

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 23, 1951

FIVE CENTS

ISL CONVENTION RESOLUTIONS:

Indep. Socialism and World War 3
... page 4

Meaning of the British Labor Govt.
... page 6

ICFTU Courts the Kiss of Death
... page 3

THE SHAME OF CICERO

By GORDON HASKELL

The riots in Cicero, Illinois, are a shocking reminder of how far we still have to go before the Negro people in America have any security in the rights they have painstakingly won in the past few decades. They also emphasize the responsibility of the two major political parties who control the police forces in every American city for the continued denial to the Negro people of their most elementary civil rights.

As a matter of fact, the Cicero riots go much farther than that. Here was a clear case of a police force which was the initiator of the assault on Harvey Clark Jr., the Negro bus driver who tried to move his family into an apartment in the all-white town of Cicero; a police force which put up no resistance to a mob of hoodlums which wrecked Clark's apartment, and which began to act with typical police brutality toward these hoodlums only when the mob began to threaten the safety of the policemen themselves.

ROLE OF THE PRESS

The true story of the Cicero riots will never be known by the vast majority of the American people. The great news services

have done an admirable job of whitewashing the police of Cicero and the role of Sheriff John Babb of Cook County, aspirant to the Republican nomination for governor of Illinois. This our free press has done, typically, by omitting large chunks of the story and emphasizing only the role of the National Guard which was finally called in to quell the riot and re-establish some semblance of order.

Of the great daily papers in New York, only the liberal *New York Post* has carried the full story of the Cicero tragedy. The following excerpts are from the dispatches filed by its special correspondent, Ted Poston.

Clark did not know, when he rented his apartment, of the danger to which he was exposing himself. "He found out quickly enough when he first tried to move in last June 8. The Cicero police, not his embattled neighbors, turned out in force, beat and kicked the young veteran, pointed pistols at his Negro lawyer, warning: "Both you blacks . . . get out of town and don't come back if you don't want bullets."

On June 19 Clark filed a \$200,000 damage suit against the town of Cicero and its officials. Later, Federal District Judge John P. Barnes issued an order to compel

the Cicero officials to protect Clark and his property and warned them: "You will exercise diligence to keep these people in that apartment peacefully or you will get into serious trouble."

THE COPS LAUGHED

Armed with this order, Clark was able to get his furniture into the house. But Poston reports: "Wednesday night, with 30 Cicero police putting up laughing and token resistance, the mob invaded the building and wrecked the unoccupied Clark apartment."

"Another 30 policemen from the State's Attorney's office mingled with the mob, watching the looting with amused grins, but making little effort to halt it. Also present were uniformed highway policemen from the Cook County Sheriff John Babb's office. But no one was arrested."

"Babb, who later was to denounce the Cicero police and call out the militia, did appear briefly and urge the mob against violence, but his shouts that 'I'm neutral in this matter, but this is not the way to do it,' brought only laughs from the marauders."

"The laughs increased when he promised to 'win with your help in 1952' and put an end to such matters."

(Turn to last page)

Truce Parleys Open Issues of U.S. Asia Policy

By MARY BELL

The Chinese delegates rapidly walked out of the Kaesong conference house with "near-scowls" on their faces . . . the Allied generals and admirals walked out calmly . . . later the Chinese were smiling . . . a message passed by the United Nations army censors reported that the first session ended in "reserved cordiality." Such is the substance of the latest reports to the peace-hungry peoples from the Korean cease-fire talks since they have resumed after the admission of UN correspondents and the establishment of a demilitarized zone in accordance with the demands of the UN High Command under General Ridgway.

If Stalinism is positively paranoid with regard to news reports, the UN dispatches are heavily censored by the Army, and one obtains more knowledge about what is happening in Kaesong from speculative editorial columnists and a knowledge of history than from on-the-spot reportage.

Although almost everyone would like to believe so, it is not yet definite that a truce will eventuate out of the talks. Their resumption after the break and the agreement of the Chinese Stalinists to the UN demands, however, is considered a token of a serious intent on their part to halt the war—at least for the moment and in that area. At the same time, U. S. (Turn to last page)

ISL AND SYL CONVENTIONS ADOPT RESOLUTIONS ON WAR

Independent Socialists Meet

The Independent Socialist League

By GERRY McDERMOTT

The Independent Socialist League, chief advocate in the United States of a third camp, anti-war point of view, recently concluded its second constitutional convention. The three full days of report, discussion and debate by socialist militants from throughout the nation were a notable success in the opinion of participants.

Briefly, the convention did the following:

- By a unanimous vote, it adopted the resolution presented by the League's National Committee on socialist policy toward a third world war. This resolution called on world labor and the colonial people to reject the leadership of either the Stalinist system headed by Moscow or the capitalist alliance led by Washington in the coming world holocaust.

- Predicted an unprecedented peacetime militarization of the American economy at the expense of labor, and called on the labor movement to resist these encroachments and to fight for a positive program to defeat Stalinism and safeguard democracy.

- By a narrow margin, reversed an earlier policy of encouraging, under certain circumstances, the fight of labor candidates running in the Democratic Party primaries. At the same time, the delegates restated their belief that an independent party of labor is the primary need of American labor today, and promised sympathetic attention and the greatest possible support to all moves in that direction.

- Adopted resolutions expanding the viewpoint of independent socialism on the British Labor government, on Titoism, and on the problems of Asia.

- Received enthusiastically greetings from the first full constitutional convention of the Socialist Youth League, youth section of the ISL.

- Dealt with many other questions, such as the current problems of the Jewish people, socialist policy in the union movement, building of the Independent Socialist press, the status of the socialist movement abroad, and other matters.

The convention was preceded, in the tradition of the ISL, by a full and public discussion in the

rankings of the League of the problems facing the independent socialist movement today. The greatest pre-convention discussion took place over the war question. Here, a minority point of view was put forward which denied the possibility of assembling a third camp at present and advocated critical socialist support of the American bloc in event of war in order to defeat Stalinism. A resolution based on this point of view failed to win any delegates, however, resulting in a unanimous vote for the resolution of the National Committee. [Text of this resolution is found elsewhere on this page.]

In evaluating the American scene, the convention recognized the differences between America's position in the last war and her position now. America's allies are now weaker and less stable. At the same time, the increased American production necessary to rearm against the rivalry of Russian imperialism finds little idle plant capacity or surplus labor force to draw on, as was the case in 1941. The result can only mean increased exploitation for labor in order to meet the needs of a war which

(Continued on page 2)

The Socialist Youth League

By DON HARRIS

National Secretary, SYL

In the last five years the Socialist Youth League, the youth section of the Independent Socialist League, has experienced a slow but steady growth. During a period when other political movements either stagnated or declined, the SYL has expanded from a few small groups into the framework of a national organization.

The youth of today are growing up in one of the most perilous periods in modern history. The task of bringing the ideas of socialism to young people is doubly important in face of the world crisis, and for the reconstruction of the American socialist movement. At every turn they are faced by the threat of war and the attack on our democratic rights. And while as yet there is no general radicalization among the youth, there is an increasing suspicion and apathy toward the present American policies.

This present stage in the development of the SYL was climaxed when delegates met in New York recently to found officially a national organization

based on the local units throughout the country. At this founding convention, all of the major political and organizational questions confronting the organization were discussed and voted upon. Finally, a representative, collective national leadership was elected.

ENTHUSIASTIC SPIRIT

The spirit and enthusiasm which permeated the convention was obvious to all who attended. Delegates came from a dozen units, some from as far distant as Berkeley and Los Angeles, California. Mostly young students and veterans, many delegates and visitors to the convention had already several years of political experience behind them, gathered both in the SYL and in organizations like YPA, Student Federalists and the YPSL.

In particular, the convention marked the first occasion on which the former comrades of the Libertarian Socialist League could participate in a national gathering of SYL members. While the total number of members represented was not large, the proceedings and discussions showed that the initial period of SYL activity has produced (Continued on page 2)

ISL, SYL CONVENTIONS — —

The Independent Socialist League

(Continued from page 1)
would drag the United States toward the level of totalitarian Russia.

ON POLITICAL ACTION

The discussion on political action was marked by sharp differences of opinion and vigorous discussion. Delegates of all points of view were concerned with the problem of persuading the labor movement to break its subservient alliance with the Democratic Party.

Some felt that in exceptional cases where sections of the labor movement decide to run candidates in the primaries against the representatives of the capitalist political machines, the ISL should encourage this action without itself giving endorsement to candidates running on the ticket of either bourgeois party.

The policy of supporting such candidates was suggested only for those unusual situations where the primary fight represented a real struggle between the labor movement and the bourgeois political machines.

Opponents of this policy felt that it ran counter to the primary goal of socialists in the United States today—a break between labor and the Democratic Party. According to these delegates, when the labor leadership is in serious conflict with the democrats, the real tendency is not to fight for control of the party but to threaten to leave it and form a new one. These comrades therefore advocated rejection of socialist support of labor's contesting in the primaries of bourgeois parties. Their policy was adopted by the convention by a close margin.

THE TRADE UNIONS

High on the agenda of the convention was discussion of the problems of the trade union movement. The resolution adopted on this question dealt with the special problems of unions in a period of mobilization. It pointed out the tendency for the government to try to absorb the labor movement into the state apparatus, and the willingness of many union leaders to go along with this process. Despite this, however, the resolution predicted that the labor leaders would have to resist government dictation in order to keep the unions from being completely paralyzed.

The slowness of the union officials to respond to the needs of the membership, however, will bring increasing rank and file pressure, the resolution predicts. It adds that no rank and file groups of major importance have appeared in the period since the war only because the labor leadership has itself led the unions in real struggles during the recent period. The resolution also took note of the increasing loyalty purge atmosphere in the labor movement and the constant decline of union democracy, calling for every possible effort to halt this

basically anti-union trend. Trade union questions of a more specialized nature were discussed further at a special panel of active trade unionists following the convention.

REPORT ON THE ISL

A major report was devoted to the ISL itself. Here it was pointed out that the long world-wide crisis of the Marxist movement caused by Stalinism continues, and still affects the ISL as well as other working class movements. Despite this, the cadres of the independent socialist movement have remained intact. Notable successes of the League in the recent period were the campaign to aid the Spanish strikers and the successful establishment of a stable and growing youth organization. Weaknesses indicating additional effort were listed as support of the ISL press, a national educational program and increased contacting. Following the na-

view that Titoism is another example of the Stalinist social system, bureaucratic collectivism, and is not a development in the direction of socialism.

A section on Asia, also published in an earlier LABOR ACTION, suggests that the socialists in the nations of Asia which are struggling to free themselves from the two imperialist power blocs should consider the advisability of advocating a democratic regional federation to strengthen their economies and their political independence.

Another resolution dealt with the problems of Israel and the Near East, and the related problem of the Jewish people in other lands. The resolution brings up to date the Marxist approach to the Jewish question in the light of the emergence of Israel as a sovereign state and the problems faced by that nation in a world torn by imperialism.

The Socialist Youth League

(Continued from page 1)

duced a solid group of politically educated members, devoted to the struggle for socialism, and dedicated to building the SYL.

CONSTITUTION ADOPTED

From almost every point of view the convention was a huge success. All of the tasks before it were completed in the allotted time, and with the feeling that the decisions arrived at would help in guiding the future course of SYL activity. The adoption of a constitution not only served the purpose of setting up the democratic structure of the organization, but also provided for a full discussion on several problems of internal functioning and practices on which disagreement existed.

TASKS OF THE SYL

The presentation of unit reports laid the basis for an extended discussion on the role and tasks of the SYL in the present period. The convention overwhelmingly endorsed the campus orientation as the main emphasis of SYL work. And the evaluation of the campus orientation for the past several years revealed in general validity of this approach in view of the SYL's growth in size and influence. However, the convention voted to place an increased emphasis on industrialization and training comrades for the labor movement.

While no basic differences in perspective were revealed, the discussion showed that there are different degrees of emphasis given to various aspects of campus work in the several units.

A majority of the convention endorsed the view that the SYL wherever possible should work toward building broad socialist and anti-war clubs with non-SYL groups and individuals, while a minority advocated an approach to other groups through united front activity around specific issues and causes. The ensuing discussion hoped to assess the experiences of various units, with a view toward being able to function more effectively as a national political group on campus.

One of the important needs of the organization, which the discussion revealed, was for a national SYL publication in which the viewpoint and ideas of the SYL could be presented. Different proposals were discussed and recommended for consideration by the incoming national committee.

The convention reaffirmed our past policy of opposing the admission of Stalinists into united fronts and of seeking their organizational isolation wherever the SYL participates in such actions. It endorsed the policy of working with socialists, pacifists, and anti-war liberals on those questions where common agreement exists. Problems related to our attitude toward specific groups were postponed for future discussion.

The convention voted unanimously in support of the SYL to *Annul and Student Partisan*, the anti-war student magazine published by a national network of socialist and anti-war clubs.

ANTI-WAR RESOLUTION

Finally, a resolution on "Youth and the War" was adopted, placing the SYL in firm opposition to the war drive of both imperialist camps, as well as to all of the manifestations of the war drive as they appear on the American scene. This resolution, which distinguishes the SYL from all other socialist and liberal groups, lays the political basis for the SYL's continued fight for academic freedom, democratic and civil rights, and against the militarization of the campus.

With its political policy well-defined, and a real national organization established, the SYL now looks forward to a continued period of expansion and growth. With this in mind, the convention in a final resolution directed the incoming national officers to make plans for a membership drive in the coming months. The response of the organization to this, as well as other proposals, will determine the effectiveness of the convention in pushing forward the growth of the SYL.

Defeated War Resolution

The following brief resolution on socialist policy in the war was presented to the convention of the ISL. It was voted on after the adoption of the resolution which is printed in full in this issue of LABOR ACTION. Although this resolution found no support in the convention, and was defeated unanimously, we are re-printing it for the information of LABOR ACTION readers.—Ed.

RESOLUTION ON SOCIALIST POLICY IN THE WAR

The ISL recognizes, as a possibility which cannot be ignored, that in the course of World War III there may arise a situation which will be the product of the interaction of the following three factors:

- (a) The urgent military pressure of Stalinist imperialism.
 - (b) The weakness of the Third Camp throughout the world, with no immediate prospect of the strengthening of these forces.
 - (c) The preservation, within the principal nations of the capitalist bloc, of a significant degree of democracy as compared to Stalinist Russia.
- In such a situation, the ISL declares that the socialist position must be one of critical support of the military struggle of the capitalist bloc against Stalinist totalitarianism.

Also under the international heading was a report on the continuing efforts of the ISL to establish close and fruitful political relations with socialist organizations and individuals throughout the world. Noted during this report was the continued precipitous decline of the remnants of the so-called Fourth International.

THE BRITISH LABOR GOVT.

One section called attention to the unprecedented steps which the British Labor government has taken toward nationalizing important sections of the British economy. These measures raise the possibility of an easier road to Socialism for the British workers, while at the same time they underline the necessity for additional emphasis on workers control of the nationalized industries.

The continued evolution of Titoism was considered in another section. Published in an earlier issue of LABOR ACTION, this resolution further elaborates the point of

view that Titoism is another example of the Stalinist social system, bureaucratic collectivism, and is not a development in the direction of socialism.

Also under the international heading was a report on the continuing efforts of the ISL to establish close and fruitful political relations with socialist organizations and individuals throughout the world. Noted during this report was the continued precipitous decline of the remnants of the so-called Fourth International.

Closing with a sober but undimmed understanding of the difficult days ahead, the delegates returned to their localities heartened by a fruitful convention and determined to launch anew the struggle for a socialist triumph.

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
Vol. 15, No. 30 July 23, 1951
Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATkins 4-4222.
Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.
Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH
Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM
by
MAX SHACHTMAN
A Basic Primer!
\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

TWO NEW YORK CLASSES
Sponsored by the Socialist Youth League
at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.
WORLD POLITICS: 1930-1950
(Tuesdays, 7:30-9 p.m.)
July 24—The Rise of Fascism.....Albert Gates
July 31—The Popular Front.....(To be announced)
Aug. 4—The Spanish Civil War.....(To be announced)
Aug. 14—The National Question and Modern WarHal Draper
Aug. 21—The Role of Stalinism in the Chinese RevolutionJack Brad
THE EVOLUTION OF STALINISM
(Tuesdays, 9-10:30 p.m.)
INSTRUCTOR: MAX SHACHTMAN
July 24—The Civil War and the Rise of the Stalinist Bureaucracy
July 31—The Stalinist Bureaucracy's Consolidation of Power
NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .
A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, minority groups, national and world politics—\$2 a year.

ICFTU Calls for Govt. Help Against CP Unions

By RICHARD TROY

"Once again the forces in the CIO dedicated to fighting Communism have taken a terrible beating at the Locke Insulator Company in Baltimore which is a branch of the General Electric Company . . . inasmuch as the CIO campaigned on the anti-Communism issue and lost, the results are alleged to be a victory for Communism . . . the CIO union accuses the company of interfering in the election through a process of 'darning with faint praise,' because the company is said to have made known its preference for the CIO union which was a kiss of death; and the UE walked off with a victory. It is claimed that as soon as the company identified itself with the CIO union, the employees, being against the company, naturally voted against the CIO and in favor of what they were told was Red Communism."—Item from the Baltimore Labor Herald, July 6, 1951.

The second congress of the two-year-old International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (the ICFTU) in Milan, Italy, last week provided the observer with a number of interesting notes on the recent activities of the trade unions of the non-Stalinist world. The ICFTU is the off-called "reply" of the free trade unions of the West to the Stalinist-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions.

The ICFTU is composed of all the major labor unions of the western nations which are not under the control of the Stalinists (with the exception of the Catholic unions). Its approximate strength is 50 million members. Its general coloring is, as to be expected, similar if not more conservative than that of its constituent bodies. Its political position is avowedly pro-U. S., pro-Atlantic Pact, pro-rearmament, and for slow, cautious change or reform in the social structure of the western nations.

But—above all else its tone is anti-Stalinist, and in fact, the second congress was dominated by questions relating to Stalinism. The post-war crisis in capitalism, one of its resolutions stated, might have been easily resolved had it not been for the machinations of international communism. Just as the Republicans in the U. S. Congress attribute the Stalinist victory in China to the blunders of a few state department officials, these international labor statesmen attribute the post-war crisis in capitalism to the Stalinist conspirators.

No attempt whatever was made to distinguish the policies of the free trade unions from that of their respective governments. And, indeed, there was no need! It is no wonder that the New York Times could praise uncritically the entire work of the conference!

A CALL FOR HELP

The most revealing action taken by the congress was the decision reached on the question of policy of the free unions in France and Italy where, as everyone knows, the Stalinists have a tight grip on the largest labor unions. One might have expected the congress to have called, in

bold headlines, for an intensified and doubly militant struggle to expose and oust the Stalinists from control. One might have hoped to have heard that the congress had declared the beginning of a more vigorous and independent struggle for higher wages in Western Europe and a letting-up on rearmament expenditures as a means of combating Stalinism. Instead, the main idea they had for wresting control from the Stalinists, an idea to which they devoted nearly an entire day of private and public discussion, was to call upon the French and Italian governments to help them in the great crisis!

The trouble with the trade union situation in France and Italy, they evidently decided, was due to a government boner . . . the governments of France and Italy were "subsidizing" the two huge Stalinist outfits. This is quite true, and has always been so in these two nations to the extent that many social-service benefits are distributed through the trade unions. The idea which has been hatching in the minds of these trade union leaders is that if the governments would cease making payments to the Stalinist unions the workers, unwilling to give up their benefits, would naturally get out of the Stalinist unions and join those of the ICFTU. "If the French and Italian governments deprive C.G.T. and C.G.I.L. of their present right to collective bargaining, which they tacitly recognize by dealing with them, there is no question that the overwhelming majority of Communist-controlled workers would eventually join the free unions." So the reasoning on the topic runs!

It is hardly necessary to point out the undemocratic and stupid character of this method of attempting to win over the rank and file of the Stalinist unions. Readers of LABOR ACTION will recall our criticism of the CIO leadership for expelling in a bureaucratic fashion, the Stalinist unions from its ranks in 1949.

A STUPID MANEUVER

And the maneuver proposed by the ICFTU is a hundred times more bureaucratic. The CIO merely expelled certain unions, while the ICFTU is actually proposing the outright destruction of two huge and powerful labor federations by government decree. The majority of the CIO membership in 1949, even if not consulted, was probably in favor of the expulsion. But in France and Italy it is beyond doubt that the majority of the working class is still pro-Stalinist.

Of course, no one can take these proposals too seriously. It is doubtful if either the French or Italian governments subsidize the Stalinist unions out of sympathy. To withdraw the sums which filter down to the workers through the trade unions might easily bring on a major political and economic crisis which neither of the two governments is strong enough to face. Such a move might upset an apple-cart too precarious to stand the slightest tilt. Perhaps the delegates at Milan knew this, but yet, the very fact that they are even thinking along such lines is significant, demonstrating their bankruptcy before the challenge of Stalinism.

It is symptomatic of the meas-

ures which the western leaders are taking, or thinking of taking, to stem the Stalinist advance. As Washington thinks in terms of atom bombs, howitzers and imprisonment for its enemies the free trade union leaders think in terms of persuading their government to decree out of existence the enemy in the shops. The weakness of the positions needs little elaboration. We need only be reminded of the incident related at the beginning of this article. . . . as soon as the company identified itself with the CIO employees, being against the company, naturally voted . . . in favor of what they were told was Red Communism.

The ICFTU in this proposal is just begging for the kiss of death.

India Govt. Outlaws Railroad Workers Strike

The following item, from a special dispatch to the New York Times, is another commentary on the "democratic" regime of Nehru in India. It should be noted that the Indian railroad workers' projected strike may well have political repercussions which are at least as important as the strictly trade union, or economic ones. The railroad workers in India are led by the Socialist Party. Its most prominent national leader, Narsinh Naryan, is also the top officer of the railroad workers union.—Ed.

NEW DELHI, India, July 11—President Rajendra Prasad issued an ordinance today empowering the Government to prohibit strikes in essential services for six months.

The action was taken because

of the fear that the railway union strike scheduled for Aug. 27 would seriously affect food distribution throughout India at a time when the threat of a famine existed.

The All-India Railwaymen's Federation, controlling 350,000 out of 1,000,000 railroad workers, voted to strike next month for a rise of 20 rupees (\$4.20) a month. The government, which owns the railways, rejected this demand but recently announced an increase of 5 rupees for 650,000 rail workers now earning less than 250 rupees a month.

Gopalaswami Ayyangar, Minister for Transport and Railways, explained in a broadcast that the critical food situation had forced the government to take the sternest measures possible to prevent a breakdown in rail traffic.

LABOR SCOPE

HOW A LABOR BUREAUCRACY GROWS

"Every once in a while I pray that God will never let me forget that I was once very poor, often hungry, cold, and homeless in and around Boston and Cambridge, Mass., in my early struggles with life. Even when I came to Indianapolis as General President I walked around all one Sunday morning looking for a place where I could get my Sunday dinner for 25 cents. . . . I had a large family in Cambridge, Mass., I had \$150 a month salary, very little expense money, and believe me, it was tough going."

As he reminisces, Dan Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters reflects that time and his workers have treated him nobly. "Now I ride in the best trains and the best and fastest planes and eat in the best hotels and we have millions in our treasury." And with the pride of a father who has done his best by his children he tells us that all six have graduated from college and with that enviable advantage are all making decent salaries.

EXALTED STATUS

Tobin now draws \$30,000 a year from his union which supplements his income by providing him with a home in Miami. So reports U. S. News and World Report on July 20 in a survey of the

salaries of America's leading labor officials. This little glimpse into the income statistics of union leaders, reminds us/again of the exalted status they enjoy when compared to the status of the workingmen who pay their salaries. The table in this issue lists only a few of the better known leaders. Their pay soars high above that of their rank and file, ranging from 8 or 9 times the pay of a skilled worker in the case of Lewis to 2 or 3 times in the case of Reuther.

A PENNY PER YEAR

Perhaps U. S. News is right when it says that union members don't begrudge their leaders this small token of esteem. Compared to the salaries and bonuses of big corporation executives, this is small potatoes indeed. And if we wanted to analyze the thing to death, we could point out that the 400,000 miners each pay only a little over 4 cents per year toward the pay of their president and the 1,000,000 auto workers only 1 cent per man per year for Reuther. Then, we could break it down to the contribution per month, per day, per hour until we all became indignant at the pittance paid to labor's elected and selected leaders.

But all this is aside from the

This table appeared in the July 20 issue of U. S. News and World Report. In addition to the salaries listed, these union leaders have at their disposal large expense accounts. The UMW furnishes John L. Lewis and Thomas Kennedy with a Cadillac each; and the CIO furnishes Phil Murray a sumptuous hotel suit on a year-round basis in Washington, D. C.—Ed.

TAKE-HOME PAY OF TOP LABOR LEADERS

	Salary	Federal Tax	Left After Tax
George M. Harrison President, AFL Railway Clerks	\$76,000*	\$31,000	\$45,000
John L. Lewis President, United Mine Workers	50,000	16,648	33,352
James C. Petrillo President, AFL Musicians Union	46,000	14,632	31,368
Thomas Kennedy Vice President, United Mine Workers	40,000	11,800	28,200
Daniel J. Tobin President, AFL Teamsters	30,000	7,574	22,426
John F. English Secretary-Treasurer, AFL Teamsters	30,000	7,574	22,426
Philip Murray President, CIO Steelworkers	25,000	5,774	19,226
William Green President, AFL	25,000	5,774	19,226
George Meany Secretary-Treasurer, AFL	22,000	4,804	17,196
Walter P. Reuther President, CIO Auto Workers	11,250	1,920	9,330

*Voted by union at convention, but not yet accepted.
NOTE: Take-home pay figures assume the taxpayer has a wife but no other dependents, that he has no other income, and that his deductions, for tax purposes, are 10 per cent of his salary.

Resolution of the Independent

Socialist League Convention

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM—

AND THE THIRD WORLD WAR

The national convention of the Independent Socialist League just held adopted four resolutions on international questions in the form of supplements to its basic resolution on Capitalism, Stalinism and the Third World War of 1949. These four documents dealt with (1) the war; (2) the British Labor government; (3) independent federation for Asia; and (4) national-Stalinism and Yugoslavia.

The last two have already been printed in LABOR ACTION—on Asia, June 11; on Yugoslavia, June 18. Although presented in these issues for pre-convention discussion, they need not be reprinted since they were adopted without changes by the convention.

The supplements on the war question and the British Labor government are published in this issue.

In presenting the war resolution, as the other three, the reporter at the convention stressed that it is to be considered wholly in the context of the 1949 basic resolution, not as if it were an independent document. The over-all 1949 resolution was directed toward stating the fundamental line of Independent Socialism in opposition to both war blocs and for a Third Camp position, rejecting support to both U. S. imperialism and Stalinist imperialism. The current document picks up from there, above all in view of the fact that since 1949 war has indeed broken out, and is especially directed toward the question how we put forward our views on the war.

Subheads in the resolution as printed here have been added editorially.—Ed.

(1) Since the last convention of the ISL, war has actually broken out in the world. To be sure, the Korean war is not yet the third world war but it is universally recognized as a preliminary to it.

We endorse the analysis and position taken by the Political Committee in its Declaration on the outbreak of the Korean war. The consequences of the Korean war fully confirm the views there expressed on the reactionary character of the foreign policy and aims of Washington and Moscow.

U. S. IMPERIALISM AND THE DEFEAT OF STALINISM

THE "GREAT DEBATE"

(2) The outbreak of the Korean war has given rise in U. S. political circles to new debates and discussions on the war threat. In this so-called "Great Debate," there have been especially counterposed (a) the line of the Truman-Acheson administration, and (b) proposals from various sectors of bourgeois and liberal thought for policies which are put forward as means of eliminating or lessening the war danger, as compared with the Truman-Acheson line.

The way in which the two have been counterposed to each other permits us once again to underline the distinctive features of the Independent Socialism which opposes and rejects them both.

THE TRUMAN WAR LINE

(3) The administration line, as the current and prevailing policy of U. S. imperialism, may be summarized as follows:

(a) It is necessary, in the interests of maintaining and expanding the power of U. S. capitalism in the world, to carry on an aggressive foreign and military policy to stop and drive back Stalinism and Stalinist-Russian expansion.

(b) This is to be done by relying primarily and mainly on military force (as in Korea, Indo-China, Malaya) and by building up more military force through an armaments race, atomic warfare preparations and power alliances.

(c) These military (and secondarily diplomatic) steps are entirely subordinated to the reactionary social and political program of U. S. capitalism, which is incapable of making any effective appeal to the peoples of the world outside of that framework. In consequence then, nowhere does the U. S. seriously attempt to meet Stalinism, in Europe or Asia, with political weapons which can counter its appeal. It is for this reason, not merely shortsightedness or stupidity, that its perspective for the struggle against Stalinism is an essentially military one—war and destruction to the bitter end, with only pious hopes that this will not entail the feared consequences of destroying the heart of civilization along with the Kremlin's power, even if it is militarily successful.

(d) In line with this perspective, the U. S. has (increasingly since Korea) openly followed the policy of seeking military alliance with every reactionary force and power in the world which is also opposed to Moscow: Franco; Chiang Kai-shek and his remnants on Formosa (reversing the White Paper policy); Syngman Rhee, Bao Dai, etc. Its policy has forced even the Indian Nehru government into open opposition in the UN, where it has pushed through its line with a display of blackmail and threats rivaling in cynicism the activities of the Moscow imperialists themselves.

(4) U. S. policy banks any hope of avoiding full-scale atomic warfare only on frightening its Russian rival into quiescence. To people of more than one school of thought, this age-old claim of "preserving peace through superior military power," which preceded both World War I and II, can have no different result in this pre-war period. In reaction against the Truman-Acheson war policy, a group of proposals arise which mark themselves off from it with respect to its point (a) above. This is their common point of approach. Three varieties of this approach have been put before the American people:

(a) The line put forward in its starkest form by Herbert Hoover, in attenuated degree by Senator Taft, and informing much of what is left of isolationist sentiment in the U. S., by and large emanating from some of the more reactionary sections of U. S. capitalism: retreat in foreign policy to the Western Hemisphere and its conversion into a "fortress." This policy, which, like that of Acheson-Truman, sees no effective political means of combating Stalinism, goes even further in its involuntary acknowledgment of the bankruptcy of world capitalism, inasmuch as it finds no reason for relying upon West European capitalism's will or ability to defend itself from Stalinist conquest. It is false to charge Hooverism, as the Acheson-Truman supporters do, that it sees no need for allies in the war against Stalinism. What is true is that it frankly sees no European allies in existence (except England, to serve as an American airfield, and France, to serve as the only reliable bulwark of "democracy" on the continent) and is resigned to fighting for survival virtually alone. Its perspective for a beleaguered "capitalism in one country," bristling with arms, could only mean a speedier acceleration of the trend toward the militarization, bureaucratization and totalitarianization of the country.

(b) "Neutralist" or "third-force" policies based on the theory of "peaceful coexistence" of the two worlds. It is the basic programmatic element in views as various otherwise as those of many American anti-Stalinist liberals, Stalinoid liberals, as well as the World Federalists and Titoists. Its central plea is that the U. S. and Russia "learn to live together," and not the need to stop and destroy Stalinism. Although not often explicitly, the practical program is a form of appeasement—going under the name of "negotiations for peace," i. e., a deal between imperialist regimes for a momentarily acceptable division of the world, as at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam; in another form, its practical program is "world government," a utopia so long as the imperialist regimes are maintained; in another, its program depends on the illusion that the Kremlin's aggressiveness is a reaction to "Western encirclement" and/or that the West's war fever is the product simply of baseless fear. All of these variants are naive or suicidal. But it must be recognized that a positive aspect of these schools of foreign policy is that their supporters are freed, by the terms of their ideas, to be highly and justly critical of the actual foreign policy and acts of both American and Russian imperialism.

(c) The policy of a breathing spell—postponement of war—by any means, on the ground that anything is better than an outbreak of atomic war. Since this approach does not necessarily depend on any of the political views or illusions noted above, it is to be found even in socialist and pacifist circles. There can be no quarrel by Independent Socialists with the general idea that the postponement of war for as long as possible is a positive good, since it permits the longest possible time for that regroupment and revival of socialist forces which is crucial to any progressive solution of the world crisis. But this consideration does not point to a peace-at-any-price ideology. A "breathing spell" gained at the expense of more basic considerations only ensures the worst possible outcome of the crisis and disarms the working class and Third Camp forces. In any case, over-emphasis on the need for a "breathing spell" as an overriding consideration can serve the deleterious end of preparing their thinking for reactionary solutions.

AGAINST STALINISM

(3) We reject entirely all such proposals which, in reaction to the Truman-Acheson line of anti-Russian belligerence, aim to or tend to abandon or de-emphasize the need to fight for the destruction of Stalinism, even if this is done under the slogan of "Peace!" We take this stand in the interest of and from the viewpoint of the working class and the future of the socialist struggle, for the following reasons:

(a) Labor and socialism cannot "coexist peacefully" with Stalinism in the same world. The rebuilding and the victory of the socialist movement require the destruction of all Stalinist influence in the working class—indeed, it can be rebuilt only through a program which includes an uncompromising fight for the destruction of Stalinism.

(b) Given the fact that the antagonism between the Stalinist and capitalist sectors of the world is a basic one, rooted in the inherent antagonism between these two rival social systems both forced to reach out for complete domination of the world, "coexistence" for any length of time can neither be "peaceful" nor permanent. It means no resolution of the world crisis but rather a perspective of cold-war-in-permanence—a perspective which can be accompanied, in the U. S. and the West, only by a concomitant permanent war economy and the deepening and hastening of all reactionary tendencies in present-day capitalism.

(c) Not least of all, furthermore, is the fact that we, as internationalist socialists, cannot callously take the

attitude that it is no concern of ours if one-third of the world suffers under the most monstrous totalitarian slavery. This is no consideration for the U. S. bourgeoisie, which can and would be thoroughly unconcerned by the fate of any other peoples, if it were not that their own power and aims are at stake.

The Independent Socialist movement, however, which is founded on the struggle for socialist democracy against both capitalism and Stalinism, is the most irreconcilable enemy of Stalinism in the fullest sense. (a) The American bourgeoisie and government, for the reasons noted above, are not. While their interests inevitably drive them into conflict with the Stalinist empire, and this conflict in the long run cannot be reconciled, this takes place in spite of their own preference (if it were possible) to strike a deal with Moscow which would confine the latter to a minor portion of the earth, at the expense of the working class and people of any and every country. Sections of the bourgeoisie and government are anxious to do this right now. Even the Truman-Acheson policymakers (Moscow willing) may come to some such over-the-counter arrangement, temporary as it may be. (b) Nor is the Independent Socialist movement poisoned by the conceptions rife in some parts of the world socialist movement which looks on Stalinist expansion as some kind of road toward socialism.

If the destruction of Stalinist tyranny and its replacement by a democratic regime—not the maintenance and expansion of U. S. capitalism—were really the politics from which Washington's foreign policy flowed, socialists would be in duty bound to support (however critically) its preparations for war and the war itself. But the claim that this is so is a lie—proved a lie by every concrete aspect of its actual policy and acts, including its A-bomb diplomacy. But it is this side of the Truman-Acheson line, its "strong" policy against Stalinist expansion, which attracts a mass of workers (not the most backward either!) in support of its foreign policy, while other sections of the masses of people are attracted to counter-programs on the basis of their fear of war. Fear of Stalinism or fear of war, the need to fight against Stalinism or the need to fight against war, hatred of the old system of exploitation or dread of the new one—these are the poles between which the progressive aspirations of the peoples are divided. The task of Independent Socialists is to demonstrate that its program alone offers a road to fight both Stalinism and war, both the old system of capitalism and the new tyranny of bureaucratic collectivism.

That is why we reject any program which illusorily subordinates the need to destroy Stalinism to the need for peace, just as we reject any program to make peace with capitalism in order to fight Stalinism.

THE NEW ELEMENTS IN THE WAR

A CONCRETE ANALYSIS

(6) It is a fundamental error, because of the concrete nature of the coming imperialist war, even to pose the problem in terms of: Which is more important—to continue the traditional socialist struggle against capitalism and imperialism at home, or to fight the new enemy Stalinism?

Marxists do not base their opposition to imperialist wars simply on the abstract ground that imperialist governments are involved and that support of war by any imperialist government is excluded on a priori principles. In each case, a concrete analysis is necessary of a given imperialist war.

In the present world crisis, the Marxist concretization of the imperialist and reactionary character of the third world war is based on precisely the new features which distinguish this war from the preceding world wars of our epoch. These new features are three:

(a) It is a war not merely between two rival imperialist blocs, but between two different and mutually antagonistic social systems.

(b) It is a war not merely for a redistribution of the colonial and undeveloped areas of the world between different exploiters, but a struggle for domination and control of the entire world, including the leading nations themselves.

(c) It is a struggle which bears within itself the potentiality for the destruction of all civilization, if not of the world itself. We recognize it as a fact that this potentiality exists today for the first time, as a result of the distortion of modern science and technology into a monster rather than a benefactor. Any war which depends on the matching of the new atomic arms to the bitter end of mutual annihilation raises a new (though not an independent) element in the considerations of socialists on the war question.

Each one of these factors points to a reinforcement of the Independent Socialist policy of opposition to both war blocs. At bottom, this is so because each one is a concrete expression in today's terms of the imperialist nature of the struggle for the world.

THEY REINFORCE OUR LINE

(7) I. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SOCIAL ANTAGONISM.—This has already been dealt with basically in the 1949 resolution of the ISL on Capitalism, Stalinism and the War, summed up in sections 8, 14, 67, 68.

Because of its anti-capitalist character, Stalinism can and does make a political and ideological appeal to the peoples of the capitalist and semi-feudal world against

their capitalist and imperialist rulers, an appeal which has been a tremendous weapon in its expansion and a potent one in its "little wars." To those peoples who have had as yet no experience under its rule, it demagogically offers a revolutionary and dynamic program of change from the old system of exploitation (landlordism, capitalism and capitalist imperialism) which the people know too well and which they are determined to destroy. Even to people under its rule and disillusioned by knowledge that this change is to a new system of oppression, the result tends to be, not active revolt, but passivity, confusion and illusions about "democratization" of Stalinism, as long as the only alternative offered is a restoration of the old system of capitalism.

Capitalism, any appeal based on capitalism, and any power which fights in the name of capitalism, cannot gain the active, sacrifice-stirring devotion of the masses of the peoples such as could bring down the Stalinist empire by crumbling it from within. Neither the Stalinist empire nor Russia is as monolithic, solid and united under terror as both its leaders and bourgeois enemies often make it out to be.

It is possible, to be sure, for the Stalinist empire to be defeated by purely reactionary military force—but not without laying waste the world and not without the consequences for capitalist society itself (intensification of all trends toward bureaucratization, militarization and totalitarianization) which are analyzed in the 1949 resolution.

The Western capitalist war bloc cannot defeat Stalinism without such reactionary consequences, both for the peoples of the world and at home, as to make the "defense of bourgeois democracy against Stalinist totalitarianism" through support of war a suicidal illusion.

The U. S. war bloc may defeat Russia militarily—if indeed there is any distinction between victor and vanquished—but capitalism cannot defeat Stalinism in any sense which means victory for any of the progressive aspirations of the people.

II. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NATIONAL ELEMENT.—

The war blocs fight for control of each others' nations, not simply for control over backward peoples. This means that on both sides—for the people as well as for the ruling classes and governments—the very existence of the nation (national independence) is in peril. Few other facts underline so clearly the reactionary nature of such a war even in comparison with World War I and with World War II (where this element already partly showed itself.)

This fact has two more concrete significations:

(a) It reinforces our view that Independent Socialism must reject any "peace" program which abandons the fight for the destruction of Stalinism. If it is true that capitalism cannot defeat Stalinism without reactionary consequences—any more than Stalinism can defeat capitalism without equally and even more reactionary consequences—it is also true that only our road of struggle can, in any progressive sense, defend the nation against the enemy without and defend the people against the class oppressor at home. Even from the point of view of the American people, capitalist imperialism can defend their national existence only at the expense of the national existence of all other peoples and at the expense of their own social existence.

(b) But if the national existence of the American people is endangered by defeat in a military struggle, this is also true for the Russian people. It is not true that the masses who suffer under Stalin's iron heel are indifferent to the national consideration: this was demonstrated by them in Russia's war against German invasion in World War II, at least by sufficient numbers of them to make clear that the character of the coming war as an imperialist struggle for control of the whole world serves to tie the Russian people closer to their own oppressors, makes more difficult the destruction of Stalinism (as distinct from the occupation of the Kremlin by an American Military Government) and assures that an American imperialist victory can be achieved only through atomic-war-to-the-bitter-end.

III. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ATOMIC WAR.—

The abolition or restriction of atomic weapons (or of any of the new weapons spawned) by agreement between the existing powers is a utopia. No program can be founded on the hope that the coming war can be kept from being an atomic war. But this is precisely why opposition to the war is doubly reinforced by this new element and why it is necessary for socialists to combat the war danger on this ground also.

For us it is not a pacifist ground, politically speaking. Not to speak of the Stalinist dictatorship (whose lack of scruples about using any and all weapons need not be discussed), the fact that the U. S. has no other weapons at its disposal except the threat of frightful military power determines the key role of atomic warfare in its calculations.

The potentialities for destruction raised by atomic warfare must flower in any resolution of the world crisis which is military or decisively military. The only program which can destroy the Stalinist empire without war—or at least, without war to the bitter (atomic) end—is one which can blow up that empire from within. Such a revolt can be stirred only on the basis of an appeal which is not only anti-Stalinist but anti-capitalist. But it does not wait only on the coming to power of genuine working-class governments in the West. Short of that, the rebellion of Stalin's enslaved peoples will be given impetus

and encouragement by demonstrations of the West's working class that they are not tied to their imperialist chariots, that there is a force in the West which offers a road to a solution which does not revolve between capitalism and Stalinism: that is, a strong, powerful and meaningful Third Camp of socialist democracy.

Our road, which seeks to build such a Third Camp, is a road which can avoid atomic destruction. It is not the least of reasons why we drive along that road with all energy and determination.

"DEFEND THE NATION"?

(8) The Independent Socialist League, while rejecting the standpoint that it is necessary to support American imperialism in the war with Stalinist Russia, is, however, not indifferent to the question of the conduct of the war or its outcome. It rejects as reactionary and criminal the policy, put forward in the name of socialism, of "defense of the Soviet Union"—unconditional or otherwise, a policy which serves at best as a cloak and apology for Stalinist imperialism, its enslavement of the working classes, its subjugation of nations and its extirpation of the socialist movement.

It rejects as reactionary and deceitful the policy, put forward in the name of democracy, of supporting American imperialism in the war or pre-war period—a policy which, at best, confers upon the last bulwark of rotting capitalism the task of saving democracy which it cannot possibly perform and which, by subordinating the working class to imperialism, precludes it from performing the tasks of democracy and socialism it is called upon to accomplish.

One of these tasks in the present period is precisely the defense of the nation and of the only consistently progressive and democratic class in the nation, the working class. In the Third World War, unlike the First, the national integrity and independence of the country are at stake. This applies both to Russia and to the United States. The ISL recognizes that if the working classes are unable to prevent the outbreak of the Third World War, and they alone can prevent it, the triumph of Stalinism in the war would mean the subjugation of the United States and most other nations and the enslavement of the working class by the totalitarian bureaucracy.

But these are exactly the dangers that cannot be warded off by entrusting the "defense of democracy" to the imperialist, reactionary bourgeoisie of the U. S.

It is not at all concerned with the question of the freedom or enslavement of the working class but only with its preservation as a producer of unlimited profits. It is not at all concerned with the question of the defense of the nation's integrity, except in the sense of an imperialist metropolis which is in a position to dominate and dictate to the rest of the world and to check or repress all popular democratic movements throughout the world, that is, it is animated by those very considerations which have brought world-wide discredit upon the nation and produced the very situation and war danger that imperil the nation and its working classes.

The socialist movement does not have, and the working class should not have, the slightest confidence in the democratic pretensions or intentions of the American capitalist class, its movement, its war, its conduct of the war, its war objectives, its war allies. The socialist movement places its confidence exclusively in that class whose very political existence makes indispensable and imperative its attachment to democracy, democratic rights and institutions, namely, the working class and its labor movement. This applies to the pre-war period and, if it is not averted, to the war itself.

Faced by the coming war crisis, the socialist movement will more urgently than ever call upon the working-class movement to take command of the nation and, should it prove necessary as a result of the reactionary and imperialist drive of Stalinism, to take command also of the defense of the nation. Even if, at the outset, a labor government which takes over the nation and defends the interest of the working people on the basis of a genuinely democratic course in foreign and domestic policy which is not in fact subordinated to the interests of capitalism and imperialism, should not yet be a socialist labor government, the socialist movement stands pledged to support and defend it in word and in deed in any war in which it is threatened by a reactionary enemy, Stalinist Russia included. It is precisely by confiding the national defense to the reactionary capitalist class, which has and can have only reactionary purposes, that the working-class movement abandons its great responsibility to the true and best interests of the nation, to the true and best interests of itself, and what is related to them, to the true and best interests of democracy all over the world. The task of the defense of the democratic nation is the task of the working class itself.

III

FOR A DEMOCRATIC FOREIGN POLICY

THE "THIRD CAMP" SLOGAN

HOW WE USE IT

(9) We use the term "Third Camp" as a vivid pointer into the key idea of the Independent Socialist position on the war. On the negative side, it means political opposition to both war blocs in the struggle for the world today. On the positive side, it can only mean in the last analysis a rebuilt and revived socialist working-class struggle against both capitalism and Stalinism.

It thus points up a programmatic direction, a political line. The problem is the creation of a labor and so-

cialist mass movement which will fight along that line. Such elements today not only exist but exist in abundance in the world today. They are unorganized, inchoate, politically confused, immobilized by the same dilemmas which have weakened the socialist movement itself. But in every country of the world, masses grope toward a line which will permit them to oppose consistently both systems and both blocs. Inconsistently, hesitatingly, as yet without a broad political perspective, millions already think along these lines.

The alternative programs which are discussed above (Section 4) are, to be sure, blind alleys or worse, but it is indisputable that much of their popular appeal to supporters (and their meaning to those supporters) exists because the latter are thinking along these lines. This is true of "neutralism" in its various forms, in part of the world-government movement, the pacifist movement and the like. A distinction must always be made between the leaders of these movements and the following they arouse, between the illusoriness of the formal program and the popular aspirations they express to one degree or another. This is of the utmost importance in determining at once our critical and sympathetic approach to these movements and its ideologies.

THE BRITISH AND INDIAN PEOPLE

(10) Such Third Camp tendencies are a natural reservoir of strength for a revival of the socialist movement. But while some sections of the socialist left are still weak, the same tendencies manifest themselves and exert their pressure and even influence through other channels. It is essential that Independent Socialists be ready to seize upon, point to, and further develop all tendencies in this direction, wherever they appear, in order to facilitate their development toward the consistent and fully thought-out Third Camp position which characterizes Independent Socialism.

Among other things, it must be understood that in the junior partners of the Western bloc, especially the smaller countries, even the bourgeoisies and government circles of those countries have little or no enthusiasm for the coming war, win or lose, since U. S. victory—with accompanying destruction and American hegemony—offers even the junior capitalist partners little to fight for. It goes without saying that such circles themselves, whatever the degree to which they tend to "neutralist" sympathies now, will not enter into the building of a Third Camp force. But even their hesitations today reflect in some measure not only their own doubts but also the pressures of the masses behind them. And to the degree that they separate themselves from the more adventurous and narrow-nationalistic performances of Washington, to that degree the working-class vanguard must point to these phenomena and utilize them to drive home their own message to the people.

Of far greater significance and symptomatic importance for the power of the forces of the Third Camp, is the course followed in foreign policy by the British Labor government and the Nehru nationalist government. To the extent that they follow and will continue to follow the leadership of American imperialism in the war and the preparations for the war, they disclose their failure to break out of the reactionary framework of imperialism and their economic and military dependency upon American capitalism. However, both governments are distinguished from all others in the American bloc by the fact that they are the direct product, in the one case, of a powerful socialist working-class upsurge, and in the other case, of a less powerful national-revolutionary and anti-imperialist people's movement. In both countries, the peoples represent the most advanced forces of the Third Camp in existence anywhere in the world, in that both strive vigorously to free themselves from attachment and subordination to American imperialism, without showing any indication of supporting or coming under the control of Stalinist imperialism.

The fact that both the Laborite and Nehru governments have come into more or less open conflict with the American government on questions of international and war policy, reflects, at bottom, the pressure of the powerful popular forces they represent. Likewise, it constitutes a striking confirmation of the existence of vast forces of the Third Camp, which require, for their victory, only greater organization and greater consistency of expression than can be given by the governments now representing them. It is a socialist task to point up the significance of these forces, today best represented by the Indian and British peoples, to defend them from malicious and reactionary attacks to utilize their example and aspirations for political education everywhere, aiming only to rally support to them and to give the movement they represent more cohesiveness, deeper understanding, clarity and purpose.

IV

LABOR NEEDS A PROGRAM

(11) To this end, the Independent Socialists, as always, do not limit themselves simply to proposing socialism as the answer to the threatened world war. It is, furthermore, a central view of Independent Socialism that "the key to the struggle for socialism today is the struggle for democracy—the fight to awaken a mass movement behind the most thorough-going democratic demands as an indispensable

(Turn to last page)

Resolution of the Independent

TWO ROADS AHEAD FOR THE

PROGRESSIVE POTENTIAL OF
LABOR'S VICTORY

(1) The five years of existence of the British Labor government confronts the Marxist movement with a new political problem. Its record of achievement is in important respects unanticipated by Marxists, in the light of previous experience with social-reformism in office. While the 1948 convention resolution of the ISL on "Capitalism, Stalinism and the War," particularly Section I-D on "The Role of the Social-Democracy," is our starting point for a consideration of this new phenomenon, a fuller examination is required of the specific development of the Labor government and its meaning for the socialist movement of the world.

The great significance of the Labor government development will remain even if a new election should restore the Tory party to power. That development may then come to a temporary halt or slow-down, but this would neither eliminate its influence on British society nor diminish the importance of understanding it.

(2) The enormous progressive potential of Labor's victory in Britain was conferred upon it and still exists today by virtue of two facts:

(a) Emerging directly out of the Second World War, in 1945, the workers and decisive sections of the middle class repudiated the social leadership of the Tories and Churchill—that is, of the capitalist class—and voted for the Labor Party as the standard-bearer of a socialist reorganization of society, for the first time giving a clear socialist mandate to the Labor Party which took over the government with an absolute majority in Parliament. Never before had the British workers so clearly and unitedly manifested their socialist aspirations. After years of uninterrupted defeats inflicted on the working classes of Europe and the world by the Stalinists, by the fascists and by the bourgeoisie, the workers of Britain demonstrated that the working class is capable of organizing itself in virtual complete political solidarity and winning a major victory over its class enemy. For the workers of the world, they gave an example which came at a vital point in historical development. For no country of the world is this example more important than for the politically backward American working class, which still faces the task of creating its own political arm.

The victory in Britain demonstrated that the political forces of labor can take over the nation; that the masses of the people, including the middle class, will turn to labor as the bourgeoisie shows its inability and unwillingness to satisfy their needs and interests. This fact alone is of tremendous importance. The British workers opened for themselves a road of political opportunity unequalled anywhere since the days of the Spanish revolution and civil war.

(b) The Labor government in power proceeded to nationalize decisive sections of the basic industry of the country, including steel, thereby undermining bourgeois property relations. This course, moreover, at a decisive conjuncture in world history: the deep-going degeneration and disintegration of world capitalism alongside the emergence of Stalinism as a world social, political and military force embracing a third of the globe. In Britain itself, in particular, the capitalist ruling class is a weak and decaying class, its empire fallen apart, reduced to junior partnership in the Western capitalist bloc in subordination to the U. S.; while the position of the working class, better organized and more cohesive than ever, has improved and strengthened. While the decay of the capitalist class made the Labor victory possible, the anti-capitalist measures taken by the victorious Labor government in its turn are striking at the heart of capitalist society.

SOCIALIST CONFIDENCE JUSTIFIED

Never more than in the case of this post-war upsurge of the British workers have socialists been justified in their confidence in the recuperative powers of the working class and its necessary emergence as the only progressive force in society.

(3) As against the Tories, we stand as unconditional defenders of the Labor Party and its government, urging the firm conviction that it is the duty of British Marxist socialists to be the most energetic and enthusiastic supporters in every electoral contest of the maintenance of the Labor Party at the head of the government and the nation, while within the Labor Party they settle the vital questions of program and policy which will decide the historic course of the Labor victory. In the United States, where the whole bourgeoisie, as well as the more conservative sections of the trade-union bureaucracy, attempts to discredit and denigrate the rule of the Labor Party in the eyes of the American people, we stand as defenders of the British working class and its government against such traducers. We exercise the right of defenders to criticize and make proposals from our own socialist standpoint, but only for the purpose of strengthening the progressive and revolutionary aspects of the British Labor government. We have nothing in common with those who attack it for the purpose of demoralizing the British workers—and of discouraging those American workers who would follow the example—as we are determinedly opposed to those whose practical ends of those aspects of it which point away from socialism, let alone those who claim that the Labor government is even now "building socialism."

The British working class has opened the road to socialism in its country. Whether it enters upon that road and travels it firmly, determinedly and boldly depends upon it and upon what happens within its party, the Labor Party, in the course of the visibly developing antagonism between the socialist aspirations of the mass of workers on the one hand, and the political course of the British Labor bureaucracy on the other. It is in this context that our analysis of the latter is put forward.

II

LABOR AT THE CROSSROADS

(1) The problem which the record of the British Labor government has posed, or seemed to pose, before Marxists revolves around the claim of a "rebirth" of reformism as a road to socialism.

On the other hand, (a) the claim is made that Britain is advancing toward socialism under the leadership and policies of a reformist party as can be found among the Social-Democracy; that reformism is therefore "proving" itself; that it is vindicating the peaceful parliamentary road to power as against revolutionary Marxist criticism.

On the other hand, (b) many or most left-socialist critics of the BLP have by and large taken the view that the BLP leadership has essentially been following the same course as classical reformism, that it seeks to do, and in fact does, no more than prop up and patch up capitalism and bourgeois power; that, in other words, there is no important difference between the role and course of the British Labor government today and of the German Social-Democracy after World War I.

We consider both of these views as basically incorrect, and as sharing the same defect: both, from opposing points of view revolve within a circle of ideas which ignore the new phenomena of the present stage of capitalism.

LABOR GOVERNMENT IS ANTI-CAPITALIST

(2) A *sine qua non* for a Marxist analysis of the British Labor government is recognition of the fact that, unlike classical reformism, its course has been *anti-capitalist*. The Labor government has already taken over ownership and control of some of the most decisive "commanding heights" of the economy—basic industries. With steel it has nationalized up to 20 per cent of the economy. This nationalized sector, in addition, swings a greater weight throughout the economy than the figure indicates, and cuts into bourgeois property rights much more deeply. It is enough to establish that bourgeois economic power has been significantly undermined—not yet abolished by any means—but undermined.

This fact is not canceled out by the argument, correct and important in itself, that the Attlee government has also been under pressure from the Labor Party left wing and from the ranks of the workers, who voted for the Labor Party twice with the understanding that it would follow a forthright socialist policy. That the working-class pressure exists is important in indicating the temper of the class, and it undoubtedly has influenced the Labor government's course. That it does not by itself explain this course is indicated by the record of the post-1918 German Social-Democratic government which *never* took any significant anti-capitalist steps in spite of its birth in a mass revolution and in spite of even stronger working-class pressure.

To belittle the significance of this with the argument that the Labor Party government is really merely bolstering capitalism with reforms is self-defeating blindness. Since it is not in accord with the reality and therefore cannot convince the workers, it leaves the field free for the claims of the reformists and sterilizes the real struggle which has to be made against the policy of the bureaucracy.

(3) The anti-capitalist trend of the Labor government's course does not, however, mean that the Labor Party bureaucracy and government is leading Britain toward socialism. Anti-capitalist nationalization, no matter how far carried through, does not of itself add up to socialism. This has been already brought home in our epoch by the phenomenon of Stalinism, which destroys capitalism, and nationalizes economy without permitting the working masses themselves any new power or participation in the life of society; which destroys capitalism in favor of the power and prestige of the state bureaucracy acting as a third social force.

In fact, the formula "nationalization equals socialism" is a false concept common to both Stalinism and reformism and representing a link in basic theory between the two.

BUREAUCRACY—A THIRD SOCIAL FORCE

(4) The emergence of the state bureaucracy as a third social force is the result, in our epoch, of two things: the disintegration and degeneration of capitalism and capitalist imperialism as a viable social system in most of the world (including England); and the failure of the working class as yet to organize its forces to dump that system into the scrapheap of history and build its own socialist power. These two accompanying phenomena create a vacuum, which *must* be filled; it is the state bureaucracy which steps in to fill it.

This is the general character of the trend. The emergence of Stalinism is only one form of this tendency, a form moreover decisively influenced by (a) its origin in one of the most backward countries of Europe, Russia, and (b) the fact that the Stalinist counter-revolution succeeded to a revolutionary (i. e., thorough and complete) destruction of capitalist power in the country.

This tendency is operating in England where the working class is one of the tightest-knit and best organized in the world, and where the power of the capitalist class has not been previously broken but where it has merely been wasting away. The process is slower and only at its beginning, and not at all to be identified with the Russian development. Its meaning for us today is that it illuminates the objective historical role and direction of the third social force arising. The issue and the fate of British society and socialism is yet to be determined by the struggle.

The role and direction of the third social force which steps into the vacuum is that of *bureaucratic collectivization*.

(5) This social tendency, which results from the disintegration of capitalism and the failure of the working class to give that system its coup de grace, like every other social tendency forces its way through different social channels. It does not and cannot operate uniformly throughout the capitalist world, nor in a straight-line development. Not the least important fact, with regard to its form and tempo, is who executes it. In many capitalist countries, the bourgeoisies themselves (or rather sections of the bourgeoisies) act as vehicles of this trend to greater or lesser degrees—even in the United States, where capitalism is still strongest and the tendency therefore weakest.

But where bourgeois elements move in this direction, in spite of the historical pressures pushing them along these lines they are held back and their efforts cut short, distorted or aborted by their *direct* ties with *immediate* capitalist interests and by their own mass base. This tendency of our epoch, we have seen, can be pushed more freely and pushed even further by elements not directly or personally tied to the old system—just as, analogously, it was the Junker Bismarck who was able to do for 19th century German capitalism what the timorous bourgeoisie would not do for itself. They can be more ruthless and less timid about stepping on particular capitalist toes. Since furthermore an extrapolation of this tendency leads outside the framework of capitalism, there is no question of capitalist class loyalty involved for them.

For such reasons, not only is the reformist Labor bureaucracy *one* of the vehicles through which bureaucratic collectivization expresses itself but it can be indeed even more effective and thoroughgoing in this direction than any section of the bourgeoisie. As a phenomenon accompanying the *dissolution* of a social system, this aspect is not new.

The reformist Labor bureaucracy is moreover peculiarly fitted to act as the vehicle of this tendency not only for the negative reason that it is non-bourgeois, but also—positively—because of its conception of socialism as noted above. The Stalinist bureaucracy, in its inception, also drove along this road in the conviction that it was building socialism.

The need of holding society together at all in our epoch of capitalist disintegration imperatively demands some form of collectivization. Where the socialist forces do not take up the historic task, the bureaucracy develops toward an independent social force to do the job in its own way—a way which is also collectivist in form, but reactionary in content and anti-socialist in consequences. Where this tendency is showing itself, as in England, where furthermore the socialist working class forces are undefeated and still aspiring to fight, the most disastrous mistake would be to mistake this tendency for the road to socialism, in a manner analogous to the way in which neo-Stalinists look on the totalitarian collectivism of Russia as a form of road to socialism.

It is this tendency which *defines* the objective direction and historical character of the politics and program of the British Labor bureaucracy, as *one* of the social forces in Britain.

A GREAT OPPORTUNITY

(6) If the Labor bureaucracy were genuinely socialist in its political program, the disintegration of the British Empire and the degeneration of capitalism—together with the firm organization and clearly socialist aspirations of the British working class—would offer it an unparalleled opportunity for a relatively peaceful road to socialism, at any rate, a better opportunity for such a highly desirable road to socialism than the world has ever seen before.

Revolutionary Marxists have always allowed for a peaceful road to socialism at least as a theoretical possibility. They envisaged this as a theoretical possibility even when capitalism was still a going concern. Today, when the capitalist social system is no longer viable but rather gangrenous within, at a time when the loss of confidence in the capitalist system has never been so widespread among the people and even among the bourgeoisie itself, when it cannot survive no matter who or what wins, the possibility of a peaceful road to socialism is even stronger. In any case, it is not this question which is of itself the crux of the difference between the reformist and Marxist lines.

The hallmark of the reformist Labor bureaucracy in today's situation is, we stress, not its expressed desire or hope to introduce "socialism by peaceful means." Rather, it is not utilizing the unparalleled opportunity noted, to follow a genuinely socialist path at all. It is following another. The opportunity exists; it is precisely the policy of the reformist Labor bureaucracy which would close the door to it.

(7) This is so because the basic hallmark of reformism in all its forms is: lack of confidence in, and fear of, the self-action of the working masses themselves; and the substitution of bureaucratic action from above for it. But

Socialist League Convention

BRITISH LABOR GOVERNMENT

the emancipation of labor must be accomplished by the laboring masses themselves. The substitution of bureaucratic action-from-above leads in a different direction from socialism, and it is the underlying reason why the Labor bureaucracy's ideology and politics are alien to the principles of workers' democracy, for all of its subjectively democratic "principles." This fundamental characteristic of reformism defines the course of the Labor bureaucracy—as it determined the course of the developing Stalinist reaction.

FOR WORKERS' CONTROL

(8) This character of the politics of the Labor bureaucracy is visible in fundamental aspects of the Labor government's domestic program as well as of its foreign policy.

In domestic program, the key to the bureaucratic form and content of the Labor government's nationalizations is the question of *workers' control*—that is, of its absence in the functioning and very structure of the nationalized sector.

While this is clear to and already a focus of struggle among broad sections of the British working class, it takes on wider significance in the context of the present analysis. For the Marxists it provides the political center of their fight against the Labor bureaucracy's policies on the domestic field.

But much of the present and growing antagonism between the workers and their bureaucracy's policy is derivative from this central question. Because of the lack of active workers' participation in the control of nationalized industries, the workers do not and cannot respond to the Labor bureaucrats' pleas for sacrifice, austerity, restraint in strikes, etc. The many cases in which the Labor government has used force and repression to break workers' struggles do not, therefore, justify themselves in their eyes—*not even in the eyes of most of the advanced and pro-Labor workers*—as necessary measures to protect a common enterprise. The wage struggles and other strikes and struggles of the ranks break out and cannot be exercised by appeals to the "national interest"—in which the workers have been given no tangible part.

The working class finds itself defending its own rights and interests and conditions not only against the capitalist class but also against the Labor bureaucracy, whose state policies and program become increasingly separated from those of the working masses and increasingly independent over against them.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF COMPENSATION

(9) Furthermore, the structure of the bureaucratized nationalized industries—public corporations, etc.—is such as to give an impulsion to a merger of the old bourgeois elements with the Labor bureaucracy. This also has a bearing on the question of compensation for the nationalized industries.

There is, to be sure, no question of *principle* involved in the question of compensation per se, even of such over-generous compensation as has been accorded by the Labor government. Marxists have always, with good reason, proclaimed their willingness to buy off the capitalists' resistance to expropriation wherever and whenever that is feasible.

In the context of the Labor government's bureaucratic nationalization, however, compensation is in fact playing the role—at least for a long while—of maintaining the "expropriated" capitalists as a powerful moneyed class, still exercising the powerful social and economic force of their wealth. At the same time, many of the capitalist elements are allowed to remain as the de-facto managers, administrators and overseers of the nationalized industries even though now as appointees of the state. Contributing to the bureaucratic nature of the Labor government's nationalization is the bureaucracy's aim of "neutralizing" the opposition of the bourgeoisie not only by maintaining it (or its "nationalized" sector) as a moneyed power through compensation, but also by giving its men commanding positions in the nationalized industries. The point is that, at the same time, the only possible counterbalance to however much of this is necessary—workers' control—is rejected and non-existent.

It is to be expected that an uninterrupted continuance of this course would lead also to a growing tendency toward a merger of the *personnel* of the disintegrating bourgeoisie and Labor bureaucratic circles; i. e., the entrance of more and more "enlightened" bourgeois (denominated "progressive") not only into the managerial structure of the nationalized economy but also into the political bureaucracy which stands behind the economy.

This "neutralization" (i. e., assimilation) of the bourgeoisie is another factor which tends to make the Labor bureaucracy an increasingly independent social force with respect to the working class.

In fighting for workers' control the socialist workers have to fight against the whole system of "neutralizing the bourgeoisie" thus represented. Individual struggles like limited wage struggles are part of this fight. Not only do the workers face the prospect of their class struggle increasingly coming up against their own bureaucracy, but in practice it tends to come up against a merger of this bureaucracy with the ex-bourgeoisie.

LABOR AND IMPERIALISM

(10) The character and program of the Labor bureaucracy on the domestic field is at bottom related to, and interacts with, the continuing policy of imperialism being carried on by the Labor government on the field of foreign policy.

It is no more part of the task or concern of the labor

bureaucracy to liberate its colonial peoples than to emancipate its own working class. Except obviously where it had no choice, where colonial independence was forced upon the rotting British Empire by the colonial peoples themselves. The Labor government is holding on (as in Malaya and Africa) or has tried its best to hold on (as in Palestine) to whatever colonial power it can. This is not in the interest of the British working class, let alone of the colonial peoples. It is in the interests of "Britain," that is, of the British government, that is, of the Labor bureaucracy which runs and controls the government as an increasingly autonomous force.

"NATIONAL SOCIALISM" AND
LABOR'S FOREIGN POLICY

(11) Side by side with bureaucratic collectivization at home goes the ideology and practice of "national-socialism." National-socialism is based on the program of "building socialism" in one country. It is a blood-brother of the theory of "socialism in one country" as developed by early Stalinism. Like the latter, the Labor bureaucracy conceives of building socialism not only without the active participation of the British workers (as subjects and not merely as objects of bureaucratic action), but also without the aid of, and independent of, the working-class of Europe and the world. The horizon of the bureaucracy is limited to England in a fashion typical of the narrow mentality of every bureaucracy.

But even less than in Russia, England cannot build socialism in one country. None of the problems of British society can be solved on the national plane. England does not have the natural and manpower resources which Russia possessed and which at least for a period made the program of socialism-in-one-country an attractive one for its tired masses.

The problems of British society—even of its present society, and doubly so for the building of a socialist society—can be solved only on the European and world plane. The road to such a solution from the socialist point of view, is given by our program for an independent Western Union.

But the Labor bureaucracy, lacking a genuinely socialist policy in foreign affairs as at home, does not orient toward alliance with the socialist and working class forces of Europe and the world. It has been precisely in connection with the need for European federation that the British Labor bureaucracy's pronouncements have most clearly formulated its national-socialist ideology.

Instead, the main line of the Labor government has substituted in foreign politics, the politics of the cold war and the U. S. war bloc. Two qualifications, which are given greater stress in Part I on War, can be noted: (1) As is also true of the other governments in the U. S. bloc, it tries to strengthen its own position inside this bloc as against the overwhelming dominance of American capitalism, and the sources of U. S.-British antagonisms from both sides are unconcealed. (2) As a Labor government, based on the working-class organizations, this government is subject to, and in several conjunctures reflects, the pressure of the ranks of labor against the coming war. But its main line in foreign policy is acquiescence to and dependence on Washington in this field.

The Labor bureaucracy's national-socialism not only leads it to its role as a junior partner in the Western war bloc, but this role also decisively affects its domestic policy, through two channels: (1) U. S. pressure for "moderation" in its domestic policy, which can be more effective in the future than in the past especially given a strengthening of Tory influence; and (2) the responsibilities of membership in this war bloc (Atlantic Pact obligations) leads to an armament program which imposes an even greater squeeze on the workers and widens the gap and deepens the antagonisms between the bureaucracy and the workers at home. An intensification of this antagonism has a dual effect: (1) it pushes the workers into the necessary path of struggle against the bureaucracy's policies, and (2) it also pushes the bureaucracy to seek ever more independent points of support as against the working class, even while it still rests on a working class mass base.

Bureaucratic collectivization and national-socialism are two sides of the same whole, with a reciprocal effect on each other.

SOCIALIST VICTORY
CAN BE WON!

(12) It is of the highest importance to underline the qualification which has already been applied to all of the above analysis of the politics of the Labor bureaucracy.

If the present basic economic trend were to continue *uninterruptedly* in Britain, the means of production and exchange would tend toward concentration in the hands of the state and the state in the hands of an independent all-powerful bureaucracy, which in that case would take on all the characteristics of a class. Beginning in different forms, with different origins, along different roads, at a different pace, but in response to the same basic social impulsions, Britain would then develop toward the type of totalitarian collectivism which is the distinguishing mark of Stalinist society (the Stalinist state in Russia being only one national form of this type of society).

But this is an extrapolation, of political value today mainly in defining and understanding the social trend which has to be fought, and in guiding the development

of an adequate socialist program. For that purpose it is a necessity.

For the prosecution of the genuine socialist struggle in Britain, however, it is equally vital to note that the consummation of such a development is still a long way off. Besides the differences between the contexts of the British and Russian developments noted in Point 4, the British workers still have a relatively democratic party in which they can raise their voice and influence the course of events, whereas in Russia Stalinism arose in a party which was already substantially bureaucratized; furthermore, when the Russian bureaucracy manifested its power, the Russian workers were already virtually exhausted. The British workers stand at the tentative beginnings, and not at the end, of such a development. They face it with their movement strong and vigorous, feeling their own power, inspired by socialist hopes and convictions, in a position to debate their problems freely and openly, unbound by a police state, and restive with the government because it does not move fast and firmly enough along genuinely socialist lines.

FOR A SOCIALIST POLICY

Moreover, they face it with a mass party, the Labor party, which is not to be automatically equated with the party's labor bureaucracy. Regardless of their opposition to, suspicion of, or restiveness with regard to the policies of the bureaucracy and government, they—the better elements among the workers included, as far as masses go—look upon the Labor Party as *their* party. In a real sense it is their party, not only the party of the bureaucracy. The task which they pose before themselves is to win their party to a genuinely socialist policy.

This can be done; at any rate (and sufficient for the point) it is not excluded either by the experience of history with such parties or by any particularities of the BLP, despite its bureaucratized structure and operation. In any case also, it is a fantasy to dream of organizing a meaningful party of the working class outside of a struggle to win the Labor Party.

It would be self-defeating for British independent socialists to take the attitude of "a plague on both your houses" as between Labor and the Tories. On the contrary, socialist left-wingers should stress that labor must fight within its party against any policy of compromise with or concession to the Tories (or to the American bourgeoisie).

It would be equally self-defeating for British Marxists to carry on this fight within the mass party of Labor only as a "raid," as a group of "borers-from-within," or for that matter as a closed sect. The task is to create, assemble and develop a broad socialist left wing based on all of those questions which distinguish the road to genuine socialism from the road of the Labor bureaucracy; and to do this openly and loyally with the aim of changing the course of the party, to win it for its views and to choose a leadership corresponding to them. Even if, as cannot be predicted now, this proves impossible with regard to the party as a whole, it is only such a course consistently followed that could lay the basis for a genuine mass party of socialist democracy.

The course of the Labor government has led Britain not to socialism but toward an historic fork in the road. Never more than today has the working class road to socialist democracy loomed close and within the grasp of the British workers. What the British working class will do in the promising days ahead depends in no small measure upon the political understanding, undogmatic flexibility and devoted enthusiasm of all proletarian socialists, the British in particular.

The convention referred the inclusion in the resolution on the urgency and importance of the struggle for full democracy inside the Labor Party to the National Committee of the ISL. In the interest of placing this resolution in the hands of the widest possible public without delay we have published it without this section, a draft of which awaits approval by the committee.

"THE CASE OF
COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of
Modern Russia

by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y.

Socialism and the War — —

(Continued from page 7)

able means of leading this fight on to socialism." (1949 ISL Resolution.)

Therefore, as against the war danger, we must propose—in the first place, as a foreign policy for the American labor movement, which today has virtually no foreign policy of its own but tags after that of the Fair Deal administration—programmatic demands which aim at both the threat of Stalinism and the threat of war by this capitalist government. What is needed is a program to fight Stalinist expansion which counters it with its own revolutionary, dynamic and democratic appeal.

A DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM

(12) Such demands would include the following:

(a) Complete and unconditional solidarity with and support of the fight against imperialist domination and for full national independence of all the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

(b) Complete and unconditional solidarity with and support of all popular democratic, revolutionary and reform movements in colonial, semi-colonial and otherwise oppressed countries.

(c) Irreconcilable opposition to political or military support to any imperialist government engaged in any action to maintain its rule over other countries or to deprive them in any way of their elementary democratic right to self-determination.

(d) Withdrawal, in particular, of all political and

military aid to puppet regimes like Chiang Kai-shek's in Formosa or Bao Dai's in Indo-China, to England in its suppression of Malaya and domination of Hong Kong, to France in its suppression of Indo-China and Morocco, etc.

(e) No political, economic or military alliance with or aid to such ultra-reactionary regimes as Franco's in Spain.

(f) Withdrawal of all occupational forces from Japan and Germany, recognition of their complete independence and national sovereignty, immediate peace treaties with these nations without annexations or tribute and the granting of their unrestricted right to determine their own economic and political, as well as military, life.

(g) A complete reversal of the prevailing trend to convert the Marshall Plan more and more into a means of facilitating and even forcing the militarization and dependency upon American imperialist policy of the countries included in the plan.

(h) The elaboration of a world-wide program of fraternal financial and technical aid to all underdeveloped, underprivileged and backward countries with no political strings attached, with no imperialist concessions exacted, and with unambiguous guarantees against imperialist exploitation.

LABOR MUST LEAD

(13) We Independent Socialists do not believe that a democratic foreign policy can be expected of this govern-

ment or any capitalist government. We know, however, that most American workers will not agree with this conclusion today. We invite them to fight for such a policy—not merely for this or that partial concession to such a policy, especially those that cost little more than words, but for a foreign policy which as a whole can accomplish the needed ends. We are confident that such a fight, if carried on consistently and without retreat, if carried on vigorously and as an appeal to the people will speedily demonstrate that the interests of the working class, and the interests of democracy and peace, cannot be defended by the capitalist class and its government, with whose interests they conflict at every important point, and that their consistent and effective defense requires that labor take its rightful place at the head of the nation.

On the question of war, unlike some specific question of wages, there is no room for lasting compromise between the aims and interests of American capitalist imperialism and what the working class wants, and wants to fight for. Such a program, as a meaningful whole, could be carried out in the U. S. only by a workers' government which does not hesitate to move outside the framework of capitalist interests and policy, which carries it through regardless of and against the opposition of the capitalist class. The creation of such a government—and in the first place of an independent labor political movement toward it—is the prime responsibility of the American labor movement toward the peace of the world and the progress rather than the destruction of civilization.

Problems of United States Asia Policy — —

(Continued from page 1)

Journalists report the build-up behind the lines of the Chinese Stalinist forces, particularly the air wing, which has not been employed in force up to the present. From the reports made by General Ridgway to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it is judged that the Chinese will be capable of launching a "major offensive" by mid-August.

Also considered significant in this regard is the fact that General Nam II, the North Korean general, not the Chinese general Tung Hua, has been doing the peace parleying. The question arises then: does the present delegation have authority? In reply to the request by the UN delegation for an exchange of prisoners of war during the current negotiations the Chinese delegation refused to give an answer. This has

apparently been true of other questions. The implication is made that all matters of importance are being referred to "higher" authority.

In any event, to have the Stalinist delegation headed by a North Korean rather than by a Chinese perpetuates the fiction that the Chinese troops are "volunteers," and that the North Koreans are operating as a sovereign nation. This has obvious propaganda value. Whether the Russians may have also been influential in shoving the Koreans to the fore in these negotiations as a way of curbing the independently expansive tendencies of the Chinese Stalinists is a matter of speculation.

The talks in the present fourth session are heading toward agreement on an agenda, that is, what

to discuss in the cease fire. Some differences are known, some are only inferred. The United States has pressed for a military cease fire, a discussion of only military questions, deferring until later all political questions. The Chinese would like a cease fire at the 38th parallel, with a six-mile demilitarized zone on each side. The UN Eighth Army would then have to retreat thirty or forty miles south of where they now are and hence are opposing a cease fire on such a basis. The UN delegation has also asked for the right to inspection as part of the assurance that hostilities will not be resumed.

WHY HALT NOW?

The strongest argument emerging thus far in an analysis of why the Russians should call a halt at this time is, as previously stated in LABOR ACTION, that the Russians see no decisive victory in Korea short of Russian intervention and they do not feel prepared for all-out war at the present time. They are thus calling a halt, putting the U. S. and its allies in the position of suing for peace, and trying to squeeze the maximum propaganda value out of the situation in the sphere of the "cold war"—the war by political means that goes on incessantly between the two conflicting spheres.

The position of the United States was summed up in the statement Secretary of State Dean Acheson made before a publishers' gathering on June 29. He considers the Korean war an incident, and not a favorable one for the decisive settling of differences. "It is important," he said, "perhaps for the inverse reason that in Korea we prevented the invalidation of collective security." He also referred to the dangers that are inherent in the "awakening of the vast populations of Asia, populations that are beginning to feel that they should have and should exercise in the world an influence which is proportionate to their numbers and worthy of their culture."

A PIOUS HOPE

The latter statement, in the light of U. S. practice, is of course, the well-worn pious hope with which officials conclude after-dinner speeches. What the *New York Times* editorialist refers to as the U. S. commitment to a "free, united and independent Korea" will run smack into the Chinese Stalinists' proposal for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea and the settlement of the problem of Korea by the Koreans. It is a democratic demand made by totalitarians. What the U. S. will counter is a "free, united and independent Korea," sponsored by the UN—after the model of despot Syngman Rhee, also set up by the UN.

The "awakening populations of Asia" will have none of that kind of "independence."

Withdrawal of all foreign troops and free elections in Korea would undoubtedly lead to Stalinist domination. Syngman Rhee could never get back into office. Once the UN forces withdrew, the Stalinists, the most conscious, the anti-capitalist forces, would soon dominate the country. This hard fact remains the most damning indictment of the futility of the American policy of supporting discredited and hated capitalist governments by military force.

The political battles of the cold war, any one of which could become another hot war, surround the negotiation attempts in Kaesong.

The U. S. is unilaterally concluding a Japanese peace treaty, which the other erstwhile belligerents, including Russia and China, may sign, if they wish. While the proposed treaty calls for an end to U. S. occupation, it comes at the close of a U. S. pacification period, which leaves Japan in the camp of the western bloc and which calls for a permanent American role in Japanese military plans.

Independent groups within Japan, such as the socialists, are fearful of retaliation by Moscow in such a unilateral peace arrangement as well as the cutting off of Japan's normal markets on the Chinese mainland. "The majority appears to have concluded," the *Times* writes, that Japan must take sides in the world struggle and that at the moment the safest course is with the West." Leaving out what "the majority" refers to, it is certainly true that in drawing up a formal peace treaty for World War II, the U. S. is assuring that Japan become its co-belligerent in World War III.

The U. S. has also arranged for mutual assistance pacts with Australia and New Zealand.

WHAT ABOUT THE PEACE?

If the cease fire takes place, what about the peace? Aside from the fact that war preparations will continue apace, what about the concrete problems that will arise immediately—China and Formosa?

The U. S. impasse on China is

another aspect of the cold-war strategy. Since the MacArthur hearings, the U. S. position against its admission to the UN has strengthened. She had been moved formerly by the fact that 17 of the 60 UN members, including Britain, the Scandinavian and Asiatic countries as well as the Russian bloc, recognized the Peking government. The question of a UN seat for China, dormant since Chinese intervention, will again become acute. The U. S. has no consistent arguments against her admission, for its delegation voted for the acceptance of the credentials of a Venezuelan representative from a government which seized power through a military junta as it did for the delegates from Czechoslovakia after the Stalinist coup in 1948.

Both Russians and U. S. delegates in the UN have blocked admission of representatives friendly to the other—Russia by veto, the U. S. by abstention. The U. S. is now exploring the possibility of modifying its stand on the use of the veto on admissions, in the eventuality of Chinese admission.

And Formosa? The *New York Times* concedes that even a UN trusteeship will mean the end of the Nationalist government there.

A PIECE-MEAL POLICY

The picture of the future of United States policy in Asia is certainly far from clear. At the moment it appears that the American government is attempting to make separate arrangements and agreements on each problem as it arises. Whatever general scheme may underlie these separate and often contradictory-seeming "settlements," it is clear that its day to day policies tack and veer under the pressures of its domestic critics and even, at times, of its allies.

For the moment, this procedure of piece-meal arrangements has at least one advantage for American imperialism. Although the allies are far from happy over the various steps taken by American policy, their opposition is as uncoordinated as the policies they oppose. And the independent peoples of Asia, who are the objects of these policies, are also divided and cannot assume a powerful, co-ordinated attitude toward them.

Cicero Riots — —

(Continued from page 1)

On Thursday night, encouraged by the merry hi jinks of the night before, some 3,000 hoodlums turned out to completely wreck the whole twenty-apartment house. Television trucks spread the knowledge of this new sport to the bars and poolrooms far and wide. The crowd of onlookers and marauders had swelled to some 8,000 when the militia arrived. They were greeted with cries of: "Go back to Korea, tin soldiers." "Got a Nigger in your knapsack, Johnny?" and a shower of bricks, bottles, lead pipes and other missiles.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People rallied to Clark's aid. Walter White, Executive Secretary of the NAACP, flew to Chicago, and has launched a campaign to raise money with which to make good Clark's loss of furniture, clothing and other belongings. The NAACP has urged Governor Stevenson to keep the National Guard in Cicero until Clark and a number of other Negro families who are now willing to take apartments in the building are secure from molestation. Whether this will be done, remains to be seen. However, it is obvious that as long as the Cicero police are left on the scene to "protect" these people their security will depend to no small degree on themselves and their friends.

"SUBVERSIVES" AT WORK

It was probably inevitable, given the present political atmosphere in the country, that someone would suggest that "communists" or "subversives" are behind the Cicero riots. The major victim, Clark, is reported as suggesting that this may be the case, and Babb has referred to "trained

agitators" in the crowd. We agree that the chief culprits are "subversive," all right, but they are to be found in the uniforms of the Cicero police force and in the sheriff's office. The fact that no arrests have been made among these elements by the FBI shows what little concern this agency has for apprehending those who really advocate and practice depriving others of property by unconstitutional means.

Many learned books have been written about the causes of race prejudice in America. These causes need not be gone into here. For one central, direct and immediate cause for the Cicero riots looms high and clear above all others. If the police had protected Harvey Clark Jr. instead of attacking him, if they had acted with reasonable firmness toward the handful of hoodlums and misguided youths who sought to molest him and his family in the beginning instead of encouraging them, it is most probable that a Negro family would have moved into its apartment with no more trouble than is experienced by other Negro's moving into a new neighborhood. There would have been some grumbling and ostracism at the beginning, and in due course their residence would have been accepted without further comment.

But the police acted otherwise. They acted as most policemen in most American cities act toward Negroes: as if they were the most vicious and dangerous of criminals. And the responsibility for this constant scandal of police behavior toward Negroes in America must fall squarely on the political organizations which hold power in America's cities: the Democratic and Republican parties.

NEW YORK

Labor Action Forums

Thursday at 8:30, July 26

The Cease-Fire Talks in Korea

MAX SHACHTMAN

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.