmer ties between the scientists and the labor unions, minority and civil-rights groups. It is particularly unfortunate that there were no large political groupings of labor or socialism to which individual scientists could have turned.

If the FAS and the Bulletin did not (and could not) ensure peace, what then has been and should be their useful role? Besides the dissemination of scientific information and the discussion of the social implications of science, the Federation and the Bulletin have been active in promoting legislation favorable to science. They have had their say on the loyalty program, in clearance procedures and security measures; they have protested guilt by association, secret hearings, and witchhunts.

Should Publicize Cost of War

The Korean war, or indeed the outbreak of another global war, need not mark the end of the FAS and the Bulletin. All of the issues with which they have been grappling will be accentuated in wartime rather than eliminated. In order to prepare for the tasks ahead, the organizations need to recognize that there is reasonable doubt of the correctness of their general approach. No one needs "injections" of fear. Information and conscious guidance are needed. It would be suicide for the FAS to attempt to become a political party but it would be equally folly for them not to discuss politics openly and fully in their organization.

It occurs to the writer that the war thrusts upon these organizations the additional task of compiling and publicizing the tremendous cost of war. The cost in men, in material, in rights and freedoms; and the cost to science of scientific personnel, plant, and talent diverted to systematic destruction—these could profitably be brought to public attention again and again.

Without a doubt, when the war comes, many of the greater (and lesser) names in science will become mere patriots interested only in devising the most efficient methods of exterminating their fellow men. This should not deter—rather should it strengthen—those who remain true to the ideal of "science in the service of mankind."

Reading from Left to Right

CANAL ZONE DISCRIMINATION, by George W. Westerman.—The Crisis, April.

The NAACP's magazine heads this article: "Jim Crow is the official policy of the U. S. government on the Canal Zone and it makes for bad neighborly relations." Westerman—a Panama City journalist and author—first harks back a bit to the exploitation that went into building the canal.

Of the 44,711 native tropical workers on the canal (in 1913), most were West Indian and colored, plus some Latin Americans and Europeans. "Work conditions of these people were intolerable. Acceptance of a job on the Canal was to risk one's life in this 'black hole of Calcutta.' Amidst the fearful ravages of yellow fever and plague they labored. Malaria claimed thousands of them as victims and working hazards accounted for the lives of innumerable others. A total of 95 deaths and 235 injuries resulted from dynamite explosions, collisions and slides during the period September 1906 to July 1914. . . ."

And most of these workers were being paid no more than 10 cents an hour!

Complete Southern-style segregation and discrimination was super-added. Since the non-U. S. workers were paid in silver and workers from the U. S. in gold, these terms came to stand for the racial difference also. "These pat-

terns of social segregation were all instituted and maintained by American governmental officials despite international obligations as set out in the Treaties of 1903 and 1936" between Panama and the U. S.

"The Southern racist attitudes transplanted to the Canal Zone have created vexing problems for North American diplomats accredited to the Republic of Panama, and have represented a potential explosive that any emergency could touch off. The 1947 rejection of the Defense Sites agreement by the unanimous vote of Panama's National Assembly, preceded by violent anti-American demonstrations, is the most recent case in point. . . ."

"... the application of the gold and silver standard [i.e., racism] of 1904 is as much in evidence today in the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal-Railroad organization, except for the fact that it has assumed a new flexibility under the white heat of protest and agitation on the part of the victimized workers. Furthermore, progressive elements among Americans on the Canal Zone have been gaining ascendancy in the past decade. In part this may be attributed to the fear of Communist infiltration of the ranks of the laboring classes in the strategic Canal area; in part, to the recoil from the tremendous amount of unfavorable publicity that has been given to these un-American conditions by the local CIO unions."

Government Denies Arabs Freedom of Movement, Property Rights Israel's Arab Policy: A Scandal

The following article is reprinted from The Jewish Newsletter, edited by William Zukerman, for April 2.

By WILLIAM ZUKERMAN

Practically nothing is known in this country about the problem of the Arab minority in Israel. Ordinarily, when the Arab problem is mentioned here at all, what is meant is the Arab refugee problem outside Israel.

But it is not widely known that, apart from the larger Arab refugee problem, there is also a problem of an Arab minority of 170,000 living in Israel who have never left the country. The official version is that this minority enjoys all rights, freedom and equality with the majority Israelis; that there is no bias, prejudice or discrimination against them. Their status is the same as that of the Israelis. They even have two representatives in the Knesset. In a word, there is no problem of any kind.

Recently, two voices have reached here which reveal facts generally unknown in the U. S., and which deserve attention. Of the two voices, one comes from Israel itself; the other from England.

The voice from Israel is the more authentic one because it comes from a well-known Arab who speaks from experience and deals only with facts and with no theories. These he states in an article in the Ner (Candle) of Jerusalem (January 1951), a publication of the Iehud Party, the organization of the late Dr. Jehuda Magnes, which has always advocated peace and understanding between Arabs and Jews, rather than force and hatred.

The article, entitled "Israel and the Arab Minority," is remarkable for the temperance of its language, for the lack of bitterness which usually characterizes the words of both Arab and Jewish nationalists when they speak on the subject, and reveals a rare understanding of the difficulties of the Israel position with regard to the Arab refugees outside Israel, but at the same time states the case of the Arab minority in Israel with a simplicity and clarity which speaks for itself.

ARABS' SIDE

Writes Mr. E. N. Koussa: "The grievances from which the Arabs of Israel suffer are serious and deserve the honest assistance of the Jewish public to

ensure an early remedy. They complain of unjustifiable intervention with their rights of property, their freedom of movement, and of flagrant discrimination. . . ."

"There is first of all, the Absentees' Properties Law of 1950, with its vicious consequences aggravated by an executive machinery that leaves much to be desired. I do not think there is in any other country, civilized or uncivilized, an enactment similar to or identical with this law whereby a person physically and lawfully present is deemed to be absent for the single purpose of depriving him of the right to control, administer and enjoy the income of his properties. . . ."

"I wonder whether many of the Jewish public realize the inequity of this law. An Arab may sit as a member of the Knesset, participate in its deliberations, have a say in the formulation of the destiny and policy of the state, and enjoy the privileges and immunities inherent in its membership, and yet he is under a legal disability to control his properties. Such is the actual condition of Mr. Taufiq Toubi, the Arab Knesset member. There are many other illustrations arising from this oppressive law which I abstain from enumerating for the sake of brevity.

"Secondly, there is the law enacted by the provisional government and subsequently ratified by the Knesset, enabling the minister of agriculture to take possession of any land allegedly left uncultivated, in pursuance of which many Arab cultivators, present in Israel, have been arbitrarily dispossessed of their properties without compensation.

"The owners are eager to recover possession, to cultivate the lands extensively and intensively and to play their part in producing some of the essential commodities necessary for the population. They wish to feel that they are citizens of the country, and not the object of racial persecution and discrimination. They have applied, time after time, to the government for the restoration of their lands, but it has hitherto turned deaf ears to their applications.

"Thirdly, the prevention of male members of resident Arab families above the age of 15 from rejoining their parents is the cause of much disappointment and distress. Doubtless, you appreciate the sufferings and sentiments of a father and of a mother who are deprived of their sons by the unjustifiable action of the

government setting down the arbitrary age limit of 15, for male members entitled to return under the scheme of reunion of split families.

"I do not think that the number of such sons is likely to exceed 1500. Is it reasonable to exclude them on the frivolous excuse that they would be a danger to the safety of the state?"

"Last, but not least, there is the military rule with its concomitant severity and harshness in Arab towns and villages whether near to, or far from, the boundaries which detrimentally affect Arab business and peaceful activities and their freedom of movement. It undoubtedly constitutes a flagrant discrimination against the Arab inhabitants of Israel."

DISASTROUS PROPOSAL

Another voice heard on the Arab minority in Israel recently came from England—the voice of Mr. R. H. Crossman, Labor member of Parliament and outstanding friend of the Zionist movement in Great Britain. Mr. Crossman is one of those curious non-Jewish liberals and friends of Zionism, frequently found in England and the U. S., who forget their liberalism when they deal with Jewish nationalism and who out-Zionize the Zionists.

Crossman recently visited Israel and is now writing a series of articles on its problems in the London New Statesman and Nation. In one of these articles (March 3), he touches on the question of the Arab minority.

Like Mr. Koussa, he confirms the fact that the Arabs in Israel are "still second-class citizens and are treated by the military authorities as potential fifth columnists," but adds that "the Israeli army is completely justified in treating them like this. . . . If the fortunes of the war changed, the vast majority of the Arab minority in Israel would side, at least passively, with the Arab armies."

He then proceeds to ask: what then is to be done? and advances a proposal which has all the earmarks of a trial balloon. He says: "The tempos of the Jewish and Arab progress are so fantastically different that the communities can never coalesce, unless the Arab becomes a Jew. Would it not be wiser to accept the fact of discrepancy and solve the problem by a wholesale exchange of populations? Why not let the 150,000 Arabs of Israel be transferred to Iraq and make place for

Letters from Franco Spain Tell Of Weakness of Fascist Regime

The May 5 issue of The Nation presents an interesting sidelight on the reaction of the Spanish people to the anti-Franco strike movements and revolts which followed the heroic Barcelona general strike, through excerpts from private letters received in this country "which were sent out of the country through various channels."

Following are some of the passages from the letters referring specifically to the stirrings against Franco.

CATCALLS FOR U. S.

March 14
The Barcelona strike was a formidable one, and the most extraordinary thing about it was the way people who you thought were for Franco sang the praises of the students and strikers. They weren't afraid any more to say what they thought. It was hard to

restrain our impatience. People who had been in hiding for months, sleeping here, there, or anywhere, came out on the street to hear the news. Now we wonder what those Americans think who believed so strongly in Franco and were willing to give him all the money he wanted to maintain his hated rule. The United States is not very popular here. The other day in Madrid the students greeted the ambassador with whistles and catcalls. (Was that in your papers?) The ambassador paid no attention but bowed and took off his hat, and then the students hissed all the more.

DEMORALIZATION ON TOP

March 20
On the frontier, soldiers and police of all kinds are forbidden to talk with civilians. The government is terrified. Extreme vigilance is exercised to keep out French newspapers containing reports of the Barcelona strikes; in the first few days after the outbreak people fought for the few papers obtainable. One day Radio-Nacional says that all these troubles are the result of the intrigues of the reds and their friends the Masons all over the world. The next day it says that nothing much happened and that the people support Franco. What people? The Falangists perhaps, but a lot of them are disillusioned and demoralized. The black-marketeers, I guess, and the generals who have grown rich by stealing, but they are now dissatisfied because there is little left to steal.

ALTERNATIVES

March 25
They say in Barcelona that the new governor general, Felipe Acedo, an ardent Falangist, is offering peace to the workers. If he is, he can't feel very secure! The alternatives open to the government are to execute dozens of people in order to terrorize the population or to show "Christian generosity." If it chooses the first course, hatred of Franco will mount; if it doesn't, people will lose fear of the government and the strikes will have been successful.

RATS RUNNING

March 28
One of the local Falangist leaders sought out Comrade X the other day to tell him that he, the local leader, like all the Old Guard of the Falange, had always been in favor of the workers and that it was only a few reactionaries in Franco's entourage who had corrupted the movement. The incident was important as evidence that they are ready to hold out a flag of truce to us.

STUDENTS IN MADRID

April 5
A second strike of students in Madrid. Some of the strikers obey precise instructions and form part of a widespread movement to sabotage the regime. Others are mere boys who see their mothers struggling with rising prices and are aroused to action by the strikers' posters and slogans. Another thing is worth mentioning. People our age who lived through the war allow themselves to be influenced by the argument that the overthrow of Franco would bring on another war. Young men of eighteen or twenty are not impressed by this. They say, "It is better to die fighting than to die of tuberculosis."

CONTAGION

April 20
People talk about nothing but the strikes; even here in —, where there are only a few factories and almost everybody works on the land, the Civil Guard is in a constant state of alarm. It is easy to see why the government is worried. It had grown used to thinking that nobody would dare to make a move

against it. But now that there has been a strike and the workers have seen that the authorities did not dare to hit back hard, there will be other strikes here or there. What makes it worse for the government is that the workers' new courage is contagious. They are growing stronger and the government is growing weaker.

AMONG THE BASQUES

April 24
Only a few lines written in great haste to get them over the border. . . . This strike has spread through practically the entire Basque country and is so vigorous and inspiring that there are no words to describe it. The governors in Vizcaya and Guipuzcoa threatened the strikers with the most formidable reprisals, but the workers in Bilbao and San Sebastian did not pay the least at-

tention to them or to the new warnings from Madrid. The workers say, "This is our hour and nobody is going to succeed in frightening us." The authorities tried to give the workers a taste of what they could expect by going to the Murgaza, a factory in Renteria, with police trucks and delivering an ultimatum to 300 strikers there: "Either resume work at once or all of you will be arrested." The entire 300 shouted "no" in chorus. Although they were arrested, the people are not afraid. In Baracaldo the leaflets calling for the strike on Monday morning were distributed publicly in the village square while the traditional Sunday outdoor dancing was taking place. The police these days is: "How is the Franco?" [The words for Franco and franc are spelled the same in Spanish.] The answer: "It couldn't be lower."

ITALY

New United Socialist Party Makes Sharp Turn to Right

By PAUL ROBERTS

This May Day saw a birth and a death in Italy. A new party was born: the "Socialist Party—Italian Section of the Socialist International" (PS-SIIS). The Socialist Unitary Party (PSU) merged with the right-wing socialist PSIL of Saragat.

In order to get the ranks of the PSU into the new party, PSIL leader Saragat had to force his comrades Simonini, D'Aragona and Lombardo to give up their comfortable seats in the clerical reactionary cabinet of Prime Minister DeGasperi. For making that one small (and they hope temporary) sacrifice, the PSIL leaders won from the PSU a complete political surrender.

The new party will end the PSU's opposition to the arms budget, to the tying of Italy to the American war bloc in general and to the Atlantic Pact in particular. The new SP will also favor electoral agreements with DeGasperi's Christian Democrats in the forthcoming local elections.

And so the way will be paved for Saragat and his friends to get back their seats in the cabinet. As LABOR ACTION said when indicating that the Saragat people would have to leave the government, they would leave saying not "Addio" (farewell) but "Arivederci" (until we meet again).

SILONE ON OUTS

The recent convention of the PSU, which voted by a bare majority in favor of the pro-merger line of Giuseppe Romita, was also the forum for vigorous anti-reformist speeches by those who supported left-winger Ignazio Silone.

Silone pointed up his opposition to this capitulation to Saragat's entire political program by staying away from the joint May Day meeting of the two executive committees that launched the new SP.

Other members of Silone's group, however, found it easier to go along with the tide. How long they will be able to do so is another matter. At the PSU convention Matteo Matteotti called upon the Socialists to say "No to Saragat, No to DeGasperi and No to the clerical-conservative government"; Matteotti has just been named one of the two assistant political secretaries of the

new SP. Mario Zagari called for "a socialist Third Front" as against the Russian and American blocs; he is one of the two international secretaries of the new party. U. G. Mondolfo called for a class line and no collaboration with DeGasperi; he is one of the two press secretaries of the new party.

RIGHT WING PUSHES

Mondolfo, incidentally, was the editor of the PSU paper *Lotta Socialista* and probably the author of an unsigned article poking fun at LABOR ACTION for speaking of trends in the PSU to abandon its opposition to the Atlantic Pact, etc. The death and transfiguration of the PSU does not make one feel like laughing, however, or one could remind Mondolfo that in Italy too there exists a proverb about "he who laughs last."

The executive committee of the new SP is headed by Saragat and Romita, as joint political secretaries. Its first act was to authorize local groups of the SP in many sections to run joint tickets with the Christian Democrats. This line is running into strong opposition from many of the most important federations of the old PSU and in a number of localities they are going ahead with an independent socialist ticket. Among these localities are the cities of Venice, Verona, Mantua, Brescia and Piacenza.

There is no doubt that the new SP, with its rightist line, will have much less likelihood of attracting the rebels from Stalinism. Questions and rumors are already beginning to appear in the Italian press about the future course of action to be followed by Silone and his group, particularly in relation to the rebel CP group led by Silone's friends Cucchi and Magnani.

The extreme right wing of Saragat's group, led by Simonini, Lombardo, D'Aragona and Vacirca, is pushing an all-out offensive for thorough collaboration with the Christian Democrats. This offensive could possibly lead to a new split in which Silone and the left wing will break from the new SP and unite with Cucchi and Magnani to form a party with an independent Socialist line of struggle against the reactionary DeGasperi government.

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.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 21

May 21, 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.

Available:
BOUND VOLUMES
of
Labor Action
1945 to 1949
\$3.00 a volume
Order from:
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

For living Marxism—read
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Anti-Stalin Russians and Voice of America —



NOTE ON PHOTOS

These photographs and their captions are reproduced from the Neue Münchner Illustrierte paper of February 10, 1951.

(Continued from page 1)

vice to his addresses. In this light, the main point he makes deserves even closer attention from Americans who have heard a great deal of nonsense about "fomenting revolt behind the Iron Curtain."

Poltava writes in this section of his letter:

"The Soviet masses hate the Bolshevik system, Bolshevik 'socialism.' But this does not mean that the Soviet peoples are longing for capitalism, which was destroyed in the territory of the present USSR back in 1917-1920. The Soviet people, in an absolute majority, are clearly against the restoration of capitalism. This is the result of the revolution of 1917-1920. . . .

"We, the members of the liberation struggle in the Ukraine, who

On the left is the reproduction of a UPA recruiting placard, showing a partisan trampling upon the flag of the Russian regime and on the Nazi swastika flag. The UPA originally arose as a resistance movement against the Nazi occupation of its land and turned its arms against Moscow's men when the Russian army rolled back over the Ukraine. On the right is the medal for bravery which is conferred by the UPA upon its men. (Radio Moscow has announced that the government also issues a special decoration "for special bravery in the liquidation of plunderers and bandit troops"—by which they mean underground fighters.)



The photo on the right is captioned by the Münchner Illustrierte: "The UPA knows no distinctions in rank but only in function. Its members do not permit themselves to be captured but prefer to die. The Soviets are already using airplanes against them." The reference to ranks and functions means that

military titles are employed in the same sense as "organizer" in a party. The photo on the left shows the advance post of a guerrilla battalion. The soldier in the background is now in Western Germany and brought this picture with him. The others are still fighting in the ranks of the UPA.



Two snapshots of comrades-in-arms of the UPA. The partisan on the right, whose face is left unconcealed, is one of those who have fallen in battles with Moscow's GPU troops.

Both photos were taken by members of a courier detachment which has succeeded in making its way into Western Germany.

are inside the Soviet Union and have connections with the broad Soviet masses—we know very well that the Soviet people do not admire capitalism, neither the old European capitalism nor contemporary American capitalism. It is impossible to call on the Soviet masses to struggle against Bolshevism in the name of the restoration of capitalism or of the American way of life. . . .

"The Bolshevik system should be criticized from the standpoint of those progressive political forces of the peoples of the USSR which fight Bolshevism not in the name of the restoration of the old system but in the name of building a new progressive society, a just social and economic system, a classless society. . . ."

WARNING

We need not stop long on Poltava's terminology: by "Bolshevism," of course, he is referring to nothing but the Stalinist regime, in contrast with the "revolution of 1917-20," the great Russian Revolution. He is using the language of the people behind the Iron Curtain themselves, and to the new "Bolshevist magnates" who constitute the ruling class of the regime the UPA often counterposes the liberating ideas of Lenin.

Nor need we stop to comment on the naïveté implied in Poltava's warning recommendation to the State Department that it cease to speak for capitalism. He is concerned with telling the State Department that its approach cannot gain the ear of the Russian peoples, and it is this that we are interested in also.

Going further, Poltava points out another reactionary conception embedded in U. S. propaganda:

"The criticism of the Bolshevik system, besides, should be carried on from the statement of the various non-Russian nationalities of the USSR which are oppressed by Moscow, in the name of the reconstruction of the USSR on the principle of independent national states for all the Soviet peoples, in the name of the liberation of the non-Russian peoples of the USSR from the national yoke which weighs on them today. . . ."

"In my opinion, in the Western world the weight and actual importance of the nationalities question in the USSR is absolutely erroneously estimated."

And in point of fact, the Voice of America continually propagates the reactionary conception of the former integral Holy Russian Empire.

"LISTENER" SPEAKS

The second document on the same subject—the reaction to the Voice of America by conscious

opponents of Stalinism in Russia—appeared in the fourth issue of the bulletin of the UPA ("The Propaganda and Information Center") which was published in the Ukraine in May 1950. An article signed "A Ukrainian Listener," which appeared in this bulletin, has also been published in the *Suchasna Ukraine* (March 3, 1951).

We read:

"In the middle of December 1949, the Voice of America suddenly discovered that, besides the Russian people, there still exist 40 million Ukrainian people in the USSR, and so the Voice began to broadcast also in the Ukrainian language. . . ."

"But all the Ukrainian patriots (i.e., supporters of national liberation from Moscow—Ed.) were deeply disappointed in their hope that the Ukrainian broadcasts would be Ukrainian in content as well as language. What happened was the same as always happens in the Soviet Union: the form (the language) is Ukrainian but the content—Sorry, in every respect far from really Ukrainian!

"Concretely: the Ukrainian broadcasts of the Voice of America in content are not Ukrainian but Russian. The authors of these broadcasts do not at all represent the trends of the Ukrainian people who have always struggled for their national independence. They represent the longings of the Great-Russian imperialists of all political shades who try in every way to suppress the liberation struggle of the Ukrainians, to keep the Ukraine within the frontiers of the Russian empire, to reconstruct a new edition of an 'integral and undivided' Russia on the ruins of the present USSR. . . ."

It is clear that the writer is referring to the propaganda of the Russian émigrés who are used for Voice of America broadcasts or who write and influence them, and who counterpose to the present Stalin regime the dream of a Russia under their own sway—which, however, would have as little room for the right of self-determination of the oppressed nationalities as did the tsar's autocracy or Stalin's today.

WHOSE VOICE?

The "Ukrainian Listener" continues: "Judging by the content of the Ukrainian broadcasts of the Voice of America and some other information known to us, it is not difficult to realize who influences these broadcasts. It stinks too much of Kerensky and of similar tramps from the Russian emigration of 1917-18, so we can't be mistaken. . . ."

"One set of Russian imperialists are ruling the Ukraine now, and another set, those in exile, are preparing themselves to replace the former. . . ."

"The Ukrainian people do not want to listen to such broadcasts and will not listen to them."

The "Ukrainian Listener" did indeed put his finger on the voice behind the mike and more especially on the type of "revolution-fomenters" in the State Department's stable who are trying to tell the people under the heel of Stalin that they should revolt. If they ever did succeed in convincing the people that Kerensky or his ilk is the alternative to Stalin, that would be the greatest gift to the Politburo's propaganda within the power of the U. S. Fortunately, it is impossible for them to do so. They can only convince them that these political fossils of the pre-revolutionary government are Washington's candidates for the role of the new masters. . . .

Even the nationalist right wing of the UPA with all its political inadequacies, let alone its Marxist movement, knows that this road is closed, and that the hope of freedom for the peoples of Russia lies in the struggle for a democratic socialist society to replace Stalinist totalitarianism.

Bitter Fruits of the Cold War

Witchhunt Stifles Thinking on Campuses Under Pall of Fear, Times Survey Shows

By MAX MARTIN

A sweeping paralysis and restriction of free thought and speech among both students and teachers on the nation's campuses has been set forth in two articles in the *New York Times* (May 11 and May 12), based on a nation-wide survey of 72 major colleges and universities.

The over-all conclusions of the report show "a widening tendency toward passive acceptance of the status quo, conformity, and a narrowing of the area of tolerance in which students, faculty and administrators feel free to speak, act and think independently." The result of this has been a decrease of student political activity and a great decrease in discussion (not to mention espousal) of unpopular or controversial ideas.

The effect of this has not merely been felt by radicalism and by radical groups. The traditionally respectable current of liberalism has been hit just as hard through depletion of the ranks of liberal student organizations and by the spread of apathy and confusion in liberal circles.

The tendency has not affected only campus political life, moreover. It cannot be confined to one sector of college life. The decline of free inquiry and a free give-and-take of ideas in campus political discussion spreads to all other areas of thought and saps the vitality of research and learning in all fields, the humanities and the physical and natural sciences as well as the social sciences. It undermines and strikes a blow, therefore, at the very basis of education itself.

The survey cites the following ways in which the increasing stifling of the campus takes place:

- (1) Reluctance to discuss controversial issues both in and out of the classroom.
- (2) Reluctance to deal with unpopular concepts even when they are part of a study program.
- (3) Unwillingness to join political clubs and a depletion of the memberships of such clubs.
- (4) Neglect of humanitarian causes because they may be suspect in the eyes of college officials.
- (5) Emphasis on non-commitment and non-affiliation.
- (6) Shying away from the use of the words "liberal," "peace" and "freedom" and from those who use them.
- (7) Serio-comic joking about some investigating committee "getting you."
- (8) Sharp turning inward to local college problems to the exclusion of broader questions.

This list obviously is not exhaustive and it omits several aspects which readers of LABOR ACTION know, and which will be discussed below.

Fear Being Labeled 'Communist'

The report states that the above conditions are due to fear of the following:

- (1) Social disapproval.
- (2) A "pink" or Communist label.
- (3) Criticism by regents, legislatures and friends.
- (4) Rejection for further study at graduate schools.
- (5) The spotlight of investigation by government and private industry for post-graduate employment and service with the armed forces.

The report discusses these causes and effects on campus after campus, and quotes from student leaders and teachers interviewed. At CCNY, for example, a student leader said that he was reluctant to express any opinion that might be considered "left-wing" even when asked to write a theme on political issues for a class. A student editor at this school said that students, particularly engineering students, were afraid to speak out.

Hunter College students asserted that there was fear of signing petitions because they were reluctant to get their names on "any list." Teachers here frequently introduce statements of analysis and interpretation with the apology: "Don't get me wrong," and "Don't think I'm a Communist."

The dean of Barnard College (girl's school of Columbia University) reported that speakers at a political institute had skimmed over vital issues and had made only "patriotic speeches." She also told the *Times* that anything identified with peace, freedom of speech and the humanitarian point of view is suspected of Stalinist influence. The college job-placement office said that the word "liberal" was a "poisonous word" to would-be employers, and that this was an important aspect of the situation.

The situation at Rutgers University would be a huge joke if it

were not so tragic in its implications. Students there related the following story:

"A number of students who were asked to sign the widely publicized anti-Communist Crusade for Freedom scroll refused because they were suspicious of the words 'crusade' and 'freedom' and unsure of the sponsors. After the scroll was explained a few came into the fold but others remained adamant, maintaining that they didn't want their names on any suspicious lists."

Reputations at Stake

The president of the student body at the University of Wisconsin pointed to the rejection of liberal journalist and columnist Max Lerner as a lecturer, refusal to permit an instructor to debate a Catholic professor on "Scholastic Sociology vs. Scientific Sociology," and the general tagging of the student board as "subversive" because of its opposition to the views of Senator McCarthy.

A student at the University of Nebraska was told by a faculty member that an article he had written which was critical of the McCarran Act might damage his reputation. The article was withdrawn. A women student at the same campus informed a faculty member that her name had been put on a Stalinist-front mailing list. Several faculty members then called the FBI to investigate.

In six Midwestern schools—Iowa State, Indiana University, Purdue, Oberlin, Kenyon and Washington University—political expression has faded in the last year and a half. It was said that students were aware of increased activity of the FBI and other investigative agencies.

The intrusion of the FBI onto the campus was also mentioned at CCNY where they were "constantly inquiring about students applying for government jobs." The FBI's invasion of the schools represents one of the most dangerous aspects of the worsening situation, undoubtedly creating great fear among the students. The problem of jobs after graduation, mentioned at so many of these schools, provides the rest.

When it comes to take up what is responsible for this general pervasive restrictive atmosphere, the report mentions in passing such factors as the "times," the probable inevitability of the draft, the fear and uncertainty of national life and a "fatalistic and frustrated conviction that little can be done in the college arena to alter international developments." But the main emphasis is put on "McCarthyism." This is done not only in the general discussion of the problem but also on a campus-to-campus basis, where students and teachers were asked to talk about the effects of "McCarthyism" on their colleges. The tone throughout implies that the current hysteria is due to the witchhunting of the more reactionary section of the Republican Party.

Hysteria Not Limited to McCarthy

In reality this is a distorted picture. It is the Truman administration which set the pattern with its "subversive list," loyalty oaths, government purges, and FBI apparatus. It is, moreover, the administration which insists on its free hand to label "subversive" and "security risk" without a hearing, public evidence or even knowledge of charges. Where McCarthy spread his foul smears over well-known figures, it is the administration which has done the same to innumerable little people who have no means of fighting back.

The restriction of democracy in this country is taking place as part of the preparations for the coming war. Just as it is able to answer Stalinist totalitarianism only with "Operation Killer," the government likewise meets the problem of support for the war through the medium of silencing dissenters.

On the campus this is connected with growing militarization. The increasing selection of former or present military men for college presidents and the spread of ROTC are all part of this trend. Are the colleges and universities ultimately due to have as their main function the supplying of bureaucrats and technicians for the needs of the military establishment. Under such conditions restriction of democracy on the campus is inevitable.

The second major error in the *Times* articles is their view of the students, faculty, administrations and boards of regents as being all equally concerned with civil liberties and as being all victims of McCarthyism. As a matter of fact, the articles imply throughout that the administrations are even more concerned than the students and are worrying about the effects of McCarthyism on the students day and night.

College Officials Also Guilty

The second article, which thus presents a rosier picture of the state of academic freedom than the pessimistic first, quotes various holiday and lip-service speeches on civil liberties by college administrators. Among such quotations are one from the University of Washington—whose administration fired three faculty members in a much publicized case some years ago; and one from the University of California—whose regents forced a loyalty oath on an unwilling faculty after a year and a half fight in opposition by students and faculty.

There are some college administrations which are genuinely for civil liberties—the University of Chicago is a good case in point—but the evidence indicates that generally the reverse is true. In most cases the administration acts as the agency for the introduction of the anti-democratic restrictions. The truth is that the defense of academic freedom is increasingly a struggle between the students on one side and the administrations on the other. This is both the usual present pattern and the tendency.

The fact that the report conceals this helps explain why practically every college in New York City is discussed except Brooklyn College. At the latter school a struggle took place recently in which the students unsuccessfully attempted to prevent the Gideonse administration from muzzling the student newspaper. This struggle is still continuing over the attempt of Gideonse to do away with all political clubs at the campus.

But if making McCarthy the devil of the play is a distortion, doing the same for the college officials would be shortsighted. In quite another sense than that of the *Times*, it is true that many of these officials are also victims of the government's war drive and accompanying social repressions. There is a whip over their heads also. Cringing under the whip, they obediently turn themselves into executioners of academic freedom; and pity for such victims is crowded out by contempt. But behind them is the real threat to democracy.

Not in the Headlines

Democratic Ally

The Foreign Policy Association's *Bulletin* (April 20) cites an American marine general on Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's army regime in Formosa. According to the U. S. officer, writes Philip Potter of the *Baltimore Sun*:

"In every unit of command there is a 'political commissar' of rank parallel to that of the military commander. These are under the leadership of Chiang Ching-kuo, son of the generalissimo, who was educated in the Soviet Union. The American marine general said Chiang Ching-kuo exercised a rigid 'thought control.' The words 'thought control' were actually used in the original directive under which the system operates but were later changed to 'reporting on activities.'"

Reds

Oliver LaFarge, the Pulitzer Prize novelist who is president of the Association of American Indian Affairs, has once again blasted away at the government's treatment of the only 100 per cent American in the country. At a meeting of the association he charged that government policies are holding Indians back from attaining full citizenship, in the name of "paternalism."

He cited restrictions on their rights to spend their own money and choose their own legal counsel, to "prevent them from hiring attorneys that will be troublesome to the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

The civil rights of Indians "are freely and habitually violated in almost all states with a sizable Indian population," and "chronic police brutality" has "almost reached the point of a 'perpetual open season on Indians.'" He added: "In large areas of the U. S., Indians are treated as subhuman, as second-class citizens because their skins are a trifle darker."

Try This One On Your Whistle

A new Russian opera on collective farm life, "From the Depths of the Heart," got the lumps from the Politburo, perhaps because (as rumor has it) Stalin judges a work of musical art on the basis of whether he can whistle the tunes. In any case, the *New York Times* reported on this one:

"*Pravda* said the plot had no development or consistency, the heroes had no human emotions and they used language composed of the 'worst opera and salon clichés.' As an example of poor language *Pravda* cited Vanya's aria, 'Now I Dream of Realizing My Project—Giving Electric Current to Fields and Setting Machinery Running. It Will Be Easier for Us to Work and Easier to Live.'"

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of L.A. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
The Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL
 Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS APT.....

CITY ZONE STATE

Bill me Payment encl. (stamps, currency or postal note)

Marshall's Line on Korea

(Continued from page 1)

tion offers the American people and the peoples of the world the discredited theory war can be prevented by sheer military supremacy.

With regard to the war in Korea, Marshall made it clear that the administration hopes to reach some kind of negotiated settlement as a result of the terrible slaughter of the Chinese and North Korean armies. In discussing the alternatives of American policy in that war he stated:

"I said we had three choices, Mr. Chairman, as I saw them. The one was the extension of the campaign along the lines suggested by General MacArthur. The one was to withdraw from Korea and violate our promise to those people and sacrifice them to assassination and probably almost extinction, and the other was to fight where we were, to what advantage we could gain by the method that we followed.

"That method was to inflict the greatest number of casualties we could in order to break down not only the morale, but the trained fabric of the Chinese armies. * * * (five lines deleted.)

"That is, inflict terrific casualties on the Chinese Communist forces.

If we break the morale of their armies, but more particularly, if we destroy their best trained armies as we have been in the process of doing, there, it seems to me, you develop the best probability of reaching a satisfactory negotiatory basis with those Chinese Communist forces, without getting ourselves into what we think would be a great hazard toward developing a much enlarged struggle with consequently larger casualties or a complete world war.

"And also that we will retain our Allies, bring them to more satisfactory reactions before the United Nations as their confidence in our leadership in this delicate matter is increased, and generally improve the situation."

At another point in his testimony

WAR FOR PRESTIGE
mony Marshall made it clear

May Day Rally Hears Shachtman In Buffalo

BUFFALO, May 1—On April 28, the Buffalo Branch of the Independent Socialist League sponsored its May Day meeting in a spirit of genuine socialist fraternalism. Max Shachtman, national chairman, spoke on "A Socialist Way to Combat Stalinism," before the audience of some fifty. Before the speech, May Day greetings were given by individual members of the local branch of the Socialist Party, the local branch of the Liberal Party, and by one of a group of Canadian socialists who came in especially for the meeting.

Following the question and discussion period, refreshments were served, and the discussions continued informally. It was one of the most successful socialist meetings seen in Buffalo for many months.

that in addition to the reasons given above for not pulling the American troops out of Korea there was the consideration that such action would have a demoralizing effect on the allies of the United States. But he also pointed out that the administration believes Russia might intervene in the event MacArthur's policy of extending the war were adopted, precisely because they too feel that to abandon the Chinese Stalinists at this point would demoralize their allies throughout the world.

Thus it appears that the war in Korea is being continued out of imperialist prestige considerations on both sides. As far as saving the Korean people from "assassination and probably almost extinction" is concerned, the war is accomplishing this horrible crime much more effectively and thoroughly than the Stalinists could ever accomplish it.

As General MacArthur testified before the same committees on May 3:

"The war in (South) Korea has already almost destroyed that nation of 20,000,000 people. I have never seen such devastation. I have seen, I guess, as much blood and disaster as any living man, and it just curdled my stomach the last time I was there. After I looked at that wreckage and those thousands of women and children and everything, I vomited."

From the whole of Secretary Marshall's testimony it remains clear that the administration has no political approach to the conflict with Stalinism which is capable of defeating it short of world war. The politics of their position is confined to an effort to get through the rearmament period without losing their allies and without getting involved in an all-out war.

A CRUSADE, OR NOT?

At one point, Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas drew Marshall out on this question. MacArthur had said that the

enemy is not the Russian government but Communism. Fulbright's questioning went as follows:

SENATOR FULBRIGHT—You regard our great opponent as Soviet Russia.

SECRETARY MARSHAL—Yes, sir.

Q—You do not regard this struggle as a sort of modern ideological crusade against communism, I take it?

A—When I said Soviet Russia and the Soviet Union, I was thinking in terms of the Communist government.

Q—Well, that is true; they are communistic, with which I agree. I understood you to say that the enemy we are concerned about is Russia. It is the armies of Soviet Russia.

A—That is correct, sir.

Q—... My only point is that you do not look upon this as sort of a crusade against communism everywhere and in any form; but it is because it is an aggressive force, and has taken on the power of the Russian state is what concerns you, is it not?

A—Yes, sir. . . .

Q—Well, now, the Yugoslavs are admittedly Communists, are they not?

A—Yes, sir.

Q—But the significant thing is they do not adhere nor are they subject to the directions of Moscow, isn't that what makes them different from other communists?

A—Exactly that.

Q—It seems to me a good illustration of the point I am seeking to make is this is not a crusade. What we are really concerned about is the threatening force of arms directed by Moscow, is that correct?

A—That is correct, with the results that would follow.

This rather peculiar exchange illustrates the political problem of the administration, and of the capitalist society it represents. They know that Stalinism has a

political appeal to masses throughout the world who are seeking a way to rid themselves of capitalism. The Marshall Plan was designed in large measure to give the capitalist countries of Europe a sufficient degree of stability and prosperity to stem the ideological appeal of Stalinism, and at the same time to prepare them for the military program which is being launched now. But as capitalism cannot make any positive appeal for a transformation of society which would give it a political advantage, the purely military side of its policy becomes the only thing in which, in the last analysis, it has any confidence.

WHY DID CHANG FALL?

This central fact was illustrated further in the testimony revolving around American policy toward Chiang Kai-shek immediately after the Second World War, and also with regard to the failure to build up a South Korean army which was capable of resisting the North Korean Stalinist forces at the beginning of the war.

Marshall testified that the U. S. had supplied Chiang with a large amount of arms and ammunition, and that his armies were far larger and much better equipped than those of the Chinese Stalinists. Although the American representatives sought to work out a political compromise in China which would have given the government wide popular support, this proved impossible. Chiang's armies disintegrated without putting up a real fight, and no popular movement came to their aid.

With regard to Korea, it was brought out that at one point the joint chiefs of staff had offered MacArthur arms with which to equip from 60,000 to 300,000 Korean troops. MacArthur had suggested that these be given to the Japanese police instead.

The significance of this is clear. MacArthur did not feel that there were enough politically reliable

South Koreans available to be equipped. This despite the fact that in the early stages of the war poorly armed Stalinist guerrilla forces were a major problem to the U. S. troops.

If the South Korean people had felt they had something to fight for, the arming of masses of peasants could have been of tremendous aid in repelling the Stalinists. But they did not feel that way, precisely because the Rhee regime and its American backers could give no social-political program for which to lay down their lives.

BOTH POLICIES FAIL

As between the Truman-Marshall policy and that advocated by MacArthur, the administration's policy tends to prolong the breathing spell before the world is plunged into all-out war. It is less irresponsible from the standpoint of U. S. strategy in that it seeks to keep allies, while MacArthur would act regardless of the effect of such actions on the allied governments.

But both policies are devoid of a political answer to Stalinism. Both are directed, each in its own way, only toward an eventual military struggle, with all the awful consequences this would have for the peoples of the world.

As long as Stalinism and capitalism exist, such a military struggle may break out at any time. Yet the only policy which can save civilization from perhaps unlimited disaster must be a political one which is directed toward undermining the political power of both the Stalinist and capitalist ruling classes. Such a policy can only be adopted and acted on by the workers and colonial peoples of the world, independently from the classes which rule over them. They must struggle to emancipate themselves from the power of these classes. They must struggle for their own behalf, for their own interests, rather than becoming pawns in the struggle for imperialist world power.

Bay Area Socialists Picket Franco

SAN FRANCISCO, May 11—A small but spirited anti-totalitarian picket line was held here at noon yesterday in front of the Spanish consulate. Sponsored jointly by the Independent Socialist League, the Berkeley Socialist Youth League, the East Bay local of the Socialist Party, the Industrial Workers of the World and the Berkeley Socialist Club, the demonstration protested U. S. aid to Franco and called for the release of the imprisoned Barcelona strikers.

Carrying signs indicating their opposition to totalitarianism on both sides of the Iron Curtain and chanting numerous slogans such as "Down with Franco, Stalin and Rhee," the marchers made clear they were opposed to both fascism and Stalinism. Two thousand copies of a printed leaflet explaining the purpose of the demonstration and calling for support to the Spanish workers' fight against Franco were distributed to passers-by.

In addition to representatives of the five sponsoring groups, several University of California students responded to the call and marched in the picket line. Thirty-five other organizations, including trade unions and minority and liberal political groups had been invited to participate, but failed to appear. Because of the anti-totalitarian nature of the demonstration, the Communist Party and its various affiliates were not invited, of course.

The local Socialist Workers Party sat in on the preliminary conferences called to organize the picket line, but later dissociated itself from any sponsorship of the action when all the other groups unanimously insisted that

the demonstration be anti-Stalinist as well as anti-Franco. The SWP had urged that the picket line be confined to an anti-Franco demonstration only and it refused to participate when a clear and unambiguous anti-Stalinist line was adopted as well.

The San Francisco Chronicle reported on the demonstration. The Chronicle attempted to secure a statement from the Spanish consulate, but reported that the Franco staff had declined comment.

comment.

comment.

Yesterday's anti-Franco picket line was the first to be held in the San Francisco Bay Area since the Spanish workers renewed their battle against fascist tyranny. It followed similar demonstrations held in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and Los Angeles, where in every case locals of the Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League were among the sponsors and participants.

Read About Socialism!

- THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISMpage \$1.00
by Max Shachtman cloth 2.00
- SOCIALISM: The Hope of Humanity 10¢
by Max Shachtman
- MARXISM IN THE U. S. 35¢
by Leon Trotsky
- PLENTY FOR ALL: The Meaning of Socialism..... 25¢
by Ernest Erber
- THE ROLE OF THE PARTY in the Fight for
Socialism (mimeo'd) 25¢
- THE ROLE OF THE TRADE UNIONS: Economic
Role under Capitalism (mimeo'd) 25¢
(Both mimeo'd pamphlets for 40¢)

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

New Issue of Forum Out

RESOLUTIONS FOR THE CONVENTION
of the
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

CONTENTS:

- (1) International Resolution (two parts)
 - (a) Independent Socialism and the Third World War.
 - (b) The Meaning of the British Labor Government.
- (2) The Situation in the United States.
- (3) Resolution on the Jewish Question: Israel and Palestine.

(Another issue of FORUM will be out soon with the remaining convention resolutions.)

Price: 15¢ per copy

Order from:

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