

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 2, 1950

FIVE CENTS

**WHY LAND REFORM FAILED
IN SOUTH KOREA**

... page 6

Tito's New Line on the Korean War

... page 3

The Plan for German Rearmament

... page 3

E. Germany: 'The New Type of Life'

... page 7

'Police-State' Bill Passed over Truman Veto As President's Message Concedes Principle

by GORDON HASKELL

The McCarran "Communist Control Act" is a rotten piece of business any way you look at it. And the fact that no one really put up a serious fight against it makes one wonder whether there will be, after all, any way of keeping this country from sliding to a police state.

Just how close can we get to a police state before a very large number of people begin to wake up and really rise up on their hind legs to stop what is taking place? Three years ago if anyone had suggested that such a law is or would be necessary in the near future to protect the country from the Stalinists he would have been denounced by every liberal and most labor leaders as a stupid reactionary.

But now some of the leading ADA "pro-labor" liberals in the Senate were caught first proposing a concentration-camp bill (to be used only when this same wild-eyed Congress proclaims there is a national emergency) as against the registration bill, then voting for a combined bill, then sneaking out so they wouldn't have to vote either way when the combined bill was returned from a Senate-House conference, and then voting against the combined bill after the president had vetoed it.

While the great liberal leaders were distinguishing themselves in this manner the reactionaries were having a field day. Westbrook Pegler may very well denounce them as a bunch of weak-kneed sissies who didn't have the moral courage to pass a bill which would provide for stringing every suspected Communist, Socialist or Fair Dealer to a lamppost on sight. But the legislators went on a rampage anyway, and the whole American people are going to have to pay for it.

The bill they passed provides that any "Communist" or "Communist-front" organization will have to register itself and its members with the government. If any organization which has been adjudged to be of such a nature refuses to register, or if any individual who belongs to such an outfit fails to make sure that his or her name has been handed in to the blacklist, fines and imprisonment await the officers of the organization or the individual.

"SAFEGUARDS"

If any register themselves, what will happen to them? It is a crime if they get a government job, get a passport, or get a job in any defense installation or plant. Just to make sure that no one makes a mistake about this, the law states that all such plants and installations must be listed publicly, so that no "Communist" can say he wasn't warned.

How are they going to tell who is a Communist? That has never been much of a

(Turn to last page)

Truman Prefers His Own Method Of Gag by Administrative Degree

By LARRY O'CONNOR

President Truman's veto of the McCarran Act (Internal Security Act of 1950) represents a mixture of democratic sentiments and of arguments which either have nothing to do with protecting the country against the assault on its civil liberties represented by the act, or are based on the complaint that certain procedures provided for in the act are more democratic than procedures which already have been adopted by the executive branch of the government.

The veto message is sprinkled with democratic sentiments: "It [the bill] would put the government of the United States in the thought-control business. It would give government officials vast powers to harass all of our citizens in the exercise of their right of free speech."

Further on the veto message states: "the application of the

registration requirements to so-called Communist-front organizations can be the greatest danger to freedom of speech, press and assembly, since the Alien and Sedition Laws of 1798. This danger arises out of the criteria or standards to be applied in determining whether an organization is a Communist-front organization."

"... the bill would permit such

(Continued on page 7)

A Sidelight From the DAV

In the light of the "Communist Control" law passed by Congress, it is interesting to recall what happened over a month ago at the August convention of the Disabled American Veterans.

The DAV adopted a platform which called for the death penalty "in extreme cases" against subversives committing acts "against the constitution or security of the United States." This was NOT included in the congressional bill. But the DAV at that time also plugged the planks for registration and concentration camps.

The concentration-camp feature was opposed by the DAV national commander, David Brown, who urged the delegates not to be "hasty." To show how democratic he was, he proposed instead that subversives should be put in jail! Whereupon a delegate yelled from the floor: "No, then you have to give them trials!"

The convention passed the concentration-camp idea. The "liberal" senators who proposed this Nazi-like measure in Washington can take a look in the DAV mirror to see themselves.

One of the three delegates at the DAV convention who opposed the concentration camps said: "It is inadvisable for us as a nation to use the tactics we deplore in others. I don't want to leave this convention wearing a black shirt."



LABOR SCOPE

Tale of Two Psychology Tests in The Factories

From UAW "Ammunition"

Harold F. Rothe, of the management consultant firm Stevenson, Jordan, and Harrison (who are no friends of wage earners), writing in the management publication, Factory Management and Maintenance, cites the statistics that prove stewards speak better than foremen, think straighter, and add, subtract, multiply, and get right answers with more zing and higher accuracy.

The proof is no phony cigarette survey proving that more doctors smoke Hare-Fur Cigaretts or showing that Hare-Fur is kind to your B-Zone. Sixty-four union stewards in 14 local unions were tested. Two hundred fifty-six foremen in 50 companies chewed the ends of their pencils in these tests. Finally, 135 executives in 35 companies took the tests, too. The tests used in this survey have been given to more than 10,000 persons in all.

Here is what the testing of stewards, foremen, and company executives showed.

When a foreman was given a number of questions dealing with the meaning of words, he only got 13 of the questions right in four minutes. Stewards, on the other hand, know words and how to use them far better than foremen. They got 20 of the questions right in four minutes. Plant executives scored slightly higher than stewards. They came up with 24 right answers in four minutes.

STEWARDS ON TOP

Since foremen and stewards have roughly the same educational background, the test is a pretty fair indication that stewards use words better than foremen. Plant executives, however, usually are far better educated in a formal way than either stewards or foremen. Actually if you take account of the fact that most plant executives have had college training, then you come up with the notion that stewards, all things considered, are smarter than or as smart as plant executives.

When this phase of the test was analyzed, it turned out that 40 per cent of the stewards tested had a command of words that equaled that of the average executive. Only 9 per cent of the foremen understood what the boss was talking about (if this test is any guide).

The tests run off by the management firm which revealed how logically a man thinks showed plant executives ranking first in the final score with a point score of five. Stewards came second with a score of four. The foremen came last with a way-down average of two. (When you consider the fact that the firm—Stevenson, Jordan and Harrison—must sell its incentive programs and its plant surveys to top management, then maybe you can understand why the plant executives always come out on top. Somebody in the firm has probably read Dale Carnegie.)

A third set of tests measured the ability to think with numbers. To add, subtract, multiply, divide and to solve problems in arithmetic. Here the plant executives scored 19, the stewards on the average scored eight and the foremen scored seven.

A test in logical relations put stewards ahead of foremen, 13 points to 10. Plant executives scored 16 on this test.

Now, again, if you make allowances for the fact that Stevenson, Jordan and Harrison ran this survey as part of a campaign to sell management their fancy speed-up techniques, and if you make allowances for the fact that plant executives should do better on these tests because of their college training, you come up with the conclusion that stewards are just as smart as plant executives and much smarter than foremen.

But that raises a question. Why are they smarter? By and large they are the same English-Irish-German - Slav - Italian - Negro-American kind of Americans as the foremen (and except for discriminatory practices) as the plant executives.

DEMOCRACY'S IQ

Factory Management and Maintenance gives part of the answer. Stewards and union officers are selected by democratic processes. They are elected. And they don't get elected unless they are leaders, are intelligent and can speak their pieces effectively. Foremen on the other hand are appointed. People with the power of appointment have a tendency to go for apple-polishers, flattery, bootlicking and eager beavers. Hardly any of these qualities add up in your intelligence quotient.

Foremen, in this survey by Stevenson, Jordan and Harrison, were also compared with workers the plant superintendent himself had named as troublemakers and agitators. Of the 13 troublemakers, three were below average on the test, one was average, while the other eight scored way above the average for the foremen. And that leads to another judgment about why foremen don't score so well as stewards. Stewards have convictions they believe to be right. They know they are on the side of the people in the plant and that the people in the plant are on their side.

From RR Unions' "Labor"

Something new has been added on the Denver & Rio Grande Western, and union leaders are

looking at it with a fishy eye. The scheme is a "psychiatric" interview system which the carrier has launched among applicants for jobs, and among veteran employes who seek promotion to supervisory positions.

From the kind of questions asked and the way these interviews are conducted, railroaders fear the scheme is a camouflaged setup for weeding out staunch trade unionists.

The real low-down on the plan came from Charles Schiller, assistant general manager in charge of personnel. Schiller, in an interview with the Denver Post and then in an address to a convention of industrial editors in Denver, took off the mask.

Under the system, as Schiller told the press, new applicants for jobs and veteran workers seeking promotion to supervisors are called in; they are "encouraged" by well-placed questions to "talk and talk"—about their childhood, habits, activities they're interested in and the organizations they belong to.

Then Schiller let the cat out of the bag. By this method, he said, the management determines whether employes have the "right attitude."

"With 7,500 to 8,500 employes of the railroad under the influence of unions, a proper selection program is a fundamental of good industrial relations," Schiller said.

"If you hire a man with too much leadership ability for a routine job, you are asking for trouble. Such a man will exercise his talent in union activity."

Warner of the Carmen declared that these disclosures by Schiller indicate strongly that the scheme may be a "new kind of union-busting policy."

OHIO LABOR NOTES

John L. Tells Mine Owners To Keep Taft out of Pits

By M. HAUSER

CLEVELAND, Sept. 24—In a letter to the president of the Ohio Coal Operators Association, John L. Lewis warned the association to keep Senator Taft out of the coal mines during his election campaign.

To quote Lewis' words: "Taft was born encased in velvet pants, and has lived to rivet an iron collar around the necks of millions of Americans. He is a relentless, albeit witless, tool of the oppressors of labor. You should refuse him entry to mines where Americans toil. The underground workings are necessarily confined and the air there is very contaminated. The effluvia of the oppressor is ever disagreeable and could enrage the men to the point of evacuation of the mines. This we would both deplore."

Taft claims he has no plans to go into the mines, although he might plan a few meetings of coal miners.

NEEDS REMINDER

It is almost certain by now that Governor Lausche of Ohio will not oppose Ferguson as senatorial candidate to unseat Taft. This, no doubt, is a relief to the Democrats of the state, because some time ago Lausche had said he might vote for either candidate. He hadn't made up his mind yet. Labor circles have held up their endorsement of Lausche until his decision.

The State Democratic Party convention is being held in Columbus this week and Lausche will endorse the platform (which he wrote) and "all democratic candidates," without naming Ferguson.

It is interesting to take a look at this program. It includes FEPC legislation, raises for teachers, liquor law enforcement, and similar points. Lausche says that the other points of the 1948 platform have been carried out.

We hope that some labor leader may have the courage to remind him that there is a Taft-Hartley Law still on the books, that a national health program has been shelved, and that there is a strong need for effective rent and price controls.

"LIBERAL" PAPER

The Cleveland Press, which considers itself the great liberal newspaper in Cleveland, has announced its support of Taft. The Press devotes much of its space to no-doubt-worthy causes such as raising money for operations for needy people, and makes an occasional defense of the Bill of Rights. However it sees only management's side in labor disputes, puts labor on the back only when it gives in to the strike-breaking of the government and management.

It isn't surprising then that they say that although they frequently disagree with Taft, they find it necessary to support him because the country needs such an "able" statesman in time of crisis.

AGAINST SIN

The Republican Party of Ohio has announced that it doesn't need a platform this year. It will merely state that it stands for all that is good and true. Using Senator Taft for an example, no doubt.

STEEL WILDCAT

A wildcat strike has closed down two American Steel and Wire Company plants in Cleveland. The issue is one of establishing work standards. The company maintains its right to decide what is a fair day's work. The workers in the shop feel that they, through their union, should have something to say about it.

Although the leadership of Local 1372, United Steelworkers (CIO) has officially asked them to return to work, the impression one gets is that they are sympathetic to the strike, although it is in violation of their contract.

In spite of the need for steel in war orders, there have been no cries of "Communist instigation." The men seem to be determined to stick it out until the issue is favorably settled.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNITY

The workers of Peco Products, a part of the Borg Warner Corporation, held a one-day demonstration this week to back demands for a 15-cent wage increase. The company had recently given their office help a 12-cent raise and offered the factory help an 8-cent raise. The employees are members of Local 363, United Auto Workers (CIO), and also belong to the Borg Warner Council with other organized Borg Warner shops.

There is a real need for industry-wide bargaining with this corporation, but so far the corporation claims it doesn't control policy in individual shops and therefore must bargain separately in each unit. The union action, then, has an added significance since this one-day walkout was held the same day in each organized Borg Warner shop, with the same demands.

The union stated that, in accordance with its contract which reopens on wages in November, they would return to work the next day, but the issue is not yet settled, and there may be further action unless the company offers a satisfactory settlement.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Sq., L. I. C. 1, New York specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Tito Regime Announces New Line on Korea As Belgrade Jumps Off Fence on UN Side

By HAL DRAPER

The Tito regime of Yugoslavia has now definitely plumped for the U.S.-UN side in the Korean war between Western and Russian imperialism. After months of silence and doubletalk, during which it was virtually the only government of any importance in the world with no expressed stand on the most vital political question of the day, it has chosen up sides strictly and solely on the basis of the narrowest nationalist considerations.

This is clear from three statements, most definitive of which was Foreign Minister Kardelj's speech at the UN on September 25. But two things must be immediately added: (1) The "special attitude" on the Korean war which Kardelj announced does NOT mean that Tito-Yugoslavia has "gone over to the Western camp" in any accepted meaning of that phrase; and (2) there is and will be still plenty of doubletalk in the Yugoslav new line, for the same reasons which dictated their line up to now.

Kardelj's speech at the UN had been preceded by two other clear indications that the Titoists had decided to cross the line. In an interview with a party of U. S. congressmen in Belgrade, the Yugoslav premier was reported to have expressed his satisfaction with the prompt and energetic intervention of United Nations forces against the North Korean invaders, whom the Yugoslavs regard as guilty of aggression. This paraphrased statement, in the New York Times for September 22, can be considered reliable, I believe, since Times correspondent Handler has been careful (and successful) in remaining persona grata in Belgrade.

Secondly, just before leaving for New York, Kardelj published an article in the Yugoslav CP Daily Borba which did not go so far as Tito's statement to the congressmen but adequately announced the turn.

All of this had been prepared for, in Yugoslav propaganda, in the fashion which we described in LABOR ACTION for August 21.

Blasts N. Korea

Kardelj's UN speech limited its open statement to a denunciation of the North Koreans war and of "those who are inspiring the policy and activities of the North Korean government" and its "aggressive course."

After stating that the Yugoslavs considered the Korean war "partly a civil war" and that they "sympathize with the cause of the independence and unity of the people of Korea," together with a nod to the "strong national democratic and liberation movement" in Korea, Kardelj said: "The government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, however, considers that the present policy of the government of North Korea does not serve the cause of the true independence and unity of the Korean people. Whether we consider the war in Korea a civil war or not, that war is in the present circumstances bound to endanger world peace, to deal a blow to all peaceful efforts and to set in motion all the forces of war in the world."

That there is a subordinate civilian element in the Korean battle goes without saying, but Kardelj's formulation indicates that, whatever the importance of this element in their opinion, their stand is decisively determined by considerations which have nothing to do with an analysis of the Korean war itself. This had been made pitifully clear by obviously inspired dispatches by Handler from Belgrade, last month, in which the Times correspondent represented the Yugoslav leaders as determining their position on Korea on the basis of their fear of Russian aggression on Yugoslavia itself. Kardelj's UN speech, in fact, featured a long section on this threat, as the background to his Korean line.

As we have pointed out before, this is indeed the major consideration in determining the Titoists' "special attitude"—an accurate phrase of Kardelj's since it points up the fact that their Korean position cannot possibly be squared with their line on the Chinese and Greek Stalinist struggles, which they supported enthusiastically. That is, they cannot be squared on the basis of any principled considerations of any kind.

This fact can be disconcerting, however, only to those circles who have been hailing the Titoist regime as "Marxist-Leninist," "socialist," or a "workers' state." But Yugoslavians' previous hesitation and present line on Korea has had nothing to do at any point with socialist, working-class, or internationalist considerations. It has been pulled by four tugs, two on each side. The winning forces were:

(1) In case of Russian aggression, the Yugoslavs want to be able to appeal to the UN (that is, the U.S.) for military aid on the basis of the Korean precedent, and hope that Washington will be as kind to them as to Syngman Rhee. This does NOT mean that Tito wants to see an American expeditionary force on his soil, except perhaps in extremis. He would want full material aid first.

Counter-Considerations Powerful

(2) A second reason for the turn now is the Yugoslavs' need for economic aid from the U. S. and from U.S.-controlled agencies. According to Handler's reports, Yugoslav economy is in a more critical state than usual (once again), made worse by a drought. It is likely (only speculation is possible on the basis of present information) that the Titoists' current purge of their Croatian CP was triggered not so much by simple pro-Conformism in that sector as by peasant discontent. (But it must be remembered that pro-Conformism could be a result of such discontent.) In the March election in Yugoslavia, the JA-vote in Croatia was notably low, relatively speaking. Croatia has always been the most industrialized and proletarianized section of the country (again, relatively speaking) and its relations with Belgrade are further complicated by the fact that it is a predominantly Catholic area.

Against these two considerations, which won the day as a consequence of increased Moscow-instigated movements on the Yugoslav frontiers, there are two others which still operate to keep Kardelj's public statements wrapped in doubletalk. These are:

(1) It is of vital concern to Yugoslav propaganda among its satellite neighbors to quash the Cominform's main line: that a break with Moscow means "going over to Western imperialism." Lies out of the whole cloth, like the Russians' accusations that U. S.

military bases exist inside Yugoslavia, are comparatively easy to combat. The new Korean line will lend color to the "Yugoslav Revolutionary Emigrés" (Cominform) underground radio blasts. Kardelj is concerned to keep the Cominform's advantage to a minimum.

(2) The Yugoslavs' hope for Titoism in China out of the Mao Tse Tung leadership is a bright and shining one, and there is no doubt that their new line on Korea will not help them in better relations there.

These last two considerations are strong ones for Belgrade, certainly not lightly to be dismissed—strong enough, it is clear, to keep them on the fence for the past months in spite of the obvious diplomatic advantage of yelling at the front of the pack for "punishment of the aggressor" in Korea, in anticipation of reciprocation in case of their own involvement. This is all the more true since there has been speculation all along, since the North Korean invasion, that the Korean invasion was only a cover for an invasion of Yugoslavia to follow.

proletarianized section of the country (again, relatively speaking) and its relations with Belgrade are further complicated by the fact that it is a predominantly Catholic area.

Against these two considerations, which won the day as a consequence of increased Moscow-instigated movements on the Yugoslav frontiers, there are two others which still operate to keep Kardelj's public statements wrapped in doubletalk. These are:

(1) It is of vital concern to Yugoslav propaganda among its satellite neighbors to quash the Cominform's main line: that a break with Moscow means "going over to Western imperialism." Lies out of the whole cloth, like the Russians' accusations that U. S.

areas the U. S. weight fell against the two men, Mao and Ho Chi-minh, to whom the Titoists look for "Titoism" with perhaps the greatest hope.

The above slap by Kardelj was immediately followed, furthermore, by an attack on those "people who are either unwilling or unable to grasp that the struggle for peace should not be identified with the struggle for the preservation of a social system" and a repetition of the Yugoslav line that there is no reason why capitalism and "socialism" (that is, Stalinism) cannot live together in the same world under the aegis of that sterling force for peace, the United Nations.

Kardelj's positive proposal on Korea was that the U. S. stop at the 38th parallel, and the establishment of a permanent International Commission of Good Offices (composed of smaller countries) to try to do something about aggressions.

Not a word about the policy of the U. S. on Formosa or Indo-China, even though in these two

areas the U. S. weight fell against the two men, Mao and Ho Chi-minh, to whom the Titoists look for "Titoism" with perhaps the greatest hope.

The above slap by Kardelj was immediately followed, furthermore, by an attack on those "people who are either unwilling or unable to grasp that the struggle for peace should not be identified with the struggle for the preservation of a social system" and a repetition of the Yugoslav line that there is no reason why capitalism and "socialism" (that is, Stalinism) cannot live together in the same world under the aegis of that sterling force for peace, the United Nations.

Kardelj's positive proposal on Korea was that the U. S. stop at the 38th parallel, and the establishment of a permanent International Commission of Good Offices (composed of smaller countries) to try to do something about aggressions.

Not a word about the policy of the U. S. on Formosa or Indo-China, even though in these two

Rearmament Plan Gives Germans Only Right To Fight for Capitalism, Not Their Freedom

By MARY BELL

Integration schemes for Western Europe by the United States were recently pushed to a higher level in the recent meetings of the North Atlantic foreign ministers at the Waldorf-Astoria as they proposed an "integrated military force" and moved toward agreement on the participation of a re-armed German in a common European army under a supreme Atlantic command which would undoubtedly be American.

The actual decision on German rearmament is secret. Whatever it was, all indications point to the inevitable rearmament. Discussion of this question was accompanied by British reservations and French opposition. Many liberals are dismayed. But all hesitancy over this question is subsumed under the preparations for the Big War which are being speeded up by the Korean "police action."

Franco has been given the olive branch by the American Congress, and Germany—Germany whose "unconditional surrender" was to make it impossible for her ever to fight again—is actively being wooed. The Big Three promise to:

- (1) End the state of war (but not the Allied occupation).
(2) Regard any attack on the Bonn government, including a Korea-style "civil war," as an attack on the Big Three.
(3) Add 30,000 police to the 10,000 in existence as a special security against Stalinist internal disruption.
(4) Permit West Germany a foreign office and ambassadors.
(5) Relax Allied controls over the West German Government and economy, specifically steel production for armaments for Western war production.

POISONOUS FLOWER

While the New Leader (Sept. 16) reports in interviews with

Konrad Adenauer, West German Republic chancellor, Ernst Reuter, Berlin mayor, and other German representatives that most Germans oppose rearmament, it is evident that this opposition is fast melting. However, it is also evident that many Germans feel that if proposals for granting Germany more independence had come earlier, the Allied powers might possibly have been suspected of altruism. As the proposals on Germany stand today, they are nothing if not part and parcel of the war program, just as were the earlier economic proposals for "integration." All countries are being drawn toward one of the two big magnetic poles of power politics, and principles are invented from day to day.

The division and occupation of Germany by the erstwhile Allies in the late "great crusade" against totalitarianism planted this problem which has come to poisonous flower today. Korea is the bloody dress rehearsal which forces on the thinking of everybody the fear that Germany will be the "big Korea" which will unleash World War III.

There was no real and thorough denazification undertaken in Germany. There was no liberation. The denazification was a token one and largely undertaken out of fear of German competition on the market. And there will not be—there cannot be under the bourgeois scheme of things—any independence. Yes, the Western Allied High Commission is nearing an end, but its end is to be based upon certain agreements. These agreements specify, according to the New York Times, that Germany "cooperate in the distribution among Western nations of raw materials and products needed for their common defense." The writer on German affairs in the same newspaper understated it as follows: "Most of the decisions were precipitated by the political and military needs of the Allies themselves."

The specific French objections will be overcome by the preponderant preparedness of the Russians. The United States argues that what it contemplates is not really "rearmament" since it will take place under a unified Western command which will be answerable to the North Atlantic Council. This argument only underscores the point that the rearmament has nothing to do with democratic aspirations but is designed to assure another ally in the war to come.

The Germans are to be permitted an additional police force, greater steel production, rearmament, a little more freedom under Allied occupation—for the purposes of war!

The French objections are colored by France's traditional fears of German militarism, reinforced by three previous wars. A more cogent objection, the fear of the effect of rearming Germany on Eastern Europe in strengthening the Stalinist propaganda there, has also been voiced among their spokesmen. The German rearmament will undoubtedly be used to

the hit by the Politburo, will be construed as one of the most significant moves thus far taken by the West to build up its war potential, and thus serve propagandistically as a unifying factor among the satellites.

U. S. Military Intelligence Bars Jewish DPs on "Red" Charges

The following is reproduced from the Jewish Newsletter of September 8. The Newsletter is published by William Zukerman at 880 West 181 Street, New York. The facts set forth have been corroborated independently from a number of sources.—Ed.

Signs of hysteria came from abroad this week. A report from Munich in the New York Jewish Morning Journal (Sept. 4) states that since the outbreak of the Korean war, American immigration authorities in Germany have practically discontinued issuing visas to Jewish DPs who are fully entitled to them on the wholesale suspicion that all Jewish DPs are communists. Every Jewish DP who applies for a visa now is subjected to an inquisition by the Counter-Intelligence Service (CIS) which would be comical if it were not so terribly pitiful. Applicants are asked: Why don't you immigrate to Israel instead of to the United States? What would you do in case of a war between the United States and Israel? Who do you think will win in Korea? Who is a greater statesman, Stalin or President Truman? Even if an applicant succeeds in convincing the CIS that he is not and has never been a communist, he is refused a visa on the grounds that for that

very reason he was chosen by the Comintern to go to the U. S. Another unfortunate aspect of the new situation is that the CIS now has a number of Jewish spies in the DP camps who inform on the prospective applicants. This has demoralized the atmosphere in the camps, apart from the fact that it has practically suspended Jewish immigration to the U. S.

NMU Group Warns of 'Screening' By Coast Guard and Curran

NEW YORK, Sept. 15 (CDU)—Charging that the present administration of the National Maritime Union is using the Coast Guard security program to oust the anti-communist opposition from the union, Ernest Nukanen, in a letter to the commandant of the Coast Guard today called for a revision of the entire screening program.

Nukanen, secretary of the Com-

Available: BOUND VOLUMES of Labor Action 1945 to 1948 \$3.00 a volume Order from: Labor Action Book Service 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Subscribers — Attention! Check your NAME, ADDRESS, CITY, ZONE, STATE, appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

14-40 If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue. RENEW NOW!

I. S. L. Autumn Social



Saturday, September 30 9:00 P.M.

Dancing Refreshments

114 WEST 14th STREET

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!

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name Address State Tel. City Zone

Propaganda on TV

ATOMIC-SPY "DRAMA" ON THE MORON LEVEL

By NORMAN JOHNSTONE

The *Traitor*, written by Herman Wouk for the Ford Theater (September 8) and described by a television periodical as a "gripping spy drama," is a fair example of what the television industry is offering in the way of conditioning on the Russian question. Before outlining the plot it might be appropriate to mention that out of the three words quoted above, only one actually describes the fare offered. It was definitely not gripping, nor was it a drama.

Using the assembly chamber of the United Nations as a backdrop, the story opens with the Old Professor listening to translations of Malik's speeches and Warren Austin's characterizations of them as lies. After a fade-out and fade-in, we see the Old Professor, a young man and his lady friend returning home from an evening at the theatre. The young man, a physicist, begs his leave and the Old Professor and the lady friend return home.

Shortly after their arrival, a young naval officer makes his appearance. He is an old flame, since deposed but unaware of it. This allows the Old Professor and the girl to chat about the physicist and build a character evaluation of him for the viewers. The young lady shows the officer some pictures she took on vacation, and jocular mention is made of her ability to ruin good pictures. The old flame wants the negatives so he may at least have her pictures to remember her by. Upon scrutinizing them he perceives that they have been exposed to radioactive bombardment. Immediately he picks up the telephone and calls Naval Intelligence.

Meantime, via fade-in and fade-out, we see the young atomic physicist meeting in a deserted park with members of a spy-ring. (The viewers do not have to be told for whom the spies work.) He keeps demanding to see the head and refuses to turn his information over to underlings.

The Plot Thickens

Back at the Old Professor's home the young lieutenant's superior officer is taking charge. With the aid of a geiger counter they ascertain that there is radioactivity in the physicist's desk.

Instantly, the place is overrun with Naval Intelligence, all surprisingly enough clad in middies. They "Roger," "over," and "out" incessantly. The telephone is tapped and a dictaphone is planted in the radio speaker; the place, which is a shambles, is transformed in apple-pie order within the space of ten minutes.

The young physicist returns home, not knowing that the professor and his girl friend have been persuaded (against their better judgment) by Naval Intelligence to help trap him. Pointed questions are asked of his whereabouts; belligerently, against his will, he tells them of his ideals, the futility of expecting peace under prevailing conditions and how he has decided that if the other great power had atomic weapons, the two powers would be compelled by sheer desperation to come together and peace would prevail. The lunacy of his thesis oddly enough doesn't strike a dissonant chord in this play. He has long since given up on Communism; he doesn't believe in Marxism, which of course is equated with Stalinism for the viewers' benefit. He is simply a man of "good will" backed against the wall who feels compelled to save the world in spite of itself.

Virtue Triumphs, Villain Foiled

After the intelligence chief arrives, he undergoes the usual struggle with conscience which is evidently routine in all stories of this nature. He begs to be allowed to leave, and this time he knows he can bring back the head of the spy ring. (The Ford Theater's hour is rapidly drawing to a close and you know that he will.) This he does, with Naval Intelligence planted at every door and window. He bargains with the spy chief, who further incriminates socialism by his cynicism and callousness. The transaction completed, the material supposedly in a dime locker in a railroad terminal, the spy draws a gun and shoots the newly converted hero, and is himself in turn dealt justice by Naval Intelligence. The physicist lives long enough to tell where they can find the stolen data, which is so powerful that it gives off radioactivity in the desk while it is reposing in general delivery in a post office somewhere on Long Island. A fade-in and fade-out take us back to the beginning with the Old Professor still listening to Malik.

As in most television plots of this nature, all logic is thrown to the winds in favor of propaganda. The physicist only under duress perceives the error of his ways; Naval Intelligence comes out triumphant; the villain is slain; the lady friend mourns, but is consoled by the knowledge of her lover's regency; the Old Professor's belief in the United Nations is buttressed; everything winds up pat, as it does in the Westerns one may see every day on television. All this at the expense of the intelligence of the viewing public.

If it is the intention of television and its sponsors to bring more of this type of war-conditioning before the public, they might at least haul out some new approaches to make them more believable.



LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 40

October 2, 1950

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

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

Reading from Left to Right

WHY HAVE A LABOR PARTY? By Herbert Agar. (Atlantic Monthly, October)

When the 1934 winner of the Pulitzer Prize in American history (also author of this year's *Price of Union*) writes a long article on the above question, and the *Atlantic* prints it as its lead article for the month, it is rather odd to find the article saying that no one except a few radical intellectuals in the labor movement is for a labor party. The prior question, in that case, would apparently have to be: Why Have an Article on a Labor Party?

But there the article is, in the top spot; and as a polemic against forming a labor party it has a unique characteristic. Its argument is that labor should NOT form its own party BECAUSE there is no difference between the two old parties.

Says Agar: "Although the plea for logic and simplification (in party lines) sometimes comes from conservatives, it more often comes from radicals, in which case it usually leads to a demand for a labor party. And in fact, if we were all to align ourselves ideologically, the emergence of a labor party would seem inevitable."

His argument is that party lines should have nothing to do with ideological lines, lines of principle and program, or any other un-American stuff like that. For "parties based on ideas and principles may be suitable for a little country like England but would not be suitable here," where "our strange form of politics grew up in response to a clear need," and has served well. Being a Pulitzer Prize winner in American history, he supports this thesis by an historical sketch of the development of parties in the U. S. The historical review is not very pointed as demonstrating the "clear need"—which seems to be the need of maintaining the United States as a federation—but the lesson is that political parties in this country also have to be federations of all ideas and interests in order the better to arrive at compromises instead of clashes. "This is what John Nance Garner had in mind when he said: 'Each of the two parties is in a sense a coalition. Any party to serve the country must be a party of all sorts of views.'"

On what ground then can one party ask for election as against the other? Agar is a "realist" and makes no bones about answering that it's just a matter of the ins and the outs. "We need more than one major party, or how could we turn the rascals out?" is Agar's simple answer to the problem. The important thing is: no clashes—compromise! This great desire for compromise, however, operates only within the framework of the interests of the ruling class. Agar defends filibusters and, in general, "the power to obstruct" legislation, as a democratic precaution, but "side by side with our devices for obstruction we have invented (in the emergency powers of the president) a device for speed." This, he writes, makes for the best of two possible worlds; and so it does for the powers that be, who can obstruct radical legislation to death but by-pass all democratic processes entirely when overriding class need (as in wartime) demands it. "If the labor-party plan is to put all the progressives into one camp and all the unprogressives into another and then to insist on strict majority rule . . . the United States will cease to be a true federation or will cease to be united. . . . They [the Democratic and Republican Parties] are the product of pure professional effort. The fact that they are so much alike in policy is a credit to the profession. Every politician would delight in finding a new set of compromises which would not only win but which would leave his own party clearly distinguishable from the other. It cannot be done. By the time the Republicans have arranged to placate every large group . . . and the Democrats have done the same . . . the chief issue must be the names they call each other."

This is certainly an extreme form of the Tweedledum-Tweedledee interpretation of the two-party system, from a supporter of that system. As a matter of fact, although socialists have sometimes simplified it as thoroughly, a Marxist could hardly accept Agar's completely cynical view without important qualifications. In any case, our labor leaders and liberals, who are constantly talking about ideological party lines, ought to be convinced by our Pulitzer Prize winner that they should be for a labor party.

FOOTNOTE ON THE TITOIST CONSTITUTION

What a state's constitution can tell us about a country's politics, and especially about the direction of its politics, is strictly limited; the following counts as background material.

The Titoist constitution of Yugoslavia was adopted in 1946, before the Cominform break, but at any rate the Titoists boast about its super-democratic character to this day—for example, in the Yugoslav Newsletter of last April 22 which we have already quoted, where it is touted as coming "as close to meeting the desires of the great majority as it was humanly possible to make it." (The constitution's preamble itself modestly presents it as "the expression of the unanimous will of all the peoples" of Yugoslavia.)

In an article in *Borba* on the 4th anniversary of the constitution this year, Moshé Piyade calls it "the first constitution of a people which today still remains a model of the consistent people's democratic system." [Belgrade radio summary, Feb. 2.]

The day before, the Belgrade radio press review had said: "The significance of the Yugoslav constitution and its superiority over constitutions not only of bourgeois states but over constitutions of the other People's Democracies rests upon the fact that it was and remains the genuine document of the People's Democratic Republic reflecting the form of a socialist state in the process of transformation from capitalism into socialism."

The Totalitarian Joker

With respect to democracy, the Tito constitution can indeed be taken as a model of all the East European constitutions. One is wise to turn a cynical eye on constitutional provisions guaranteeing democratic rights (cf. what is happening to the U. S. Bill of Rights). But when a constitution guarantees no democratic rights, there is less reason to be skeptical of its meaning. The first part of the constitution deals with "Fundamental Principles" (the second part with state structure). It consists of 43 articles.

The first 42 articles guarantee every democratic right one has ever heard of, and some less well known. Correction: with two exceptions—(1) the right to free movement within and to and from the nation, and (2) the non-retroactivity of law. In any case, the first 42 articles are simply bursting with democracy. Then comes Article 43:

"With a view to safeguarding the civic liberties and democratic organization of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, established by this Constitution, it is declared illegal and punishable to make use of civic rights in order to change or undermine the constitutional order for anti-democratic purposes."

At the risk of insulting our readers' intelligence, we point out: (1) that there is no question here even of the gimmick used by the Smith Gag Act in the U. S., "by force or violence," or "by unconstitutional methods," or any similar phrase which is characteristic of the capitalist democracies' way of getting around democratic guarantees. (2) It is not only illegal to us, "civic rights" to change but to "undermine"—and to undermine what? (3) The "constitutional order," which means anything,

and makes no bones about answering that it's just a matter of the ins and the outs. "We need more than one major party, or how could we turn the rascals out?" is Agar's simple answer to the problem.

The important thing is: no clashes—compromise! This great desire for compromise, however, operates only within the framework of the interests of the ruling class. Agar defends filibusters and, in general, "the power to obstruct" legislation, as a democratic precaution, but "side by side with our devices for obstruction we have invented (in the emergency powers of the president) a device for speed." This, he writes, makes for the best of two possible worlds; and so it does for the powers that be, who can obstruct radical legislation to death but by-pass all democratic processes entirely when overriding class need (as in wartime) demands it.

"If the labor-party plan is to put all the progressives into one camp and all the unprogressives into another and then to insist on strict majority rule . . . the United States will cease to be a true federation or will cease to be united. . . . They [the Democratic and Republican Parties] are the product of pure professional effort. The fact that they are so much alike in policy is a credit to the profession. Every politician would delight in finding a new set of compromises which would not only win but which would leave his own party clearly distinguishable from the other. It cannot be done. By the time the Republicans have arranged to placate every large group . . . and the Democrats have done the same . . . the chief issue must be the names they call each other."

This is certainly an extreme form of the Tweedledum-Tweedledee interpretation of the two-party system, from a supporter of that system. As a matter of fact, although socialists have sometimes simplified it as thoroughly, a Marxist could hardly accept Agar's completely cynical view without important qualifications. In any case, our labor leaders and liberals, who are constantly talking about ideological party lines, ought to be convinced by our Pulitzer Prize winner that they should be for a labor party.

This is certainly an extreme form of the Tweedledum-Tweedledee interpretation of the two-party system, from a supporter of that system. As a matter of fact, although socialists have sometimes simplified it as thoroughly, a Marxist could hardly accept Agar's completely cynical view without important qualifications. In any case, our labor leaders and liberals, who are constantly talking about ideological party lines, ought to be convinced by our Pulitzer Prize winner that they should be for a labor party.

THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—10

The Tito Party and Its People's Front

By HAL DRAPER

The Stalinist stamp is on every line of the Yugoslav state structure, not only in the totalitarian principles so loudly proclaimed by the leaders of the Tito regime. The key to this is the CP's proclaimed monopoly of political control in every sphere. We will see first how this is applied in the case of the Yugoslavs' "People's Front" and in their elections.

It was precisely to this characteristic of the Stalinist state structure that Trotsky pointed as revealing the "whole fictitiousness" of Kremlin "democracy." It is only by steadfastly ignoring it—though it leaps to the eye—that our pro-Titoists can bring themselves to speak of Yugoslavia as a "workers' state" or "on the road to democracy."

In his *Revolution Betrayed* Trotsky discusses Stalin's claim for the 1936 constitution, which was so widely acclaimed by fellow travelers and "radical tourists" as putting Russia "on the road to democracy": "Lists of nominees will be presented not only by the Communist Party but also by all kinds of non-party social organizations. . . . Each one of the little strata [of Soviet society] can have its special interests. . . ."

These non-party social organizations, comments Trotsky, "do not in the least represent the interests of different 'little strata,' for they all have one and the same hierarchical structure. Even in those cases where they apparently represent mass organizations, as in the trade unions and cooperatives [for Yugoslavia we can add the 'workers' councils'—H. D.], the active role in them is played exclusively by representatives of the upper privileged groups, and the last word remains with the 'party'—that is, the bureaucracy. The constitution merely refers the elector from Pantius to Pilate." [Page 269.]

And as proof Trotsky cites the 1936 constitution itself, its notorious statement that "the Communist Party . . . constitutes the guiding nucleus of all organizations, both social and governmental." He comments: "This astoundingly candid formula, introduced into the text of the constitution itself, reveals the whole fictitiousness of the political role of those 'social organizations'—subordinate branches of the bureaucratic firm."

The formula may have been "astoundingly candid" for that time in Russia but it is standard stuff in the Stalinist world today, not less so in Yugoslavia.

Addressing students at the Juro Jakovic Party School in Belgrade (who are clairvoyantly described in the June 15 Tanjug dispatch as "future leaders of the party") Tito laid it down cold:

"Our party must be the bearer of the creative spirit of labor, it must control the state apparatus, it must lead every domain of activity in our country, but it must not bureaucratize itself."

(Anticipating a bit, we point out that this uncompromising statement of bureaucratic domination typically falls in the middle of a passage in which Tito is inveighing against a "bureaucratism" . . . It is exactly like saying: "Eat all the green apples you want but you are forbidden to get a bellyache." . . . But we will come back to this revealing sentence of Tito's in a future installment.)

The main "non-party" mass organization of the Tito bureaucratic firm is the so-called People's Front, the post-war successor of the National Liberation Front in whose name the partisan war was carried on.

A paradox: the Communist Party is the only organization in Yugoslavia which operates as a political organization, but it does not run any candidates. Candidates are run by the People's Front.

It is a hallmark of the Stalinist political structure that it introduces a separation between political control and electoral action, depoliticizing the latter. With no political CHOICE possible, elections tend to lose any political character except for the words used. The vehicle for the Tito regimes electoral activity, the People's Front, likewise tends to lose any real political character (let alone a democratic one!).

Candid Formula

In the first place it should be understood what the People's Front is, in Yugoslavia. It is not even formally any coalition of forces. Everybody is supposed to belong to the People's Front—such is the aim. It is "the organization of all the toiling citizens of our country" (Tito). As of April 1949 there were 7,768,328 members in the People's Front, and only 1,246,317 voters in the whole country who were not members (figures given by Tito at the 3rd Congress of the People's Front). This organization of 86 per cent of the electorate had the half million members of the CPY in it as its "guiding nucleus."

What Trotsky described as an "astoundingly candid formula" is, for Tito, part of the ABC of Yugoslav politics. Take, for example, the marshal's speech to the People's Front itself at its 3rd Congress: in the whole first part of this speech, where Tito is discussing the organization itself, it seems almost literally impossible for him to utter the very words People's Front without dragging in a sharp reminder to his listeners that the boss is the CP—

"It is only thanks to the People's Front which, already in the course of the war of liberation, had accepted and recognized the leading role of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, that we have been able. . . ."

"It was only with this Front, under the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, that it was possible to. . . ."

"This People's Front which, till today,

has with the greatest confidence adopted all the political and economic decisions of the CPY, still continues at present to adopt and apply them."

"It has not ceased to develop and strengthen itself from the ideological point of view, under the influence of the achievement of the line of our Party. . . ."

The constant reiteration is almost brutal in its assertion of mastery. If one did not know that Tito was speaking to his trained dogs, it might be considered untactful.

Role Assigned to People's Front

What is the role of this People's Front? Remember, it is the only organization which runs candidates in elections. Yet, in discussing its tasks in the last part of his speech, Tito barely reminds himself that it is supposed to be a "political" organization—and when he does, we shall see how.

The "tasks" of the People's Front are: to set forth the results achieved by the workers' labor; exchange experiences from different parts of the country, ascertain weakness in the work, "and make decisions to intensify still more the activity and the zeal of the members. . . ." (Such decisions they can make with full freedom. . . .)

"One can see what enormous importance the People's Front has in the building of socialism in our country," Tito told them, "by the fact alone that, during the year 1948, the Front furnished more than 329 million hours of voluntary labor. . . ."

The "army of labor," he describes it in his final peroration. He is speaking to and of the only organization permitted to participate in elections.

In another speech in December 1948 Tito lauded the 305 million man-hours of "voluntary" labor contributed by the Front's members and added that this "clearly illustrates the role of the People's Front in the construction of socialism in our country." It does. Its electoral role, monopoly though it is, is a subordinate part of the business of this branch of the bureaucratic firm. For example, in February of this year the Central Committee of the CP of Montenegro passed "decisions [which] point out last year's deficiencies, such as overemphasizing the importance of People's Front activity at the expense of the supply of permanent manpower. . . ." (Belgrade radio, Feb. 8.)

But let us return to Tito's speech before the People's Front congress itself. Although he has already made remarks on the subject, he once more announces: "Comrades, permit me now some words on the tasks of the People's Front." There follow nine solid pamphlet pages on how "the People's Front is called on to devote all the forces at its disposal" to the task of achieving productivity for the Five Year Plan.

Count Them: Seven

But doesn't he present any political tasks to this People's Front, which alone runs candidates in the country?

He does. Seven "political" tasks, in fact. They cap the point.

(1) The first is: maintain unity. "It is important, in the first place, to maintain the political unity which has been shown up to now in all the actions undertaken. . . . Our first task is then to safeguard this political unity for the future."

(2) The second is: maintain unity.

"Our second task will be to maintain the fraternity and unity of our peoples, based on the correct solution of the national question . . . all other dangers are very small and insignificant as compared with the danger we would incur if we permit anyone to break our internal unity."

(3) The third is: maintain unity.

"The third task of the People's Front is to reinforce and develop still more the moral and political unity of our peoples . . . to make unity of thought and action reign. . . ."

(4) The fourth starts out as if it was going to be a departure but quickly turns out to be: maintain unity.

"The fourth task of the People's Front is to indefatigably help and work so that the people's power corresponds in its activity to the interests of the people. . . . The members of the PF must give proof of their vigilance and take the necessary measures to eliminate from the organs of people's power . . . all elements who . . . sabotage the regular functioning of the power, provoke material damage, by their behavior cause discontent among the people. . . ."

(5) The fifth actually lifts the needle out of the rut: it is the struggle for peace, in general terms.

(6) The sixth is: maintain unity.

"The sixth task of the People's Front is to stimulate all the members to show the greatest vigilance against all attempts of various harmful elements and organizations which would like to hinder internally our tranquil labor. . . ."

(7) The seventh is: maintain unity.

"The seventh task of the People's Front . . . the defense of our socialist fatherland, to watch with the greatest vigilance and defeat any attempt, either from within or without, against our state community."

Would it be possible to invent a more cutting caricature of the totalitarian mind at work on the problem of composing seven "political tasks" for an organization which simultaneously (a) has nothing to do with the real POLITICAL life of the country and (b) has a monopoly on the ELECTORAL life of the country?

For a study of the bare mechanisms of Stalinist totalitarianism, I would maintain that the Tito regime is more enlightening today than even the regimes in Russia or in the Russian satellites. Not—god save the mark—because Titoism is more Stalinist or totalitarian than its Kremlin-bound blood-brothers! Precisely because it is more shaky; because the Tito regime faces problems of totalitarianization of a population still quivering from the Cominform split; because the Tito regime is confronting a task of totalitarianization which the Russians long ago passed over and which the satellite fuhners, with the Russian army at their backs, never had to meet.

The Russian totalitarianism has now been overlaid by a vast accretion of over two decades of specific features and peculiarities that have grown up over the bare skeleton. The bare skeleton of Stalinist totalitarianism is before us in Yugoslavia for investigation, not quite fleshed, still in the process of becoming, not yet stable. The totalitarian straitjacket is being adjusted; it is not yet a habit. The techniques of subjection are all the more visible.

(Next week: The Yugoslav elections.)

"THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of Modern Russia

by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Why Land Reform Failed In South Korea

By ABEL BAKER

Several readers of LABOR ACTION have sent in letters and clippings quoting various American spokesmen to the effect that the Stalinists had to invade South Korea because conditions of life there were so much better as to constitute "democracy's reply to communism."

John Foster Dulles has spoken in this fashion several times. Dr. Arthur Bunce, ECA official, has mentioned that "more than 500,000 landless in South Korea have become landowners since the end of the [Second World] war. When you do a job like that, you've got communism licked."

While Dulles need not be taken too seriously in this context, Dr. Bunce is another matter. And by the story associated with his name many of the questions asked by our readers can be answered.

Dr. Bunce is one of the tiny band of honorable Americans, turned Protestant missionary, who devoted many years to social service in Korea under the hated Japanese regime and thereby helped preserve some small citadels of relatively liberal thought in that country. The Protestant missions were incubators for nationalist revolutionaries, particularly at the time of the 1919 revolt. Bunce is a liberal in politics and economics. Land reform for Korea was one of the passions of his life.

In January, 1946, he led a State Department mission to Seoul with the object of developing a land reform program. The immediate reaction by the American military government was to try to force the mission to leave or to abandon its purpose. His plan was labeled "Bunce's Folly" and treated as such.

Landlords Retained Full Power

The rationale developed by the American military government against land reform at that time is still interesting. The AMG felt that this should be left to a Korean government rather than be inaugurated by a foreign occupier. But Bunce and his experts, supported by the State Department, opposed this argument because, quite rightly, they did not trust any Korean government acceptable to the AMG to make such a reform.

However, Bunce's plan was finally adopted by the occupation as a political reply to the radical measures applied by Stalinism in the North. In April, 1948, a program was inaugurated to sell to peasants the land formerly owned by Japanese landlords; this land had been taken over by AMG as war booty. Since Japanese had owned 15.3 per cent of the arable land, the reform affected only a limited area, although this area contained most of the richest rice land. Altogether some 500,000 peasants benefited.

The U. S. attempted two other measures of major significance: rents were limited to one third of the crop as a rent-reduction step, and land distribution plans affecting the entire country were pressed upon the government repeatedly.

Why did not all these measures serve in South Korea as the "answer to communism" which Bunce would like to see? Part of the answer is supplied by C. C. Mitchell, administrator of the American land-reform plan.

With regard to the rent-reduction law, he writes: "This restriction was and is still widely scotched by Korean landlords; a tenant threatened with eviction must ordinarily obey his landlord's orders." The trouble, then, is that the landlords retained their full power while the peasants had none. The law was useless, a formality or less than that.

Can't Reform Without Peasant Power

How is it that the landlord remained an omnipotent Asiatic despot in face of land reform? Mitchell tells us: "The government elected in 1948 has thus far failed to implement its promise of social reforms; and the land-reform program initiated by the occupation authorities... has been left uncompleted.... It is doubtful, however, whether the Korean executive branch of the government, which is responsible to the land-owning classes, will implement the bill."

Before undertaking actual land sales Mitchell tried to get the South Korean Interim Legislature to take over the actual administration of the program. However, "the bill was not brought up for formal discussion on the SKIL floor because a quorum could never be maintained... members repeatedly left the floor when the bill came up."

So the AMG had to do the job because the Korean landlords in control of the state sabotaged every such effort.

What finally happened to the measures pressed upon the government by the U. S.? In May, 1949, a land-reform bill actually passed the legislature. Here is Mitchell's comment on this law: "It remains to be seen whether an extremely conservative bureaucracy will be disposed to carry out the wishes of the legislature... prompt sales to tenants with-

out favoritism and patronage is, in the opinion of many American observers, almost too much to expect." These excerpts are from an article based on the final report on land-reform efforts as administered by Mitchell and Bunce.

All this means that it is impossible to reform from above in land. Without the actual participation of the peasant, the power remains in landlord hands, and with this power the landlord can find a thousand new and old ways to keep the peasant in his depressed status and prevent any basic social change.

The American effort maintained the existing social code, ameliorating conditions for half a million peasant families. With his additional 1.1 acre, the peasant who got this land acquired no new rights. His economic condition was temporarily lightened but the landlord would find a way to deal with this in time. No new dynamic or incentive came into the countryside. The dead weight of Asiatic feudalism remained.

Techniques or Politics?

Why didn't the U. S. force through more complete reform? This same question had been posed in China before. A foreign power could do this in one of two ways: rouse the peasantry to its support and create a new power in the land which could carry the reforms through and enforce such a change; or it could impose the reform itself by becoming the new state, and thereby arouse the united opposition of the whole people.

Furthermore, the U. S. reformers inevitably saw the problems in American terms, as might be expected of them even with the best will in the world.

Thus, in good legalistic fashion, they opposed confiscation of the Japanese lands and their free distribution to the cultivators because "it would be impossible to decide which Japanese had secured their land through perfectly legal purchases [and] which had coerced Koreans into selling. There was, moreover, no assurance that the Korean tenant now on a former Japanese farm was the one from whom the land had been 'stolen' many years before."

Furthermore, the same Mitchell argues: "There appears to be no valid reason for wiping them [the landlords] out through land confiscation or purchase at artificially low prices... [because] the larger Korean landlords have often performed useful functions." The reader may impatiently wonder why such fatuities could not have been set aside for higher considerations. But then the reader would be asking AMG to act contrary to American laws, social patterns and thinking.

This Korean example shows, in large measure, why the U. S. has not done the obvious in those parts of Asia it has controlled. Americans have been adept at drawing up plans for land reform. Most often these plans have been oriented from a technical viewpoint rather than a social one. This happened in Korea. Instead of the villager, who knows the history and value of every grain of soil and therefore could have reorganized agriculture on the basis of social effectiveness, U. S. experts, doing their very best, planned for the very best technical efficiency. Which is all they could do without inaugurating social revolution.

Not in the Headlines

Precocious

"Karl Marx said it over 150 years ago: 'There's only one way to kill capitalism... by taxes, taxes and more taxes.' Marx knew what he was talking about."

This fake quotation from Marx is being currently broadcast by the united front of reactionary organizations (Committee for Constitutional Freedom, etc.) banded together to cut taxes on the wealthy. It is quoted above from the "Tax Outlook," a newsletter ground out by the "National Research Bureau."

Needless to say, Marx never wrote anything of the sort or anything like it. And if he had written it 150 years ago, it would have been about a quarter century before he was born. Marx knew what he was talking about, but not that soon.

Postal Workers

The case of the allegedly disloyal Cleveland postal workers continues. The latest development involves their final appeal through civil service channels. The Civil Service Loyalty Review Board has found two "innocent" and 12 "guilty" of disloyalty charges, with six more awaiting decisions. Their case has attracted widespread attention because almost all the accused were Negroes or Jews, with the greatest number being Negroes. All were active in fighting for the end of discrimination in the postal service.

This latest action is the end of the line for those found guilty, except for the possibility of challenging the original loyalty order before the U. S. Supreme Court on grounds of constitutionality. Such an appeal has already been filed.

I had left in search of "the new relations between the worker and his work," in search of "the new type of life" which the official propaganda speaks so much of, I found only the old relations between human beings — but worsened — based upon individualism and upon the ability to "use one's elbows."

Clarifying

In the Canadian legislature, one Senator Roebuck, who had voted for the government's bill to force the railway workers back to work, undertook to correct a possible misinterpretation of his act.

"I fear," he said, "that my vote in favor of the measure may perhaps be interpreted by some as an indication I favor the measure. But I want to say publicly and plainly that I do not."

Draper, Shachtman Discuss Tito Regime; Rogge Debate Off

NEW YORK, Sept. 22.—As the result of a late withdrawal by O. John Rogge, the scheduled debate between Rogge and Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION, on "Is Yugoslavia on the Road to Socialist Democracy?" was transformed into a lecture on the same subject presenting the Independent Socialist League point of view. Comrade Draper spoke on the immediate subject, while Max Shachtman, chairman of the ISL, followed with a discussion of the nature of Stalinism and Titoism.

On Wednesday, two days before the event, Rogge's office informed the ISL sponsors of the debate that he would be unable to be present since his wife was undergoing a very serious operation west, and suggested postponement. However, because of the lateness of the information it was impossible to do so.

Draper presented a highly detailed picture of the state of democracy—or rather the lack of it—under the Tito regime, starting with the facts on the totalitarian principles of the Titoists which have already been presented in LABOR ACTION so far, and ranging to the Yugoslav elections, the police regime, political trials, the Tito cult, the "fight against bureaucratism," decentralization and the newly announced "workers' councils."

INSIDE EAST GERMANY

The 'New Type of Life' In the Stalinist State

By BENNO SAREL

The Leipzig Fair, a sort of world fair for the Russian Zone, at the same time provides the opportunity of looking around behind the Iron Curtain. Once within the big Saxon city it is easy to visit outlying areas. Although it is strictly forbidden, I made such trips, and for more than a week I traveled between Leipzig, Weimar, Dresden, Eisenach, Riesa and several other smaller cities.

The police asked for my papers only once; it was not far from Riesa and I was stopped on the bridge over the Elbe, from which there is a magnificent view. As soon as I exhibited an identity card drawn up in French a genuine miracle took place: the "people's policeman" began to murder our language in evoking memories of the Paris of 1942 and a quarter of an hour later he rapidly told me that he would like to go back.

There were no other incidents. I had left in search of "the new relations between the worker and his work," in search of "the new type of life" which the official propaganda speaks so much of, I found only the old relations between human beings — but worsened — based upon individualism and upon the ability to "use one's elbows."

The material situation has without doubt become better in the last two years and is continuing to become better. However, the worker does not always consider his (nationalized) factory as really his. A metal worker from Riesa, a city traditionally Communist, said to me: "It's not like before 1933. At union meetings there is a deathly silence. One of the officers reads a resolution on the National Front or on the factory's production; you vote yes each time; and then you go home. It's only afterwards, in little groups, that you bitch. Everyone's afraid of his job."

An engineer from Weimar said to me in turn: "You can rarely have confidence in anyone. Everyone tries to get ahead by his own efforts, often at the expense of others, and everyone shuts himself up within himself and his family."

THE JOLIOT-CURIE CLUB

A student from Leipzig, a member of the FDJ (CP Youth) and studying under a government grant, said to me: "I receive the lowest subsidy, 120 marks a month. But if I were to grind away at 'The History of the Bolshevik Party' and Stalin's 'Problems of Leninism' and if I were to go to meetings and say to one comrade or

another, 'Comrade, you are not following the line; Stalin has already said that...' etc, six months later I would be certain to receive the highest subsidy of 200 marks. Others have tried it and have been successful."

A prematurely old woman in Leipzig, who ran a stand selling shoe polish, said to me: "I am a refugee from Silesia. When I arrived with my husband we owned only what we had with us. No one helped us. It's the same everywhere else, everyone lives for himself."

At Riesa, an industrial city, the metal workers' union recently formed a club open to all metal workers. They baptized it with the name of the French Stalinist scientist Joliot-Curie. I'll describe it.

Everything is brand-new and in good taste: there is a reading room, a restaurant, a meeting hall and a room for chess. But in this whole building for metal workers there were only three young women, local belles who obviously didn't work in a factory.

"Why don't workers come here?" I asked the janitor. "They still have prejudices," he replied, "and inferiority complexes. One has the impression that they don't dare come here, that it is too fine for them."

After a few minutes I became aware that the janitor was a thousand-per-cent party member, which is very often equivalent to being a police stool-pigeon. Sev-

eral workers later gave me, as a reason for the emptiness of the club, the fact that "all day in the factory or at the canteen you feel yourself watched. In the evening it's more pleasant at home with one's family."

STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

The problem is the following: the worker does not feel himself at home in the club created by his union, just as he does not feel at home in union meetings, in his factory, or in his dealings with the party or the state, which, moreover proclaims itself to be proletarian.

The refugees (20 per cent of the population), as in Western Germany, continue to be isolated and in general live miserably. Everyone is more than ever forced to struggle for existence and no one can think of the other person.

The fact of rarely feeling oneself to be among friends, of seldom being able to confide in one another, and the poverty which always exists in comparison with the Western zones contribute to making life more narrow, more disintegrating, more stifling for the common people in the German "democracy" than in capitalist Germany. A genuine social life of mutual confidence, which would permit the expansion and fruitful exchange of ideas, currently exists in Eastern Germany much less than it did under the Hitler regime.

What Truman Prefers --

(Continued from page 1)

a determination to be based solely upon "the extent to which the positions taken or advanced fit from time to time on matters of policy do not deviate from those" of the Communist movement.

"Thus, an organization which advocates low-cost housing for sincere humanitarian reasons might be classified as a Communist-front organization because the Communists regularly exploit slum conditions as one of their fifth-column techniques.

"It is not enough to say that this probably would not be done. The mere fact that it could be done shows clearly how the bill would open a Pandora's box of opportunities for official condemnation of organizations and individuals for perfectly honest opinions which happen to be stated also by Communists.

A "LONG SPEECH"

"The basic error of these sections is that they move in the direction of suppressing opinion and belief. This would be a very dangerous course to take, not because we have any sympathy for Communist opinions, but because any governmental stifling of the free expression of opinion is a long step toward totalitarianism....

There is more along similar lines. Yet these general sentiments are mingled with criticisms of the law which are based either on the administrative difficulties it places in the way of the government, or on the contention that the law is not severe enough to suit the president.

For instance, with regard to the concentration-camp provisions of the law, the president states that the law is not severe enough and does not include enough potential consequences: "It may be that legislation of this type [to provide for concentration camps for "dangerous people"] should be on the statute books. But the provisions in H.R. 9490 [the McCarran Act] would

achieve the objective sought, since they would not suspend the writ of habeas corpus, and under our time to detain a man not charged with a crime would raise serious constitutional questions unless the writ of habeas corpus were suspended.

"Furthermore, it may well be that other persons than those covered by these provisions would be more important to detain in the event of emergency. This whole problem, therefore, should clearly be studied more thoroughly before further legislative action along these lines is considered."

WITHOUT LAW

Only one comment on that is necessary. Who besides potential saboteurs or spies does the president think should be detained without right of habeas corpus in a time of crisis? Perhaps people who advocate popular ideas which are distasteful to the powers that be?

Further, the veto points out that almost every restriction on the political or civil rights of "Communists" and "Communist-front" organizations which is now enacted into law has already been put into effect by the administration without benefit of law.

"It is claimed," the message states, "that this bill would deny income-tax exemptions to Communist organizations. The fact is that the Bureau of Internal Revenue already denies income-tax exemptions to such organizations.

"It is claimed that this bill would deny passports to Communists. The fact is that the government can and does deny passports to Communists under existing law.

"It is claimed that this bill would prohibit employment of Communists by the federal government. The fact is that the employment of Communists by the federal government is already prohibited and, at least in the ex-

Calif. Professor Denounces Loyalty Oath in Classroom

The battle to retain some degree of academic freedom at the University of California has not ended. Although the reactionaries on the Board of Regents and in the state have succeeded in dividing, confusing and defeating the faculty and student body over the issue of the "loyalty oaths," the conflict continues to simmer under the surface.

The latest flare-up came at the beginning of the fall semester when Dr. Robert A. Gordon, a professor of economics at Berkeley, opened a lecture to his elementary economics class with a ten-minute talk on the loyalty-oath fight.

"I do not appear here," said Gordon, "with any enthusiasm. I cannot say, as I have for so many years, that I am proud to teach here at the University of California. Actually I feel apologetic that I haven't been fired."

After reviewing the long fight over the anti-Stalinist oath he pointed out that the American Psychological Association and the American Mathematics Society had already blacklisted the university, and stated that there would be more to come.

How is it that with such views on the effect of the loyalty oath on academic freedom at the university Dr. Gordon had signed it? He explained to the class that he had signed the oath after the Stalinists marched into South Korea because "I was afraid that the fight for academic freedom would become confused with disloyalty."

MORE WILL SPEAK UP

Whatever one may think of the

firmness of Dr. Gordon's principles as revealed in the light of this statement, it is clear that his conscience has been bothering him. The fact is that to make a statement of this kind in his class in the present circumstances took a good deal of courage. He was immediately attacked by the San Francisco Examiner, a Hearst paper, in an editorial entitled, "Abuse of the Classroom."

"We wonder," wrote the Hearstling editor, "who, if anybody, gave Gordon permission to use his classroom as a forum to present a one-sided argument and a vicious attack upon the Regents... Gordon, of course, is not a Communist. He is merely a confused professor. But in the present debate his position and his language cannot fail to please the Communists."

We, in turn, wonder since when a professor is supposed to get "permission" to express his opinions in a classroom on a matter of vital importance to his students. But then, to be perfectly honest, we can't say we have to wonder too much about it.

Gordon has spoken up, and others are bound to speak up as the stifling atmosphere at the university becomes increasingly intolerable to men who have a shred of integrity left. It would have been better if he had realized the full consequences of the loyalty-oath fight when it first broke out and had fought it in a principled manner. But actions such as that of the Berkeley professor demonstrate that even after a defeat in the struggle for academic freedom has been suffered, the fight can and will go on.

Whatever one may think of the

governments.

In attacking the provisions of the bill which would virtually sever cultural and commercial relations with a number of foreign countries, the veto states: "As one instance it is clear that under the definitions of the bill the present government of Spain, among others, would be classified as 'totalitarian.'"

UNDERMINING THE IDEA

The important thing which must be understood if the fight for civil liberties and democratic rights is to be conducted with any vigor and consistency is that the veto message reflects the contradictory thinking of a large number of liberals and leaders in the labor movement. Today they are willing to oppose some measures while they embrace others which are basically just as undemocratic. Tomorrow, when the reactionaries propose even more vicious curbs on civil liberties, they will no doubt embrace the ones thus laid down as being "better" than the ones proposed.

By this method civil liberties are gradually eroded. What is even more dangerous in the long run, the very IDEA of what democracy is, of what civil liberties are, is gradually adulterated and turned into its opposite.

Socialists do not need police-state methods in the struggle against Stalinism. They propose a positive political struggle not only against the Stalinists, but against the decaying capitalist system which is the breeding ground for Stalinism. That is what justifies our claim that the struggle for socialism is the struggle for democracy, and that the only consistent struggle for democracy can be conducted through the struggle for socialism.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

Read About Socialism!

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

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

N. Y. Public Forum

LABOR UNIONS, WAR, AND CIVIL LIBERTY

Speaker: **BEN HALL**

Thursday, 8:30 p.m.

OCTOBER 5

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 St., N. Y. C.
35 cents

'Police - State' Bill --

(Continued from page 1)

problem for Hearst, McCarthy, the American Legion, G. L. K. Smith and many of the worthy legislators who passed the bill. For years they have been lashing out indiscriminately at liberals, Stalinists, socialists and trade-unionists of a dozen political shades of belief as "reds."

Nevertheless, the law has its "safeguards." The Department of Justice will go before a Subversive Activities Control Board (set up by the law) and point out the organizations which the department thinks are "Communist" or "Communist fronts." The board will then hold hearings and decide whether or not each organization thus charged is "guilty." (Guilty of what? Advocating the current Stalinist line on foreign policy? Or perhaps guilty of advocating strikes in wartime, which will probably also be advocated by Stalinists?)

The organization will have the right to appear before the board and try to prove that it is neither "communist" nor a front for Stalinists. If the board decides against it, it will have the right to appeal to the courts.

Once that is all done, if the courts have ruled against the organization, the board will order it to register its name and the names of all its members. It will have to clearly mark all literature sold or distributed by it as "Communist literature." And beyond that, each and every individual member of the organization is personally responsible to see to it that he or she has been registered.

Cannot "Force CP into the Open"

But what if no one registers? The individuals (either officers or members of the organizations) will then have to be indicted and brought before the courts, just like any other "criminals." In each individual case the Department of Justice will have to prove that the particular person was guilty of willful non-registration, after having proved that he or she was in fact a member of a Communist organization.

What a monstrosity! People will not be jailed for committing any specific crime against the laws of the land. Their crime will be "non-registration." And as everyone knows that no one will register, it is perfectly clear that the purpose of the law cannot be to force Stalinists to "come into the open." Its sole purpose is to jail people for belonging to a political organization—which means to jail them for daring to hold certain opinions and joining with other people to try to do something about them.

And as imprisonment or the threat of imprisonment can be the only result of this law, it is clear that its main effect will be to terrorize people into not joining any organization whose ideas are not completely in conformity with those held by the congressional yahoos who put the bill over.

That is only one side of the law. The other part is just as much a pure police-state measure as this one. And the glory for this part belongs above all to the liberals in the Senate who introduced it as a "preferable" alternative to the registration bill, and then got trapped into voting for a bill which combined them both.

This is the concentration-camp section. When the same Congress which voted overwhelmingly for this vicious law decides that there is a national emergency, the FBI can proceed without further ado to round up anyone whom it feels might become a saboteur or spy. Into concentration camps they will go. Then, after they have been deprived of their freedom, they will have the right to prove that they are not really dangerous.

Grounds of the Veto

President Truman vetoed this bill. But he did not do as much as he could have done had he really been opposed to the bill in principle. He returned his veto with lightning speed, at a time when he knew that Congress was most anxious to quit and get to their electioneering. Had he held on to the bill for nine days, as the law permits him to, there might have been a real chance for nation-wide opposition to gather and sway the vote-hungry legislators into reconsidering their action.

The veto was based on two chief grounds. The law is a danger to civil liberties in general, and "would open the way for thought control." Secondly, it provides such a clumsy administrative procedure that it would do more harm than good as far as handling the Stalinists is concerned.

The president was no doubt moved in part, at least, by the knowledge that the passage of this law would deal another blow to the notion that America is the home of the free. In the struggle against Stalinism on a world scale this notion is important. Not only the Stalinists themselves, but socialists and consistent democrats of all varieties throughout the world will condemn the law, and will continue condemning it whenever people are made to suffer the penalties provided under it.

Further, Truman pointed out that he has set up administrative machinery which is quite adequate to deal with any real threat the Stalinists may offer in the way of espionage, sabotage and even general political activity. For years the FBI has been keeping its eyes, ears and noses close to the Communist Party and its front organizations (as well as to

all others who dare to oppose the system or even to have too radical criticisms of it). The "subversive" list, which now appears (together with the Smith Gag Act and the Voorhies Act) as the legitimate parent of this abomination, was Truman's handiwork. Under the executive order which set up the "subversive" list the FBI and the loyalty boards have had a free hand to throw out of the government (and recently out of factories with government contracts) anyone they considered "dangerous." Although this law is worse than any of its parents it is quite likely to complicate the job of the Department of Justice rather than to aid it, from the administration's point of view.

The McCarran Act has been referred to as a "police-state law." That it is. But until its provisions have actually been put consistently into operation on a wide scale, we will not be living in a police state. There is still time, if the time is used, to prevent this from coming to pass.

It must be stated that the behavior of the labor movement and the liberals in connection with this act does not offer too much hope that the time will be used well. They have stated that they are against this law, to be sure. But their statements have been so divorced from any serious attempt to mobilize public opinion and public action against the bill that they have sounded almost hypocritical.

The labor movement is mobilizing its political strength for the elections. But by and large they are mobilizing their strength behind Democratic Party candidates. In the Senate alone 26 Democrats (including Scott Lucas, majority leader) voted to override the veto. In the House of Representatives the veto was overridden by a vote of 286 to 48. Will the labor leaders make the vote on this bill a decisive measure of the worth of a legislator? We doubt it. This would force the labor movement to dump a large number of the "friends of labor" from its slates, in short, to break its alliance with the Democratic Party.

Will They Stand Up for Democracy?

The same reasons which prevent the labor leaders and the liberals from really fighting the legislators who are trying to put shackles on our civil liberties will also prevent them from doing an all-out job to educate the workers to the full meaning of this bill. To call a spade a spade in this situation, that is, to say clearly and forcefully that if this law is ever enforced it will mean that the people of the United States are well on their way toward the totalitarian state—this could bring into question their whole political policy.

For what logic can there be to continuing a political alliance with people (the majority of the Democratic and Republican Parties) who are willing to deprive us of our liberties in the name of fighting a totalitarian force? If that is what they are doing (and they are), isn't it high time that the labor movement, which needs democratic rights and a large amount of political freedom for its very life, broke off this sterile alliance and set out to fight for its interests and those of all the common people independently?

The liberal and labor leaders have not shown that they have the intelligence and the fortitude to put up a serious fight against the invading police state. For militants in the labor movement to continue to rely on them to lead the fight for democracy would be foolish. It is precisely in times such as these that every man with political courage must be willing to stand up and tell the truth about what is going on. The risks are great, but the prize to be won makes them well worth taking. The prize is the maintenance of a degree of democracy in this country which will permit the labor movement to live as a free labor movement.

ISL URGED SUPPORT OF VETO

Sept. 23, 1950

Senator Herbert A. Lehman
Senator Irvin Ives
Senate Building
Washington, D. C.

As a democratic socialist organization and opponents of totalitarianism in any form, the Independent Socialist League urges you to uphold the president's veto of the so-called subversive control bill passed by the Senate and the House. To override the veto means to permit the bill, which is a violation of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the most elementary democratic rights, to stand. It means to give way to the know-nothing hysteria and witchhunt atmosphere which is so widely prevalent and which dominated the deliberations of the Senate and the House on this question.

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE
Max Shachtman, National Chairman
Albert Gates, National Secretary

Wallace Praises The Bill with Faint Damns

By L. G. SMITH

Henry A. Wallace has had a few words to say about the McCarran Act. From a man who, but a short time ago, was declaiming in terms of a "Gideon's army" which would fight for righteousness, one might expect a rousing condemnation of the act. And such an expectation might be heightened when it is recalled that the McCarran Act is directed most immediately and clearly at those who were but yesterday Wallace's comrades-in-arms.

But Henry Wallace's statement on this act sounds like an apology for it, unless he has been flagrantly misquoted by the newspapers.

This vicious law, it seems to Wallace, is "an extreme step caused by a time of crisis." It is "a reflection of the seriousness of the times," and in his opinion, in passing it "Congress mirrors the sentiments of the people of the United States."

LIBERALESE

Although the use of such words as "extreme" might lead one to think that things have really gone too far, it does not seem that this is Wallace's meaning. His statement continues:

"When any people prepare for an all-out effort they are likely to take extreme steps. The important thing is that any action of this sort can be undone in calmer times, when the crisis is over. I believe that the Supreme Court would declare such a law to be unconstitutional in peaceful times, but in a period of crisis there is no assurance that the court would do so.

"As we fight against all forms of suppression of human rights abroad, we must avoid molding ourselves at home into the image of that which we are fighting. The actions of the administration and of extremists of both the right and the left will determine the extent to which this legislation will cost us our most-prized constitutional liberties."

CRACK AT CP

That statement is indeed a classic of "liberalese." In fact, even Wallace has out-muddled himself, if that is possible. Exactly what this statement means is anyone's guess.

Yet it is clear that Wallace is conveying at least one impression: he does not condemn the act. In fact, he seems to think the nation is in the kind of crisis which might make the McCarran Act justifiable. He only hopes that when the situation changes the powers that be will condescend to change the act too.

It is also clear that Wallace is taking a crack at his erstwhile buddies of the Communist Party. Why will their behavior, in addition to that of others, determine the extent to which we lose our constitutional liberties? After all, till a few months ago Wallace assured us that the Stalinists were no force in the country (and none whatever in the Progressive Party). How could their actions then seriously affect the issue?

JOINING THE HUNT?

Is this statement just a bit of typical Wallace wind, and nothing else? Is it just possible that he is out to make it clear that he will not defend the Stalinists? Is he, perhaps, trying to clean his political skirts of some of the Stalinist muck which adhered to them during the Progressive Party adventure in the hope that in due course he will be able to make people forget it?

What better defense than to join the pack and howl—if not the loudest, then at least as loudly as the next hyena? At best, it may avert suspicion. At worst, the record will show that their sins of yesterday have been atoned for.

Is Henry Wallace's statement the first tentative yelp let out to see whether the other creatures will permit him to join in the hunt?