

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 29, 1951

FIVE CENTS

KENNAN AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

... page 6

Liberals and the Egyptian Crisis

... page 3

Be-Kind-to-the-UN Week

... page 7

## N. Y. Dockers Fight Ryan, Gangsters, Wage Freeze

By BEN HALL

NEW YORK, Oct. 23 — A few hundred longshoremen gathered across the street from the entrance to piers in lower West Side Manhattan early Monday morning, October 15. They were members of Chelsea Local 791 of the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL) and they had just gone on strike. They were striking in defiance of the ILA top leadership headed by King Joe Ryan, lifetime president of the ILA.

They were demanding revocation of the two-year contract just signed by Ryan and the Atlantic Coast shipping employers. They were neither impressed nor intimidated by the fact that the ten-cent hourly increase allowed under the new contract was all that was permitted by the rulings of the Wage Stabilization Board. They were ready to fight for drastic improvements in working conditions and they believed that longshoremen in the port of New York would back them up.

A few hours later, members of another local, 808, covering a few piers in Brooklyn, joined the walkout and the strike that was to shut down all pier operations in the area was on.

### NOT THE FIRST TIME

The strike quickly snowballed. First, throughout Manhattan and Brooklyn. Then across the Hudson river to Hoboken and Jersey City. Then to Staten Island. By Monday, October 22, one week after it had begun, the strike closed the whole Port of New York area and was spreading to the harbor of Boston.

Cargo piled up on the docks. Freighters remained unloaded. Railroads were forced to declare an embargo on all rail freight bound for New York to be exported. All attempts of Ryan to send the men back to work failed and he was compelled to admit defeat. Strike leadership was never in his hands; it was taken over by a group of local union officials who are long-standing opponents of his regime.

This is not the first ILA rank-and-file strike. Three years ago, under similar circumstances, an unauthorized stoppage forced a revision of contract terms. But it is the most widespread and most effective.

### AGAINST WSB

Regardless of how it is finally settled, and at this writing it seems certain that the strike will be victorious, this action of thousands of rank-and-file workers taking the initiative in their own hands, resisting the efforts of their top officials to squeeze them into the wage board formulas, is bound to

dispel some of that deadly bureaucratic smog that is settling over the labor movement.

It is a warning to the Truman administration and a threat to the Wage Stabilization Board. It is a reminder to high-ranking labor leaders everywhere, especially those who are forgetting the lessons of the rank-and-file strikes of the last war, that the ranks possess an enormous potential of struggle and resistance against employers, against government boards, and, if need be, against union officials.

On October 11, the ILA signed a contract with the Employers Shipping Association covering the entire Atlantic Coast, providing for a wage increase of ten cents per hour, all that was permitted under wage board rulings. But the strikers insisted upon piercing the WSB ceilings with a 25 cents hourly increase, demanded improved vacation benefits, and sought modifications in the "shape-up" system.

(East Coast longshoremen report to the piers each morning and sometimes twice a day, without knowing in advance whether they will be hired for the day or not. From among those who thus "shape up" the required number of men are hired. This system carries with it some notorious abuses and favoritism.)

### NEEDED A LEAD

Beneath these concrete demands runs an undercurrent of dissatisfaction with Ryan's leadership and an opposition to the monarchical institution of lifetime office for him.

The signing of the contract touched off the strike. Ryan insists that an Atlantic Coast mem-

bership referendum endorsed the contract by a vote of 10,912 to 3,593. If these figures are truthful, and no one can vouch for it, they demonstrate not that longshoremen are opposed to the strike and to its demands but that workers who see no possibility of leadership from their officials, no possibility of united action through their international union, will sometimes reconcile themselves to accepting an agreement which they would rather fight.

But as soon as effective leadership appears and the possibility of are ready to join in the battle, a successful struggle arises. This is what has happened in the ILA.

Locals which voted to accept the contract have now voted to strike, including Local 824 which has been super-loyal to Ryan and which overwhelmingly endorsed his settlement.

### RED HERRINGS

Ryan refused to support the strike on the grounds that it was the action of a minority against the wishes of the vast majority of the membership. But when asked if he would accept leadership of the strike and reopen negotiations if a majority of the workers joined in the actual struggle he replied with a flat "No."

Obviously this strike reflects the real mood of the ILA membership, for it spread rapidly in the face of all efforts to end it. Every other day, New York newspapers reported that the strike was ending only to admit the next

(Continued on page 2)

## The Cold-War Angle in Truman's Vatican Deal

By HAL DRAPER

President Truman's appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican, for the first time in American history, has justifiably raised a storm of protest. But the basis for the widespread protests are not all above suspicion. And what is, for us, one of the chief grounds of objection—one which should be of concern to liberals also—has received little or no notice.

There can be little doubt that an indeterminate but substantial amount of the steam behind the grass-roots denunciations comes from pure-and-simple anti-Catholicism in the worst sense—bigotry. The press has been busily recalling the virulent anti-Catholicism unleashed when Al Smith ran for the presidency. The element is there but it has something substantial to work on.

Some of the sharpness comes from motivations irrelevant to the basic issues. The fitness of General Mark Clark for the new post is in reality a side issue, except for one consideration we shall mention. So are the blasts against the way in which Truman chose to make the move, interesting though speculation may be on whether it was a "smart" political maneuver to corral Catholic votes or a stupid blunder which will alienate his friends.

The president's new department deserves protest on two grounds. One of these is the question of separation of church and state which has already received the main emphasis from the most se-

### rious protestants (with a small P).

This objection, to be sure, cannot be placed on the basis of the argument that Vatican City is only a "small" state or that it is a theocratic state—that is, a state ruled by a religious hierarchy. (So is Tibet.) It is one thing to establish formal diplomatic relations with a state which is ruled by a religious hierarchy, and it is another thing to establish such relations with a religious hierarchy which has arbitrarily denominated its headquarters as a "state."

### FAVORED POSITION

Even more to the point is the fact that, insofar as Vatican City is a state at all in any sense of the term, including the most formal, it is a state apparatus set up expressly to watch over the affairs of world Catholicism and not of the "citizens" of Vatican City—all of whom are the "state's" functionaries. This is what raises the question of separation of church and state in this country.

Defenders of Truman's step are comparing it with sending an ambassador to Israel. The comparison is ludicrous. The function of the pope's department of foreign affairs is to concern itself with the interests of the church within other countries. The function of a papal nuncio in Washington would be to represent, directly or indirectly, not the thousand or so dwellers of the pope's tiny territory, but the Catholic Church as a religious body with political interests within our own borders. In this sense, the Catholic hierarchy of the U. S. obtains a favored position which is new.

The impossibility of the fiction that the Vatican is a state "like any other" (except smaller) is highlighted by the argument which was made by Glen L. Archer, executive director of a Protestant organization. He pointed out: "The Vatican cannot eat its cake and have it too. It can't be a church one minute and a state the next. If we are going

(Turn to last page)

## EMBARRASSING MOMENT

An item in a new publication, *Exposé*, recounts an embarrassing episode at the last annual shindig of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Part of the "entertainment" at the Waldorf-Astoria was going to be the showing of a captured Russian propaganda film. Scheduled to introduce the film was a Russian refugee, Miss Galena Netchi, who had escaped from Russia two years before. She had been a radio, concert, operetta and film star; her father and later her stepfather had been murdered by the police. She was also not hard to look at.

"The day before the big event, Miss Netchi was summoned to a specially reserved 3-room suite at the Waldorf, where she was interviewed by no less than six NAM people at one time.

"Miss Netchi told her story and all were impressed. The questions were nearing an end when one of the scriptwriters remarked: 'It must be hell to live in Russia today.'

"She shuddered. 'I cannot tell you,' she said, 'how very terrible it is. It is too horrible to describe.'

"And you've had that all your life," he said sympathetically.

"Oh, no," Miss Netchi said, surprised. "Not all my life."

"What do you mean?"

"Not under Lenin. Under Lenin it was paradise!"

"A shocked silence hit the room. Nobody seemed able to move. One of the men uttered an embarrassed cough. The woman in charge took Netchi's hand.

"My dear," she said, trying to control herself, "under no circumstances must you say anything like what you've just said when you appear tomorrow. Do you understand?"

"Netchi, who had walked 400 miles to escape Russian secret police, said she understood.

"At the NAM luncheon, she made no mention of Lenin. She described her own personal struggle for freedom, sang the Star-Spangled Banner, and when she was through, there were few dry eyes in the roomful of corporation executives."



# New York Dockers' Strike

(Continued from page 1)  
day that the number of strikers had grown.

"The back of the strike is broken," said Ryan; but a little later he admitted that the situation was "deteriorating," i.e., he was helpless to end it. On Sunday he swore that Staten Island would never go out; by Monday all its piers were shut down.

He tried to split the ranks by denouncing the Brooklyn strikers as the stooges of "communists" sent in by Bridges while patting the Manhattan strikers on the head as men with "honest grievances." It did no good. The local branch of the Association of Catholic Trade-Unionists reprimanded Ryan for falsely accusing the strikers of "red" ties. One of the Brooklyn strikers climbed on top of a truck to tell his fellow workers, "Anyone who calls us Communists is a damn liar. We are patriotic. Gene Sampson [leader of Local 791 which started the strike] is our man and a better leader than Joe Ryan."

On Wednesday, October 17, Paul Hall, vice-president of the Seafarers International Union (AFI), addressed the Brooklyn strikers.

Understanding a work return. One can understand his distrust of a rank-and-file revolt in another AFL waterfront union . . . perhaps his own members might get ideas.

But his appeal failed. On Tuesday, Ryan promised to send down a gang of 300 longshoremen to induce the Brooklyn men to go back to work; on Wednesday they showed up—twenty men, a few union officials, and six sound trucks. The strike went on.

### PATRIOTIC GOON

But these public maneuvers are child's play compared to the real threat that every striker and strike leader knows lurks behind the scenes. Those who take public responsibility for the direction of this action are menaced by the sinister group of gangsters and racketeers that infest their union and their industry.

One local leader was brutally beaten by the agents of Anthony Anastasia, brother of the notorious Albert Anastasia linked to "Murder Incorporated." So far, this has been the only violence reported.

Anthony Anastasia, the hiring boss of a group of piers, brought a group of his cohorts, 100 strong,

down to the striking Brooklyn piers on October 17. "This is one place you gotta work," he said, "if you don't supply the men. This is army base controlled by the United States army. I was here yesterday and I'm back today as a good American citizen." When he was ignored, he sent seventy-five of his men to work the struck pier.

"We don't want our jobs taken away by gangsters," said one of the strike leaders and the men returned to work. But as soon as Anastasia's goons had left, the men walked off the job.

In the presence of Lieutenant John J. Boyle, head of the Brooklyn riverfront squad, Anastasia threatened to throw a group of newspaper reporters and two photographers into the river. Boyle simply warned him not to molest the newsmen and this warning remains the full effort of the policemen against notorious strong-arm gangster elements.

### WITH BARE HANDS

Frank Nawrocki, business agent of Local 808, one of the local strike leaders, reported that he was roughed up by Anastasia's men. "There were well-heeled goons down there," he said, "and we were in no position to risk bloodshed. If anything happens to me I hold the Anastasia brothers responsible."

"Every pier that's still working is protected by a gangster," one striker told Murray Kempton of the New York Post.

The same reporter states: "In Brooklyn, what back-to-work movement there is belongs to Tony Anastasia. . . . A convicted bootlegger named Ed Florio tried to hold the Hoboken piers for Ryan on Saturday and got slug-ged for his pains."

"Joe Ryan has no resource but the men with the guns or the bricks or the cobblestones. Every man with bare hands is against him. . . ."

"And these men, alone, isolated and almost without an open spokesman, are stronger than any other enemy Joe Ryan has. On Sunday, at the French Line pier, Harold Bowers looked at strike leader Willie Lynch and said softly, 'Well, now we know who's behind all this.' And Lynch answered, 'So you know, I'm not afraid to die.'"

### ALLIES IN GOV.

And it is this spirit that dominates the strikers, a courage that is ready to face the most sinister elements of corruption ever to infest any labor movement.

One strike rally called for the expulsion of Anastasia from the ILA. A group of 25 pickets shouted out to Ryan as he was leaving his office, "Get rid of the gangsters. Keep your word. Open up the contract, Joe."

Everyone knows that this is more than an ordinary union struggle and even more than just a fight between a union membership and its leadership. It is in part a movement to shake the union loose from racketeering and gangsterism.

If the strike is broken, gangland strengthens its hold on the waterfront. Despite all the revelations of the Kefauver Committee, none of the agencies of government has moved in to clean up this nest of rotteness.

That is not surprising. The hearings of the committee exposed what everyone already knew, that city politicians are smeared with the same filth, that large-scale organized racketeering is impossible without their connivance and participation. It has become a crying public scandal.

This explains one curious aspect of the strike. Cargo and supplies addressed to the army and navy are held up. Yet newspapers have been singularly reluctant to denounce the strikers for lack of "loyalty" and even display a sort of half-sympathy for them.

### NO OUTCRY—YET

Simple decency must restrain editorialists from placing the banner of patriotism into the hands of ordinary crooks. How long these restraints will maintain their power we cannot say.

The strike succeeded in rallying virtually the whole ILA membership in the New York area. It began on Monday with only a few locals out. By Thursday, 3,000 workers had shut down 33 piers, all in Manhattan and Brooklyn.

By Saturday, 90 piers were closed. On Sunday, October 21, a motorcade of 17 autos and 100 strikers toured Manhattan and New Jersey for 6 hours and by Monday 5,000 were out. Hoboken and Jersey City piers closed, and by the end of the day the strike spread to Staten Island. One hundred and thirty-two piers were on strike. Even some of Anastasia's piers were closed. Boston workers began to walk off the job. Ryan threw up his hands and abandoned all efforts to halt the movement.

The strike leaders have already won de facto recognition from federal mediators, who have entered the picture to meet with them and with Ryan. Baltimore dock workers are refusing to handle any cargos diverted from New York. The most convincing sign of the effectiveness of the strike was the declaration by Joe Curran, president of the CIO National Maritime Union, that his union would respect the ILA picket lines.

## Haskell Debates UN and Peace With Barbour of Wayne Co. CIO

Gordon Haskell's tour for the Socialist Youth League got off to a flying start with successful meetings in the first three cities where he spoke.

In Buffalo and Cleveland, where no SYL units exist, Comrade Haskell spoke for the ISL to small but interested audiences. It was at Oberlin, however, that he scored a real success. Thirty-five to forty students turned out to hear an analysis of "The British Labor Party and the Elections," given before the Political Discussion Club, a campus organization. The discussion following the meeting was lively, and ended by the speaker going out for beer with part of the audience.

Following Oberlin, the next stop on the schedule was Detroit, where meetings were planned at two nearby colleges. In addition,

at Wayne University, Haskell appeared under the auspices of The Student League for Industrial Democracy in a debate with Al Barbour of the Wayne County CIO Council on "Is the UN the Way to World Peace?" A more complete report of the meetings in Detroit is expected for next week's LABOR ACTION.

The last part of the tour includes stops at Madison, Chicago, St. Louis and Pittsburgh. At Madison, Haskell will appear before the Socialist Club, and at Chicago he will speak before the Politics Club at the University of Chicago, as well as addressing meetings of the ISL and SYL. On Sunday, October 28, he will speak in St. Louis, and on Tuesday, October 30, he will be in Pittsburgh to address a meeting of the ISL.

## ISL Branches Plan for Shachtman Tour, West Coast Dates Extended

Full plans for the national tour by Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League and editor of *The New Internationalist*, are now being completed by branches of the ISL. Reports from branches are that public meetings are planned in all cities on the two main subjects of his lectures, "The Elections in Britain" and "The Struggle for World Power." Debates and socials are being arranged in addition to the lectures and these will be announced from week to week in LABOR ACTION.

Readers will note a change of dates for West Coast cities. This was necessitated by the demands made by branches there for an extension of Shachtman's stay. This extension is noted in the schedule listed below. Reports of the progress of the tour will be carried in subsequent issues of LABOR ACTION.

Buffalo	Nov. 2-4
Pittsburgh	Nov. 5-6
Cleveland	Nov. 7-8
Detroit	Nov. 9-11
Chicago	Nov. 12-14
Seattle	Nov. 15, 16, 17 & 18
Oakland	Nov. 20, 21, 22 & 23
Los Angeles	Nov. 24, 25 & 26
Newark	Dec. 13 or 14
Philadelphia	Dec. 14 or 15
Reading, Pa.	Dec. 15 or 16
New York City	To be set

### The Standard Biographical Work—

#### "KARL MARX"

by Franz Mehring

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

#### LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street

New York 11, N. Y.

# LABOR SCOPE

## UNION HAS TO BACK FIGHTING WORDS IN SHOWDOWN

By BEN HALL

What happens when a strike is called off upon request of the Wage Stabilization Board and the boss refuses to take back a group of active unionists?

That is what the United Auto Workers wants to know. It seems (from the story of the Wolverine Tube Plant in Decatur, Ala.) that the board and the Truman administration are armed with peremptory powers to send strikers back to work—except when the employer doesn't want them.

On September 24, the UAW revoked its strike call in the copper and brass industry; the wage board had urgently requested a postponement of the strike. The war effort will suffer, it said, and besides we will not even discuss your demands unless you call off the walkout. Strikes in 16 plants were postponed. In two other plants, including the Wolverine plant, strikes were already in progress. Here the UAW sent its members back to work.

"Following the union action, workers who appeared at the plant ready for work were asked by the company to sign statements agreeing to accept unconditionally any job and pay rate offered by the company at any terms and conditions the company might prescribe." So reports the UAW.

Now the UAW demands that the government seize the plant and hold it until the company agrees to reinstate the discharged workers and sign a contract with the union.

"It must not be the phony variety [of seizure] in effect on the railroads where company executives receive generous army salaries and expenses in addition to their regular railroad pay while the workers wait in vain for settlement of their just demands."

"The board cannot retain the respect of the workers of America, or for that matter its own self-respect, if it allows employers to victimize workers who pay heed to the strikers' urgings to recess their strikes pending hearings on the merits of the issues in dispute."

### IS IT A BLUFF?

This statement by UAW Regional Director Leonard Woodcock continues:

"Similar urgings in future situations will be ignored and properly so, unless the board and the administration demonstrate that all appropriate powers of the government will be used to protect, against employer reprisals, workers who are willing to cooperate with the board. The government apparently does not hesitate to use Taft-Hartley injunctions against workers who, in furtherance of their legitimate demands and in protection of their basic rights, are forced reluctantly to strike in defense plants. Let the government show now, in this situation, that it is at least equally ready to use other legal powers in its possession against employers who seek to per-

vert the national defense effort to their union-busting purposes."

These are fighting words by Leonard Woodcock and if put into action by the union should bring results. Meanwhile, we note that Jack Livingstone, UAW vice-president, sits on the Wage Stabilization Board as a representative of the CIO. Will the union advise him to speak out in the same spirit?

The UAW has rejected the appeal of the wage board to call off its strike at the Borg-Warner Corporation; the stoppage in ten plants of the company, insists the UAW, has only a trivial effect on war production. The company manufactures automotive and aircraft parts.

But this incident does not mean that Woodcock's statement has become the policy of the UAW. Just one day after the release of his public statement, the UAW announced that upon request of the wage board it had voted to "recess" its strikes at the Douglas Aircraft plant in California and at the Wright Aeronautical plant in New Jersey. What happens to the fighting words? Do they become an empty bluff?

## The FIGHT for SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00

Cloth-bound \$2.00

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.

# Some Liberals and the Egyptian Crisis: Talk about 'Asian Revolution' Was—Talk

By SAM FELIX

The reaction of many liberals on the Egyptian and Iranian crises would be a puzzling one if one merely went by their previously oft-repeated expressions of sympathy for "the Asian revolution."

The long bitter months of dispute over American Far Eastern policy brought on a wave of soul searching over the series of defeats which were climaxed by the Stalinist victory in China and U. S. loss of prestige in Asia. Liberal opinion rejected the McCarthy-McCarran assertion that they were caused by a "Communist conspiracy" in the government. They argued that the defeats resulted from the U. S.'s failure to ally itself with the revolutionary national independence and anti-colonial movements and this was correct as far as it went.

Long articles were written and longer speeches made on the necessity for the U. S. to become the champion of the colonial nations seeking to throw off the last vestiges of foreign control. Perhaps the climax was reached when even Governor Thomas Dewey returned from a trip to Asia and told the American public that the U. S. slogan in Asia should be "Asia for the Asiatics."

Therefore some might have reasonably expected that when the Iranian, and in recent weeks the Egyptian, people demanded the end of all foreign control in their countries, their "friends" would have been shouting accolades of support. But no such thing happened.

In place of national sovereignty they shifted the spotlight to "international agreements," "legality," and "strategic military areas." It appears that there are two kinds of nationalists: the reasonable kind who are mainly engaged in resisting Stalinist imperialism or who do not raise too much fuss about Western imperialism, such as Bao Dai; the others are the "fanatics" and "chauvinists," that is the Mossadeghs and Pashas who have been demanding complete national sovereignty—now.

### HOW THEY FALL INTO LINE

In the clash between the legitimate aspirations of the Arab world for freedom from their semi-independent status and U. S. imperialism's plans for a world-wide series of alliances and bases, liberals too have fallen in line. Not only does the U. S. have its own commitments, but it has to assume the responsibilities of its faltering allies, Britain and France, in Africa and Asia.

The result of trying to twist out of this conflict comes out something like this:

"We in the U. S. find ourselves drawn morally to sympathy with the nations that are seeking self-determination. At the same time we know realistically that the Near East is essential to the defense of the democratic world and that the present political chaos there is an invitation to Russia to inject itself harmfully." (Frank Kingdon, N. Y. Post.)

The two proposals to solve this dilemma have been clearly rejected by the Egyptian government. One was the proposed five-power pact for the Near East in which Egypt would have only a one-fifth voice in control of the Suez Canal area, and the other was the internationalization of the Suez under the UN. The U.S. quickly poured cold water on the UN scheme for it would bring into question U.S. sole control of the Panama Canal.

Since there is no immediate prospect for a settlement along any one of these two lines, the next most comforting thought is that Iran and Egypt are playing tough in order to win a better bargain. Then after a period of time an agreement will be reached. The advice for the present is to sit out the storm.

A corollary of this stratagem is that Iran and Egypt have no place to go other than to side with the West. To sit on this idea is to be sitting on a powder keg. Anti-American and anti-British sentiments are sweeping through the Near East touching off riots and demonstrations. And according to newspaper dispatches there has been a rise in pro-Russian feeling.

As this is written, the press reports that a mass demonstration of about 3000 in Cairo had assembled before the Russian legation to cheer Russia and shout "Down with Britain!"—"Up with Egypt!" This does not yet tell us much, to be sure, to what extent the West's policy is actually turning sections

of the Egyptian people toward real sympathy with the Kremlin rivals for world domination. But it is at least a portent. For the question is not only whether the Egyptian government and ruling classes have anywhere else to go but also the meaning of a policy which drives the population into the arms of Stalin under the guise of ensuring defense of the Near East against Stalinist expansion.

### LINE OF APOLOGY

The last line of defense in the refusal to come out with open support for Iran and Egypt has been to point to the reactionary nature of the native ruling classes. Max Lerner, writing in the N. Y. Post, believes that the British would "be better off out of Egypt and the Sudan" without stating whether he is opposed to all foreign control. Lerner continues:

"It is a falacy to believe that nationalism in itself is enough or that it solves anything. The poverty and squalor and disease are still there in the streets and villages of Egypt, the harvest of hatred—of British, of Americans, of Jews—is still stowed in their hearts. The people of Israel could show them a lesson on how nationalism and freedom can lead to social vigor and creativeness, better living standards, cultural greatness. The trouble is that if the Moslem peoples once start wanting these things, they might turn against their leaders who don't dare lead them to such goals."

Or Frank Kingdon, also writing in the N. Y. Post: "In both Iran and Egypt the privileged rulers are inflaming prejudice against the 'foreigner' to turn the people's minds away from the injustices they suffer under their own governors. These men are cynically exploiting the troubled world situation to confirm themselves in power. Since this is the basis of their operations they must be dealt with in these terms. Mossadegh's flouting of United Nations authority must not retard that body from taking jurisdiction over the dispute to the end of achieving justice in putting the full power of this government behind British resistance to the renunciation of its obligations by Farouk of Egypt."

For all of their lamenting over the fact that it is the reactionary feudal landlords that are leading the fight against the foreign oppression, neither Lerner nor Kingdon are aware that it is their government's attitude toward this nationalism that unites the Arab falahin with the feudal landlord.

### CASE OF LIBYA

One of the things that a successful struggle for national independence can solve is to break the alliance of the exploited and the exploiter. But that can be accomplished after the foreign imperialist is thrown out of the country. To point to the case of Israel is to point to a nation after it won its national sovereignty.

Once the struggle for nationalhood is won, then the struggle really to raise the standard of living of the people and to throw off the tyranny of reactionary rulers can be carried on with the enemies at home directly facing each other. Although political leadership and the legislatures are dominated by the feudal rulers, outside progressive and even socialist forces are developing, such as the young Socialist Party of Egypt.

The basic difference between the old imperialist outlook and the demands for complete independence was demonstrated at a recent meeting of the U.N. Council for Libya where the Egyptians criticized the UN plan as a disguise for British domination.

Michael Hoffman writing in the



Drawn for LABOR by John M. Baer

From "Labor," the railroad union's weekly

October 12 N. Y. Times says:

"The Egyptian attitude on Libya surprised many Westerners, perhaps because it was based on premises that Westerners seldom understand. . . ."

"It did not seem odd to Western minds that Britain, which has been meeting the area's \$4.76 million annual balance-of-payment deficit and probably would continue to aid Libya financially, should want some say in what went on there."

"To a query about how to help the region develop a higher standard of living, the Egyptian reply is, 'Let them ask for aid from whom they want it, do not force it on them.'"

This is part of the real meaning of national independence. The seeming concern of the British and French for the standard of living of these peoples is rather sudden. As often as not, it is an attempt to split the Arab population, after the colonial powers supported the feudal landlords for decades.

### CAIRO'S INDICTMENT

The real intent of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization policy in North Africa and the Near East rides between a waiting policy being advocated by the Americans, and a French policy to revive the *Entente Cordiale* of 1904 between England and France. By this agreement Britain had a free hand in Egypt and France in Morocco and Algeria.

But the British empire is being chipped away piece by piece and France increases its colonial terror. Behind these crumbling empires stands the power of the United States earning, for itself, the hatred of these colonial and exploited peoples.

Britain's attempts to hold its footing on Egyptian soil by armed force against the people reflects on the U. S. also, as long as Washington stands behind London. On

October 21, the Egyptian government, in a note, described the behavior of the British military as that of "would-be conquerors."

It was charged that, in many cases, the British units had deliberately provoked Egyptian crowds which had been behaving in a completely orderly fashion. There had been several attempts by the British to break up peaceful demonstrations of Egyptians celebrating the eventual departure of the British under the new law. Naturally, the note related, some minor retaliation was to be expected from the people.

Thus it appears that the British have, as it were, gone out of their way to assert their dominance over the sections of Egypt which they control. Not satisfied with their defiant rejection of the Egyptian move to achieve complete sovereignty over their own land, the British have evidently assumed the responsibility, at least in the area they police, of silencing demonstrations favoring the new moves toward sovereignty. These tactics, of course, make the burden of British control of the Suez area all the more intolerable and intensify the desire for independence.

Egypt was conquered by force—the famous 1888 bombardment of Alexandria by His Majesty's Navy—only the use of force in 1951 can only further enrage an already excited people.

In this connection it is interesting to note the documents recently made available by Iran, in which it is shown, from captured Anglo-Iranian files, that the British worked closely with the former premier of Iran, Ali Razmara, to protect their interests. In private memorandum Anglo-Iranian made its needs known to the premier; set forth conditions, suggested legislation, etc. As Egypt is now being treated as a "conquered country" Iran was then treated as a British province.



# The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED? Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League— 114 W. 14th Street New York 11, N. Y. I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL. I want to join the ISL. Name Address City Zone State Tel.

# NAM ITS STENCH OFFENDS EVEN ITS BEST FRIENDS

The following is excerpted from an article in the UAW-CIO's Ammunition for October, entitled "Big Business Has Dementia Praecox."

Most recently, Malcolm Forbes, associate publisher of Forbes, magazine of business, fired an editorial volley at the National Association of Manufacturers.

In Forbes, which is a kind of Ladies' Home Journal for big businessmen, Malcolm Forbes said that the National Association of Manufacturers ought to drop dead.

Malcolm Forbes is no better than any reactionary in the National Association of Manufacturers. But this shows even a rich man can see how absurd the NAM is; at the same time he can admire himself in the mirror.

Forbes said, attacking the NAM, "As one who believes a national sales tax is necessary, I was discouraged at its prospects when the NAM came out in its favor. . . .

" . . . all it takes is (an NAM) . . . endorsement of a measure or a viewpoint to damn it in the eyes of legislators, large numbers of businessmen and influential groups everywhere. . . ."

The most powerful propaganda in the country against free enterprise, Forbes said, is " . . . when an immense dais of white-tie-and-tails executives is pictured throughout the nation's press looking down toward a ballroom filled with hundreds more in white-tie-and-tails, listening to speeches about What This Country Needs."

Forbes wound up by saying that " . . . those who believe in free enterprise would be far better if the NAM would jump into one of the holes it is constantly digging."

The NAM came back from the attack with an editorial answer in its own magazine, the NAM News, that curiously enough revealed that the leaders of the NAM regard themselves as bloody, wounded heroes in a kind of last-ditch fight against something called "political encroachment."

Forbes, says the NAM, " . . . has earned no wound stripes as a front-line fighter for the principles in which most businessmen believe. . . ."

Forbes, continues the NAM News, " . . . has shed no blood in the battle. . . ."

The NAM has a tragic view of its destiny. " . . . if NAM did not exist, it would have to be invented. An organization . . . with the guts to carry on this fight to vindicate and preserve the political and economic principles which made America the greatest nation on earth is a vital necessity. The responsibility cannot be entrusted to jelly-kneed, self-styled 'spokesmen' for business."

The NAM obviously imagines itself as a character with guts who has earned wound stripes and shed blood in a fight for its principles.

BOUQUETS WITH BRICKS Fortune, the dollar and a quarter a copy magazine of Big Business, did a full dress stomp on the NAM last year. In the article that took the NAM to pieces, it quoted businessmen, big businessmen, on the NAM and the NAM pitch.

President of an Aircraft Company: "Every time I see the big shots of the NAM having dinner at the Waldorf and posing for newspaper photographers, I retch."

Vice-President Manufacturing Company: "Kiss of death."

Airline Vice-President: "Spokesmen of the vested interests." (The rich and powerful are fascinating; imagine an airlines vice-president who lives on a government allowance and a vested interest resented vested interest spokesmen.)

Vice-President Farm Machinery Company: "This is the greatest country in the world for free enterprisers to tell each other about free enterprise."

President Insurance Company: "Capitalist convincing capitalist."

President Department Store: "Three hundred important businessmen looking like penguins, complete with boiled shirt . . . seems a picture of entrenched greed."

Next-A Labor Party! by Jack Ranger A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party 25 cents a copy Order from: Independent Socialist Press, 114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly Vol. 15, No. 44 October 29, 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, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIXS Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

# READING from LEFT to RIGHT

THE AFRICAN RESPONSE TO RACIAL LAWS, by Z. K. Matthews.—Foreign Affairs, October.

Professor Matthews (of the South African Native College) reviews the racist record and policies of the South African government; his article is interesting for its comments on the African National Congress, of which he is himself a member of the National Executive.

The African National Congress, he explains, arose in 1912, as a reaction against the union of white South Africa in 1910. Very soon the movement set out to base itself on mass membership: "Chiefs and commoners, literate and illiterate, tribal and detribalized Africans in all parts of the country were sought as members." Today it is the largest existing organization of the natives.

The preamble to its 1949 program states: "The fundamental principles of the program of action of the ANC are inspired by the desire to achieve national freedom. By national freedom we mean freedom from white domination and the attainment of political independence. This implies the rejection of conceptions of segregation, apartheid, trusteeship or white leadership, which are all in one way or another motivated by the idea of white domination or the domination of the whites over the blacks. Like all other people, the African people claim the right to self-determination."

While the ANC policy was originally put forward as one of "non-cooperation" with whites, it later took a modified (and more progressive) form with the formulation of the president-

general of the congress, Dr. J. S. Moroka: co-operation with all on terms of equality only. The movement sought to make clear that it did not aim at establishing an exclusively African nation, without any place for a white minority. (The whites are at most only 20 per cent of the South African population.)

The policy of "cooperation on terms of equality only" excluded, among other things, any support to the fake schemes for "native representation" which the white rulers had put forward from time to time. In particular the ANC repudiates any compromise such as accepting "representation" for the natives by Europeans.

The "non-whites," it must also be remembered, include not only the native blacks but also a substantial minority of Indians and the "Colored" section—the latter being the South African term for those of mixed race as distinct from the native blacks. Matthews reports that today these two sections fully support the demands and struggle of the blacks, a fact that has not always been true.

# WORLD POLITICS

## THE SECOND BEVAN PAMPHLET ON TRANSPORT HOUSE

The Bevan group's second pamphlet, Going Our Way (following up on its One Way Only) was released just before Attlee announced the new election, a step which led to a temporary truce in the internal Labor Party fight. Its interest is therefore very limited at the moment, in addition to the fact that it does not add very much to the previous pamphlet, which was discussed in detail in LABOR ACTION. One section, however, is of particular interest as a sidelight on the lineups in the party struggle.

As is well known, the trade-union bureaucracies pretty much control the apparatus of the Labor Party, and the section entitled "The Mystery of Transport House" goes after this. (Transport House is the headquarters of the Trade Union Congress.)

Says the pamphlet: "There could be no case against a trade-union leader casting, by the use of a single card, 800,000 votes at a party conference if he were supporting what he knew to be the views of his 800,000 affiliated members, or at least a majority of them. But equally there can be no justification, in a democratic organization, for the authority given by a mass membership to be used against the known feelings of those members. Yet that is precisely what has been happening during the past few months. During the past few months, most of the 12 trade-union members of the National Executive (of the Labor Party) have been casting their votes against the wishes of the people who elected them."

Then they call the roll, on the issue of the budget—

There is Bill Potter, who represents the railwaymen on the Executive. But his union had been categorical in its expression of views at its last congress: "This Congress strongly disapproves the policy expressed in the statements of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his 1951 budgetary speech." The National Union of Railwaymen, furthermore, had condemned the government's policy on the level of rearmament as a danger to peace and had demanded its reduction.

There is Edwin George Gooch, president of the National Union of Agricultural Workers. His union had attacked the government's failure "to take energetic action radically to alter and rationalize

# Youth and Student Corner

## SP-YPSL Tries to Prevent Anti-War Work by Socialist Pacifists

By BOB BONE

[The first part of this article, on the effect of the SP's pro-war line on the left-wing pacifists, appeared two issues ago. We have now to consider the party's tactics in the anti-war field.]

Many political pacifists of an earlier generation will undoubtedly retain friendly relations, and even membership in the SP, in spite of its explicit pro-war position. Personal ties, emotional loyalties and sheer inertia will remain decisive factors in some instances. Others will resign, as the only way to maintain their political integrity. Of this we can at least be certain: the days of recruitment from among political pacifists are over for the SP. No one with strong anti-war convictions will join an organization which supports the Korean slaughter as a "UN police action." At one stroke, the SP has irrevocably cut itself off from its traditional pacifist periphery.

On the other hand, the SP is prepared to go to any lengths to prevent political pacifists from joining forces with third-camp, anti-war socialists. Since work of a constructive nature in the anti-war movement is now out of the question for the SP, the party has turned to a destructive policy. The price which a political pacifist must now pay to stay in the SP is, at the very least, a willingness to refrain from certain anti-war work of a positive nature. At worst, he may be called upon to sabotage constructive projects being carried out by third-camp, anti-war socialists.

The student anti-war publication Anvil is a case in point. Consider a magazine with a circulation of some 5,000, winning increasing endorsement from campus anti-war groups of all sorts and attempting to crystallize anti-war sentiment on the American campus into an effective movement of national proportions. What is the reaction of the SP-YPSL to this activity?

They denounce the magazine as a "totalitarian" publication. Up to last July members were forbidden to sell, sponsor, or in any way promote the magazine. It is tragic enough for the student anti-war movement that the YPSL (which once was the spearhead of campus anti-war activity) should promote such a negative policy among its own membership. It is especially reprehensible when the SP-YPSL introduces this do-nothing perspective into other organizations, in a petty attempt to block any constructive anti-war work which they themselves did not, and indeed could not, initiate.

Such has been the case in the War Resister's League, the leading organization among secular pacifists. At its annual summer conference, a "campus workshop" of student members voted to make use of Anvil as a tool in building a broad student anti-war movement. At the request of an SP member, who was present at the plenary session, the students' proposal was held in abeyance until the WRL executive committee could "investigate" Anvil.

Therefore, the faithful watchdog of the SP lost no opportunity to snipe at Anvil, or to obstruct its circulation among student pacifists. To block endorsement of the magazine by WRL campus groups, he presented a statement to the WRL executive committee which would do credit to a Stalinist hatchetman. He also maneuvered the members of the committee even into rejecting a year's free subscription!

Throughout this episode, the individual involved was unquestionably acting as an SP member. A letter attacking Anvil, written to members of the WRL executive committee, was signed "Former Membership Secretary, Socialist Party." It is hard to avoid the conclusion that he was more interested in defending the factional interests of the SP than in working for the legitimate interests of the War Resister's League—of which a growing student anti-war movement is surely one.

Time will blunt the SP's attack on Anvil. WRL students will find that this magazine is not a narrow, sectarian Marxist organ, but a useful tool in their campus anti-war work. And contrary to the SP member's charge, they will find it thoroughly democratic in character.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE 114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y. I want more information about the Socialist Youth League. I want to join the Socialist Youth League. NAME ADDRESS SCHOOL (IF STUDENT) CITY ZONE STATE

### What is INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM?

For information and literature about the Independent Socialist League, write: 114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

(1) A guaranteed adequate government-provided income for those unable to work or voluntarily retired from work due to advanced age. This amount is not to be reduced by industry pensions, personal property, savings or gifts. An appropriate sum, at today's price levels, should not be less than \$40 per week per couple.

(2) Free medical and hospital care. A large-scale program of medical research to prolong life and to alleviate the suffering from the diseases of advanced years.

(3) Public provided housing facilities to spare our elders the indignities of living, when unwanted or unwilling, with relatives and the poverty of the poorhouse, the "county" or "old age homes."

(4) A flexible employment policy worked out by the employees (including the older ones) which would provide suitable work and working conditions for those who wish to remain employed after the normal retirement age.



# KENNAN and U. S. FOREIGN POLICY

By RICHARD TROY

Amid a chorus of excited comment from the nation's political scientists George Kennan, one of the foremost "creators" of American foreign policy, brought out a little book several weeks ago entitled *American Diplomacy 1900-1950*. In some circles, mainly centered around our universities, Kennan's writings, having a certain scholarly air about them, inspire tremendous respect; and thus the publication of this book became an event of importance.

In a certain sense the expectation was justified; for never, to our knowledge, has an American statesman so eminently placed in our diplomatic corps spoken quite so frankly as Kennan does in this little volume. But otherwise his book deserves little of the rapt attention many serious reviewers and students are giving it: most of the book's main points, even if they may be novel to the "reading public," are old stuff to the student of American diplomacy. That his book is being made required reading in a number of college courses seems, then, an exaggeration of its significance.

However, in its own modest way it is really a rather daring book for Kennan, as we shall see. It explains to a certain extent why Kennan left the State Department last year after occupying one of its most important posts (as head of the Policy Planning Staff).

His major thesis, around which he rather pompously revolves through the book, is that (a) American foreign policy has too often clothed its real aims behind a series of moral and legal subterfuges, and (b) these subterfuges have often blinded the American people and their statesmen to the true realities of the global power structure.

Kennan asserts that the only true rationale for a foreign policy is the protection or extension of "national interests." He does not define the nature of America's "national interests," its origins or its dynamics. The suggestion is, however, that "national interests" are on a level somewhere beneath that of "moral" concerns, or, at least, having nothing to do with them, since he constantly counterposes the two.

At any rate, the point is clear: Whatever national interests may be, it is on them alone that the State Department should focus its efforts; no other construction is possible.

## Realism vs. Slogans

He inveighs, therefore, against those groups which have tried to make it appear that American foreign policy has been in the interests of "making the world safe for democracy" or protecting the "national integrity" of China or forwarding the interests of the "Four Freedoms" or any others from the customary sloganology of American world politics. He is particularly concerned that Americans should have been under illusions about the character of its allies during the last war.

All these conclusions, mind you, are presented in a most circuitous and wordy manner with a semi-historical framework. Surely much of the abstract philosophizing which occupies page after page of his book is unnecessary, not to say misleading.

But we must wade through his asides and cut through to the key points: "We can see that our security has been dependent throughout much of [the 50 years] of the position of Britain . . . and that Britain's position has, in turn, depended on the maintenance of a balance of power on the European continent. Thus it was essential to us,

## Read

### The NEW INTERNATIONAL

### The Handy Way to Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

LABOR ACTION  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:

- NEW
- RENEWAL
- 6 months at \$1.00
- 1 year at \$2.00

NAME ..... (please print)

ADDRESS .....

ZONE ..... APT. ....

CITY .....

STATE .....

Bill me  Payment enclosed

as it was to Britain, that no single continental land power should come to dominate the entire Eurasian land mass." The retention of this "balance" would thus prevent "an overseas expansion hostile to ourselves . . . [and] supported by the immense resources of the interior of Europe and Asia."

Consequently the entrance of the United States into the First World War is explained as "a realization of the danger of defeat that confronted the Entente powers and an awareness of the damage that would be done to our world position by the elimination of England as a strong force in the world. . . ." But what was the "moral" rationale for it? "Germany was militaristic and anti-democratic. The Allies were fighting to make the world safe for democracy. Prussian militarism had to be destroyed to make way for the sort of peace we wanted. . . . The peace would be just and secure."

He concludes: "In the name of such principles [Italics mine—R. T.] you could fight a war to the end. A future so brilliant would surely wash away the follies and brutalities of the war. . . ."

## Wants No Moral Crusades

Kennan has nothing but contempt for the excuses generally given for the American entrance into the war. Men really alert to the American "national interests" would have acted more boldly. "When war broke out, you could have ignored the nonsensical timidity of technical neutrality and used our influence to achieve the earliest possible termination of a war that nobody could really win." All the talk about the violations of neutrality, the barbarities of submarine warfare, etc. . . . was just talk. The real issue was the "European balance of power."

Kennan quotes approvingly an article written in 1913 in which it was said that "it is no affair of the United States even though England were defeated, so long as the general balance is preserved." No sentimental ties with the "democracies" should have determined our course; the realities of power must dictate. And everyone understood that it was then necessary, in order to maintain the "balance," to destroy the growing power of imperial Germany, the great threat to the Anglo-American status quo and world domination. Therefore, and for this reason alone, England had to be supported.

"And if you finally had to intervene," he writes, "to save the British from final defeat. . . then you could have gone in frankly for the avowed purpose of doing this. . . you could have refrained from moralistic slogans, refrained from picturing your effort as a crusade. . . ."

Kennan's treatment of the "Open Door" for China is quite similar in approach. The purpose (he states without too much disguise) of the "Open Door" notes was to keep China open to British and American commerce without involving American troops. "Morality" was going to prevent the carving up of China. The maintenance of the "integrity of China" was necessary for the commercial designs; and it was unfortunate that we could not purge ourselves of the sentimental attachments which this whole maneuver involved. Since we did not, and we thought our Far Eastern policy was grounded upon our moral goals, we lost touch with the "power realities" of the situation.

## International Law and Morality

This is all clear enough. . . . instead of making ourselves slaves of the concept of international law and morality, we would confine these concepts to the unobtrusive, almost feminine, function of the gentle civilizer of national self-interest in which they find their true value. . . ."

But the question arises: Why is this matter of such great concern to Kennan? Why not let American leaders indulge in these personal fancies of theirs?

Kennan's answer is fairly cogent: The presence of these moral justifications has often made it impossible for the United States to capitalize most fully upon its great military victories, its huge war efforts. If, for example, the American people had not become so engulfed in the anti-German passions of the 1917-1918 war effort it would have been possible to have cut the war short before Germany was completely defeated.

Kennan fully grasps the fact that Germany's utter defeat in the First World War fought only, after all, to preserve the "balance," ended up by making France temporarily the chief power on the continent, an unnatural condition which had, in its turn, much to do with the subsequent rise of the Nazis in Germany—which, in its turn, completely wrecked the European balance so necessary to American security and imperial well-being.

In addition, Kennan, an astute student of *Realpolitik*, sees the disastrous effects which the destruction of the Austro-Hungarian empire ultimately had on the European "balance." The war went too far; it was clearly not in the American "national interest" to create a series of small unstable Balkan states which later could so easily be gobbled up by a dynamic Germany or, later, Russia.

These disastrous consequences of the First World War, he suggests, might have been avoided had the Allies held a more realistic view of their war aims and had not talked so much, for example, about the "right of self-determination." They were hindered, in other words, by the moral clothing they donned when they moved into battle.

## Statesmen Fooled by Verbiage

The U. S. faced the same problems in the aftermath of the Second World War when it was forced to wait several years before it could remilitarize Germany and Japan, partly because time had to elapse before the deeply ingrained idea that the national characters of the Germans and Japanese were eternally "aggressive" could be extinguished, and partly because almost as much time had to pass before masses could be convinced that Stalin was not what he was painted to be during the war, "a great democratic leader."

Thus the false concepts which the warring powers encourage in fighting a war present stumbling-blocks to its statesmen once the war is over; in fact, they blind the statesmen as well as the people. The rapid shifts in allegiance which are required by modern *Realpolitik* are impossible when moral issues are involved and people's emotions are stirred by such misleading documents as the Fourteen Points of World War I and the Atlantic Charter of World War II.

Of course, Kennan does little to explain the origins of the developing American interest in world affairs during the period he so correctly singles out for study, 1900-1950. He rejects Brooks Adams' analysis which, he says, puts too much weight on trade and overseas investment factors. To be sure, he correctly characterizes the mood which produced America's debut as a world power, around the Spanish-American War, as imperial in nature, but he carries the thought no further.

## Collapse of the European System

Furthermore, he neglects to discuss one of the most important reasons for the peculiar importance which American statesmen, above all others, attach to lofty rationales for global warfare: the almost congenital isolationism of the Midwest which found its expression for the first quarter of the century in the Democratic Party and for the second quarter in the Republican Party. This isolationist ideology which could only be overwhelmed with the most grandiose of idealistic notions (Woodrow Wilson).

But his most serious piece of neglect is his failure to study the opposite side of the coin of the deterioration of the European "balance" of old. Wars played their part, but there was something deeper: an advancing social revolution. With this in mind he might have been better able to explain the breakdown of the old concert of powers.

He would have seen that the collapse of the European system was largely due to internal developments over which the American State Department could exercise little control: the breakdown of Austria-Hungary; the failure of the German Social-Democracy; the rabby character of the English and French post-war bourgeoisie. In addition, with these things in mind, he might have observed that, as each year passes, the ideological (or "moral") components or requirements of war, rather than declining to suit his personal awakening, have become more and more important to the masses of the people.

## Why They Need the Slogans

And it is at this point that his analysis hits its most serious snag. After all, did Wilson dress up the First World War in moral paraphernalia simply in order to satisfy some idle fancy of his? Was the Atlantic Charter simply a bit of Churchillian eccentricity? Would the people have fought, in the First World War had they not believed it was more than a war for the sake of "national interest"? And the great promises and hopes held out in front of millions during the Second World War? Would anyone have budged?

Can these things be dispensed with so easily? Could there have been any genuine cooperation between the Western powers and Stalinist Russia in the last war if the two had not so thoroughly whitewashed each other? It is not difficult to imagine the response of millions if there had been any comprehension during the war itself of the absolutely hopeless character which the post-war world was going to assume. And, yet, anyone not caught up in the sizzling emotions of war-time cooperation could easily see. . . .

In fact, one is tempted to establish a kind of rule-of-thumb on this question: The more sinister the war aims, or the more hopeless the post-war prospects, that much greater is the need for false propaganda to spur men to fight and die. And as the confidence of the masses in capitalism withers, this becomes each day truer.

Kennan, who is extremely cynical about the whole question of war aims, as anyone can see, refuses to recognize this cynical fact of modern political warfare. And this fact is of particular significance today when the struggle for the protection of "national interests," particularly American "national interests," inspires almost no one to the pitch of hatred and hope necessary to make good fighters ("Killers," the generals call them) out of peace-loving men.

## Reversing His Field

But if Kennan does not admit this fact openly he does so indirectly. At the end of his book there are reprinted two essays by him which originally appeared in the magazine *Foreign Affairs*. Both of the essays deal with issues of current interest and are designed for broad distribution and wide influence. The first article, which made Kennan famous as "Mr. X," an analysis of the "Sources of Soviet Conduct," is the one which set forth the 1947 "policy of containment." The second is of greater interest here because, in a sense, it sets forth official American war aims in regard to Russia: "America and the Russian Future."

Although Kennan admits, in the article, that the post-war Russia may not exactly resemble the United States he definitely foresees a peaceful liberal semi-capitalist country which will take its rightful place as a law-abiding member of the "community of nations." And since, as he sees it, Russian aggressiveness is the main cause of present global troubles, this victory over Russia will, as a matter of fact, probably end the age-old struggle for Peace and Harmony. The "community of nations" will be established at last in an "atmosphere of emotional sanity and moderation." He does not quite put it in these words; but this is the essence of the thought. Being a scholar, of course, he cannot guarantee a peaceful future, but it certainly looks as though. . . .

(Continued on page 7)

# This Is Be-Kind-to-the-UN Week . . .

By EMMA STOKES

On the heels of the murder of the premier of Pakistan, while the Sabre jets in "Mig Alley" increase the more than a million-and-a-half casualties in the Korean war, while Far Eastern local wars endure and Middle Eastern nationalism flares again, "United Nations Week" comes along.

In a country which celebrates more weeks than there are in the year—Buy-a-Tie Week, Be-Kind-to-Animals Week, etc.—it is doubtful that UN Week, aside from a few prayers and official speeches, will be widely observed with feeling or make an impression on the public consciousness.

That is not because it lacks a commercial sponsor or a special pressure group, we think, but because its actions, powers and influence are so at variance with what it is supposed to accomplish that it cannot arouse genuine enthusiasm and support, here or abroad.

Some of the ideals and arguments advanced in support of the UN by its starry-eyed supporters are noble, if unreal and impossible of achievement by the UN. Its subcommittees produce beautiful documents and admirable patterns of conduct for the world to follow. The Declaration of Human Rights by the sub-committee headed

by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt is a laudable paper. Studies produced on the opium trade, the condition of women, slavery, the convention against genocide—are all commendable works.

But these things serve only occasionally to confuse a few as to the real nature of the UN. They accomplish next to nothing.

## ONE OF THE WARRING BLOCS

The pious hopes placed in the UN were summed up by Dr. Frank Graham, United Nations representative for India and Pakistan:

"The United Nations, with all its growing pains and frustrations, is the only international body for the settlement of the most difficult international disputes. The failure of peaceful settlement of such deep disputes has involved the world in tragedies too terrible to risk again. The United Nations, with all its defects, is nevertheless, with its multilateral procedures for the peaceful settlement of complex disputes, still the best hope of the peoples for peace."

This was spoken as though the UN were not involved knee-deep in the war in Korea. As though it had not condemned the North Korean aggression, nor entered the conflict through its

"police action," named the Chinese Stalinists "aggressors" and carried the burden of the war there.

How can the UN be an instrument for the "peaceful settlement of international disputes when it becomes, not just a disputant, but one of the warring parties?"

The reality is that the UN is an arena for the power struggle which is splitting the world in two. It has done nothing to further the aims of world peace for which it was ostensibly formed. It was unable to stop the subjugation of Eastern Europe by Stalinism, just as it has been unable to prevent or conclude the violence in Korea. The production of armaments has never been on such a vast and expanding scale as during the life of the UN. It has been unable to internationalize atomic energy and atomic armaments.

## NOT A 'CONCERT OF NATIONS'

In view of its substantial record of non-fulfillment, how can it bring tranquility to Iran? Mossadegh repudiates the right of the UN to intervene in internal problems of his country. Britain counts on additional British troops and the Egyptians on further nationalist strikes against the British, and neither on UN offices, to solve their problems.

The simple truth is that the UN was not conceived, organized nor conducted as a democratic concert of nations. It was set up by the big powers as an instrument for strategy and alliance-making in an interlude between wars. The Big Four have special privileges, including the right of veto. Second- and third-class powers have second- and third-class rights accordingly.

While the Western bloc under the leadership of the United States has a numerical majority, the Russians often resort to the veto. And because of this majority, the U. S. dominates the UN, employing its economic strength to force through its policies. On the other hand, the Russians use it as a sounding board and rostrum for international propaganda.

Being a big power show, the UN has no moral influence upon the lesser powers, whether it is an issue of the Indo-Chinese against the French or that of the South Africans insisting on the maintenance of their racial policies.

## MYTH OF UNITY

How hollow is the myth of unity among the nations of the UN is shown in a report that appeared over a month ago on the new military scheme drawn up in secrecy by seven UN powers, which proposed a plan providing that regional military groups, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, would act for the United Nations in case of aggression. Other regional military groups implicitly covered in the recommendation are the Organization of American States and the Arab League.

Also: there would be a deliberate effort to invite non-members of the UN to participate in any military action, including Western Germany, Japan, and Fascist Spain. The vanquished Axis powers of World War II may not make the UN by the front door, but they are thus guaranteed access through the rear.

The United Nations is united in the form of power blocs and for the purposes of military alliances in preparation for World War III and in no hitherto demonstrable way is it a barrier or bulwark of any kind against any small war or the pending atomic big war.

Lewis Mumford, the architectural iconoclast, tells us that the modernistic, inverted matchbox structure on 42nd Street and the East River faces the wrong way from an esthetic point of view in relation to its surroundings and functionally in relation to the heat and light of the sun. He also complains that the glass-walled offices accommodate the VIPs while secretaries and clerical help labor in windowless inside offices.

We're not experts on architecture. But Mumford's complaint may well be settled in an atomic war which the UN organization can't prevent and is in part responsible for.

We trust that the UN architects were "functional" enough to include lead-lined air-raid shelters.



# Kennan and U. S. Foreign Policy—

(Continued from page 6)

Kennan's boldness, then, is almost wholly confined to the past. So far as the present is concerned he finds it, apparently, most expedient to join in the growing chorus of those who see the United States in the midst of a great crusade to liberate the Russian people and thus re-establish the reign of law and order, with "moderation" upon the much-troubled earth.

The American Century? He says that the American citizen "will . . . experience a certain gratitude to a Providence which, by providing the American people with this implacable challenge, has made their entire security as a nation dependent on their pulling themselves together and accepting the responsibilities of moral and political leadership that history plainly intended them to bear."

True enough, he does not assert that America's so-called "national interests" are being neglected in the present policies but he finds it "gratifying" that these interests are coincidental with a great "moral" course which History—and Providence—have outlined for it.

Thus Kennan himself finds it difficult, faced with History himself, to lead his people on to war without resorting to the devices and tricks of old. He knows as well as do the leaders of modern American propaganda that it is insufficient to sell an unpopular war as simply the extension of "national interests." For even with the grand quality of American propaganda Washington finds it increasingly difficult to enlist the genuine aid and enthusiasm of the leaders of its satellites abroad, to say nothing of the millions whom they govern.



## LONDON LETTER

## Tory Mouthpieces Presented No Program to the People

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Oct. 18.—By the time this is read in the United States, the election here will be over. On October 25 the people will decide; and on October 26 you will probably be able to read the result in your newspapers, every edition of our six-page papers here will be sold out and we will know who is going to have the honor of weathering future economic crises.

A visitor to the metropolis of London today would hardly know that an election campaign is going on. He would see quiet notices advertising meetings and occasionally his ear might pick up the word "socialist" or "Tory" from a fellow passenger on the subway. This is not to suggest that people in this country are not politically conscious. But they are not exuberantly so—aside from the fact that it is often said that the British are not exuberant anyway.

The most prominent electoral events of the past week have been the nightly broadcasts on the radio, by the outstanding personalities of the three main parties, Labor, Conservative and Liberal. The Liberal Party, to be sure, is not considered to be of much import—it is putting up only 100 candidates. It had less than 10 MPs in the last Parliament. Both the Labor and Conservative Parties are putting up 600 each. In a few seats in backward Northern Ireland, Labor is not standing, since it would be wasting election money.

The radio addresses by the major parties have been interesting particularly because they have brought out two points. One of them is the complete bankruptcy of the Conservatives.

The Tories' star radio personality, Dr. Charles Hill, who is the most violent opponent of the

Health Service, spent half an hour mudslinging at all of the Labor Party leaders. As examples of his level of political argumentation: he said that Morrison's knowledge of foreign affairs extended no further than the Isle of Wight (on England's south coast); that if Nye Bevan became minister, the end would be nigh . . . ; referring to the fact that some years ago Bevan spoke of the Conservatives as "vermin," he said that Atlee would take the ermine while Bevan looked after the vermin. . . .

Besides a number of demagogic demands for more imperialism in foreign policy, their only real references to political issues have been dishonest discussions of the fall in value of the pound sterling. Miss Hornsby-Smith, a prim bourgeois young lady, indulged in virtual sabotage of the country's economy by telling electors that

their savings were becoming valueless and that the pound sterling was worth only three-quarters of what it was when Labor came to power.

In complete contradistinction to the vituperations of the Tories, Labor has put forward a good case for controls, for nationalization, for rationing. One felt that the speeches struck a chord in political time with the voters' thinking. This was particularly true of Jim Griffiths, ex-miner and now colonial minister. Half his speech was devoted to an account of the achievement in nationalized coal and its production. The other half dealt with the efforts of the government to help the colonies.

Herbert Morrison, the foreign minister, made a very down-to-earth talk. His theme was the existence of a new world in which

peoples of other countries were becoming conscious of their rights to run their own affairs. He said that the Tories would have sent 30-40,000 troops to India to make them unwilling subjects. Referring to Dr. Hill's empty attacks, he commented only "Everyone to his taste."

Any impartial observer would have noted that Labor has dealt with real political issues, not personalities or personal abuse.

The election forecasts here are that the Tories will manage to befuddle the public and gain a majority (40 or so) in the new Parliament. If they do, they are in a dilemma, for the only issues on which they have a positive policy are controls and rationing. Even they know, however, that economic realities will not allow them to abolish these or act substantially differently than Labor has done.

## Truman and the Vatican — —

(Continued from page 1)

to recognize it as a foreign power for the purpose of sending an ambassador, then we should recognize it as a foreign power in all ways and require the American members of the Catholic hierarchy to register as foreign agents."

One doesn't have to be enthusi-

## ACLU Protests Gov't Attack on Indian Rights

OCT. 15.—The American Civil Liberties Union called on President Truman this week to intercede with Interior Secretary Oscar L. Chapman to halt the promulgation of new regulations regarding contracts between Indian tribes and their attorneys proposed by Indian Commissioner Dillon S. Myer.

The proposed rules permit the Indian commissioner to disapprove attorneys' contracts for a complex and numerous variety of reasons. Ostensibly they are designed to protect Indians from being defrauded at the hands of unethical lawyers, but the commissioner has offered no evidence that such dishonesty has taken place in recent years.

The ACLU's letter said the new rules:

- (1) "transcend authority given by existing law";
- (2) "deprive Indians of the basic right to employ counsel of their own choosing";
- (3) are largely "based on an 1872 law which applied such regulations to Indians of the U. S."—whereas Indians have been citizens since 1924;

(4) "repudiate, in effect, many gains won for American Indians by the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934," which the U. S. "cited not long ago before the UN as an example of a concrete step this country has taken to improve its treatment of minorities";

(5) permit the Indian commissioner, against whose Indian Bureau much of the tribes' legal action is brought, to disapprove attorney contracts for so wide a variety of reasons to "violate a sacred principle of American liberty: that no man shall be a judge in his own cause";

(6) are wanted by no one other than the commissioner himself and opposed unitedly by Indian tribes and organizations;

(7) "would constitute the first major backward step taken by the government in its dealings with Indians since before the turn of the century."

astic about the registration law itself to recognize that what this points up is the hypocrisy of the "it's just another state" argument.

But we're not at all sure that the chief importance of this affair is its impact on American domestic policy, the aspect on which virtually all eyes have been focused, either from the point of view of the church-and-state issue or Truman's political fortunes.

The fact is that the president himself motivated his break with precedent on grounds of foreign policy. The assumption of even the critics has been that this foreign-policy motivation is good in itself but is either to be discounted as a pretext or overborne by the other considerations.

## "LISTENING POST"

Now, Truman's proposal is a foreign policy measure, and will justifiably be considered by the rest of the world as such, even if one believes that its motivation was primarily domestic-partisan. This is so not only because it has an objective meaning and effect apart from any motivation, but also because even as a pretext it betrays the lines of foreign-policy thinking of the government.

The official reason given for the establishment of an embassy at the Vatican is the cold-war and its needs. Since the Vatican has no army and the Swiss Guards are not expected to come under Eisenhower's jurisdiction, the necessity for recognizing the Vatican as a state is not immediately apparent even from the viewpoint of the Western bloc's war preparations themselves. The connection had to be further concretized. And this has been embarrassing both to Washington and the Vatican.

For the sum and substance of the explanation given is that the Vatican is so valuable to the war alliance—so valuable that an ambassador is necessary, in violation of U. S. tradition—because it has a built-in spy system all over the world. The respectable way to put it, it seems, is that the Vatican is a "listening post," so called from the Paris *Le Monde* to the Detroit *Free Press*.

## GIFT FOR STALIN

It is one thing for the Vatican to use the . . . "listening" services of its prelates or communicants for its religious objectives. It is another when the U. S. government more or less openly proclaims that this service is now to be mobilized as part of its cold war, and that this is what justifies the appointment of an ambassador. That is, Truman is proclaiming that the Catholic machinery will be serving a political function, and not only

a political function but one in the service of one of the war blocs. (We use the future tense only to indicate the minimum meaning of this step.)

All that is exactly what the Stalinist governments have accused the Catholic Church of doing.

It is no wonder that, the press reports, the Vatican organ *L'Osservatore* abstained from mentioning Truman's motivation in connection with a step which gave it so much satisfaction.

This gift to Stalin's propaganda machine does not yet quite explain itself, however, even with the talk about the Vatican's facilities for undercover work. Why an ambassador? Even the public motivation does not explain why this formal recognition of the Vatican as a state is necessary to utilize its political services.

## IS IT A DEAL?

As is well known, the U. S. (under both Roosevelt and Truman) maintained relations with the Vatican during the war through a presidential representative, Myron Taylor. There are undoubtedly a half dozen other forms through which the same result could have been obtained, practically speaking, for the purposes of the Atlantic Pact bloc.

If there is a strong tendency in this country (rightly or wrongly) to view the president's move in terms of domestic political maneuvering, this is not likely to be so much the case in Europe and Asia and still less so to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain themselves.

Is it a deal with the Vatican? It is the Vatican which alone gains in the extension of state recognition by the United States. Is this a concession demanded by the papal diplomats before agreeing to all-out utilization of its "services" by the Western war bloc?

Such a view does not suffer in

credibility when the man named by Truman for the post—whether he is personally competent or not—is a general in active service, in spite of legal restrictions against such civil posts for active military personnel. Here again *L'Osservatore* was perspicacious enough in referring to its expected guest as "Mr. Mark Clark."

The peoples of West and East, who saw the U. S. government make its deal with Franco only yesterday and who do not have to be told by Moscow's propaganda

machine that Washington is willing to whitewash any reactionary regime in the world if it will be an obliging instrument in the cold war, inevitably must look upon this as another war alliance—with a power which gave its blessing to Mussolini as it did to Franco. The politically reactionary hierarchy of the Vatican will not be a fragrant ally for the people who want to fight Stalinist tyranny but do not wish to fight for a Holy Alliance of reaction, even against the Kremlin.

## Not in the Headlines

## Moments in History, Or: Two Giant Intellectuals Meet

Senator Alexander Wiley (Wis.), recorded for posterity in the *Congressional Record* for October:

"It was on my journey from Europe in 1947 on the Queen Elizabeth that I met one of the individuals who was returning to Lake Success to represent the Soviet Union, Mr. Andrei Vishinsky. I relearned from him then one of the key differences between his way of life and ours.

"I had been asked whether I would like to meet Mr. Vishinsky. I stated that I would indeed be glad to meet him; and so a meeting was arranged. Seeing him, I grasped his hand firmly, and I said: 'Mr. Vishinsky, I pray every night that the peoples of our two respective countries may fulfill their great responsibilities and be able to consummate a lasting peace.' Mr. Vishinsky for a moment did not reply. His hand was gripped tightly in mine. Then, slowly, he spoke: 'I do not pray.' 'There is the juxtaposition of our two contrasting approaches.'

## Welfare State

"I notice that the more our government goes into welfare programs the more the tax burden is shifted to those whom welfare programs are supposed to be helping, and the more the tax burden is shifted away from those who are best prepared to pay their share of the cost of such enterprises." — Hubert Humphrey (Minn.) in Senate speech, Sept. 21.

## Trend

Here's something to cause more concern than any of the crookedness disclosed by probes: In just the past 10 years, the

number of farms in the United States decreased by about 500,000, a drop of 8 per cent. The main reason for this, the Census Bureau reports is "a trend toward combining small farms to form fewer and larger ones."

If that continues, America is on a dangerous path. Small farmers have always been supporters of democracy. Big "factory farmers" will bring back the feudal landlordism which has ruled and ruined many nations in the past. —Memphis Labor Rev.

## They're Class-Conscious

A government directory reveals that there are 1500 national trade associations and an additional 300 associations made up predominantly of businessmen. The 1500 trade associations have a paid staff of 16,000 persons and a gross membership of over one million business firms. Including locals and branches, it is estimated by the editors of the directory that there are 12,000 trade associations and 4000 Chambers of Commerce, to say nothing of 15,000 civic service groups, luncheon clubs, and similar organizations of business and professional men and women.

## Unfair to Profits

The McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, the biggest publisher of business magazines, is on another advertising campaign for free enterprise. Target this time is the escalator clause in union contracts.

An editorial in all McGraw-Hill magazines argues: "Maintenance of real wages during inflation cannot in fairness be allowed."

In other words, it's ethical for businessmen to raise their prices (inflation) but its favoritism if unions try to get the pay envelope to catch up.

## IN NEW YORK

SYL

## Hallowe'en Party Saturday, Nov. 3

Games, Dancing, Refreshments, and that great dramatic production, "Dear Comrade," an original portrayal of Life in These United Fronts.

LABOR ACTION HALL  
114 West 14 Street