

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 2, 1951

FIVE CENTS

CLOSING THE CIRCLE:
The 4th International and CP Entry

... page 6

ZIONISM vs. THE JEWISH PEOPLE:
The New 'McCarran Act' in Israel

... page 3

New Smith Bill Threatens Labor

... page 2

Gov't 'Seizure' Clubs RR Labor Into Settlement

By GORDON HASKELL

The government "returned" the railroads of the United States to their private owners last week, ending almost two years of operation under a "seizure" which tied the unions hand and foot. The agreement between the unions and employers which preceded the termination of the legal fiction of government "seizure" was a capitulation of the firemen's, engineers' and conductors' unions to terms which had been offered them right after the government first took over. The other major operating brotherhood, that of the trainmen, had accepted these conditions over a year ago.

Although the heads of the three unions are attempting to make it appear that the workers have gained substantially through their long hold-out under government control, even they could not claim a victory. "There are no better alternatives under one-sided government seizure and rule by labor injunction," one of them said.

The contracts signed give the workers a total raise of 37 cents an hour for men in yard service, and 22½ cents for men in road service. This includes a ten-cent cost-of-living increase, much of it retroactive to October 1, 1950. It permits railroad workers to keep pace with increases gained by workers in other industries during the past three years, but does nothing to aid them in making up for wages and conditions which lagged far behind those of many other industries to start with.

to hamper and harass the unions in every possible way (Taft-Hartley). They press for laws which would make industry-wide bargaining illegal and would thus return the struggle to the single-plant or single-company level at which they can hope once more to "handle" the unions in the old way. The big monopolists recognize that since their struggle with the unions has taken on nationwide proportions, the struggle itself as well as the terms on which

(Turn to last page)

Signs the Pact



ADENAUER

Fights War Alliance



KURT SCHUMACHER
Socialist Leader

German Treaty Ushers in New Cold-War Crisis

By L. G. SMITH

The United States government and its editorial supporters on matters of foreign policy in this country have just finished celebrating the signing of the "contractual agreement" between Western Germany and the three Allied occupying powers, which is designed to bring the Bonn government fully and finally into the American military camp.

One might expect that an event which is heralded as of such historic moment would be celebrated by all its principals, and that in Western Germany, which is supposed to gain "virtual" independence and sovereignty by this agreement, there would be dancing in the streets.

But according to newspaper reports, the only kind of people who turned out in force when the contractual agreement was signed in Bonn on May 26 were powerful police reinforcements who were gathered to prevent possible rioting.

This was indeed a fitting commentary on the act which has been looked forward to as the most glittering achievement of American diplomacy. For although the governments of Britain, France and Western Germany were parties to it, there can be no dispute over which government has been the chief architect of this particular structure.

The essence of the "contractual agreement" is this: The Bonn government will now have the right to manage its internal affairs with-

in very broad limits. It will also be permitted to conduct its own foreign affairs, as long as these do not clash too strongly with the main purposes of the foreign policy of the Allies. In return, Western Germany will build up an army of some 12 divisions which will be part and parcel of a Western European army. This army will be related to NATO in roughly the same manner as the national armed forces of Britain and France are related to it today. All this will take place... if...

OPPOSITION STRONG

The first "if" is the question of the ratification of both this contractual agreement and the pact forming the Western European army. The French government is far from solid on the matter. On the eve of the completion of the two pacts, the French suddenly demanded that the United States and Britain guarantee that they will not permit Western Germany to pull out of the Western European army once it has been formed. Although Secretary of State Acheson and Foreign Minister Eden were willing to give such guarantees, the fact that the French government demanded them indicates the uneasiness with which the parties which form the present shaky government coalition regard the whole matter.

In Britain, the Labor Party has stated that it will oppose ratification of the contractual agreement.

(Turn to last page)

Boss's Weapon

The experience of the railroad workers raises once more the question of the future of collective bargaining in the railroad industry, as the steel "seizure" raised the same question for steel. In general terms the situation is fairly simple. The workers in America's basic industries are now so solidly organized that they are in a position to strike and hold firm against the major concentrations of capital on a nationwide basis. The employers no longer feel that they can cope with the situation through the old methods of scabbing and starving the workers into subservience. Such methods tend to be employed only where strikes involve workers in a single plant or in a series of plants owned by one company which make up a minor section of an industry.

The tendency of the employers is to seek other methods of hamstringing and weakening the unions. They seek legislative action

Protests Helped—More Needed!

The Franco terror in Spain has been forced to ease up on one group of anti-fascist victims, according to advices received from the (Spanish) Basque government-in-exile by the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims.

But the situation with regard to the new wave of arrests in Barcelona still continues to be serious, and the Committee has directed another letter to the U. S. State Department to propose that Washington take some overt step to show disapproval of the Falangist dictator's murderous plans.

The news about the Vitoria prisoners is contained in a letter to the Committee from Jesus de Galindez, Basque Delegate to the U. S., under date of May 27: "Dear friends:

"I am very happy to announce to you that the 16 people under trial at Vitoria [Spain] who have been in jail since one year ago have been released in some kind of provisional freedom (more or less free on bail).

"Of course, they are still indicted and the trial will be held soon; but we believe that this step is a very good symptom, and the direct consequence of the actions taken in the outside world by organizations like yours.

"I profit by the occasion also to state, on behalf of Basque President Dr. Aguirre, our backing for the petition addressed to you by Mr. Wilbaldo Solano [the appeal by the Spanish POUM printed last week.—Ed.].

"Sincerely yours,
"Jesus de GALINDEZ."

The new letter by the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims sent to the State Department, after referring to previous correspondence, states:

"It would appear, however, that

the United States interest in these matters brooks no delay in some more positive action by the Department of State. Many American citizens are attending the 35th World Eucharistic Congress at Barcelona. In preparation for this meeting the Franco regime has launched a new wave of arrests of members of the CNT, the Socialist Party and the POUM. At the same time, according to reliable reports to us, hundreds of petty thieves, pickpockets and prostitutes have been released from jail.

"While we are opposed to all restrictions on the foreign travel of American citizens, we can see no justification in the favoring of one totalitarian country over another in the matter of American travel.

"At the very least, Americans who are planning to go to Spain should be advised of the situation officially, and the Department of State should more forcefully present the widespread alarm of Americans over these expanding persecutions."

New Smith Bill Threatens Labor with a Police Billy

By MARY BELL

The author of the "Alien Registration and Peacetime Sedition Act of 1940," and the wartime "Smith-Connally Act" to break strikes, Congressman Howard Smith of Virginia, has come up with another typical anti-labor bill (H. R. 7647) in the form of an amendment to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

The proposed legislation, an extension of Taft-Hartleyism, is being vigorously denounced by the entire labor movement as the most shackling proposal yet made against the organized labor movement in these hysterical times.

H. R. 7647 is Smith's solution to the dilemma posed by the steel "seizure" which was undertaken with strong recommendations in labor's behalf. In addition to legalizing "seizure" of employer property by means of "receiverships" in a period of emergency when a strike or lockout threatens, the Smith bill would also authorize receivership for the property of labor organizations. The receivership principle in relation to company property operates essentially in the manner of the traditional "seizure" principle. The receivers would operate and manage the property to the extent necessary to maintain production without interruption and would have "no power to change the terms and conditions of employment from those in effect at the time of his appointment."

With relation to the seizure of labor-union property, however, the receiver "shall have the full power to manage and operate such property to the extent necessary to prevent such property from being used in aid of any concerted interference with the continued operation of the plants, mines, or facilities in question."

LABOR SMASHING

The bill provides that "it shall be unlawful (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person, to interfere, by lockout, strike, slowdown, concerted absences from work, or other interruption with the operation of such property, or (2) to aid any such lockout, strike, slowdown, concerted absences from work, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such property, by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption, or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein."

This provision would give the receiver, by order of the court, complete control over the union and its funds. It would become unlawful to aid any such strike, even by providing funds. The wording of the act is considered broad enough not merely to cause workers who went on strike to be jailed, but also trade-union leaders or sympathizers who aided the strikers and editors or newspapermen who might be charged with encouraging the strikers editorially.

In every respect, where the receivership for the companies is limited, without power to prevent management's interruption of production for its own reasons or

measure and to that degree is characteristic of police states. The conscription of company property is phony. No conscription of the real wealth of the corporations is proposed: their profits are not to be tampered with. The conscription of labor's "property," is real. That is, the treasury, made up of union dues, and all other appurtenances necessary to the life of a union, are really to be conscripted.

BEYOND T-H

Congressman Smith—of the Democratic Party—has had a successful record in the field of combating civil liberties. He may better Taft-Hartley in narrowing the field of labor's rights. The bill is not deemed simply a crackpot proposal. At the best, given the reactionary mood of Congress and labor's political me-tooism with regard to the Democratic Party, some form of watered-down legislative compromise on the right to strike may be expected.

POLICE-STATE CLUB

Aside from its novel seizure features, the Smith measure is first and foremost an anti-strike bill. At the outset it proposes that "Whenever, during any period of national emergency declared by the president, the president of the United States shall find that a threatened or actual strike or lockout in any one or more plants, mines, or facilities will, if permitted to occur or continue, imperil the national defense, or when Congress . . . shall so declare, the attorney general shall petition any district court of the United States . . . and if the court finds that such threatened strike or lockout, if permitted to occur or continue will imperil the national defense, it shall enjoin such strike or lockout . . . and make such other orders as may be appropriate."

Further, the board of inquiry which the bill provides the president shall appoint, is empowered to report only facts and make no recommendations. In short, the proposed law would prevent strikes, force workers to work, rob the unions of their treasuries and properties, permit no change in conditions of work and make labor foot the bill.

Like all no-strike measures, the bill before us is a forced-labor

On the Labor Front in Los Angeles

By LES WRIGHT

LOS ANGELES, May 24—A number of important events took place this week on the local labor front. The most widely publicized was the election contest at Standard Coil Products Co., where four unions made a bid for recognition and contract rights. The principal contestants were the Stalinist-led United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers (UE) and James Carey's CIO electrical union, the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE).

The AFL electrical workers (IBEW) and Machinists ran third and fourth in the election held on May 20, and there will be a runoff between the UE (which topped the vote) and the IUE-CIO (which has a chance to win this time). The four-way battle aroused a good deal of newspaper publicity, with a lot of the red-scare angle thrown in.

FUNNY THING

An interesting comment was made by the LA Daily News staff writer Ernest Brashear: "Funny thing is that many of the same workers who insist on voting in this union fight will take no interest at all in voting in the big national elections." (It would become less funny if the labor movement gave these workers labor candidates to

vote for, instead of capitalist machine politicians.)

Another important struggle is taking place at North American Aviation's El Segundo plant. United Auto Workers, Local 887, during a three-day period of voting this week, was given a mandate by its 9,610 membership to strike, if it should become necessary, to win the workers' demands. The big issue among these aircraft workers is the fact that auto wages run about 20 to 25 cents higher per hour than the wages in aircraft. North American has countered the union demands with an offer of 5 cents per hour.

FOOTHOLD IN AIRCRAFT

Meanwhile another UAW-CIO local at Douglas Aircraft in Long Beach is still fighting for the union-shop demand approved by the members but held up by the local NLRB. The aircraft industry on the West Coast is an area where the union is only beginning to get a serious foothold comparable to its base in the older organized industries. As a result, aircraft wages have been notoriously low. During Reuther's recent Los Angeles tour, the UAW leader addressed a Long Beach rally of 10,000 unionists, and the union-shop question was one of the prin-

cipal features of the discussion.

Local 43 of the CIO Rubber Workers is negotiating with B. F. Goodrich Co. in a Cincinnati meeting for a wage increase, pension benefits, and the union shop. The CIO Newsweekers Local 75 has claimed a victory in its fight with Hearst's Examiner and other Los Angeles papers to keep additional self-service newsstands or racks more than half a block from the vendors. The publishers had agreed to this during the first union contracts, but under the Taft-Hartley Act the papers found loopholes in their favor. After a union boycott campaign against these papers in certain selected areas, the Examiner finally gave in with an attempt to save face, with Chandler's Times at its tail.

MARITIME

A coastwide strike may be called on May 26 by the AFL Sailors Union of the Pacific. Shipping was tied up today and the SUP's secretary, Harry Lundeberg, following a San Francisco meeting, said "we'll keep it that way." Three thousand seamen have already walked off their jobs along the coast, and Lundeberg declared: "If the shipowners are looking for a fight, we'll give it to them. We don't care how long it takes." May 26 is the union dead-

LONDON LETTER

Who Wants to Buy British Road-Haulage Industry?

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, May 20 — An event of considerable political interest occurred here this week. Herbert Morrison, for the Labor Party, rose in Parliament to announce that, if the Conservatives denationalize road haulage, Labor will renationalize it without further compensation, if returned to power at the next election.

The Conservatives regarded the nationalization of steel and road haulage as "class measures" and determined to denationalize them on being returned at the last election. In order to obviate this possibility, the Labor Party threatened to pay no compensation for the "good will" of these industries if they are denationalized.

When the steel industry was taken over in 1951, it was comparatively prosperous. But road haulage was like the curate's egg—only bad in parts. In trying to sell the industry back to private owners, the Conservatives found considerable unwillingness to buy back the bad, old or unprofitable stock, so that it seemed to them that only the most profitable would be put into private hands, the rest being left for the government.

The situation was complicated by the fact that the most profitable denationalized road transport would compete severely with the nationalized railways. As it was considered to be in the national interest that many unprofitable railways services should be run, the railways (and therefore the revenue) would lose more money than at present. With this probability in view, the Conservatives had proposed to make a levy on road transport to help the railways.

This immediately scared the potential buyers, the Road Haulers Association. Not only was the government asking them to buy back a poor investment with a possibility of confiscation, but also it wanted a levy from their profits to aid the competing railways. Needless to say, the secretary of the Transport and General Workers Union, Arthur Deakin, had something fierce to say about the whole policy of de-

nationalization, and many local branches of the union threatened strike action.

Thus the Tories are presented with the problem of trying to sell an industry, run by the people, who oppose the idea of selling it, to people who don't want to buy it. They are in for further trouble from their own back-bench supporters if they don't carry it through, and industrial unrest if they do. Further, they are establishing the precedent of every government repealing the "class measures" of its predecessor.

This is something of a milestone in British history, for hitherto successive governments have been of roughly similar class aspirations, and so a continuity of policy was accepted. Now the class nature of governments is becoming more manifest.

ABOUT-FACE

Another equally significant break in policy continuity has been the comparatively sudden about-face by the Labor Party on Germany.

Whereas, when in power, they had been persuaded of the urgency of German rearmament, now they have laid down conditions for its execution.

Firstly, they have called for a four-power conference. With sublime naïveté, Hugh Dalton commented: "We also insist that no more time should be wasted in a slow-motion exchange of long and argumentative notes between Western powers and the Soviet Union. We want to see four-power conference, without further delay."

Secondly, they have decided that general elections would be desirable before rearmament should start, as it is believed that Kurt Schumacher's anti-rearmament Social Democratic Party might gain power.

If this departure from a "bi-partisan" and extremely right-wing foreign policy heralds a general surge of independence by the Labor Party, it is all to the good as a political advance. If it merely manifests a childish trust in the good will of the Stalinists, or the maneuver of an Opposition with little to oppose, it cannot be viewed with the same interest.

ZIONISM vs. THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Israel's New 'McCarran Act' on Citizenship

By HAL DRAPER

The Nationality Act adopted by the Israel parliament on March 25, and which became law on April 1, once more illustrates the difference between two sentiments which are too often confused: on the one hand, Israeli nationalism, and on the other, Zionist Jewish chauvinism.

It is not any kind of mere Israeli nationalism which rules the state of Israel and its government leaders; this would be as understandable and as "legitimate" as in the case of any other state which is struggling for national existence against difficulties. It is Zionist Jewish chauvinism which has put its stamp upon the new law.

And in doing so it gives aid and comfort to anti-Semitism, it jeopardizes the future of Israel as a nation, it inflames precisely the reactionary forms of Arab nationalism in the Middle East, and it serves to encumber the road to a solution of Israel's pressing economic crisis.

The new Nationality Act does this in two related ways. (1) It discriminates against non-Jews (mainly Israeli Arabs, of course) by depriving them of citizenship unless they were citizens of Palestine before the establishment of the new state and can prove continuous residence in territory now held by Israel and unless they were included in the official register before January 1, 1952.

(2) It extends the right of immediate citizenship to all Jews of any nationality, permitting them to hold double nationality—in the country from which they have emigrated and in Israel.

This makes sense only from the point of view of the Zionists' ideology, and not from the viewpoint of building a united nation or of easing the situation of Israel as an island-ghetto in an Arab world or of making peace with the Arab world.

The grant of double citizenship and special privilege to Jews of all countries is, of course, not at all required by the desire to make Israeli a haven for Jews oppressed in other lands, who could have no difficulty in becoming Israeli citizens without these special provisions. What it means is that the peculiarly Zionist aim of the "Ingathering of the Exiles" has been written into the basic law of the state. Its sponsors openly stated during the debate in the Knesset that it was designed especially to encourage the immigration of Jews from the United States without "burning their bridges behind them" as far as citizenship is concerned. (Though as a matter of fact U.S. law forbids double citizenship.)

Other Side of Anti-Semitism

In writing the "Ingathering of the Exiles" into state law, the Knesset made official the Zionist theory that Jews are "exiles" in an alien land wherever they live, outside of Israel, regardless of their traditions, culture, roots and conditions, and that it is the duty of the "Jewish tribes" everywhere to leave their "exile" and "return." (It was the Israeli Zionists at the last world Zionist congress who spoke in these terms of the Jewish "tribes.")

As William Zukerman, editor of the liberal Jewish Newsletter, points out, "it revives a dangerous racist theory that smacks of the slogan of a previous generation, 'A German is a German wherever he is.'"

And further: "this law, passed by a state which calls itself the 'Jewish State,' may be interpreted by some future anti-Semitic government as an invitation to deport its Jews to Israel.

"In any event, such a law strengthens the moral position of the anti-Semites in all countries by confirming their claim that Jews are aliens everywhere, that they cannot become a real part of any country or civilization, except in Israel. Such a law, abysmally false as its theory is, may in an age of propaganda cause irreparable harm to millions of innocent Jews in this and in other countries, who have nothing to do with nationalism in any form and do not even know of the existence of its fantastic claims, and yet may be made to pay the penalty of nationalistic excesses."

Before coming back to this point, we must also make clear what will be the effect of the provisions regarding non-Jews. Like the notorious "grandfather" clauses of Jim Crow laws in the American Southern states, the exact nature of the conditions set for citizenship by Israeli Arabs is not the main point; the point is that, quite beyond a doubt, the conditions have been devised for no other purpose than to exclude the vast majority of Israeli Arabs from nationality in the state. To become citizens, they must be naturalized, even though they and their ancestors have lived in the land longer than its present governors.

It was stated in the Knesset that only about 10 per cent of the native Arab population that lives in Israel can now obtain citizenship under the law. This, and not specific reasons for the specific conditions set, was the intent of the law.

The difference between the Israeli Nationality Act and the aforementioned "grandfather clauses" does not reflect credit on the Israelis. The "grandfather clauses" and their successors today make no official distinction between Né-

Syngman Rhee Loose Again

America's defender of democracy in Korea, Syngman Rhee, is embarrassing Washington again by terrorizing his own National Assembly in order to ensure his own re-election as president.

While the South Korean people are supposed to get enthusiastic about defending Democracy against Totalitarianism, Rhee has thrown eight National Assemblymen into jail, after having 47 of them "detained" by the South Korean army. This was done after the imposition of martial law in Pusan by presidential decree, under the pretext of danger from Stalinist guerrilla activity.

The National Assembly is due for a new election of the president late next month. Rhee's private strong-arm squads and storm troops recently staged demonstrations outside the National Assembly to intimidate its members in preparation for the vote—no doubt to remind them that Rhee has not been loath to have legislators murdered if their opposition became inconvenient.

"In addition to those Assemblymen detained by the government, another dozen are believed to be in hiding, making it impossible to hold a meeting of the Assembly for two days. There are 183 Assemblymen in the Legislature and 92 are needed for a quorum," reports a careful dispatch from U. S. army headquarters in the N. Y. Times (May 28). General Van Fleet has conferred with the paladin of South Korean democracy, presumably to urge moderation, or at least discretion.

An AP dispatch later reported that, gathering a quorum at last out of Rhee's clutches, the National Assembly has voted 96-3 to lift martial law in Pusan.

Labor on TV

To the Editor: Marking the first time that organized labor here has used TV to present its views to the public, the California Machinists Non-Partisan Political League is now sponsoring a weekly program in the S. F. bay area called "Without Fear." The program is a documentary-type production and appears every Tuesday evening at 9:30 (PDST) on KGO, Channel 7, San Francisco. It is a very favorable time for securing a good audience and consequently expensive, all expenses being met by voluntary contributions from International Association of Machinists locals throughout California, through per-capita contributions and through donations on the part of individuals to the Non-Partisan Political League.

Its programs are "controversial" and have dealt with the AMA, Point Four, and aspects of the coming national and local elections. "Without Fear" is strongest when dealing with immediate grievances of labor, such as those surrounding National Health Insurance, and weakest when going into politics—this being the present dilemma of labor on a national scale. To do even this kind of a job has been enough to provoke much opposition; but of the letters written in, the overwhelming response is one of praise and "keep up the good work."

The program is endorsed by the president of the IAM, whose office was probably quite involved in overseeing the preparations and noting the "tone" of the scripts proposed. It is quite an effective program nevertheless, and deserves the critical support of socialists and labor militants in general. The one criticism that remains is that of the limited audience TV reaches compared to the more common AM and FM sets in the homes of workers. Perhaps the novelty and "dramatic" quality of TV will inspire other unions to sponsor regular radio programs of their own on less costly but more regularly appearing daily newscast programs representing labor's views.

Jack WALKER
Oakland, May 24.

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

MAX SHACHTMAN

A Basic Primer!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor and Socialist Library.

SEND FOR OUR FREE BOOK LIST.

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

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.

YOU and SCIENCE

The Tin Can Tied to Imperialism's Tail

By CARL DARTON

This is a synthetic age in more ways than one. It is usually considered that science, particularly chemistry, can produce substitutes for almost anything. While it is true that, given time, modern technology can give us substitutes galore, from the short-range viewpoint industry is still dependent on many irreplaceable raw materials, particularly minerals. Industry and the war machine must get along with the immediate materials at hand. All in all, there are at least 70 strategic minerals which are not mined in the United States in sufficient quantities and the present cold-war economy.

One of the most important of these scarce materials is tin. This commonplace product touches each one of us in the canned foods we eat daily but the mining of tin requires the vicious exploitation of native populations in the far corners of the world. These backward countries, so essential to the operation of modern industry, are the focal points not only of antagonisms between Russia and the United States but are also the source of much jockeying within the allied camp by Britain and the United States.

The United States has practically no tin resources of its own, the total yearly production, mostly from Alaska, being not over 70 tons. Yet following World War II U. S. consumption averaged about 55,000 tons yearly, nearly equal to that of the remainder of the world. About 63 per cent of U. S. consumption is in the form of tins for tin cans, 17 per cent for solder, 9 per cent for bearing metal, bronze and brass, and the remainder for miscellaneous industrial purposes.

Very much in the news today are Malaya and Bolivia, two small countries which produce over half of the world's tin. Other southeastern Asian countries adjacent to Malaya produce an additional 25 per cent. During World War II all Far Eastern sources were lost to America, which was forced to depend mostly on Bolivian tin and the few substitutes which were available. Some of the substitutes are here to stay. Thus while slightly over ten years ago the average amount of tin on a "tin" can was over 1 1/2 per cent, it is now close to 1/2 of 1 per cent—that is, only one-third of what it used to be. This is still not enough; the struggle for tin goes on.

The Case of Bolivia and Malaya

At the start of the Korean war the world's tin production was nearly back to pre-war level and the price quite low at 74 cents per pound. The fear of again losing the Far Eastern tin supply forced Washington into a stockpiling program but the English and other European absentee-owner cartels, which control tin mining, grasped the opportunity to squeeze out a few extra American dollars. By February 1, 1951 the price rose to \$1.90 per pound. The RFC then stepped in with government control and forced the price down to \$1.03 per pound in six months. No purchases developed and the tin became another political football within the Truman administration. Negotiations between the Bolivian tin producers and the United States continue, while a "revolution" occurs in Bolivia.

The importance of the threatened nationalization of tin in Bolivia is apparent from the fact that 72 per cent of the producing mines are controlled by non-Bolivians. Furthermore, 41 per cent of the Bolivian government revenue is derived from the export of tin concentrates which constitute about 72 per cent of the value of all Bolivian exports. In contrast, Bolivia is compelled to import 85 per cent of all its food. Bolivia clearly illustrates the evil of an economy dependent on one-commodity production with excess profits for absentee owners and starvation for its native people.

On the other side of the world, in Malaya, the impact of intense mechanization of tin mining is apparent every day. The original Chinese miners did little more than dig holes in the surface of the rich deposits, and primitive methods and hard labor still prevail among the native producers. With the turn of the century, and particularly after World War I, the investment of European capital brought the introduction of large-scale machinery. Most of the tin today is mined by huge dredges mounted on barges. This is an important factor in the war against Stalinist guerrillas since the large armed barges have to be surrounded by fortified posts on land, which offer good military protection; thus tin production proceeds.

Thus tin, for which science has as yet found no effective substitute, becomes the occasion for political intrigue and struggle through the world. This illustrates that even with the scientific and technical miracles of today no country can be entirely self-sufficient relative to all its industrial raw materials. Yet the effective utilization of the earth's resources await the replacement of national barriers by an international workers' socialized economy. Only then will the industrial areas of the world give to the less developed countries technical aid for self-betterment in fair exchange for its vital natural materials.

DON'T MISS A SINGLE ISSUE OF LABOR ACTION!
SUBSCRIPTION FOR ONE YEAR IS ONLY \$2.00

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
Vol. 16, No. 22 June 2, 1952
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, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH
Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

ASIA AND THE WORLD. Theses by the editors.—Pacific (Paris), No. 1, April-May.

Pacific is a new magazine published in Paris by a group of South Asian socialists, edited by Ley Hian, with articles mostly in French, some in English. It is a venture worthy of note, planning to print informative articles on political, social and cultural questions of the whole Pacific area, from China to the Philippines, handsomely printed and illustrated.

Its declaration of principles emphasizes Asia's need for democratic socialism, federation, and peace, in order to avoid both subordination to Western imperialism and domination by Stalinism. The old colonial powers, it says, have been trying to maintain their economic interests in the region by giving financial and military support to native leaders who are willing to cooperate with them, but the real problems of Asia are social ones: agrarian reforms, new labor legislation, a reconstruction program to raise the standard of living of the masses. The masses are dissatisfied socially, and their resentment will not be able to be silenced by appealing to foreign dangers. The Stalinists exploit this social discontent, and this is why Mao Tse-tung has become "a powerful magnet for the masses of the other Asian countries" in spite of Mao's totalitarianism and orientation toward Moscow. To quote Pacific's English version of its declaration:

"... with or without the intervention of Mao's troops," they fear, "the perspectives of a victorious Communist expansion in Asia become clearer day after day. The Communists are so

aware of this fact that they do not feel the need to haste in the military field: after the error of a hot war in Korea, they seem to be sure that through a simple cold or lukewarm war, they could grasp more successfully the fruits of the popular revolution. . . ."

Military force, they stress, cannot solve this, for force is powerless "against those who have nothing to lose." Truman's Point Four and the Colombo Plan are ineffective. The solution for Asia lies through a socialist reorganization of society, and since aid from the West is necessary, this in turn depends on "the concomitant march of all democratic nations toward socialism."

At this point the emphasis is placed on the necessity for peace, as a prerequisite for the fight for socialism. Unfortunately, the road to peace is represented as a matter of getting an international agreement among the powers, U. S. and Russia, by negotiation in an international conference. Clearly, there are illusions here about the nature of Russian totalitarianism, as well as of Western capitalism, for the statement looks forward to a growing-together ("osmosis") of the two worlds: "the tendency toward justice in the West should bring about a certain balance. So realizing a middle level for human progress, a genuine peaceful coexistence will be assured."

The best stress is the final one: "For the Asiatic continent, the present task consists in laying the basis for a DEMOCRATIC AND SOCIALIST FEDERATION OF THE FREE PEOPLES OF ASIA."

WORLD POLITICS

AFTER THE JAPANESE TREATY: SOCIALISTS STATE POLICY

The Central Executive of the (Left-wing) Social-Democratic Party of Japan, at its recent meeting, adopted a resolution concerning the internal and international policies to be pursued after the Peace and Security Treaties come into effect.

position in the world crisis will then become more endangered. To avoid war, to attain freedom and national independence, and to give the people security in their lives, the party will conduct a struggle on the following lines:

1. Against Rearmament and for the Protection of People's Lives

(a) By defending the interests of the working people on the farm lands appropriated for military purposes, as regards their labor contracts and the confiscation of goods by garrison troops, and by preventing bases for atomic bombs from being built.

(b) By resisting the militarization of the National Police Reserve and supporting the development of the police.

(c) By fighting against reactionary laws such as the prohibition of general strikes, the Anti-Subversive Activities Bill, the Special Code of Legal Procedure, and the revision of the Labor Law which protects the basic rights of the workers.

(d) By opposing the defense budget and advocating, instead, land amelioration schemes, the development of industry, education and social insurance.

(e) By demanding that there be no mobilization of industry for military purposes and, instead, a self-reliant economy be built up able to provide secure existence and employment for all.

2. For the Constitution

The struggle for the Constitution is the most important of all. In particular, we stand against any revision of Articles 9, 18 and

22, which read as follows: "Article 9—Aspiring sincerely to an international Japanese people based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes. "In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized."

"Article 18—No person shall be held in bondage of any kind. Involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime, is prohibited."

"Article 22—Every person shall have freedom to choose and change his residence and to choose his occupation to the extent that it does not interfere with the public welfare.

"Freedom of all persons to move to a foreign country and to divest themselves of their nationality shall be inviolate."

In January this year the party submitted an interpellation to the Supreme Court asking it to confirm that any governmental decision on the National Police Reserve—even the decision to form it—is unconstitutional, because Article 9 of the Constitution prohibits all war potential.

3. For the Emancipation of Asia and for Economic and Cultural Cooperation among the Asian Countries

(a) By the reopening and development of trade with the countries of Asia, including China, and the organization of an Asian Economic Conference.

(b) By close cooperation with other Asian countries in the fields of education, culture and youth work.

(c) By helping to bring about a conference of Asian Socialist Parties and by strengthening their influence in the Socialist International.

(d) By improving diplomatic relations with countries not represented at the San Francisco Conference, and by developing contact not only at government, but also at non-government levels.

Youth and Student Corner

Defending the 'American Way': Fascist Youth Fuehrer Gets an Award

By HAROLD WEST

LOS ANGELES, May 15—Recent events in this area indicate how far the so-called "anti-subversive" drive on a national scale has contributed to the strength of the reactionaries, both among public authorities and big private groups, in their attempt to gain full control of the schools. Not only Stalinism but genuine radicalism of all sorts, even the liberal brand of critical opposition to the status quo, is throttled in a hundred devious ways by school administrations, vigilante strong-arm methods against meetings, etc., and by a new informer network of cells on California college campuses which report directly to, and exchange information with, a central body co-operating with the notorious State Senate Un-American Committee.

Meanwhile the disseminators and organizers of vicious hate campaigns against minorities (under the guise of fighting "socialism") are tolerated—or even given awards.

When William Schneiderman, a defendant in the current Stalinist trial here, attempted to use Roosevelt High School to speak against the Smith Act, the school board carried out Superintendent Alexander Stoddard's proposal to revoke the permit for the speech (already obtained by the sponsoring Eastside Defense Committee). At the time, the excuse was that any sort of meeting would interfere with evening classes. One school authority said this excuse was invalid.

On May 13 the Eastside Defense Committee won at least a temporary victory. Using Stoddard's dubious argument about "evening classes being jeopardized" by a speech on the same campus as a basis for its attack, the committee was able to get a permit for the use of Hollenbeck Junior High School on May 22 to enable CP defendant Dorothy Healey, organizational secretary of the Los Angeles County CP, to speak against the Smith Act on a panel with attorneys William B. Easterman and Don Wheeldon.

MUNGER CASE

Stoddard and his confederates among the city's "educators" can be expected to think up a gimmick before the night of May 22 in order to wield the axe again against the traditional right of all groups to use school buildings for speeches and panels. For the reactionary stooges of American capitalism, freedom of assembly means freedom only to propagate the ideas of the NAM, the American Legion, the China Lobby, etc., and these ideological exponents of imperialism and reaction have no trouble in finding available school buildings, even if they don't need them from a financial standpoint.

Last night an award was made to a youthful "defender of the American Way" on the campus. Robert Munger, without doubt a publicity hound with political ambitions as well as an open hater-monger of the Wesley Swift va-

riety, was given \$1000 in "honor" of his fight against radicalism among campus youth. Munger's picture got a prominent display in the Los Angeles Mirror with the news item that his reward was presented by Mrs. James Kevin McGuinness, widow of a film writer, from the McGuinness Memorial Award at a meeting of the reactionary Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals.

WOULD-BE FUEHRER

The so-called American "ideals" which Munger vociferously represents are those of denouncing Jews as agents of "world collectivism" behind a smoke screen of a federation of "MacArthur Clubs." His racist views are no secret to the film group, the school authorities or the yellow press. But he seems to have a cloak of respectability which is therefore never acquired and is therefore more useful to those who aim to put the screws on American freedom.

Munger, a former Los Angeles City College student who worked in close collaboration with Vice-President Milham of LACC to ferret out the names of "dangerous radicals" on campus and to break up street meetings of socialist youth, is now a junior at Pepperdine College. A recent letter to LABOR ACTION from a student at Pepperdine reported that Munger's tirades against minorities are well known to the students, who defeated his candidates in a school election there, but not by an overwhelming margin.

The letter-writer also stated that Munger's disciples predict he will make a bid for Congress after graduation, with the support of powerful Republican groups who like his kind of language. There is a strong probability that Munger and his lieutenants at other colleges are reformers for the new statewide network for supplying information on radicals to California college administrations and the State Un-American Committee, whose late head, the notorious Jack Tenney, is now an aspirant for Congress.

Other propagandists of the "American Way" campaigning to undermine Stalinism abroad and to enhance American capitalism's economic and political control of other nations will find it a little difficult to explain the reasons for the discrepancies between our vaunted traditions of freedom and the increasing warfare on those democratic rights at all levels.

Particularly, these foreign targets of the blatant "Sell America" program may ask why the schools in America are being purged of unpopular ideas, recalcitrant independents in the faculties and opposition youth groups. The partial treatment given the Mungers with their dirty race-baiting in contrast to the threats and dismissals meted out to radicals, liberals and Stalinists is the ugly skeleton behind the form of American "democracy" which no amount of official whitewash or high-powered advertising can conceal.

KNOW-NOTHINGS

Los Angeles schools are being attacked by reactionaries for harboring "dangerous" instructors, books, methods, and student groups. Progressive education and John Dewey's philosophy are denounced as "socialistic" by big-business groups and public figures. On the latter charge, Pasadena's school superintendent was forced out of his position. Actually, "progressive education" is not much in evidence and some of the teachers under attack are themselves political conservatives. The AFL Teachers Union charges that teachers are subject-

WHERE'D HE THINK HE WAS, ANYWAY?

From an AP dispatch in the Los Angeles Mirror (May 14): "PEARL HARBOR—A parade of navy witnesses identified Bruce S. Hopping yesterday as the ring-leader of complaining crewmen aboard the salvage ship Reclaimer.

"Hopping, 30-year-old lumber executive from Maplewood, N. J., is being tried by a special court-martial on charges that he conspired to complain against navy discipline and to discredit his superior officers.

"He faces a possible maximum sentence of six months at hard labor, two-thirds loss of pay and bad-conduct discharge if convicted.

"Lt. Marion C. Kilpatrick, Watervliet, N. Y., Hopping's former skipper, quoted Hopping as saying 'his ship—and the whole navy—should be run like Hopping's hometown lumber business, with policy decisions formulated by discussion among all hands. "Enlisted men from the Reclaimer testified Hopping had suggested they tell their gripes to a newspaper reporter."

It's Different!

The New York Socialist Youth League invites you to its

FOLK DANCE SOCIAL

Some folk dancing for all (no previous experience required) as well as demonstrations of folk dances of various countries—Russia, Israel, Mexico, Ukraine, Philippines, Scandinavia, Italy, etc. (no square dancing). Lots of fun, and authentic folk-dance music to go with. Of course, regular social dancing too, as well as refreshments and such.

SATURDAY EVENING — JUNE 7 — Come at 8:30

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

Just out—Summer issue of

ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN

In this issue:
Debate on American Foreign Policy
Faulkner's Writing and the Southern Myth,
by Irving Howe
God, the Devil and Jean-Paul Sartre
Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?
plus other articles and student Reports
20 cents per copy Order bundles now

ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN
247 Lexington Avenue, New York City

The 4th International Closes the Circle

Decision on Entry into Communist Parties Marks New Stage in Decay

By PHILIP COBEN

The Fourth International Trotskyists have closed the circle. Its leadership has decided that its present groups are to disband their essential forces into the Communist Parties wherever the CP is the main power in the working class.

Other groups are to liquidate entirely to enter socialist parties. Independent groups are to remain only in countries where neither socialists nor Stalinists are the main center of the labor movement—that is, where there is nothing to liquidate into.

Their press has maintained a deathly silence on this till now, and more curious still, one organ even headily denied it. But the document which was adopted last February has now been published in the organ of the "International Secretariat," *Quatrième Internationale*, the new issue of which is dated February-April. Not a peep in all this time, however, has yet been heard from either the newspaper of the French Trotskyist PCI (which is the group primarily indicated to take the high dive into the Communist Party) or from the Socialist Workers Party (Cannonite) press in this country.

The decision on entry into the CPs marks an integral continuation of the pro-Stalinist degeneration of the Fourth International Trotskyist movement, this time in organizational terms. We have pointed out several times before this, in analyzing the stages of their political decay, that such a step was a strictly logical conclusion from their increasingly pro-Stalinist policies. That the step has now actually been decided on, however, is not a minor development in the course of this evolution. It is one thing to adopt policies whose whole inner logic points in a certain direction, and it is another thing to embrace the disgraceful conclusions themselves in full consciousness.

Phantasmagoria

The motivating document, as we shall see, is a political phantasmagoria that qualifies for the lunatic fringe; but before plunging into it we note an even more bizarre episode which took place during the three months of pregnant silence from the FI press.

The first published report on the decision for entry (since LABOR ACTION had decided not to print the news we received until it had been confirmed by document) appeared in France in the Paris weekly *L'Observateur* of February 14 in an item by one Giles Martinet. This gentleman announced that "it seems" the Trotskyist leadership "considered that the time has come to put an end to the activity of the little parties composing the International and to engage their militants in working in the existing big workers' organization, like the Labor Party in England and the Communist Party in France." He further reported "lively opposition within the PCI" and "passionate discussions."

Just about the time this perfectly accurate item appeared in print, as has now been confirmed, not only had the discussion on the proposal already been ended in the leadership, but the "10th Plenum of the International Executive Committee" had voted 12-0 (with two abstentions) to adopt it, thus making it the official and binding position for the FI groups.

Yet in its issue dated February 13-March 4, *La Vérité*, the organ of the French Trotskyist PCI, dumped a small heap of garbage over Martinet's hapless head—with a parting shot in the last sentence which is as close to unbelievable as it can get.

Sarcastically heading it "A Well-Informed Observer," *Vérité* quoted the "strange announcement" from the "reputedly serious weekly," and added its indignant denial, which we reproduce in full for the benefit of History:

"The author of this unsigned article is none other than Mr. Giles Martinet, hard-working theoretician charged with the defense and guiding of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the eyes of the petty bourgeoisie. The personality of the author gives a special savor to the 'information.' In point of fact, in order that the 'Trotskyists enter the Communist Party,' it would be necessary not only that they so decide, but above all that the 'Communist Party,' or rather its bureaucratic leadership and GPU supervisors, have the desire to open the ranks of the CP to the Trotskyists!

"It is truly a sensational bit of information. But from whom could Mr. Giles Martinet have gotten it if not . . . from the GPU?"

Whatever the "personality" or putrid politics of this Martinet, it turned out that the news had been manufactured not in the cauldrons of the GPU but in the chamber-pots of the FI leadership itself. *Vérité* means "truth."

"Calumny" Exposed

Even this was not enough for the honest folk of *Vérité*. Two issues later they returned to the battered hulk of the well-informed observer with an article chidingly entitled "To Deceive Is Not to Inform, Monsieur Martinet!" This raked Martinet fore and aft, port and starboard, for an article of his which apparently did less than justice to the glorious record of the Fourth International—without, however, mentioning that his information on the new decision happened by chance to be correct.

To make sure that there was nothing left of Martinet's reputation on this earth, the very next issue of *The Truth* informed its readers that:

"Before a full hall, our Comrade Favre-Bleibtreu ex-

plained the motives of the anti-Trotskyist calumny of Giles Martinet, who, out of the wastebasket of the pro-American Lafont, fishes out the assertion that Trotskyism, in a blind alley, is committing hara-kiri in honor of Stalin. Vigorously refuting this 'information,' the lecturer showed . . ." (that Martinet is a petty-bourgeois lackey of the Kremlin and other very bad things, etc.).

Thus the Stalinized decision of the FI leadership was introduced to the world in a manner befitting its content, as if to demonstrate to the Stalinists that their new would-be recruits already knew the ropes.

The document which has now finally been given to the world (even if the "International Secretariat" had to do it itself) is the report to the "10th Plenum" by the general secretary of the International, M. Pablo. Its relevant content can be soberly summarized in a couple of propositions:

(1) The revolution is not only on the March, it is here; this is the most revolutionary period in all history, B.C. and A.D.; the Final Conflict is two-three years away, give or take a fraction; we must hurry to prepare for it, for it may already be upon us.

(2) Therefore . . . in ineluctable consequence thereof . . . as a logical result of such a perspective, so obvious that only the most ossified sectarian can fail to understand it . . . WE MUST LIQUIDATE ALL OUR INDEPENDENT GROUPS THAT CAN FIND ANYTHING TO LIQUIDATE INTO.

Deep Pessimism

The undialectical reader who imagines that the imminence of explosive revolutions would, on the contrary, be a reason for renewed efforts to raise the independent banner of Trotskyism-Cannonism-Pabloism before the working class will discover (from Pablo's report) that he is merely suffering from dogmatism, sectarianism, schematism, formalism, and a lack of realism and flexibility. It will be harder for him to find out why. For Pablo does not mention that, in spite of the extra-terrestrial but highly revolutionary expectations which are presented, the actual approach of the FI generals is one of deep-dyed pessimism.

This popped out most clearly in the article written by the same Pablo for his "third world congress" last year, the same congress which adopted the definitive view that the expansion of Stalinist power was a form in which the social revolution was triumphing. He wrote then:

"People who despair of the fate of humanity because Stalinism continues to exist and even gains victories are shortening history to their measure. They would have liked the whole process of the transformation of capitalist society into socialism to be accomplished within the period of their brief life, so that they might be recompensed for their efforts in behalf of the revolution. As for ourselves we affirm what we wrote in the first article we devoted to the Yugoslav affair. This transformation will probably occupy an entire historical period of several centuries, which will be filled in between times by transitional forms and regimes between capitalism and socialism, necessarily remote from 'pure' forms and from norms. We know that this affirmation has shocked certain comrades and has served others as a springboard for attacking our 'revisionism.' But we are not disarming." (Our emphasis.)

What Pablo meant was "several centuries" of development THROUGH STALINISM to socialism. The deep pessimism of the FI leaders, which manifests itself as revolutionary burbling, is not marked by the simple decision for a wide policy of "entrism" but by their political motivation for the step: belief ONLY in the revolutionary possibilities of totalitarian Stalinism.

How Long Is Long?

But in countries without strong CPs, the Trotskyist groups are to be dissolved into the reformist organizations, for lack of the real thing. Pablo stresses that there is no expectation that these socialist parties can be transformed into revolutionary organizations—the possibility is excluded. With regard to the Communist Parties, on the other hand, this is precisely the perspective which it is proposed to aim for.

Pablo emphasizes that this entrism is different from that of 1934-1938 (then labeled the "French turn") when Trotsky's outlook was for a more or less quick commando raid. At that time, writes Pablo, "it was not a question of facing the tasks of war and revolution by remaining inside these parties." Now, presumably, it is a question of greeting the most explosive revolution in history, as we are told it is, as discreet factions inside the reformist social-democratic parties—and of hastening dissolution in order to be thoroughly dissolved when the revolution breaks!

Furthermore, says Pablo, our outlook is a "long-term" one in such entry, not a quick dash-in-and-out. Here we get into a bewildering array of time estimates which contradictorily stud his report.

For this we have to go back to Proposition I—the revolution is here. There once was a J. R. Johnson who made a semi-profession in the Trotskyist movement of predicting soviets in two years in the U. S., but the said Johnson today has other fish to fry, or whales to harpoon; Pablo has taken over:

"Now it is a question of going forward and everywhere taking up timely positions for the final conflict. We do not

have a very long period before us to accomplish this task. Events are developing rapidly. But if there remains for us still two-three years—and even a little more—before the decisive struggle, this is not enough for us to prepare ourselves."

"In this period of history, which has already opened, the most revolutionary in history (and not only in the history of capitalism), when the final fate of capitalism is at stake with a relatively short time to go . . ."

"The situation is everywhere pre-revolutionary in different degrees, and is developing toward the revolution with relatively short delay. And in general this process is now irreversible."

"[For our Latin American groups] the explosive crisis . . . is their inevitable future tomorrow, very close. . . . To the comrades of Bolivia and Ceylon, the International says today: power is within your grasp, not 10 years from now but immediately, in the few years to come, if not this very year." [Incidentally, under point 3 on the agenda, the 10th Plenum took up the Bolivian situation, heard a report, held a "preliminary discussion," and then decided . . . that "this question would constitute one of the principal points on the agenda for the next plenum." Which sounds like a very lackadaisical attitude toward a situation which is likely to put state power in your hands any hour on the hour.]

" . . . the relatively short time which separates us from the decisive conflict."

"We start always from the consideration that the decisive developments and denouement will be in the few years to come and not in an indeterminate or very distant future."

Interspersed with the above alarms, however, strangely enough, is the repeated assurance that "we enter [the socialist parties] in order to remain there a long time. . . . How one can remain there a 'long time' when the revolution is only two or three years (or perhaps as much as three years and six months) away, is the secret of Pablo's calendar. Questions of this technical order need not interfere with the unanimity of decisions.

How to Make a Revolution

If entry into the reformist parties is a good thing, then entry into the Communist Parties is the very acme of revolutionary strategy. Pablo really goes to town on this. There is, to be sure, one little drawback. The CPs are terribly bureaucratic—"superbureaucratic" in fact—and this will be a difficulty. "If not for this, we would have been—and a long time ago, at that—for a total entrism policy." As it is, while most of the forces go into the CP, an "independent section" will be kept out, to put out a press for instance; but it is to include only (1) those "strictly necessary" to carry on such supplementary work—the skeleton crew; (2) those who can't get into the Stalinist organizations "in spite of all our efforts"; and (3) those who, it is deemed advisable, should get their Trotskyist training outside of CP ranks. . . .

Of course, exception (2) by itself could keep the whole of the French PCI outside in the independent "skeleton crew" but the grand sweep of Pablo's politics does not concern itself with such trifles.

Not only is entry into the CP demanded because the revolution is at hand, but (so much is all nature stood on its head) the nearer comes the war and revolution, the more people go into the CP. Pablo quotes his own letter to the French PCI:

"In these countries [like France] it is a question of putting into effect, more and more, a kind of entrism policy sui generis with relation to the organizations and workers influenced by the Stalinists. That means that, in proportion as we get closer to the war, a more and more important part of our forces must be integrated into the various political and trade-union organizations led or influenced by the Stalinists, including the CP, and remain and work there with tactics adapted to the nature of these organizations and subordinated to the principle of long-term work."

The tactics referred to mean that the comrade must "put entirely in the background his character as a Trotskyist if the bureaucratic leadership requires it and if we ourselves come to the conclusion that this is necessary to facilitate our integration."

The Trotskyists, properly divested of their "character as Trotskyists" and firmly integrated into the bureaucratic structure of the CPs, will then—who can fail to see it?—be in the most advantageous position that History has ever granted to meet the tasks of war and revolution. . . .

All Bets on Stalinism

Anyone who tries to make this new line jibe with the most elementary concepts held by Lenin and Trotsky on how to prepare for a revolutionary crisis, will break his head in vain. He will only end up by looking behind Pablo for the men in the white coats. It will begin to make sense (Pabloite sense, to be sure, but sense) only if it is understood from the angle which we predicted for the Fourth International ever since it fell like a ton of bricks for Titoism.

Pablo himself is not entirely unenlightening on this point. We have been late in adopting this orientation, he explains, because our eyes were fixed on the crisis of Stalinism of 1948-50, the "Yugoslav affair" and its repercussions. But now we have seen, he expounds, that

(Continued bottom of next page)

BOOKS and Ideas

A Study in Terror under the Witchhunt

THE JUDGES AND THE JUDGED, by Merle Miller.—Doubleday and Co., \$2.50.

By STAN GREY

This book is the result of an investigation made by Merle Miller at the suggestion, and with the active cooperation, of the American Civil Liberties Union, into the notorious publications *Red Channels* and *Counterattack* and their impact on radio and television. It is a notable reporter-achievement.

From it emerges a picture of the radio and television industry completely terrorized by a handful of assiduous Know-Nothings. *Red Channels* has become the "Bible" of the industry and constitutes a virtual blacklist in hiring for radio and TV programs.

This despite the fact that no evidence has ever been produced to substantiate the charges made in *Red Channels*, and that the FBI agents who put out the publication do not claim to have proof and have even asserted they do not know what a Communist really is.

The book reviews the well-known cases of Jean Muir and of Paul Draper and Larry Adler. In the Muir case, the actress had already been signed to play Mrs. Aldrich on a TV show when she was dropped because her name appeared on the *Red Channels* Index and a handful of telephone-vigilantes had protested. It is interesting that most executives in the industry concede that her firing was a deplorable mistake. More accurately, they deplore not the firing but the manner of it.

CRIME COMPOUNDED

They believe that a more alert agency would not have admitted the *Red Channels* prohibition but would have dropped her for some technical reason. And that mistake has not been repeated. Thus, throughout the industry people lose their jobs or cannot get contracts for reasons they cannot fathom except that they had been named in *Red Channels*—and to this the highly alert agencies will no longer admit. This of course compounds the viciousness of the evil, for now not only is the victim guilty merely by accusation; now the accusation is not even acknowledged but the execution takes place nevertheless.

The industry shuns the "controversial" figure for it is its life's principle that no listener or viewer shall be offended lest the sponsor lose a sale. And a person becomes "controversial" by virtue of a *Red Channels* listing.

In the many cases listed in the book, reported without proper names for fear of prolonging the

"controversy" around some of the actors, Miller succeeds in showing the blanket of fear in which the industry is wrapped.

It is a sector of life in which responsibility, evidence, truth, due process, simple respect for human rights have withered away. The accusation is self-sufficient; the accused is automatically guilty, or automatically suffers the consequence of being guilty. There is no defense against being accused and an accusation is its own verdict. That is the hallmark of terror. That is the accusers' scholarship consists of having perused the files of the FBI and that their ignorance of communism is invincible is relevant only insofar as it intensifies the audacity with which they carry on their ideological blackmail.

PRICE OF FREEDOM

It is crucial to the understanding of the situation that this is not the first time that attempts have been made to intimidate the industry by the weapon of irresponsible accusations and threats of purchasing-power reprisals. This has happened before but only now has this terror reached any degree of success. Reactionary, vicious Know-Nothingism is always present on the scene but, with it as with any social phenomenon, it required a favorable

atmosphere in which to blossom to full flower. And that atmosphere has been generated to hot-house perfection by the cold-war on the international scene and by the cold-repression at home.

Merle Miller had set out to do an objective reporter's job on the radio and television industries and this he did with a minimum of editorializing. He cannot be too highly praised for the thoroughness and pointedness of the report.

In the last chapter entitled "The Price of Freedom" he does allow himself some editorial comment. He says: "Freedom is expensive. In wartime it is bought at the cost of lives; in peacetime the price must be paid in terms of cool-headed courage. It is a price that Americans have a right to expect the leaders of its basic industries to pay. We have a right to demand moral responsibility in radio and television as well as in government."

It would be churlish to quarrel with the nobility and forthrightness of this last demand. It is, however, in order to point out that while we do have a right to demand this moral responsibility of radio and TV, do we have a right to expect it? After all, radio and TV and every other business, in its nature and with no sense of shame, is dedicated to the proposition that that way of running business

is best which yields the greatest return in dollars. If, therefore, an industry finds it must brush aside the niceties of democratic procedure to avoid a business risk, it should occasion no traumatic shocks that it proceeds to do so. Indeed, the point has been reached where the "morality" of the defilers of morality is no longer measured by their acts but by the degree of reluctance and hypocrisy with which they commit their atrocities.

MISPLACED INDIGNATION

But if that is true of business, what of the government and the administration? If business is devoted to making dollars, let democracy fall where it will, the administration is devoted to democracy. Yet one must always ask, what has the administration done? Who has built the hothouse in which *Red Channels* and *Counterattack* grow their carnivorous plants? Why expect of a radio executive, whose graphs measure profit and loss, that he do what the Supreme Court does not do when it upholds guilt by association and the criminality of certain ideas? Who is it that by executive order established that what was legal yesterday is subversive today? Who is it that decreed loyalty oaths? Who, in a word, has created the atmosphere that is choking off democracy in

sector after sector of American life? There is no need to defend radio executives, for nobody accuses them of being paragons of morality, but an attack on them which does not mention the primary role of the government fails to see the whole problem as it really is.

It was not the purpose of Miller's book to go beyond a report on the facts of the case and thus it is not a just criticism to say that he has not begun to analyze the problem. Nevertheless, the few remarks he does allow himself lead one to believe that here is another instance of that liberal tendency toward misplaced indignation. The executives of radio and TV cringe before the telephone-terrorists and blackmailers in a manner that turns the stomach, but they are not alone today. They have their peers in cravenness in other sections of life, in education, in industry, in art. It would be unnatural not to be indignant at these people but they too are the victims of an atmosphere of repression and suspicion, of mysterious accusations and star-chamber verdicts, of guilt by letterhead and second-cousin relationship, victims of the police—state practices of the government which sap the foundations of moral behavior and cause the moral sense to disappear altogether.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Thomas in Japan

To the Editor:

I read with interest the statement of the Japanese Social-Democratic Party's chairman, Mosaburo Suzuki, concerning the feasibility of an independent Japan, the Japanese socialists' opposition to rearmament which the American treaty would force on a people occupied by its new "ally," American imperialism. Although Suzuki's "neutralism" with reference to the war efforts of both Moscow and Washington leaves much to be desired from a vigorous Third-Camp socialist position, and his appeal to America to support democratic, progressive elements in Japan instead of the old militarists and capitalist cliques sounds a little naive, nevertheless I also agree that anti-war socialists can welcome the general attitude and feelings of the Japanese socialist left wing not to line up with either world imperialism.

Norman Thomas in his May 10 dispatch from Hong Kong (published by the *Denver Post* Syndicate and in the Los Angeles *Mirror* of May 20) must have had

Suzuki's article in mind as well as his conversations with Japanese socialists when he, Thomas, wrote: "Its [Japan's] peace and security will somehow be guaranteed by membership in an Asian bloc, a third force, led perhaps by Nehru, and reinforced by the power of the United Nations to which by some miracle Stalin and Mao will honorably subscribe. But reason tells me that theirs [the Japanese view] is a fantastic hope." Thomas is correct about the Stalinists (he himself puts his faith in the UN as led by the U. S.), but he obviously thinks Asians must give up their Third Force idea. He said in Los Angeles last January that there can be "no real third force between democracy and totalitarianism."

These terms being his own for the forces involved, capitalism and Stalinism. In answer to a question at this meeting, Thomas described as a dangerous illusion all talk of a strong third force, ridiculed Dr. Lohia's suggestions concerning a third force, and then said that a third force would be undesirable. He felt that foreign criticism of American affairs was exaggerated by propaganda and rationalistic distrust, and that

other countries must line up beside the U. S. government in the cold war against the Kremlin.

Everywhere that Thomas goes in Asia, as in Japan recently, he tells socialists and labor officials to give up all ideas of building a third camp of the people against both war blocs and to join the American campaign. In the same *New Leader* article mentioned above, Thomas, the Socialist Party's chief spokesman and a useful aid, though unofficial, to the State Department's line, states: "It is only from strength that we may be able to persuade the men in the Kremlin in their own interest to consent to universal foolproof disarmament under a strengthened UN."

Thus, Thomas, in his own way, also dreams of "some miracle." His miracle, however, is to be brought about "from strength"—which surely means more rearmament, does it not?—but he has only scorn for the kind of strength which a Third Camp mobilization of the peoples can exert.

I'm sure that Asian socialists will not accept Thomas' view and surrender their national independence, to say nothing of their liv-

ing standards, to the American armaments campaign. One can also hope that the Socialist Party's left-wingers will really challenge this line of their chief spokesman at the SP's convention this summer. For Thomas' position is an embarrassing one, not only to the SP opposition group, but to the American socialist movement as a whole, since Thomas is often regarded as the voice of American socialists.

Gerald CARR

Los Angeles, May 21.

Likes Us

To the Editor:

Permit me to congratulate you upon your excellent paper. I think that your special May Day issue of LABOR ACTION [issue of May 6] is one of the finest explanations of the New Deal and the Fair Deal that I have ever read. Your paper is by far the best labor paper published in this country. Keep up the good work for socialism.

Very truly yours,
MERCHANT SEAMAN

San Francisco, May 20.

Closing the Circle: Decision on CP Entry Marks New Stage —

(Continued from page 6)

on the one hand Stalinist policy "went to the left" and that on the other hand the Yugoslavs have gone sour. We have to be in on the ground floor when such "centrist tendencies" develop in the Stalinist movement, he surely implies, in order to make sure that the "Yugoslav affair" is not repeated the same way the next time. For that we have to be in the Communist Parties now, so that we are there when they make "the revolution."

Thus, even Pablo's "several centuries" comes into the same focus with his talk of revolution in the next "two-three years." The revolution of the next "two-three years" is the Stalinist "revolution." The "revolution" for perhaps "several centuries" will be the development of socialism out of a consolidated Stalinist totalitarianism.

We trust everything is clear.

The official-Trotskyists have completely, thoroughly, and entirely given up the slightest vestige of belief in the working-class socialist revolution. They have not a particle more faith in the revolutionary potentialities of the independent working class than the most defeatist of the tired ex-radicals who have retired, in some numbers, to raising families, running businesses, straightening out their psyches, planning retreats to Chile or a cave, or indeed offering their invaluable services to the

government for patriotic duty.

They have decided to plump their chips on the triumph of Stalinism (over the working class as well as over capitalism), to tie their fate to the victories of Stalinism. They have decided to stand or fall with Stalinism. This is their revolution also.

Such is the politics behind the decision of the FI leadership on entry into the Communist Parties. But we must not neglect to note that what this line will mean or can mean in practice is quite another matter.

With regard to France, we have already mentioned that it is doubtful whether more than a handful could sneak into the CP anyway. In any case, it is also in France that the newly blossomed line has been, it appears, decisively rejected by a large part of the PCI, if not a majority. There are even reports that a split has already taken place, though we do not know; the bizarre antics of *La Vérité* which we described earlier may indicate that the national leadership of the PCI wishes to have nothing to do with the Pablo-Pierre Frank decision (though futilely denying its existence is rather a length to go).

Even at the February plenum, and among the passages chosen to be publicly printed, Pablo had this to say: "Naturally the orientation which we now insist upon for the whole of our movement meets the resistance of

inertia, of habit, of the past, of the inevitable lack of understanding of a number of elements. . . . People are surprised, astounded, and vainly struggle to fit a new, rich and explosive reality into narrow and out-of-date mental schemas. Then they rebel not against the schemas but against those whom they call iconoclasts and visionaries. They react, they sulk, they cry 'scandal,' they hang onto their schemas, they no longer understand."

And at the same plenum, point 2 of the agenda was: "Situation of the French situation: on the past relations between the I. S. and the French section, the IEC adopted a series of measures re-establishing the normal course of the organization and guaranteeing the effective application in France of the line of the 3rd World Congress."

If this indicates that the bulk of the militants of the French PCI have drawn the line at swallowing this further installment of the Fourth International's capitulation to Stalinism, then we can only be very glad, for this raises the possibility that they, or at least some of them, may be able to find their way back from the labyrinthine swamp into which they have been led. It will surely be impossible for them to remain knee-deep in the mire while, farther along, they see the Pabloites' heads disappearing under.

German Treaty: New Crisis — —

(Continued from page 1)
until a new election has been held in Germany. This position is based on the contention of the German Social Democratic Party (SPD) that a majority of the German people oppose the pact, and would turn the Adenauer government out of office if they were given a chance to vote on the question.

Although the Conservatives in Britain have a sufficient majority in Parliament to ensure ratification, there can be no doubt that the BLP represents a majority of the British people who have thus expressed themselves against the pact, at least under the present circumstances.

As to Western Germany itself, there can be no doubt about the lack of enthusiasm for this "contractual agreement" of the nation. The SPD, which has opposed it in unequivocal terms, has been gain-

ing strength in most local and state elections. It is so confident in the popular support of its position that it has repeatedly challenged Adenauer to permit a general election before ratification in order to establish the will of the nation. Even sections of Adenauer's own coalition have shown tendencies to resistance and even of outright opposition to the final and complete commitment of their country to the American bloc in the cold war.

TENSION MOUNTS

Even the most enthusiastic supporters of the pact in the United States admit that it initiates the most dangerous period in the cold war.

The Stalinists have made it clear that they will bend every effort to prevent the ratification of the agreement and the forma-

tion of a West German army. To date their tactics appear to be twofold: (1) Continued and stepped-up maneuvers to dangle the prospect of the unification of Germany before the people of that country; (2) increased economic and military pressure on Western Germany (and in the first place, Western Berlin) to impress on them the possible consequences of an irrevocable commitment to the American military bloc.

It would be foolhardy to deny the possibility that this pact will be ratified by the four governments involved, and that in due course a German army will be raised to give it substance. The present effects of the parliamentary systems of both Western Germany and Britain are such as to deny the majority of the people of those countries effective

political expression. French politics has been in such a state of balanced confusion since the war that no one can predict with confidence whether the present government will last for another three months or what conditions would bring about its downfall.

U. S. ISOLATION

But one aspect of the situation is clear. Even if the contractual agreement is ratified and the Western European army is formed, there is no reason to believe that they will strengthen democracy either politically or militarily on the continent. The German SPD will remain pledged to demand their modification or repudiation if it comes to power. The British Labor Party will be hard-pressed to deny their German comrades support,

in full or in part, for this demand. The Belgian Socialist Party has already proclaimed itself in favor of the SPD's position, and it is possible that even the socialists of France would find themselves compelled to support the position of an SPD government on this question.

Thus the signing of the contractual agreement by the foreign ministers serves once more to emphasize the isolation of American policy from the interests and aspirations of the popular masses in Europe. The projects of the American government continue to receive their main support from the old and discredited ruling classes alone. In turn, the American government is bound to give its support to these classes. This is neither the road to democracy in Western Europe, nor to prosperity, nor to peace.

'Seizure' Clubs Rail Unions — —

(Continued from page 1)
it is settled affects the economy of the whole nation. Hence it is bound to involve the government, and to become a "political" struggle in the full meaning of the word.

The railroad workers have been affected first and most directly by this gradual change in the nature of collective bargaining. The uninterrupted operation of the railroads is so vital to the whole economy that a national tie-up immediately threatens to close down thousands of factories all over the country. This makes them most vulnerable to government intervention. And as they, along with the rest of the labor movement, have little political power, the intervention of the government is almost certain to be to their disadvantage in every instance.

UNIONS STYMIED

The last "seizure" has been a bitter lesson for the railroad workers. After long and involved negotiations, the government took over the roads, and the unions were enjoined from striking. As James P. Shields, grand chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers said in a recent interview, this "put the carriers in an unassailable position." The govern-

ment refused to negotiate with the unions. Government officials told them to continue to negotiate with the employers. A wage increase equal to HALF of what had been offered by the companies was given the workers, as a sort of sop during seizure. The companies continued to make their full profits; the workers could not strike. There was obviously no way of putting pressure on the employers to negotiate anything.

The unions attempted a couple of strikes against individual roads or groups of roads, only to be quickly enjoined by the courts. This maneuver was apparently designed to improve their legal position in court actions in which the unions sought to have the injunctions lifted and the whole seizure declared illegal. But there was simply no way by which real pressure could be applied against the companies without running directly into the power of the government.

The railroad brotherhoods are seeking some kind of legislative relief from the impossible position in which they were put by this type of government "seizure." They have had introduced in Congress a bill which provides that in the event of a government seizure of the railroads, the profits of the companies will go to the Treasury of the United States,

from which they would be paid only a rental to be determined by a special board. This board would also have the power to negotiate a contract with the unions to remain in force for the duration of government seizure. The brotherhoods feel that under the threat of this type of seizure the railroad companies would have a considerable incentive to reach a settlement early during the seizure, if not before.

THE MURRAY BILL

From the point of view of the workers, such a procedure would certainly have some advantages which the present setup lacks completely. The chief advantage would probably be that the railroad companies would put up as stiff an opposition to government seizure as the steel companies have put up during the past few weeks. But that does not begin to solve the problem.

In major disputes it seems likely that the bill which the railroad brotherhoods are seeking to have passed (the Murray bill) would have a tendency to lead to a type of temporary "nationalization" of the railroads which would have

all the drawbacks and none of the advantages of a genuine and direct nationalization. The companies could make a highly profitable thing out of the government "rentals." Any "contract" signed between the unions and the government board would expire the moment the roads were returned to private ownership (they would at all times remain under effective operation, as during past seizures). The only way the unions could then get a good contract would be to threaten to strike again, and the merry-go-round would start up once more.

There is simply no way of avoiding the central issue in the long run. Once the workers are powerful enough to challenge capital in its major strongholds and on a national basis, "free" collective bargaining tends to become a thing of the past. The impact of the struggle on the whole country is so powerful that the government must step in and solve it.

GOV'T THE KEY

But the manner in which the government steps in and the means by which the struggle is solved depend on the kind of government

we have. This means that it depends on the relative strength of the workers and the employers in the government.

It is at this point that the unions are still woefully weak. Even in the case of steel, where the president is obviously trying to use the greed of the steel industry as a basis for the political campaign of the Democratic Party, the union is finding, to its sorrow, that once the government steps in the workers get it in the neck. The employers so thoroughly control the two old parties that even if the president should want to throw the government's weight behind the steel workers in this particular instance, the overwhelming mass of government officers in all sections of the government are just about bound to be against them.

There is only one way to change that. The workers must seek to make their own at least to the same degree as it now belongs to the employers. Even though they have rejected the formation of a labor party in the past, the hard realities of collective bargaining under the new conditions may force them to it in the future.

In English — At Last
The Famed 'Vol. 4' of 'Capital'
KARL MARX'S
"History of Economic Theories"
—From the Physiocrats to A. Smith
The Langland Press 337 pages \$5.00

Order from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Labor Action FORUM • New York
THURSDAY EVENING—JUNE 5—at 8:30

The Anti-Anti-Witchhunters
Examining a type of "liberal" attitude on civil liberties recently expressed by Irving Kristol, of *Commentary* magazine, and others . . .

Speaker:
Hal Draper
Editor, Labor Action

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

