

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

THE PRESENT DANGER
OF ATOMIC RADIATION
IN THE UNITED STATES

... page 6

APRIL 12, 1954

FIVE CENTS

That Bang You Heard in the Pacific Was U.S. Foreign Policy Blowing Up

'NATO Obsolete': What's Left?

By JACK WILSON

What was plain to see for top military men in 1945 has now become public knowledge, Brigadier General S. L. A. Marshall, noted military critic and historian, wrote this past week in the *Detroit News*.

He was referring, of course, to the impact on military strategy and tactics of the development of nuclear weapons, vividly illustrated by the H-bomb explosions in the Pacific.

It may be recalled that, in a press conference not very long ago, President Eisenhower also made the point that a D-day landing of the kind that featured World War II was not possible any more.

Marshall goes farther. He ridicules the idea of a NATO army and the traditional concepts of European defense, so much the public center of American military strategy in Europe.

As for battle fleets and land battles, Marshall relegates them among the relics of the past—just as by the way, Russian military writers have done as far back as 1945.

BANKRUPT POLICY

Well, then, why the big military budgets and swollen armies and navies? And why the insistence on NATO, etc.? These are political questions, not military matters, Marshall declares. It's a problem of winning allegiance to the West, and of retaining governmental control over civil populations.

Nor does the over-all impact of the H-bomb exclude more Indo-Chinas or Koreas, Marshall adds. Here traditional warfare finds its last refuge and its gory glory. And civilian defense also finds some military purpose.

Military strategy has become reduced to an absurdity in the era of the H-bomb. "Massive retaliation" becomes a gruesome gesture of a bankrupt policy. It signifies the failure of the military idea of winning a war by imposing one's will on the enemy, and this has been the cornerstone of all military thought even before it was put into a general theory by Clausewitz.

The very military advances in weapons serve to minimize the significance of the art of war. It is reduced to senseless butchery almost impossible to conceive. So the struggle between the East and the West camps becomes more than ever a struggle of ideas, a struggle for men's minds.

Not very long ago, General Fuller, the noted English military writer, challenged the American army to justify any of its training practices and its tactics. The H-bomb events of recent weeks serve to emphasize his sharp criticisms. One might as

(Continued on page 3)



Revulsion Against H-Bomb Unites BLP, Jolts Tories

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, March 31—There can be no doubt that the U. S. hydrogen bomb tests have done more to bring British Labor's foreign policy into some sort of focus with current reality than anything the Washington government has done for many a year.

In reaction the Labor Party has taken on a "Bevanite" cast: this is the latest welcome development within the Labor movement. Reading the *Daily Herald*—that organ of staunch, solid, entrenched right-wing Labor—over the last week or so, it would appear to the casual observer that the *Tribune* had moved over to the office of the *Herald* in Endell Street.

Editorial after editorial in the *Daily Herald* has denounced the irresponsibility of the H-bomb tests and demanded that they be called off immediately. This Tuesday, for instance, the headline in the *Herald* was "H-bomb: U. S. Does It Again,"

and today the headline was "H-Bomb Storm Grows." A special series of extra front-page editorials have been written driving home the "new look" of the *Herald's* foreign policy articles.

Today, in a front-page article entitled "Dodging the Issue," the *Herald* writes: "Millions throughout the world looked to Britain yesterday for a strong, sane lead about the hydrogen bomb. It did not come."

"Instead, Sir Winston Churchill spoke

(Continued on page 3)

By HAL DRAPER

It was the United States government's foreign policy that blew up in the Pacific in the month of March.

We have been reassured that the bomb itself was *not* "out of control." (Its power was only *twice* as great as expected.) But the H-bomb test went completely out of control, nonetheless. Its *political* impact rose higher than the mushroom cloud, and its fall-out over the minds of the world's peoples burned in lessons that the scientists did not intend from their experiments.

The prime minister of Great Britain, that grim old Tory bulldog, wept and stammered before his Parliament. The president of the United States, speaking on Monday, discussing the H-bomb, bumbled through lines that scarcely put a straight sentence together. Hardly a commentator in the U. S. who touched on the question failed to indicate bewilderment over "Where do we go from here?"

It was the American people who were scared in the first place, as a result of this demonstration of frightful destructive power that was supposed to scare the Russians into sweet reasonableness.

WHO'S SCARED

"BOSTON, Apr. 3—... The statement that the hydrogen bomb could destroy any city left most people thinking in defensive terms. 'That means it can destroy Boston,' said a suburban hardware clerk, 'and it means it can reach us here ten miles out...'" (N. Y. Times, Apr. 4.)

Maps in the New York papers showed the effects of the H-bomb blast reaching out to New Rochelle. Maps of Philadelphia showed the radii of different degrees of death embracing Washington, D. C. on the one side to New York on the other, with Baltimore, Wilmington, Newark, Harrisburg included. (The press restrained itself from printing accompanying maps of Moscow, Odessa, or Stalingrad.) In London the *News Chronicle* put ground-zero at Birmingham and swung the compasses of megamurder around the whole British Isles, half of France, all of the Low Countries and part of Germany. Anyone in the world can try it on his own city.

On March 30, Secretary of Defense Wilson, calling the H-bomb blast "unbelievable," declined to add details, saying "I think we oughtn't to scare everybody so that they don't sleep nights." The next day Admiral Strauss, AEC chairman, did just that. The jolt in his report was apparently just as unplanned and unforeseen as the ashes that fell on the Pacific. Let us call attention to the fact that it was *not* in his prepared statement that he revealed the bomb could destroy any city. The transcript of the interview shows that he apparently blundered into this disclosure under questioning, after some hem-and-hawing. In fact, his prepared text had expressly denied that any "atoll or large island"

(Turn to last page)

Who's the Biggest Liar in the Case?

By GORDON HASKELL

There has been many a freak show in the history of American politics. But it is doubtful whether any have been gaudier than the one which may (and again, may not) go on the road under the billing of "Investigation of the Controversy Between the Army and Senator McCarthy," or, as it is more intimately known among us outsiders: "Who Did What with Which to Whom?"

In this "now you see it, and now you don't" affair, what seems to be at issue is really quite a simple matter. The army has charged that McCarthy, and the chief lawyer for his committee, Roy Cohn, tried to use their influence to get a soft deal for a friend of Cohn's who had rendered the committee certain services. McCarthy and Cohn, true to their usual tactics, reacted to the army's charges by counter-attacking.

So far, the "case" seems pretty simple. As Cohn and McCarthy deny they tried to pressure the army, all that needs to be established is: who is a liar, or, perhaps, who is the bigger liar.

But that was just the beginning, and as time has dragged on, it is a beginning which has been fading away and almost out of sight. The burning issue of the day has become not whether McCarthy has used his power to threaten people into doing favors for his friends, but rather who is to investigate the matter?

BACK-SCRATCHING CLUB

Now, we run into the Senate, not as a legislative body, but as a "gentlemen's club," or a mutual back-scratching society. McCarthy is a "defendant" in this case. But McCarthy demands the right to cross-examine the army witnesses. Of course, no one accused of any wrongdoing before his committee (or before any other congressional committee, for that matter) was ever given that right before. But McCarthy is chairman of the committee, and to prevent him from exercising his "rights" as a committee member in the case is worse than the Senate can get itself to do to a member of the club.

Of course, the reasonable thing to do would have been to have some other committee take up the matter. But gentlemen will be gentlemen, and so they would not violate the club code of honor by removing the case from the jurisdiction of the McCarthy group. Chief element in their failure to do so, it appears, was the reluctance of Senator Saltonstall, head of the Armed Services Committee, to take jurisdiction of the case. That courageous senator (who sometimes passes for a "liberal" Republican) is up for re-election this year, and seems to feel that it is the better part of wisdom to leave McCarthy alone.

At this point, the question came up: if the McCarthy-Cohn case is to be heard by the McCarthy committee, should the preparations for the hearing also be made by Cohn, chief counsel for the committee? That would have been pretty hard to shove down people's throats, and besides, Cohn is not a member of the club but just an employee. So it was decided to get another attorney, of impeccable reputation and impartiality, to conduct the investigation.

McC FOR McC

After a couple of weeks of frenzied searching, the committee came up with a man who, it was said, filled the bill to perfection. He was questioned by Democrats and Republicans on the committee, and approved with an audible sigh of relief. He was, and is, Samuel P. Sears of Boston.

But when the newspaper got hold of his name, they took a peek at his record. It turns out that this Sears is one of the most ardent and outspoken McCarthyites in Boston, if not in the whole country. He had tried to raise money for the senator's campaign in 1952, had offered to debate on his behalf before a men's club in Boston, and had taken up the McCarthyite cudgels against Harvard University. To top it all, he had told committee members that he has no record of public support for McCarthy, a "less than candid" statement, according to one of them.

By this time, the issue in the dispute had been dimmed by the "issue" of whether or not Sears is really equipped to carry on an "impartial" investigation. In fact, the issue has become so dim, that McCarthy's friends have now concluded that they can pretend that it never existed.

When the army first issued its report on the McCarthy-Cohn affair, no senator

or other public figure came to his defense. He seemed to be really isolated for the first time. In fact, he seemed to be so isolated that even President Eisenhower mustered the courage to take a swipe at him, as did at least one senator. But time has passed, and the first public shock has abated. Last week, Senator Pat McCarran, Democrat of Nevada, rose on the floor of the Senate and spoke as follows:

"I do not believe quite all the American people have lost sight of the basic question that started this entire controversy. That question is 'who in the United States army promoted and permitted the honorable discharge of Major Peress?'"

"All of the principals on both sides of this so-called 'Army versus McCarthy' controversy could be liars in one degree or another and it would not change by one iota the fact that there is a conspiracy in the world, that this conspiracy seeks the overthrow of the government of the United States by force and violence, that this conspiracy is active in our country today, and that the greatest proportion of exposure of portions of the Communist conspiracy in recent years has been the investigations of congressional committees."

The senator then made his bow to the demand for truth and his opposition to liars, however high or low they may be. But he wound up on the following note:

BOOKS and Ideas

'Unity and Diversity in European Labor'

UNITY AND DIVERSITY IN EUROPEAN LABOR, by Adolf Sturmthal.—The Free Press, 227 pages, \$3.75.

By BEN HALL

Sturmthal's book ranges widely and skims lightly over the history of the labor and socialist movement of many countries and of many times since 1860. Their rise and development in France, Germany and England; debates between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks in Russia; some opinions of Rosa Luxemburg; collective bargaining in selected countries with emphasis on the knotty question of the role of unions in industries nationalized by labor governments; a comparison of the labor movements in the United States and Europe—all these subjects, and more, pass quickly under his scrutiny and it is not surprising that he does justice to few of his selected topics.

Many of his excursions into history and current events come off badly, as, for example, his discussion of the "new ideology" of European social-democracy, an extremely significant subject which deserves a better fate. Consider this typical paragraph:

"For a definite separation from communism [by social-democracy] is a break with the past of the socialist movement and its basic creed of class-consciousness and the solidarity of the working class, at least as interpreted during the inter-war period. The Communist Party is no longer regarded as the most obvious ally; indeed, it has become the most dangerous enemy. In the light of the post-war development of Soviet Communism, the parties under its control are no longer considered labor parties aiming by a different route at the same objective, but enemies of the working class trying to subject it to the dictatorship of a small self-appointed elite."

Two antagonistic and mutually exclusive thoughts are crammed together by an author who notices no contradiction. A break with the Communist Party is considered, on the one hand, (1) as a break with class-consciousness, and, on the other, (2) as a product of an advanced class-consciousness which understands the truly anti-working-class character of the CP. Social-Democracy may in fact be caught up in such a foggy contradiction; if so, the author shares its disorientation.

ON LENIN

And this explains the most glaring omission in a work dealing with the European labor movement: an utter failure to analyze the nature of Stalinism, which in at least two countries, Italy and France, is the strongest single political tendency inside the working class.

In an appendix on Selig Perlman's *A Theory of the Labor Movement*, Sturmthal digresses briefly into a discussion of a well-known passage from Lenin's *What is to be Done*. "Scholarship" in the mod-

"The real issue is rapidly becoming to be [sic] whether, at long last, the Communists, with the aid of front groups, fellow travelers, Communist sympathizers and dupes, are going to succeed in their efforts to silence the committees of the United States Congress who have been starting to tear away the mask from the sinister operations in this country of the world Communist conspiracy."

NEW ACT OPENING

This is typical of the argumentation of McCarthyism; the witchhunt in general, and its apologists of all stripes.

Question: Did Cohn and McCarthy try to pressure the army for special favors for their pal Schine?

Answer: There is a world-wide Communist conspiracy which threatens the United States government.

Q: Did Cohn and McCarthy lie when they denied that they tried to pressure the army for special favors, or, when they charged the army with trying to blackmail them?

A: That is the kind of question asked by Communists, their front groups, sympathizers, fellow travelers and dupes.

Q: Do McCarthy's methods violate all common decency, do they spread fear and endanger civil liberties in the country?

A: There is a world-wide Communist conspiracy which threatens the United

States government. Why are you attacking people who are against this conspiracy?

Of course, there is nothing new or unique in McCarran's defense of McCarthy. But what it indicates is that the tactics of delay, confusion and issue-shifting have worked at least to the point at which the McCarthyites (Democratic and Republican) feel they are safe in beginning to openly defend their leader before the public once more.

Will the McCarthy committee finally turn down Sears and resume its search for a "truly impartial" attorney to conduct the hearing? Will even the Senate be forced, at long last, to end this particular phase of the farce by shifting the investigation to another committee? Will the American people ever really find out to what extent McCarthy and his stooge, Cohn, have been going about intimidating not only the army but public officials of all kinds, under the guise of "digging out communists"? Or will it all get buried away, as the famous report on the Wisconsin senator's financial shenanigans was buried three years ago?

AS WE GO TO PRESS: Sears has quit under fire and a new act in the farce is due to start.

ern, cold-war, anti-socialist epoch demands that every phrase of Lenin be forged, swedged, shaped, milled, cut apart and reassembled to fit the notion, conceived in advance, that Leninism leads to totalitarianism. On this point at least, the author avoids such an easy path to "deep thought."

Lenin wrote in 1902: "We said that there could not yet be social-democratic consciousness among the workers. This consciousness could only be brought to them from without. The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade-union consciousness. . . . The theory of socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical and economic theories that were elaborated by the educated representatives of the propertied classes, the intellectuals."

Here, the author points out, Lenin and Perlman are on common ground; both pose socialism as an ideology carried into the working class from the outside by intellectuals, the one to criticize the "pure" trade-union struggle and the other to criticize socialism as alien to the nature of the working class.

"However," Sturmthal continues, "Lenin soon recanted." His views were criticized by Plekhanoff, leading Russian Marxist. "Lenin answered that Plekhanoff had attacked sentences torn out of their context or individual expressions which I have not formulated well or carefully enough." The references to the spontaneity of the workers and their trade-union consciousness ought to have been read in connection with the attack upon 'economism.' The 'economists' had bent the stick in one direction. To make it straight, he bent it in the other direction."

PLATITUDE?

If this work was simply and frankly one of those introductory survey textbooks designed to scrape together a potpourri of assorted facts, some connected and some disconnected, to stimulate the interest of the reader-student we could simply extract what was worthwhile and forget the rest. But the author has a "thesis," which he insists upon intruding.

The word "diversity" in the title is the excuse for extended divagations whose very formlessness is fitted to the author's intent: "The main thesis of the pages that follow is precisely that a diversity of tradition, of economic, social, and political conditions will lead to a diversity of solutions even when the problem, as it rarely does, seems identical from one country to another."

This would seem like a classical commonplace, because it is. That different traditions lead to different solutions is not exactly a novel thought. The author succeeds in one respect: he leaves us with a feeling for the rich and varied experience of the international working class.

But the question that arises for the student of labor history, to say nothing of

those actively engaged in the movement itself, is this: Which of the competing, or at least "divergent," programs was best suited to the cause of labor? And which were faulty?

Sturmthal transforms his gigantic commonplace into an involved evasion of this main question, taking refuge in the occupational right of professors, dedicated to Arctic truth, to observe but not to judge. The difference of "spirit" of the labor movements in Europe and United States "is the result of different social and political histories. If this view is accepted, it follows that there is no simple 'right' or 'wrong' way of the labor movement. . . . Not only the social sciences but also the act of international cooperation begin with this kind of approach: not to see who is right or wrong, not to find the one and unique method leading to success, but rather to find out why are the movements different?"

STURMTAL'S THESIS

His main conclusion emerges clearly even if it is not stated clearly: the labor movement of each country, formed by its own history and tradition, is "fitted" to the conditions of its own existence. Each is therefore as "valid" as the other. "This implies a rejection of the thesis according to which labor in some countries is ahead of other labor movements to the point that the present state of one movement may be used to forecast the future of others."

From this reading of history we may be fascinated with assorted tidbits, amazed by the labor movements in its multifarious forms. But about decisive tasks and experiences, it tells us exactly nothing.

The labor movements of Germany and Spain, to cite only two examples, were, like all the others, molded by the societies in which they arose. Both were powerful. And both were wiped out by fascism. In France and Italy, today, the majority of organized workers support Stalinism, while socialist and labor currents struggle in opposition to it.

All these different and opposing tendencies, the author would have to say, are "fitted" to their conditions of existence. Very interesting but hardly illuminating!

Sturmthal is overanxious to appear uncritical of the democratic labor movement anywhere, anytime. Whatever is, is valid; because it is the product of history. Above all, this thesis gives him free rein to write with sympathy of socialist labor in Europe without prejudice to the pro-capitalism of American labor.

Nevertheless, he can say, "The labor movement emerges as a class movement aiming at the establishment of a society without class privileges. The main tool of this transformation is the power of the state, though in Britain this idea was less widely accepted than on the continent. To obtain control of this power, labor must

BRAZIL

Socialists Divide over Policy in Coming Elections—

Vargas Apes Peron in Bid for Labor Vote

By JOAO MACHADO

RIO DE JANEIRO, March 18—The forthcoming elections for Brazil's president and the governors of several of the most important states now bring into view all the tendencies heretofore hidden under the surface of our political life. The clash between the bourgeois efforts to continue dominating the political arena and the popular reaction to this situation is reaching its final stages.

A part of the bourgeoisie, grouped around President Getulio Vargas, is engaged in a subtle maneuver to win for itself the support of the more active part of the working class, represented by the trade unions. Because of their recently acquired class-consciousness, the Brazilian workers cannot now be taken in by purely bourgeois-democratic slogans, such as "social peace," "progress," or "moralization of the administration." This fact forced the bourgeoisie to turn to Peronist methods of infiltration into the trade unions.

Almost half a year ago the minister of labor, Jango Goulart, openly started a campaign for a complete shake-up of the completely corrupt and opportunist trade-union officials, profiting by the reaction against these cliques among the rank and file of the workers. Of course, this governmental action was not intended to replace them with genuine proletarian representatives but rather with pseudo-proletarians who would serve the interests of that part of the bourgeoisie represented in the government.

Thus the ministry of labor started supporting strikes, demands for wage increases, a rise in the minimum legal wage, and other worker's demands, attributing the success of some of these to the intervention of the minister and his puppets in the unions. "Only with Getulio and Jango" was the slogan. This campaign had wide success, particularly among the unions' paid staffs, and it can be said that the government may now count upon a large measure of political support in the unions, the only organized sector of the working class.

At the same time a purely demagogic nationalist campaign was started against imperialism and for nationalization of the basic sectors of economy, such as power sources, which are still largely controlled by foreign investors. It was hoped that this would win the support of the anti-imperialist petty-bourgeoisie as well as the workers.

THE QUADROS TYPE

But these policies endanger the interests of another bourgeois group, the industrialists, who feel uneasy about the government's open flirtation with the workers. Measures like political support (or at least neutrality) in strikes and a rise in the minimum wage by almost 100 per cent, enforced by law, are particularly unpopular among them. The objective situation reinforces this attitude: that is, the immaturity and consequent insecurity of this colonial capitalism requires the greatest possible primitive accumulation and cannot allow itself, politically or economically, the luxury of great concessions to the workers. This sector still stands on the traditional bourgeois positions. (It has since been successful in having Jango Goulart replaced as labor minister.)

It may be stated generally that in the underdeveloped colonial capitalist regimes a contradiction exists between the historico-economical interests and the immediate political interests of the bour-

geoisie—a contradiction which prevents the full union of all the ruling classes. It can be solved (temporarily) only by the political suppression of the workers' and middle classes' demands.

The popular reaction to the muddle of bourgeois politics was concretized in the considerable support given to independent candidates, and in some places they won, through this support, important political positions against the confederated bourgeois forces. A typical phenomenon of this kind took place in the election (discussed in a previous LABOR ACTION article) of Janio Quadros, as mayor of the city of Sao Paulo, with the support of the Socialist Party.

Though the Socialists always had serious objections to Quadros as a politician, it was a general hope among us and among the people in general that he could group around him all the progressive strata of the population for the election of the governor of the state. This issue is a very important one, not only because the state of Sao Paulo is economically and in other respects the most important state in the union, but also because a campaign based on a truly progressive program could liberate the people from the absurd dilemma of deciding only to which of the equally backward bourgeois camps to give support.

Revulsion at H-Bomb in Britain — —

(Continued from page 1)

as if the bomb were simply another weapon, like gunpowder. That is to miss the point. It is a destructive force that has no limit. No one knows what its cumulative effects may be.

"It sets an entirely new and terrible problem: mankind must control its use or die.

"That is the challenge which the prime minister avoided. But it is unavoidable. The battle between human reason and the forces of death is on. The demand grows: **"STOP THAT BOMB."**

The *Herald* has published a selection of letters from rank-and-file Labor supporters congratulating the *Herald* on its first bold moves toward an independent Labor foreign policy. These testify to the strong feeling in the movement about this latest brazen action of the American government.

Last night, no less than 100 back-bench Labor MPs signed a motion by Ellis Smith (MP for Stokes-on-Trent) urging the government to take the initiative to prevent the explosion of more H-bombs.

U. S. ISOLATED

Taken together with Secretary of State Dulles' warning to China not to intervene in Southeast Asia, and his threats to transform the war in Indo-China into a second Korea, the H-bomb episode can be seen as one of the major factors forcing the labor movements in Western Europe, and also the junior partners of the Western capitalist alliance, to think twice about their all-too-great dependence on the American colossus.

The BBC radio and TV have cleverly slanted news in such a fashion that now, for the first time in years, there is open and frank criticism of the U. S. government. McCarthyism has been vigorously attacked on both TV and the BBC, and it is difficult to believe that these specially featured programs have not been inspired by authorities at the very highest levels.

In a certain sense, America's over-all internal and external shift to the right has increasingly isolated her in the very capitalist alliance she has created, nurtured and guided. Britain and France are moving left and even the reactionary forces in these countries have participated up to a point in these shifts of opinion. Already in France, the possibility of a new Popular Front cannot be excluded, or at least the possibility of a semi-neutralist government with CP backing or tolerance.

The opposition to EDC is increasing, not decreasing. America's virtual alli-

ance with the Adenauer government of West Germany and with Franco Spain has alienated those countries which believed they had gone to war to fight fascism.

The recent anti-BBC conference in Paris, where there were represented all shades of opinion from left to right, underlined the isolation of America in her own alliance. The Bevanite MPs who spoke at the conference, much to the annoyance of the right-wing press, may well have tipped the balance in the French Socialist Party in favor of continued opposition to EDC, and thus sealed the fate of this device.

The over-all picture we have, therefore, is this: After three years of furious internal party strife, the Labor Party has had to shift in the direction of Bevanism. It is now only a question of time before the right-wing leadership (Atlee-Morrison) is forced to repudiate its support for West German rearmament, or is forced to resign.

SP DISPUTE

This situation presented the Socialist Party with the problem of what to do now. The party had been prepared to support Quadros, even in collaboration with other less progressive parties, on the basis of a minimum program. We knew that if he was to be elected governor (and this was a probability) we should be obliged to break with him because he would not carry out his promises. But even under those conditions we were prepared to participate in the electoral campaign in order to get in closer touch with the popular movement that backed him, to project the party as such

on the political scene and, in the course of the electoral work, to win militants and supporters for the party.

Now support of Quadros became almost impossible. But even under these conditions some more or less opportunistic sectors in the party, for the sake of political advantage, want to invite him to become the Socialist Party's exclusive candidate. The party, they claim, would be able to put forth its minimum program—mainly industrialization and agrarian reform—to a larger audience than it could gather without him. The question remains whether a man covered with the dirt of bourgeois compromise can perform this function.

The other alternative is to present a less well-known candidate who, even without making a mass impact, could defend a really socialist program. Such a course would only have the purpose of saving the party's face and spreading our ideas on a little wider basis but, objectively speaking, the party hardly has enough strength to carry on, alone, an efficient campaign on a national scope.

There is a serious division in the membership on this question and it is difficult to foresee which point of view will prevail. In any case the party has a period of very hard work before it. This is a crucial year for the country's political development because the success of Vargas in his attempted "Peronade" would certainly mean an end to the democratic regime in Brazil. Any decision the party makes on the political issue will have to be taken not only with regard to the ideological aspects of the question but also in connection with the imperative necessity of checking Vargas' maneuvers.

policy in favor of an alliance with America is concerned.

If Dulles continues his policy of adamant refusal to face the facts of Stalinism in the Far East—as is only too clear from his recent speeches—the chances are very remote of the Big Five conference of the powers in Geneva achieving anything besides widening the rift between the Western capitalist allies.

The big question facing the Labor Party now is this: Now that "we are all Bevanites," where do we go from here? *Tribune* has remained where it was at Margate. It has made that most necessary shift to the left occasioned by the shift to the left on the part of the whole movement.

The confusion, hesitancy and general lack of clarity of *Tribune* on most of the major questions facing the Labor Party today become particularly clear now that Bevanism has turned full circle. Stalinism, nationalization policy, problems of workers' control, European policy, the colonial question—all these will have to be grappled with before *Tribune* can set in motion the next advances of our movement.

NATO Obsolete — —

(Continued from page 1)

well put knights in armor on a field now, as concentrate a modern army of 250,000 in a major war between Russia and America.

Symbolic of the new day was the placing of the giant battleship Missouri in mothballs. With it went the heart of the naval theory once vigorously proclaimed by Admiral Mahan. Sea-power and land-power are outmoded concepts in military science as of the advent of nuclear power.

The shock effect of the H-bomb explosions is bound to be reflected in all echelons of military life as it was demonstrated to be in civilian life throughout the world this past week.

It may be questioned if the will-to-fight, let alone the will-to-win, is going to find fertile soil among the military theorists and writers, in view of their knowledge that a major war signifies self-destruction. This kind of debate has just begun, not ended, no matter what public displays of saber-rattling the world may see via more H-bomb explosions.

The Charge of the Light Brigade may make a rousing poem and a good action film, but it hardly enthralls the sober-minded men whose job heretofore consisted in finding a way to win a war.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

CELEBRATE MAY DAY

WITH THE N. Y. ISL

See page 8

YOU and SCIENCE

Reply to Two Critics

By CARL DARTON

The March 8 issue of LA carried discussions of two of our previous columns. On Hawthorne and industrial psychology we have no particular disagreement with correspondent D. R. C. Our original column was perhaps more agitational than learned, and we are glad that he expanded upon the subject. We are obviously all in favor of unions, socialists, and workers in general learning something from the psychological aspects of industrial relationships. But they will learn nothing unless they clearly recognize the "slanted" and "loaded" aspects of such studies conducted by management.

Eric Fromm may rightly, and admirably, conclude from such studies that only under socialism can there be sound work relationships. However, if many others drew the same conclusion we are sure that management would soon drop their sponsorship of such projects.

As to D. R. C.'s criticism of unions' neglect of the mental health of their members, there is little defense. Recently the CIO sponsored a study in human relations at a West Coast university but apparently learnt nothing more than how to get along with the bosses.

D. R. C., in his concluding comments, also posed some interesting questions on work relationships. Even under "socialism" there will be full need for proper study and understanding of the work process as well as leisure in an industrial, mechanized society.

However, under present-day social

conditions problems of adjustment arise much more rapidly than individual solutions can possibly be found. Without minimizing the need for ameliorating many present-day living and working conditions let us pose the question to which most psychologists give the wrong answer. Should an individual or group change themselves to better suit a maladjusted society or should they use their own "maladjustment" as a lever to build a healthier society? And at the risk of starting an argument we feel that while struggling for improvement of physical conditions under capitalism is necessary, there is greater danger in psychological adjustment and acceptance.

Unfortunately we cannot sympathize as readily with E. Contreras' comments on our February 1 column on "parapsychology." Nowhere in our article is it implied, as he states, that parapsychology is false only because it arises in a period of basic irrationalism such as today.

Relative to Aldous Huxley being a poor representative of the movement we can only comment that professional "psi scientists" will have to bear the responsibility of the company they keep. We recently received a prospectus advertising a review of psychical research with Dr. Rhine and other professors of parapsychology listed as contributors and, apparently, sponsors. The announcement fully capitalized on quotes from Huxley's *Life* article. At the best, we can only say for "psi" that mankind has never made advancements by making a cult of the unexplainable. That would appear to be the basic error of parapsychology.

Djilas's Portrait of the Titoist Bureaucratic Caste

By HAL DRAPER

To round off our coverage of the Djilas affair in Yugoslavia, we can now present some material which we had planned to include in the previous series of articles that LA carried but which we did not have available in time. We think it's still important enough to publish even at this date.

Paradoxically, this material is from the one article by Djilas which attracted the widest attention in the press but whose most important passages were not quoted. The article is the last one that Djilas published before the storm broke, in the magazine *Nova Misao*, about the case of the "beautiful young wife" of the high army officer who was snubbed by the wives of the bureaucracy.

The press reports concentrated on the rather sensationalistic "human interest" content of the piece, that is, the case of the snubbed wife herself, and to be sure this made up the major portion of the article and was startling enough to deserve the attention it got. Djilas, using a highly literary style, describes the sad case of this young actress who married the high military officer (both anonymous but easily identifiable), was looked upon as a social upstart and interloper by the wives of the other high bureaucrats, and was insulted and cold-shouldered. Because of her profession, the other wives regarded her as something less than respectable, and in one of his most amazing passages Djilas defends her by citing the past sexual histories of a couple of the other high society dames (also anonymous).

But juicy as this is, we would like to direct attention to those numerous passages in the article in which Djilas GENERALIZES about the social character of the Titoist bureaucratic caste. After all, the explosion of rage which greeted this article was obviously not caused simply by the succulent revelations about the individual case itself.

In these passages, in an impressionistic way, Djilas comes close to making a class analysis of the Titoist bureaucracy as a new crystallized caste above society. Well, anyway, how close he comes can be judged from the following excerpts.

"To Protect a Closed-Off Class . . ."

First Djilas remarks that the other women's "contempt and hatred" was "inexplicable except by the presumption that there must exist an animal craving for keeping acquired social rank and position, a beastly urge more stupid, more savage, more monstrous and more merciless than any fight among wild animals could ever be. Look what happened! The social positions of that set have suddenly, by the simple appearance of a young woman at the door, become menaced merely because she was . . . an actress; an actress, mind you, like all the rest of them who, goodness knows, have managed to worm themselves into the party which now, good lord, contains all kinds of heterogeneous rabble! . . ."

He refers to the husbands of these wives, the top bureaucrats themselves, who "loaf about in their magnificent parvenu offices, move about from place to place, live in their own choice and specially reserved summer resorts, gather in their own special clubs, sleep in their own special houses, sit in their own special theater and stadium boxes." Meanwhile the wives had made themselves "the watchdogs of an imaginary moral code—their own—established in response to the urge to protect a class closed off and blocked, in various high official posts inaccessible to anyone of a lower caste."

But the men were not stirred by the actress' invasion the way their wives were, nor did they blame him; for "he belonged to their own set . . . he really belonged to them." For "them" he was not an upstart nor an intruder who had crashed "among them," into this Communism of "theirs."

Again Djilas remarks that the poor girl's crime was that she had crashed into the circle of those "who have fought in the war, have won the power we now wield and the freedom we now enjoy and who now, after the war, all have ranking positions in the state, have their own cars, travel by Pullman, get their food and clothing at special stores, spend their holidays in choice villas at special summer resorts and watering places and who, in the glory of these attainments, now look on themselves as specially deserving, until they have gradually become convinced that everything around them is so very natural and logical that only fools and stubborn enemies could have any doubt about it."

The Caste Solidarity of the Hierarchy

Djilas angrily writes that "in this case of ours the general rule that marriage is a sacred thing was lightly overturned and scorned as soon as it clashed with the raging instinctive interests, behind which lurked a still concealed but already tyrannical caste-solidarity." The "sanctity of marriage" was "trampled on and forgotten as soon as it disagreed with caste interests."

"Such was the mentality in this one of the higher social circles. It grew up rather unconsciously from quite normal and natural reasoning. . . . This attitude and this system ramified out in all directions from the top to the bottom, everywhere. Thus people were classified into categories and levels, near-levels, related professional categories, etc., each neatly arranged in separate pigeonholes, but bound together by a sense of solidarity, common to all of them, which was not so much the result of an ideological or ethical unity but rather of a certain way of life and similar interests which arose out of the nature of the official authority they wielded and the manner in which they had attained it.

"In the lower social levels, life was franker, more brutal, more savage, more crude. A district secretary's wife overnight became the First Lady of the district regardless of her intellectual or other attainments. She would choose her friends carefully and everybody would regard it as a privilege to join her hallowed circle. . . ."

"The women of these secluded circles are slowly losing their personal traits, their personal values and their individuality, since little by little their personal importance is no longer judged by what they are worth as individuals but by the job their husbands hold. . . ."

"This is only one more confirmation of the old and unchanged truth that people are not what they imagine they are but of what their conditions of life have made them. They are what the particular social order for which they stand has made of them. . . ."

"Here, then, is the so-called logic of the hierarchy—to get on top and then to keep out the 'undeserving,' the 'immoral' ones. Here then is this horrible logic of our so-called 'reality,' of the hierarchies and the privileges which have made selfish monsters out of heroic men and women. . . ."

"Why? How? Whither?"

Still speaking of the new bureaucratic magnates, Djilas concedes that "Some of them have not changed and have remained simple, particularly those politically and ethically formed before the war." But for the most part ("they, or a good majority of them") have come to look on themselves as a "sham aristocracy," with a behavior to match. They try to "outclimb" each other. "Some of them . . . began to grab and hoard de-luxe furniture and pieces of art, tasteless of course, but in this way they revealed their primitive instincts of greed. . . ."

He cries: "Is it possible among people like these? Are these the new ethics? Is this Communism?"

"Together with the growing bureaucratism and all that it implies developed a dogmatism which corroded all the ethical values behind which the secluded world of the circles sheltered itself, and by which it swore."

Djilas ends his article as follows, speaking ostensibly of the young ex-actress: "When the curtain finally went down, she broke down. She staggered to the sofa, hid her head in her hands and cried bitterly.

"Why? How? Whither?"

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

McCarthyism

To the Editor:

I think Hal Draper's recent characterization of McCarthyism as an independent political force is a step in the right direction as far as an analysis of that phenomenon is concerned. The big question is, however, does McCarthyism represent a mere shift to the right within the democratic framework, or does it aim to smash that framework? Is McCarthy merely another reactionary politician or is he a fascist and the leader of an incipient fascist movement?

I myself take the position that there is a qualitative difference between McCarthy and Eisenhower, for example. I also see no reason to believe that McCarthy has any intention of retaining democratic rights or of permitting any opposition once he comes to power. With Gov. Shivers of Texas asking that all Communists be shot, its not hard to believe that those oil barons are backing Joe with the knowledge of what his aims are.

What is still more important is that the other senators who have the power to impeach McCarthy will not do so because he has impressed and intimidated them with his power. The Wisconsin senator commands a mass-movement in the form of millions of petty bourgeoisie who have found in "anti-Communism" the scapegoat for their frustrations.

Fascism in this country will, no doubt, tend to clothe its activities with a "legal"

cover. The "storm troops" of today (the paid informers, the hordes of special agents and investigators, etc.) have a nominal legal sanction. Fascism can have part of its base in the government itself. As Trotsky said: ". . . the new middle class, the functionaries of the state, . . . can constitute such a base . . ." (for fascism). For these and other reasons I believe it is necessary and correct to identify McCarthyism as incipient fascism even though it is not a carbon copy of Hitler's or Mussolini's parties.

William STANLEY

Berkeley, Calif.

I expect that discussion and analysis of McCarthyism will be, or should be, an aspect of pre-convention ISL discussion in the coming period, at which time justice can be done to the view that it is "fascism." Since, however, Comrade Stanley refers to my article of March 8—which among other things did indeed view the tendency behind McCarthyism as an "independent political force" not necessarily tied to the GOP—I just want to state now that in my own opinion it is entirely misleading to interpret it in terms of "fascism." I would ask Stanley to remember that "fascism" is only one form of totalitarian tendency; and if present-day McCarthyism bears virtually none of the specific stigmata of a fascist type of totalitarianization, it does not help much to use a ready-made label with misleading connotations.

—Hal DRAPER



LABOR ACTION

April 12, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 15

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—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.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Asst. Editors: GORDON HASKELL,
BEN HALL, MARY BELL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Now again available for the first time in years—

Karl Marx's 'CAPITAL' Vol. 2 & 3

These volumes, republished in India, contain the same translation as the American edition.

Vol. 2..... \$6.00
Vol. 3..... \$7.50

Order from:
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.
(Send remittance with order.)

At California Student Meeting—

Young Socialists Lead Civil-Liberties Fight

By AL PRICE and SANDRA PESTOFF

BERKELEY, Calif., March 23—Students from two campuses of the University of California met at Berkeley, March 20, in a conference on civil liberties. The more than 50 delegates and observers formed a complete cross-section of the political elements on campus.

SDA-type liberals and socialists of the Young Socialist League and the YPSL (Socialist Party) were the largest and most articulate groups at the conference, but Republicans and Stalinists were represented also, along with observers from the McCarthyite Students for America (SFA) and from the Berkeley police "security detail."

The conference demonstrated that it is possible for liberals and democratic socialists to unite on a practical principled program on McCarthyism and the attacks on civil liberties, academic freedom, and student rights. It also provided a joint activity for the Berkeley and Los Angeles YSL units.

The Student Civil Liberties Union (SCLU), which called the conference, is probably unique among student organizations in the United States. Organized by socialists and liberals three years ago on the Berkeley campus as a fraternal affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union, SCLU has at times involved hundreds of students in fights on specific civil-liberties issues, often with successful results. This month an appeals court reversed the conviction of a student, defended by SCLU, who had collected signatures on a petition at a sidewalk table after the city council had denied him a permit to do so.

FASCISTS AND STALINISTS

In the last year, however, SCLU has become more conservative, and the student base it once had has gradually dropped away. It has restricted its attention mainly to legal questions, and concentrated on "behind the scenes" activity. By the beginning of the spring semester, SCLU was practically non-existent. The conference last week was called to reactivate the organization, and to make recommendations on policy and for more effective activity.

During the period of SCLU's decline, two new organizations appeared at Berkeley. One was the arch-reactionary Students for America which, while it now consists of two or three students at most, has received considerable publicity in the reactionary press and in the student newspaper, the *Daily Californian*.

It had its own civil-liberties issue when its spokesman was expelled from the university band, according to SFA for political reasons. The avowed purpose of SFA is the persecution of liberal and radical students and faculty members, and it boasts of its regular reports on "subversive activities" to the FBI.

The other organization was the Students to Combat McCarthyism, a Stalinist-controlled group which grew out of the Velde committee's investigation of the university. Using the technique of the mass meeting, leaflet distributions, and small action committees, it has surpassed SCLU in size and activity. In this committee, the Stalinists have established their most effective campus base in years.

SCLU MEETS

The characteristic reaction of some of the leading liberals in SCLU to both of these organizations has been intense embarrassment. They argue that if one ignores these groups, they will disappear. When the anti-McCarthy committee approached SCLU for a united front, some of these liberals wanted to ignore the invitation completely. They have also muted efforts to expose the fascist ties of SFA or to publicize the activities of professional stoolpigeons on campus.

The conference opened in the same theme with a keynote speech by physics Professor Robert Brode, chairman of the Academic Senate's academic-freedom committee. He defined academic freedom

NEXT WEEK
A 4-PAGE "CHALLENGE"
FEATURING THE
FIGHT FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

as the teacher's right to feel immune from persecution for anything he might say or teach in connection with his work. Brode contrasted this condition with that of a gas-company worker who cannot expect the right to advocate the municipalization of public utilities.

From a token advocacy of academic freedom, he retreated to a defense of some of the devices used to intimidate the campus. Brode admitted that paid police informers and Un-American Committee contact men on campus were a menace to academic freedom, but opposed publicizing their existence if the intent was to eliminate them, because "we have to be sure we are not destroying the good in these institutions along with the bad."

After Professor Brode's address and reports from the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses, the conference divided into panels on intimidation of students, on student civil-liberties organizations, and on the campus and the community.

All three panels devoted much of their attention to the same two questions: the attitude to adopt toward the Stalinists, and how SCLU should function.

THREE POSITIONS

A resolution advocating civil liberties for everyone including Communists and fascists was reported out of one panel without opposition and adopted unanimously by the conference. No one but the SFA opposed this position, which is rarely affirmed today even by "liberals."

There were three positions on the role of the Stalinists and organizations like the anti-McCarthy committee in the fight for civil liberties. Some of the liberals opposed any cooperation with groups like the Students to Combat McCarthyism, but loudly "deplored" political criticism advanced by the YSL of the Stalinists and their allies.

The position of the Stalinists themselves was that "if all groups which are fighting for civil liberties do not unite in a common organization, the struggle itself will be lost between the sects." They claimed that explicit repudiation of the Communist Party and its politics was "red-baiting."

The YSL and YPSL delegates maintained that a civil-liberties organization could not successfully defend the rights of Stalinists by claiming that they are misunderstood and persecuted "progressives" who have merely been fighting McCarthyism, Jim Crow, and big business. The young socialists characterized the Communist Party as a totalitarian agency of the Russian state, and held that SCLU must draw a sharp political line between itself and the Stalinists.

YOUNG SOCIALIST VIEWS

They argued for limited cooperation with Stalinist-influenced organizations, conditioning such cooperation upon the defense of political freedom for everyone, and repudiation of Stalinism as an enemy of civil liberties. Such a course would encourage a split between the Stalinists and their liberal allies and would strengthen the consistent democrats in both organizations. The Stalinists could not function long in an organization whose program was more

radical than their own.

Jim Robertson, organizer of the Berkeley YSL, pointed out that the Stalinists have been successful in building a civil-liberties group not because of their Stalinist politics but because their techniques of organization, if less "respectable," reached and involved in activity large numbers of students.

David McReynolds of the Los Angeles YPSL also spoke in favor of approaching students through every practical means including public distributions of leaflets. He stressed the value of small organizations which publicize their radical programs unequivocally.

UNANIMOUS RESOLUTION

Robertson introduced a resolution in the panel on student organizations urging SCLU to seek to educate and involve the largest possible number of students. Because "it is not respectable today to defend the full rights of Communists and radicals," the resolution concluded, "... to the extent that there might be alienation from SCLU through its using direct, popular means to reach students, there will be a strong correlation between distaste for such means and disagreement with a full civil-libertarian program." The division of opinion on this statement became sharp enough so that no vote was taken; instead, the question was referred back to SCLU itself.

The conference unanimously adopted resolutions from the panel on the campus and the community declaring that the defense of academic freedom and student rights was inseparable from the defense of civil liberties in the larger community, and that helping to direct students into political activity was an important part of this defense.

YSL and YPSL speakers presented American capitalism and its war preparations as the root of the totalitarian trend in this country, and pointed out how support of the U. S. camp in the struggle for world power led to a gradual abandonment of the attempt to preserve political freedom.

WAR AND DEMOCRACY

In a featured address of the final session of the conference, Vern Davidson of the Los Angeles YPSL attacked the capitulation of the liberals to attacks on civil liberties in the name of "national security." He pointed out that the present attack began in the early forties with the (liberal-supported) Smith Act and Japanese-American relocations. Even from the point of view of the war, these measures were unnecessary, because most of the people saw it as a war against reactionary Nazism and supported it wholeheartedly.

In the preparations for World War II, the popular appeal of Stalinism and the fact that the aim of the war is world rule even at the risk of atomic incineration make the suppression of dissent a necessary part of such preparations. Be-

cause they support the permanent war economy and the foreign policy of American capitalism, the liberals can only complain that McCarthy and his kind are not effective enough in persecuting Communists. They oppose loyalty oaths primarily because "Communists would sign them anyway."

The liberal Democrats boast that they established the subversive list and the "loyalty program" "which have done more to root the Communists out of American life than all the McCarthys," who usually end by persecuting liberals. They complain that the various un-American activities committees have turned out practically no anti-Communist legislation, and then every member of the ADA fraction save one in the Senate votes in favor of funds for McCarthy's committee.

Davidson concluded by counterposing the Third Camp socialist opposition to both Stalinism and capitalism to the opportunism of those liberals who support one of the imperialist camps. The audience, composed mostly of liberals, was impressed by the forthright presentation of the independent socialist position, and indicated widespread interest in, if not sympathy for, the Third Camp position.

SNAFU IN L.A.

In its implications for the Berkeley SCLU, the conference was clearly successful. Interest in SCLU was revived, and the conference recommendations to the organization, while not mandatory, were all in the direction of a more aggressive approach. If the conference has any effect on the Los Angeles campus, however, it will be despite the lack of preparation there.

The Los Angeles YPSL, which was responsible for organizing the UCLA delegation, for reasons of organizational jealousy preferred that the YSL not be represented at the conference. They scrupulously avoided mentioning the conference to YSL members, despite the fact that the latter had been active in every attempt to build a broad civil-liberties group at UCLA in the last two years.

No meeting was called of the SCLU executive committee, which contained YSL members, despite the fact that the conference was called in the name of the Los Angeles SCLU. Because the YPSL alone was involved in the preparations, the conference was poorly publicized at UCLA. (No articles appeared in the *UCLA Daily Bruin*.)

Despite the lack of any sort of working agreement between YPSL and YSL, their *de facto* united front at the conference demonstrated the political closeness of the two groups. The leading role played in the conference by the young socialist delegates flowed from the fact that they alone presented a consistent principled position. If such a position is clearly counterposed to the opportunism of the Stalinists and of the "official" liberals, it will receive the support of most politically active students.

S. F. BAY AREA

Berkeley YSL Spring Class
Sunday at 6 p.m.

The Meaning of Fascism

Apr. 4—DICTATORS IN HISTORY & THE RISE OF ITALIAN FASCISM.

Dictatorships of different character from Cromwell to Mussolini. A study of fascist authoritarianism.

Apr. 18—FASCIST MOVEMENTS BETWEEN THE TWO WARS.

German fascism as a "classic" model. The Austrian and Spanish situations. The role of Stalinism.

May 2—THE THREAT OF FASCISM IN AMERICA.

Features of reaction on the American scene. McCarthyism, the Garrison State, and the role of the labor movement.

All sessions at Berkeley YSL headquarters, 2412 Haste Street, at 6 p.m. As usual, there will be ample opportunity for audience participation and questions in these informal classes.

The Present Danger of Atomic

By PHILIP COBEN

"Much has been said about [atomic] bombs. An official book has even been written on the subject. Peacetime applications have been described by AEC officials in millions of words. But very little has been said about hazards from plants such as nuclear reactors. . . .

"... the time is long past on bringing the public up to date on the hazards of nuclear reactors, which are now dotting almost all parts of the country. . . ."—Editorial in "Nucleonics," March 1953.

"... If any of these reactors [at Hanford] ever go completely out of control, dangerous amounts of radioactivity may be released to the atmosphere. The reactors cannot explode like a bomb, but, under the worst possible conditions, they could produce so much heat that the fuel elements would melt, thus releasing a very dense and highly radioactive cloud—more dangerous than the cloud produced by an atomic bomb explosion."—From a statement of the Atomic Energy Commission, about January 1953.

With the world-wide publicity and shocked attention given to the case of the Japanese fishermen and American personnel in the Pacific who were "burned" by the radioactive ashes from the fall-out of the H-bomb explosion in March, it becomes truer than ever that "the time is long past" for Americans to learn that it can happen here, in continental United States, and now.

As the quotations above indicate, the presence of a similar type of danger springs not merely from the deliberate explosion of H-bombs, or even "old-type" nuclear fission bombs, but from the existence of atomic plants, the essential portion of which consist of nuclear reactors or atomic piles.

This could be an "alarmist" type of article, hinting that any minute now one of the atomic plants "which are now dotting almost all parts of the country" could spread death over vast areas around them. That would probably be something of an exaggeration. But in the minds of competent men a high degree of danger does indubitably exist, perhaps all the more fearsome for being largely unknown and undefined.

Since the danger stems not exclusively from experimentation with nuclear bombs but also from any plants involving nuclear reactors—including any future plants dedicated to the peaceful application of the atom—it is not a question of raising a hue and cry about their elimination, in line with the current demands for stopping the bomb tests. The conclusions (to anticipate a bit) will involve three other points:

(1) The policy of the authorities is to hush this danger up, to deceive the public about it with carefully chosen words even in those rare cases where it has been mentioned. This policy is not motivated by the need for secrecy, but by the head-in-the-sand approach of which the Atomic Energy Commission has been accused time and again. Allegedly it is followed because the authorities do not want to cause any "panic." But it has been demonstrated more than once that the real psychological danger is the very reverse of panic: apathy. Moreover—

(2) Behind the screen of such motivations can be discerned an even more dangerous lack of concern by the authorities themselves, their disinclination to take certain clearly indicated steps to minimize or even eliminate the dangers which exist. As long as the situation is hushed up, there is little public pressure on them to do anything about it.

(3) The policy on industrial development of atomic energy which the government proposes to follow is guaranteed to raise all dangers to the maximum and to make safety measures immensely more difficult.

What is the danger, in the light of information now available?

It Has Happened Already!

When the AEC admitted, over a year ago, what could happen to an atomic plant "under the worst possible conditions"—including a radioactive cloud "more dangerous than the cloud produced by an atomic bomb explosion"—it was not discussing a merely hypothetical event. Something like that had already happened.

In its January 1953 issue, the magazine *Nucleonics* (a McGraw-Hill technical trade journal for the industry) reported that the atomic plant at Chalk River, Canada, had gone out of control in December. Let us remember at this point that Canada's secrecy laws are not the same as this country's. If it had happened in a U. S. plant, we should very likely never have been told about it.

"The reactor had been shut down," reported *Nucleonics*, "and the flow of cooling water was considerably lower than that for full operation. Because of a misunderstanding [not further explained—P. C.], all the control rods were suddenly pulled out, and the power in

the reactor built up very rapidly. This rapid build-up of power, combined with the small flow of water, caused at least one of the fuel rods to vaporize, and many thousands of curies of radioactive gases were carried up the exhaust stack."

The "fuel rod" or rods that vaporized were of uranium. This, wrote *Nucleonics* in January, was "the first public announcement that such bursts do occur. According to C. D. Howe, minister of trade and commerce [of Canada, who made the announcement], bursts of rods have occurred before at Chalk River and also in other reactors."

Furthermore, "According to Howe, such bursts must be expected when there is still so much to learn about the behavior of materials under high irradiation."

Chalk River is located in a remote place. It was evacuated, and the reactor shut down. The American AEC sent in experts to help with decontamination—and also to learn how these things happen. (Ironically, Gordon Dean, then AEC chairman, pointed out that if the accident had occurred in the U. S., cooperation with the Canadians would probably have been held up by U. S. laws.)

The accident was ascribed for the record to "an unusual series of coincidences." One of these, according to the announcement, was "unusual atmospheric conditions":

"The released radioactive gases and dust from the burst rods were carried up the exhaust stack, but, owing to unusual atmospheric conditions and the severity of the discharge, they were not widely dispersed. Buildings near the reactor were contaminated sufficiently to affect research instruments."

In this case the "unusual" atmospheric conditions kept the gases and dust concentrated on the plant itself, thus concentrating the radioactivity in a smaller area; hence the need for total evacuation. In the case of the Pacific H-bomb fall-out, it will be remembered, unusual weather conditions were also to blame: the winds that carried the fall-out in the wrong direction were unpredicted. We need hardly add that reactor safety cannot depend on our ability to predict winds and weather, or on hope that meteorological phenomena will be the "usual." As for the factor of human mistakes, we will see that come in for discussion later, but not by the AEC.

Question-Mark Over Hanford

In any case, the extent of the disaster in this remote spot was no doubt increased by a combination of circumstances—to the point where it had to be made public—but we have now been told that similar accidents occurred at Chalk River even previously; that they had occurred at "other reactors," and that they "must be expected."

From *Nucleonics* we also learn that "Another accident on which no public information is available is the one which took place last summer [1952] in an experiment with fissionable material at Argonne National Laboratory. This was probably considered a 'minor' accident although four people were hospitalized."

Inside the United States, for reasons which we shall see, the greatest danger centers around the atomic plant at Hanford, on the Columbia River. Coincidentally it was directly after the "burst" of radioactive gases and dust from Chalk River—an accident which the AEC virtually admitted it did not understand any more than did the Canadians—that the AEC saw fit (in a step no doubt already planned before the Chalk River affair) to release a large tract of land near Hanford from restriction. This was an area of about 87,000 acres at two ends of the Waihlake Slope across the river from the plant.

"A statement signed by the four AEC commissioners said that the only real danger in the area (other than enemy action) is the unlikely eventuality that one of the reactors would go completely out of control. . . . No towns or cities will be permitted to be established within 25 miles of the Hanford reactor area."

It is in this same statement that there follows the admission which is given in the second quotation at the head of this article, possibly induced by the then still fresh Chalk River accident. As for the likelihood of the "unlikely eventuality," we will meet a somewhat different view later.

The AEC statement also asserted that the chance of a "major accident or disaster" at Hanford is "small." On this an editorial in *Nucleonics* commented: "Was the recent accident in the reactor at Chalk River a 'major' one? Presumably it wasn't a catastrophe as defined above"—in the AEC warning of a cloud more dangerous than an A-bomb cloud—but, adds the editorial, "it comes close to being one." The editorial then mentions the unexplained accident at Argonne, and asks some questions.

Briton Points a Finger

The policy and attitudes of the American authorities on this whole question of reactor safeguards was pointed up last October when a top man in the British atomic energy program confronted his American colleagues at a conference on atomic energy in industry organized by the National Industrial Conference Board, in New York City. The British representative at the conference was Sir Christopher Hinton, deputy controller of the British atomic-energy agency, speaking on "British Developments in Atomic Energy." (The passages below are from his speech and the resultant exchange of opinion as printed in *Nucleonics* for January 1954.)

Although couched in terms of Britain's different conditions, and therefore not overtly critical of U. S. practices, Hinton's speech apparently struck his hearers an implied criticism, to judge by the reaction. In any case, what was "un-American" about Hinton's remarks was

that he actually paid a great deal of attention to the problem of reactor safety for the communities outside of the plant itself.

A reactor of the type used at Hanford (he said)—that is, a water-cooled, graphite-moderated reactor—"has a serious disadvantage in that . . . it can, under unfavorable circumstances, explode and scatter dangerous fission products over the countryside." (Emphasis added.)

In the U. S., he went on to say, you can meet this problem by building in remote areas, but in England this is harder. "It was because of this that we decided to build air-cooled reactors for the production of plutonium.

"The air-cooled reactor has many disadvantages as compared with the water-cooled reactor . . . it is appreciably more expensive in capital cost. It is more costly to operate. . . .

"We felt, and I am sure that in our case it was true, that all of these disadvantages were outweighed by the fact that the air-cooled graphite-moderated reactor is inherently safe. . . ."

In another section of his speech he discussed the problems of atomic developments as the British saw them. Here he leveled at the problem of reactor safety at even greater length:

"By far the most difficult and, to my mind, by far the most important of the three problems is the last; namely, that of evolving more advanced types of inherently safe reactors." (This, the "most important" problem for the British deputy controller—how far down on the list is it for the AEC?)

"Irresponsible"

He referred again to the "inherent risk" of the Hanford-type reactor, and went on:

"The magnitude of disaster in the event of such an accident is so great that no responsible engineer or industrialist could contemplate taking the responsibility for it. . . .

"Accidents almost invariably happen to all plants and machines that break into pioneering fields; . . . Our trouble in the design of reactors lies primarily in the fact that engineers learn from their mistakes rather than from their successes, and in the case of a nuclear reactor the penalty for failure is so great that the responsible engineer dare not risk it.

"It seems to me that it is absolutely essential that our knowledge of the safety of the reactors should be improved and that we should learn more about the effect of an accident. . . .

"It is, to my mind, unsatisfactory to suggest that a reactor that is inherently unsafe can be made safe by the application of mechanical controls and gadgets; all of these can fail . . ."—and the implication of this British point of view was that, in the case of atomic plants a single failure was one too many.

The important place in Hinton's speech that this question occupied was furthermore demonstrated when he went on from this discussion to end with a concrete proposal on what to do, which we will come to.

H. D. Smyth of the AEC got up to answer Hinton. "Essentially," said Smyth, "I agree with what Sir Christopher has said, but I would like to put a little different emphasis on some aspects." One little different emphasis was that Smyth would say that a reactor might explode only "under an improbable combination of unfavorable circumstances." Another was that Smyth went on to advocate the "gadget-approach" to reactor safety, without commenting on the central aspects of Hinton's thought in this regard. And lastly Smyth praised the idea of a safety-envelope "to enclose the reactor by a strong and gas-tight envelope of some sort. This is what we are doing at the reactor being built near Schenectady."

But clearly the Briton would not consider that this experimentation with a crowded population, in a field still full of mysteries and gremlins, was—in the term he had frequently employed—responsible.

Let the People Know!

Virtually nothing of this problem, which may yet burst upon the people in some concrete and unexpected form, like the radioactive fall-out upon the Japanese fishermen which burned its way around the world, has been explained by the U. S. authorities. The very first and elementary point to be made was that to which the above-mentioned *Nucleonics* editorial was devoted: Let the people know! It said:

"At this point in the determination of its information policy, AEC must have asked itself, 'How far should we go? Should we tell the public everything permitted by security which is in the public interest?'

"Apparently there has been one self-imposed limitation—that stemming from the fear of negative public reaction to (or perhaps misinterpretation of) any talk about man-created environmental radioactivity.

"A good example of this was in connection with the decision in 1950 to locate a weapons test site within the continental U. S. [in Nevada—P. C.]. Obviously, this was of great public concern. Yet it wasn't until early this year [1953]—after erroneous ideas were getting into print—that an explanation of the radioactivity effects of those tests was given. Although waiting three years permitted AEC to back up its statements with considerable data (in an excellent report), a very worthwhile preliminary job could have been done in 1950."

Hence the editorial went on to proclaim that "the time is long past" to tell the people the truth about the hazards of reactors.

"We're pretty familiar with the 'hazards' from weap-

Radiation in the United States

ons [the editorialist found out different exactly one year after writing these words—P. C.], but what are the hazards from reactors?"

The AEC explanation to which the editorial referred is worth some attention in connection with the subject of this article. This appeared in its 13th Semiannual Report last year. A condensation of this report, with extensive quotations, appeared in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* for last April.

It should be borne in mind that this report dealt only with the results of monitoring after the bomb tests in Nevada, where for the most part the smaller bombs have been detonated. The report is written in accents of reassurance. In general, it asserts that the degree of radioactivity added to the atmosphere by the bomb tests have not been anywhere sufficient to cause damage. The condensation reads:

"Relatively minor effects, however, cannot be confined to even the large area of the Nevada Proving Ground, and some are at least continental in range. It is only rarely that these phenomena result in property damage, and there is every indication that at present scale of operations they should have no biological effects."

The Dangers of Fall-Out

But as everyone learned recently, the danger of the fall-out is not the same as the danger from mere radioactivity in the atmosphere. The fall-out consists of radioactive particles of matter. The condensation said:

"Fall-out—the descent of the particles back to earth—may occur in the immediate vicinity of the detonation or as far as several thousand miles away, although it is heaviest near the site. The manner in which the particles descend through various layers of the atmosphere . . . is not well understood. . . ."

"Fall-out of particles carrying some of this residual radioactivity, however, may occur in virtually any portion of the United States."

Measurement of fall-out radioactivity, the report states, has shown none beyond the recommended maximum, BUT—

" . . . there exist two other effects from such fall-out that might be dangerous. One is the appreciably higher radiation doses that result if the particles actually settle on a living organism and are not removed for a long time. . . . A second possible mechanism to increase the danger from fall-out is if the radioactivity is inhaled or taken into the body in food or water. The danger from this is particularly hard to evaluate."

Perhaps the AEC has learned more about this from the Japanese fishermen.

Then there is an entirely different danger involved also, in addition to those mentioned. The preceding questions dealt with what is called the somatic effect of radiation. The last one deals with its genetic effect—its effect on germ cells and inheritable characteristics, particularly in causing mutations in offspring.

The report properly points out that mutation occurs spontaneously in nature, only one cause being natural (i.e., not man-made) radioactivity. But since radioactivity is at least one cause, an appreciable increase in radioactivity is bound to speed up the production of mutations.

Now it is doubtless true that exposure to a burst of radioactivity (whether from a bomb blast or from a reactor accident) does not mean that one's children will be born "monsters," and the reassurances that are based on Hiroshima and Nagasaki surveys emphasize denial of such exaggerated alarms. But such reassurances by no means end the question—far from it. Any appreciable increase in the rate of mutation is a danger; for the large majority of mutations are not viable or at least are debilitating.

Cheap Reassurances

In discussing this question, the AEC report points to a very important difference between the somatic effects of radioactivity and its genetic effects. The former are not cumulative—that is, the body can repair the damage, if there is not too much at one time. This does not hold for the genetic effects. The original report said:

"Radiation, however, increases the frequency of mutations above the normal rate, and the increase seems to be in direct proportion to the dosage. Since most mutations are disadvantageous, large increases are considered undesirable."

"We have noted that low levels of radiation produce no detectable somatic effect; that is, the body is able to repair the damage virtually as quickly as it occurs. Such low-level exposure can be continued indefinitely without any detectable bodily change. This does not seem to be the case for the germ plasm. Evidence accumulated to date indicates that mutations are in proportion to the dose, with no repair or recovery process at work. It follows that small doses are cumulative in their genetic effects, and that daily or weekly repetitions of such doses over a long period could produce a noticeable increase in the numbers of mutations among offspring."

We repeat that the commission's reassurances, on this point as well as the others, is based upon the results observed after the Nevada bomb tests. From a broader point of view—considering that we are told we are entering an Atomic Era and that an atomic industry is in the offing—we have to ask what the facts point to for the future, and therefore what steps are necessary now.

When a few smokestacks began pouring smoke to the skies with the Industrial Revolution, not many could have asked themselves what the results of urban and indus-

trial air pollution could be for the health and well-being of the whole human race. We have been warned, and besides the prospect of radioactivity being poured into the atmosphere in these beginnings of the Atomic Revolution can scarcely be equated with mere smoke pollution.

In the light of the unknown dangers, even more perturbing than the lack of attention to remedial action on the part of the authorities is their penchant for light reassurances. One wonders whether these are intended only to allay public fear with misleading comfort, or whether the issuers of these statements are saving their own conscience in turning their eyes away.

Even the magazine *Nucleonics*, which has been outstanding in bringing radiation dangers to the light of day and demanding an information policy on the part of the government, goes in for flip reassuring generalities which its own material belies. In its August 1953 issue, apparently forgetting what it itself wrote on the subject of reactor hazards, it dealt editorially with the prospects of using nuclear radiation for industrial purposes—a subject very close to the heart of its editors. It was arguing that the public can be educated to accept "atomic products," that is, for example, foods that had been sterilized by radiation—a proposition that is no doubt perfectly true, given sufficient testing by scientists who are not tied up by the AEC. And in the course of this argument, it said in passing:

"The principal barrier to acceptance is ignorance. This can only be fought by information—information about nuclear radiation, the fact that its hazards can easily be protected against, the fact that there are many more insidious materials in daily use in industry and by the public."

Now this sort of talk is highly disingenuous. We can agree for the sake of argument that the hazards of atomic plants can be protected—whether "easily" or less easily—but only on the condition that a great deal of special work is put into the problem of doing so. There's the rub. There is no indication that the great concentration of money and attention on the military atom will be put aside in the U. S. sufficiently to do this.

The Qualitative Difference

And standing in the way of this development is a type of thinking which constantly crops up in this connection, exemplified by the last phrases of the above-quoted *Nucleonics* editorial: *After all, radioactivity is dangerous but there are many dangerous materials in use and we have muddled through with them, haven't we?*

What is missing is the realization which was voiced only by the Britisher, Sir Christopher Hinton—the realization of the QUALITATIVE difference between muddling through in the field of atomic radiation and muddling through with (say) the danger of exploding gasoline.

On September 10, 1953 a member of the AEC's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (the body which is supposed to be concerned officially with the problem, although actually its main concern is probably that of intra-plant safety), Edward Teller, gave a talk at a Berkeley conference on nuclear engineering. Typically his dominant tone was that of poohpoohing the danger:

"No one has yet been killed by a reactor in this country. But in any great development, fatal accidents occur sooner or later. . . ."

Now compare his following remarks with the information we have already seen:

"Reactors are inherently safe because (1) We understand them in all essential features. . . ."

This is a thoroughly irresponsible half-truth. It is precisely in the field of safety that reactors are not understood in all their "essential" features, as was shown by the not-quite-"major" catastrophe at Chalk River. Nor do scientists understand the problem of controlling fall-out in all its "essential" features. Nor do they understand the biological effect of radioactivity in all its features that are essential for safety.

Later Teller went on to say, however: "The only real danger associated with reactors is the fission products they produce. If a reactor blows up and gaseous fission products escape, there will be considerable danger. The reactor is a self-destructive mechanism that could kill an extremely great number of people if fission products were released. A runaway reactor can be relatively more dangerous than an atomic bomb producing the same radioactivity. Fission-product gases can't be detected by the senses. If a reactor accident occurs in which fewer by-standers are hurt than in conventional accidents, an exceedingly great number of other people will become worried because of this."

Last December *Nucleonics* reported, on the bright side of the ledger, that "The whole reactor safeguard picture has brightened considerably as the result of very important tests conducted in recent months at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho." That sounds encouraging, but (1) this mention occurred in the magazine's rumor column ("The Editors Hear . . ."), and (2) there is no indication whether the tests dealt with the subject of this article, or with that aspect of "reactor safeguards" which has never been slighted, namely, the problems of protecting atomic-plant personnel in the ordinary course of their work.

What Can Be Done?

What could be done about it? There is one big proposal which has been made more than once. This is in addition to the whole question of approach which Hinton had advocated: more work on developing inherently

safe types of reactors—really inherently safe, not "inherently safe" in the Pickwickian sense defined by Teller.

This proposal is the one with which Hinton had ended his presentation at the New York conference. "We have no practical experience of what happens if a reactor runs away," he told the Americans. He proposed that money be devoted to building a reactor in a remote place—as carefully chosen as the site for a bomb test—and deliberately making it super-critical under controlled conditions, that is, to undertake deliberate experiments with the possible causes of catastrophic accidents, instead of just letting them happen under unknown conditions and then trying to investigate under handicaps which do not exist for "conventional" accidents.

"Such a test," he said, "would cost no more than the trial of a single atomic bomb, and it might give information of tremendous value. May I suggest that with all your tremendous resources of money and of technical capacity in America, and with the great areas of thinly populated country conveniently at your disposal, this is an experiment that you might well carry out and that might pay handsome dividends."

At the time of the Chalk River burst, *Nucleonics* had reported as follows:

"According to Dean [then AEC chairman], AEC scientists had previously speculated on the effects of such an accident. There had even been several suggestions that experiments along these lines might be profitable. However, because of the cost involved, no serious thought was given to the idea. . . ."

That tells the story about what stands in the way of exploring this field. Billions for H-bombs but. . . .

In February 1953, *Nucleonics* reported that "The health-safety and waste-disposal methods at the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Schenectady, have been approved by the Mohawk River Advisory Committee. The committee reported that the controls appeared adequate to assure conformance with anti-pollution standards of New York."

Every word in the above news item is a testimonial to what is wrong. The same agency which concerns itself with garbage in rivers is supposed to exercise competence over a field which is not essentially understood by the nation's leading atomic authorities. The anti-pollution laws of the state have about as much relevance to this new problem as an anti-noise ordinance. The only salutary word is "appears."

Safety vs. Private Profit

The reference to waste-disposal methods at the Schenectady plant reminds us of a whole danger area which we have not even touched upon so far, and which is without any question another field which is not "essentially understood."

Liquid and solid wastes resulting from the operation of reactors are "hot"—radioactive—and they cannot be given to the local garbage collectors! Oak Ridge and Hanford have worked out temporary methods of storing such waste in underground tanks; other wastes have been dumped into the ocean in various types of containers.

In August 1953, for example, it was reported that Hanford was going to build 15 huge underground tanks to store waste, at a cost (lowest bid) of nearly two-and-a-half million. In the case of underground storage there is the danger of leaching of radioactive materials by ground water and other risks, including the contamination of underground water supplies and the "concentration of radioactive materials by plant or animal life."

The last-quoted phrase is from an interesting dispute that appeared in the pages of *Nucleonics* in September 1953. The magazine printed a study by three MIT scientists from Oak Ridge concerning the "Economic Evaluation of Permanent Disposal of Radioactive Wastes." Note that the study dealt with the comparative costs of different types of disposal. But in the same issue the editors printed a comment on the article by L. P. Hatch of Brookhaven Laboratory, who made a basic criticism of the whole approach.

Hatch simply pointed out that the problem that faced the field was not yet that of merely comparing costs but rather of SOLVING the problems of permanent disposal—and that this problem was far from solved. Yet—and we add, how typically!—when a study on the question WAS finally made, it did not even raise the question of solving the serious problem itself but already concerned itself with the CHEAPEST way of disposal!

It is this problem, this problem, as well as other reactor hazards, which can only be exacerbated by the government's orientation toward turning over the field of atomics to private enterprise for industrial exploitation. In addition to all the other arguments against turning atomic energy over to private-profit developments there is the stark fact that this would guarantee a maximum of national and community danger in the course of its development.

If the government, preoccupied with producing bigger bangs, has paid a minimum of attention to the problem, surely the history of private exploitation of resources and industries offers little reason to believe that safety will get many pennies in the course of the hunt for a quick profit. Government supervision—even by a government which really wanted to supervise conscientiously—could offer little hope of amelioration, once it was out of their hands.

The radioactive gases and dusts, like the soot particles of and chemical vapors of the early factories, are only beginning to pour into the skies. And it is being shown that, in the hands of capitalist society, atomic energy is a fearsome plaything not only in the form of bombs but also in its "peaceful" aspects.

U.S. Foreign Policy Blows

(Continued from page 1)

had disappeared in the explosion—it was just a "sandspit or reef." Photographs showed the truth. How much else was concealed or falsified?

"WHAT CAN WE DO?"

Bewilderment is the keynote from top to bottom and from these shores across the seas.

"But common to both groups—[AEC and civil-defense officials] was the bewilderment that comes with a sense of the arrival of what the scientists call 'the discontinuity of history' . . . and neither produced any confident answers," explains Arthur Krock learnedly. (Civil-defense officials first blurted out that all present preparations are meaningless, and then announced that there would be "no basic change" in plans—the H-bomb was just a very, very big freeracker.)

A senator is quoted: "People say to me, 'Senator why isn't there more discussion of this atom business?' But what in God's name can I do about it and what can I discuss?"

The British Daily Mail echoes from abroad: "What can we do about it? Here one feels the powerlessness of the individual and the inadequacy of language. We can say that the H-bomb ought not to be allowed—but what then?"

The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists says: "The alarming fact is that statesmen (and ordinary citizens) discuss (and some of them advocate) 'massive retaliation' as an answer to local aggression at the very moment when the Bikini test should have taught them. 'Atomic retaliation' has become something no sane person should ever consider. . . ."

It does not let on that it is talking about the only foreign policy this government has. And has the policy of a government of the U. S. ever been so widely discussed

in terms of "sanity" and "madness"—phrases that keep cropping up from the scientists and Lewis Mumford to Acheson and Eisenhower?

STAMMER AND ROAR

Listen to a president of the United States, colossus of the world, stuttering like an idiot as he discusses the H-bomb crisis before millions of listeners:

"Now the H-bomb. The H-bomb and the atomic age, they are not in themselves a great threat to us. Of course not. The H-bomb is a threat to us only if a potential aggressor who also has the secrets of the H-bomb determines to use it against us. [What world is he living in?] . . . So let us first then take these problems one by one. . . . By this I mean, let's take the Kremlin. The Kremlin, when we say that word we mean the Politburo and what may be its designs against us, what may be dictators, the dictators' intentions with respect to war and aggression, his plans to enslave the world. Of all these, of course, war imposes to us the gravest threat because of its destructive qualities." And so on, painfully.

The only relatively clear voice is that of Dulles, roaring in the posture known as "leading from strength," and this clear voice is invoking the threat of all-out war against Stalinist China if, when, on condition that . . . thundering speeches in terms of war threats while the whole world cowers before the realization of what might happen if he really meant what he says!

But at the same time the whole world knows what this "leading from strength" means. Before the British parliament Churchill reveals that Russia, if it is behind at all, is closer to the U. S. on the H-bomb than it was on the puny fission bomb. We learn indeed that it was only

with the March bombs that the U. S. caught up with Russia, which has been ahead! Few people raise the obvious question: Given equal H-bomb strength between Washington and Moscow, what about the targets? Even before 1950, when Truman made the fateful decision to go ahead with H-bomb development, his advisers had pointed out that the U. S. might find itself with a bomb but without a target. It is the U. S. that has the population and industrial concentrations that make it "worthwhile" to drop an H-bomb. There arise questionings about the meaningfulness of even the disastrous and reactionary military-based foreign policy of the U. S., which the secretary of state is now brandishing before the world in all its emptiness.

Lord, behold: even the New Leader prints an editorial about Washington's "atavistic" policy and asks ". . . wherein lies the policy of the U. S. in the global ideological struggle? . . . we were marching blindly. . . . Our hope now rests with statesmen and philosophers. . . ." In other words, wh-wh-where are we? True, soon that haunted look will die out of their eyes, color will return to their cheeks, and the editors will return to normal. . . .

FIRST CASUALTIES

At the same time that Dulles calls for "united action" of the Western allies on Indo-China, there has never been such an explosion of rage and frustration against U. S. policy on the part of its allies.

"It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the most serious political casualty from the hydrogen weapon explosions in the Pacific have been suffered by those governments, in Britain and in Europe, which are the most friendly to the U. S." (N. Y. Times, April 4.)

In Britain, Churchill speaks like a broken man. A newspaper like the Manchester Guardian demands calling off the H-bomb tests. Bidault in France speaks of "the sorcerer's apprentice." In Japan, a near-unanimous press (right to left) cries out in horror. "Barbarians" is heard from India, along with Nehru's call for an end to H-bomb blasts.

Meanwhile, as the whole world looks at the U. S. government as if it were run by cretins playing with dynamite, the Russians make the headlines too. For the first time they are talking about the H-bomb's threat to civilization. (Hypocritical? Of course, but that is not the point.) They make a grandstand play about joining NATO to ease the cold war. (A demagogic and meaningless gesture? Certainly.) They announce that East Germany is now sovereign. (A fake? Sure!)

The point is that while America is rattling the H-bomb, the Stalinists are fluttering their painted peace dove. See the contrast!—say the millions in the world who believe what they think they see more than exposés of Russian slave-labor camps, or at least are more impressed by the former.

WHO'S REALISTIC?

The point is not merely to "expose" the demagoguery of the Stalinist war camp and its political appeal. The fact is that all the U. S. camp has to offer as alternative is its own brand of blind-alley imperialist militarism, symbolized by the H-bomb. What the U. S. offers was also symbolized this past week, coincidentally, by two headlines: "Franco Parades U. S. Material" just received off the boat, and

"Chiang's Stock Rises" as Dulles moves toward a second Korea in Indo-China.

U. S. foreign policy is a shambles. The democratic anti-imperialist foreign policy we advocate may be subject to many criticisms, but at least we need not answer those who sneer at it as "unrealistic" because they can conceive of no policy that is not tied to the bewildered and confused ruling class of the U. S. While Dulles threatens a world holocaust over Indo-China we say: A democratic foreign policy would encourage the Indo-Chinese people, who want to fight against the Stalinists, to take over their own government from French domination, and unite the country behind a free, democratic independent government that could undercut Ho Chi Minh's support. Not H-bombs, or unity with the imperialist West against the imperialist East, but an unleashing of the democratic Third Camp forces in the world can counter the strategy of Stalinist expansionism; and nowhere in the world does this Third Camp policy offer a more realistic road than in Indo-China today, The current cruz of the war danger.

Such a policy cannot be expected of an American capitalist government; for such a policy, labor must strike out independently, in the U. S. as in Britain, Europe and Asia; but only along these lines lies sanity and realism under the cloud that rose out of the Pacific.

And tell us now: who else has a different line that can honestly be called even a POLICY, to stop war as well as the Stalinist threat?

European Labor —

(Continued from page 2)

emphasize the political struggle." But he loses this quintessential fact in ramblings over "diversity."

Arising out of varying backgrounds—entering political life sometimes where bourgeois democracy had hardly been born; sometimes where it had been half-established; sometimes where it had been firmly founded—the labor movement everywhere tends toward a common goal, despite its inevitable divergencies in outlook and ideology. In a century of class struggles, the international labor movement has created, tested and abandoned some programs and tactics; it has created and adopted others: all in pursuit of its never-ending struggle for "the establishment of a society without class privilege."

This is what emerges out of its experiences; its struggles of the past, defeats and victories, become a guide for the struggles of tomorrow. And this is what escapes our author completely.

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

ISL FUND DRIVE

Fund Drive Is in Danger!

By ALBERT GATES

One month remains for the Fund Drive from the time of this writing and the campaign is in real danger for the first time in the history of our Fund Drives.

With only four weeks remaining, only \$5526.50 has been contributed, and of this amount, less than \$4500 has been sent in by the branches assigned quotas. Fund Drive Director

We know from past experience that a real spurt takes place in the closing weeks of the drive, but we are too close to the

end and too far from our goal for comfort.

Too many areas are hovering around and below the 50 per cent mark, and they are the ones who are holding us back.

This last week brought in contributions totaling only \$355.50 at a time when we should be receiving over a \$1000 weekly. Only New York City is now keeping efforts at a fairly high level. With \$275.50 it is trying hard to meet the demands of its high quota of \$4000. It has now collected \$2179 and passed Pittsburgh and Cleveland in the standings.

A measure of the decline this past week is the fact that the standings, aside from New York, remain unchanged. In addition to New York, only Newark, Philadelphia and the National Office made contributions in this low week. Fourteen sections were not heard from at all.

The biggest mystery in the campaign remains Los Angeles. We would like to think that it is planning to send in its quota at one time since, to date, not a single penny has come in for the Coast's leading city. Seattle is just about as bad as Los Angeles. Had it not been for one of our old-time friends, that branch would be in the zero column too.

We have tried to keep our exhortations down to a minimum, but this is it, comrades and friends. We have to make it all up in the next few weeks or our Fund Drive will go under.

Only St. Louis and Reading have made 100 per cent or more of their goals. The other sixteen quotas have to make up the difference. We are counting on you to lift the drive up and quickly too.

BOX SCORE

	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$10,200	\$5526.50	54.1
St. Louis	25	50	200
Reading	50	50	100
Streator	25	20	80
Chicago	1800	1435	79.7
Nat'l Office	1500	1058	70.5
Newark	400	265.50	66.3
New York	4000	2179	54.4
Pittsburgh	150	81	54
Cleveland	150	75	50
Buffalo	300	138	46
Bay Area	500	210	42
Philadelphia	250	77	30.8
Detroit	300	50	16.6
Seattle	150	10	6
Los Angeles	600	0	0
Indiana	50	0	0
Akron	50	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1954 Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

NEW YORK

Celebrate May Day & 14 Years of the ISL

SPECIAL FILM
FEATURE

FOOD • DANCING

CAMARADERIE

at the
Women's Trade Union League
247 Lexington Avenue, N. Y. C.

SATURDAY EVENING
MAY 1