

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 30, 1956

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

Pussyfooting

The U. S. press has done a bit of gloating, not unjustified, about the mildness and ambiguity displayed even on colonial questions by the three neutralist heads of state at Brioni. Nehru, Nasser and Tito went very easy on the sore questions of Algeria and Cyprus, adopting the formula that "rights on both sides" must be respected.

Thus even on the colonial question the bloc of in-betweeners found it impossible to take a forthright stand. The French inhabitants of Algeria undoubtedly have rights that should be respected, as any national minority in a foreign country, but only after they respect the right of the majority to control their own destiny.

The reason for this pussyfooting by the One-and-a-Half Camp was explained in advance in these columns. Except insofar as their own interests are involved, these states do not want to fight either of the rival imperialisms; they want to reconcile them to each other.

This is why Nehru's neutralism is the very opposite of Third Camp policy, not a relative of it.

This is a political position. It has nothing to do with Nehru's undoubted personal (and the Indian people's mass) hatred of imperialist injustice, nor with the sincere expressions of general opposition to imperialism that come from him, or for that matter from Colonel Nasser.

Nasser's own emotions on imperialism have no doubt been raised to a boiling point by the tricky squeeze play which Washington has worked on Egypt in reversing its offer of aid to the Aswan Dam project. It appears that this reversal is a calculated risk to call Nasser's presumed bluff on Russian aid; the whole thing, on all sides, is a charade in power politics. But what we were going to say is: Nasser is now fulminating with hard language about Washington's shady motives and imperialist dealings, and most of this language is no doubt entirely just, but all that this "anti-imperialist" can think of doing is to fall back into the embrace of Russian imperialism.

Thus he makes Egypt a shuttlecock battered back and forth between the two rival war camps.

This is not "standing outside the two blocs." This is not "opposition to the policy of blocs." This is merely scuttling about in the no-man's-land between them.

Strong Language

We note that the maverick on the Subversive Activities Control Board, ex-Sen. Harry Cain, has used some smoking epithets to denounce the administration's bill to include all federal employees (not only those in "sensitive" jobs) in the security program, in order to nullify the

(Turn to last page)

NEW WARNINGS PILE UP AS PACIFIC BLASTS END—

H-BOMBS ARE POISONING THE PLANET'S ATMOSPHERE

Scientists Report Peril Deadlier Than AEC Has Admitted

By GENE LISTER

Since the Bikini H-bomb test and its fall-out effect on Japanese fisherman, a new phase of the atomic danger has arisen. Deadly windborne radioactivity has been a subject which governments have been reluctant to talk about but when bits of information do get out, a wave of horror runs around the world as the vastness of its danger becomes known.

This occurred on June 28 when the secret testimony of Lieutenant General Gavin, U. S. Army Director of Research and Development, became public. A routine release of a U. S. Government Printing Office pamphlet provided the leak which army officials belatedly made vain efforts to stop.

The report disclosed that Gen. Gavin in earlier secret testimony had answered a question as to the effect on Russia of an all-out assault by the United States

(Continued on page 4)

By HAL DRAPER

"Operation Alert," a civil-defense test, and the final shots in a series of H-bomb tests in the Pacific have coincided this past week to put the spotlight on both the give-and-take aspects of nuclear annihilation.

The main product has been the now standard mixture of official alarmism on the one hand and official soothing-syrup on the other. The first is designed to combat apathy about civil defense; the second is intended to prevent panic. The one expedient that the government authorities, it seems, have not yet decided to try is to tell the whole truth.

This has been indicated once again as Lewis Strauss, head of the Atomic Energy Commission, sought to assure the nation that the problem of radioactive fallout had been mastered. So, at least, said the headlines, as planned. It turned out, however, (a) that Strauss hadn't quite said that, really; and (2) that even the head of Congress's Joint Atomic Energy Committee had not heard about this great advance until he read it in Mr. Strauss's misleading headlines.

Meanwhile, "Operation Alert" closed with the official announcement that "millions" had been "killed" when 124 nu-

clear bombs were theoretically dropped on the U. S. during the test. Clearly this should have read tens of millions. In New York City alone, first estimates were over four million; then (*Times*, July 23) Lt. Gen. C. R. Huebner, state director of Civil Defense, estimated the "death toll" at five million.

If in the other 74 areas where bombs were theoretically dropped there were only a scant half-million deaths each, then the total death toll would have equalled the entire population of either France or England, or the total combined population of Argentina, Chile, Columbia and Peru.

It proved once again that a whole nation can be assassinated today, and that the meaning of war is qualitatively different from anything in the past.

THEY TALK OF LESSONS

In New York City, where the CD task of caring for the survivors was eased only by their relative fewness, Civil Defense Director Robert Condon used the occasion to announce that he needed a million dollars more in order to operate "efficiently."

This urgent request was somewhat counterbalanced by his admission in the same statement that an "adequate" defense of the city against H-bomb attack was impossible.

It seems that he needs the extra million in order to get to the point where he can begin to be inadequate efficiently.

"As an example of the problems of civil defense, Mr. Condon cited the inability of his organization to get delivery on \$75,000 in Geiger counters it had ordered."

On a national scale, Interior Secretary Seaton held a press conference on Monday at the secret (or at any rate, unpublicized) "emergency headquarters" of the operation, summing up its lessons. The *Times* headline said, "Efficiency Gain Shown..."

The main lesson learned, said the news report, is "most apparent in the types of mock emergency orders issued by the President"—namely, "a state of unlimited national emergency and a state of war," rather than a "martial law order."

One new discovery of this sort every year and we should be well prepared for all eventualities except a real emergency. (As the cartoonist Lichty has his CD director saying, "The test was a complete success. We now know how to cope with mock atom bombs.")

(Turn to last page)

Steel Union Raises Issue Of Co. Prices and Profits

By GORDON HASKELL

As this is being written, the papers announce that a settlement of the steel strike is expected before July 27.

If their predictions prove accurate, the strike will have lasted a total of 26 days. It appears that a settlement was made possible by the sudden decision of the companies to retreat from the adamant and unyielding position they had taken since the beginning of the strike.

The story is that this change of heart was brought about by the combination of a drastic reduction in steel inventories over the country, and strong pressure from the Republican administration which wants to present the country with as rosy an economic picture as possible in this pre-election period.

Present predictions are that whatever the terms of the final settlement will be, the steel industry will increase its prices, and that the increase will be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$8-10 a ton. What this will mean to consumers and the economy as a whole is obvious. In a period of economic stabilization and even

decline such as the present one, a steel price increase signals a further decline in production. A price increase at such a time is possible only because of the monopolistic character of the steel industry.

This steel strike has once again underlined two facts of major long-run importance to the development of the American labor movement. One is the fact that the clash between the economic interests of labor on the one hand and capital on the other leads to struggle, regardless of the social theories and wishes of the leadership of the labor movement. The other is that the labor movement has now become such an important sector of American so-

(Continued on page 3)

NATALIA TROTSKY DENOUNCES THE NEW REGIME OF STALIN'S HEIRS

... page 6

Rulers of America: A Dissection by Mills

... page 7

Marine Corps on Trial Before the Nation

... page 5

The British Auto Strike in Difficulties

... page 3

The Negro's Natural Ally: Labor

... page 2

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH on The Negro's Natural Ally: Labor, White and Black

Following are excerpts from the militant address to the recent San Francisco convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People made by A. Philip Randolph, president of the Sleeping Car Porters and the most prominent Negro union leader in the country.

Illiterate and emotional white and black workers are still played off against each other, thereby depressing already low wage rates in the South to lower levels which, in turn, weaken the economy of southern states by reducing the purchasing power of both sections of labor, black and white.

But, separation of workers, upon a basis of race and color, religion and nationality, is an abnormal condition since all workers have the same basic interest; namely, decent wages, improved working conditions and shorter hours of work. Nevertheless, these cannot be attained while laboring masses are divided, because division creates weakness which employers are shrewd enough to exploit.

Therefore, since well-nigh nine-tenths of Negroes are working people and must sell their labor in the market daily for wages with which to buy food, clothing and shelter, education and recreation, organized labor and the Negro have a natural basis for alliance.

As all the southern states have "right-to-work" laws, more appropriately labeled "right-to-wreck labor unions" laws, legislation to ban the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has also been enacted in southern states, including Louisiana and Alabama, with prospects of this plague spreading to other southern states.

As leaders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People are mobbed and lynched because of their fight for civil rights, labor leaders are, too, threatened, intimidated, kidnapped and, sometimes, shot and killed because of their efforts to organize workers into unions to fight for their labor's rights.

As the South's fight for states' rights is to enable it to be free to maintain segregation, it also resorts to the dogma of states' rights to outlaw labor organization.

Call to Freedom

In the official call for the September convention of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, A. Philip Randolph, on behalf of the Executive Board, starts out some distance away from bread-and-butter union problems, with an appeal to support the struggles of the colonial peoples against imperialism:

"Written in unmistakable and fearful lines across the world horizon are the signs of the end of the ruthless rule of the white man over the peoples of color in the world. This rejection of the overlordship of the white world applies to both the old capitalist colonial world powers, such as Great Britain, France, Italy, Spain and Holland, as well as it does to the Russian Communist Soviet Union.

"But since no great world power voluntarily surrenders its rule and control of people, however unjust, un-democratic and unchristian it may be, the old colonial world nations, with palsied and feeble hands, still seek to maintain their crumbling colonial empires by a policy of appeasement. But there is nothing more obvious in our contemporary times than that the subjugated, oppressed and exploited black, brown and yellow peoples of the world are no longer accepting a half a loaf of freedom and independence—they want the whole loaf."

As Negroes' rights are flouted and given less respect in the South, so does labor meet a comparable fate.

As civil rights organizations are weakest in the South, so are workers' labor organizations.

If the literacy test and poll tax and violence discourage the Negro vote, the poll tax and the literacy test also reduce the vote of the poor whites.

It is obvious that this condition demonstrates that Negro and white workers have more in common than they have in opposition. In fact, white workers have more in common with Negro workers than they have in common with White Citizens Councils and the Eastlands.

This fact has been obscured to poor whites by the identification of all whites in the South upon a basis of race instead of class. Southern white Bourbon rulers, faced with the possible unity of poor whites with poor blacks against poverty and illiteracy, low wages, poor working conditions and long hours of work, promptly gave the poor whites compensation for their economic, social and political inadequacies, in the form of the doctrine of racial superiority, while poor blacks looked with scorn and contempt upon their lowly white brothers.

Thus, if Negroes and poor whites fail to sense the necessity and value of unity as workers in trade unions and, too, at the ballot box, it is not because of a lack of a basic interest between them, but on account of ignorance....

But, since neither labor nor the Negro is fully free and because both can only survive and win their complete rights within the framework of a democratic society, Negroes and white trade unionists can most effectively advance their cause by the recognition of the common interest both have at the point of production, on the job and in the union hall, as well as at the ballot box.

Both have the problem of getting the southern political demagogues off their backs, who ride into office from year to year on the slogan of racialism. Both have the problem of liberating themselves from the economic clutches of exploitation of city industrial and financial capitalists of the South and a semi-feudalistic plantation oligarchy.

It is because of the logical and historical validity of these conditions that should make for unity of Negroes and trade unions. The moral alliance between Negroes and organized labor constitutes a major key, not only for the achievement of labor's and Negroes' as well as other minorities' rights but also for the consolidation and preservation of our democratic life. They are the test of the democratic process and the democratic philosophy....

Obviously, the development of a strong and aggressive labor movement in the South, embracing black and white workers, is the key to the transition of control of southern economy, state and local politics and governments from the weak and palsied hands of a rural, semi-feudalistic share-cropper and tenant farming economy, the breeding grounds of Ku Kluxism, White Citizens' Council, Racism, lynch-law and illiterate emotional white masses to an urban industrialism and labor unionism, where the paramount social struggle will shift from racialism to economic social and political reformism in the interest of higher wages and improved living standards and better government for all citizens, black and white.

Thus, the old South is deathly afraid of a growing, enlightened labor movement free from the illusions and frustrations of the dogma of racial superiority.

It is afraid that with the passing of segregation, now, free and independent voices among the repressed white population, including students in the schools and colleges as well as teachers, workers in trade unions, preachers in the churches, writers on daily press, will speak out in repudiation and condemnation of a desperate and decadent racist oligarchy.

LABOR SCOPE

Labor's Criticism of Dems Still Mounting

By BEN HALL

Criticism of the Democratic Party from the labor movement continues. Two weeks ago, we printed a sample of what is being said along these lines.

There was also a speech by former President Emil Rieve at the recent convention of the United Textile Workers Union: "the public opinion polls tell us that the president will be re-elected," he told the delegates. "Why? One reason I think is that the Democrats are offering little that is better. To be sure, there are Democrats and Democrats. But it is time the party realized that it cannot have one policy for Texas and another for New York, whether the issue is natural gas, the Taft-Hartley Act or segregation in the public schools. If the Democratic Party tries to work both sides of the street it will no longer deserve the support of the labor movement."

A columnist, B. A., in *Labor's Daily* (June 28,) ridicules the Democrats for adding a billion dollars to the arms budget over the objections of President Eisenhower.

By their action, he argues, "they have reinforced the glue on the label which may have been pasted on them. The label says 'War Party.' This does not mean the Democrats are about to provoke a war or even want one. It does, though, mean that they have adopted the philosophy of 'arm-to-the-teeth.'"

He insists that all wings are just as guilty, including Kefauver and Stevenson, and concludes: "Unless they produce a genuine peace platform the Democrats will have no chance—and no right—to supplant Eisenhower."

And William T. Evjue, editor of the *Madison Capital-Times*, returns to the theme, as quoted by *Labor's Daily*:

"Further evidence for the statement... that the words Republican and Democrat no longer have any meaning, was demonstrated last week in the announcement by Senator George of Georgia that he would not be a candidate for re-election. Immediately following came the announcement that President Eisenhower would name George as the president's ambassador to the NATO in Paris. The Republican president paid high tribute to this Tory Southern Democrat."

It all adds up to the most continuous, most public, most vigorous, most threatening criticism of the Democratic Party from spokesmen for organized labor since Roosevelt took over in 1932.

BARS DOWN

The Switchmen's Union has finally agreed to take in Negroes on the basis of full equality.

The union had been negotiating with the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, which acted for Negro switchmen. A collective-bargaining election was pending on the Central of Georgia Railroad with the Switchmen's Union competing against the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, a union which discriminates against Negroes.

After agreeing to withdraw all bars against Negroes, the Switchmen's Union won the election.

SILENCE IS NOT ENOUGH

In a statement on the Southern Congressional Manifesto, the Industrial Union Department (AFL-CIO) criticized the 96 congressmen who signed it as demonstrating "their contempt for equal rights for all Americans." And of those who did not sign, it said that mere silence is not enough, and demanded that the great majority in Congress "stand up and say so, in order that all of America and the rest of the world will know our country and its people overwhelmingly support the Supreme Court decision on desegregation."

Vigorous as the statement is, it would have been stronger and more effective, not to say more honest, if it had mentioned by name those signers who had

been supported by labor in the past, like Sparkman and Hill of Alabama.

RESISTANCE

Early this month, the CIO and AFL state organizations merged in Virginia to form a new federation representing 60,000 unionists. Speaking to the Virginia Federation of Labor as the personal representative of George Meany, Peter J. McGavin called for "the eradication of every vestige of discrimination, whether it be because of race, religion or national origin."

When Arkansas labor united, AFL-CIO Organizational Director Livingstone spoke as bluntly. But following the joint Arkansas convention, mergers took place in other Southern states (Louisiana, Tennessee) with no reports of open denunciations of Jim Crow.

McGavin's speech comes as a welcome sign; for while the labor movement officially backs the Negro struggle by a large majority, there is resistance to stated policy.

In Miami, an AFL central labor body tried to bar Negro delegates.

In Georgia, the State AFL convention and the Machinist's State Council endorsed the senatorial candidacy of Herman Talmadge, a man who stands for white supremacy and who, while governor, signed the state's "right-to-work law."

Along the same lines, the Metal Trades Council (AFL-CIO) in its May Bulletin expresses sympathy for "moderation," reminds us that "Social habits of many generations are not undone in a few weeks or months by legal action," and adds that "The feeling in the South is that time will eventually heal the wounds." It points out, too, that "Responsible Southern liberals have warned the NAACP and other groups not to push too hard."

ALLIED VICTIMS

If Negroes need civil rights in the South, so does the labor movement. Here are just a few recent incidents:

● In March, two ILGWU organizers were kidnapped in the city of Cullman, Alabama, and forcibly deported by five men armed with lead pipes. The FBI was not interested, and the union had to file a suit for damages.

● Columbia, Tennessee was recently the scene of a Till-type trial involving not a murdered Negro but a murdered striker. A scab, Roy Brindley, had confessed that he shot a striking carman to death during the Louisville, Nashville railroad strike last year. The judge permitted the exclusion of all union members from the trial jury; after only an hour's deliberation, the jury found the admitted killer not guilty.

● In Washington, D.C. two pickets from the Retail Clerks Union were beaten by thugs. The union asked for an FBI investigation of this violation of civil rights. Apparently J. Edgar Hoover was not interested.

PETRILLO, PATRIOT

James C. Petrillo continues to stand guard against subversion in music.

It seems that the State Department had canceled a foreign tour of the Symphony of the Air because it had discovered "subversives" in the 92-man orchestra. Perhaps it feared that some horn-tooter would sound a clear note of insurrection; or perhaps sound a sour note of simple harmonic sabotage.

Petrillo, it should be reported, protested because no proof of "subversion" had been adduced. He made clear, however, that he would never permit the overthrow of our American way of music: patriotic airs and loyal tunes.

"I appeal to you, Mr. Secretary," he wrote to Dulles, "that if, in fact, there is proof of subversive influences within the Symphony of the Air, that you arm me with that proof so that I may, as is my sworn duty, weed out these undesirable and save the good name and honor of a great cultural organization which, on its last tour to the Orient, was publicly described as your 'Ambassador of Democracy.'"

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

LONDON LETTER **British Auto Strike Finds Unions Lagging in the Crisis**

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, July 20

The battle lines are drawn up in the British automobile industry. Unless the situation changes drastically within the next few days some 48,000 workers employed in the five plants of the British Motor Corporation will not turn up to punch their time clocks on Monday morning.

The threatened strike arises from the decision of the company last month to fire some 6000 of its workers. The men were fired at a day's notice and without any prior consultation with either the men on the job or the union officials.

The blame for the situation, said the company, was due to the government's policy of higher purchase tax and stiffer installment-buying terms which caused a drop in home demand. Tougher markets abroad, due to import restrictions and intensified competition, had further worsened the situation.

The 15 unions with men working at the plants were caught with their pants down. They immediately raised a storm about not being consulted on the firings but it was only after a great deal of scratching around that they finally came across with some positive demands. Reinstate the sacked workers, they said, open negotiations on the whole question of the dismissals and, if any workers were eventually sacked, pay them money compensation.

By the time this policy had been

formulated, the men marked out for firing were already signing on at the Labor Exchanges for their relief money from state funds and, in some cases, were already at work in other jobs. This meant that the union leaders had to win support for their demands from the men left in the plants, who knew that they had escaped firing.

As could be expected in such a situation, certain sections of the workers showed little enthusiasm for any sort of action.

STAND PAT

The company flatly refused to concede to the demands of the unions. There could be no question, it said, of any payment of compensation. It was a national matter and could not be settled by any one firm acting on its own. Never before had any firm paid compensation and they were not going to set the pattern and maybe get themselves stuck out on a limb from the rest of Britain's employers.

After two days of talks arranged by the Ministry of Labor the firm still refused to budge and the unions—which had previously announced their intentions of calling a strike on July 23 if demands were not met—made preparations for downing tools.

Meanwhile there have been indications that all is not well in the auto plants. In one of the tool rooms (where the

highest paid workers are employed) 200 men made public their intention of refusing to follow the strike call. Today there are tales that in another plant of the company, shop stewards organized their own ballot on the question of striking with the result that 1284 votes were cast against strike action and only 241 in favor.

NO PLANS

The press has, of course, magnified these happenings as an example of the "intelligent approach of the workers in contrast to the lunacy of the unions." The tame industrial correspondents have tried hard to spread confusion among the workers at BMC and to raise serious doubts about the response to the strike call on Monday.

In the current situation such an occurrence was inevitable. It stems from the fact that the unions had no plans whatsoever prepared in advance.

By the time they had worked out their demands the workers marked out for firing had already been fired. No agreements exist at all to cover such an eventuality as layoffs, and as a consequence the union officials were working under the handicap of knowing that the firm had already made its move, the men left felt relieved that they had been passed over, and that they were starting from scratch in trying to formulate a policy.

This brought out quite clearly the

situation, commented upon in a previous London Letter, that the peak period of the unions' bargaining power has passed.

What will be the outcome of the current auto dispute is anybody's business. But it may have one happy result. It may make British trade-unionists, leaders and rank and file alike, realize that they cannot meet modern problems with old fashioned ideas.

The current sackings in the automobile industry are due to economic policies of governments endeavoring to stave off inflation, but they might just as well have been due to automation or some other process of technological change. The unions would still have had no plans to meet them.

THINKING THROUGH

Many British trade-unionists are still thinking in the terms of putting forward a bald slogan like "No Sackings." Instead of seriously getting down to winning agreements on seniority rights, severance pay, compensation for family hardships, retraining schemes and the like, they are following the crackpots who think that all the problems can be solved by insisting that the companies should retain their existing labor force no matter what happens.

It is tough, of course, that the speeding up of automated techniques in Britain should coincide with the credit-squeeze policies of the Tory government, because the problems confronting the trade unions are made that much harder. But harder problems demand harder thinking and, unfortunately, there is little indication at present that any measurable section of the British trade-union movement is getting down to thinking along the right lines. With all the experiences of the American trade unions in recent years to draw on this is nothing less than tragic.

Steel Union Raises Issues — —

(Continued from page 1)

ciety that its actions affect the whole in vital ways.

Even though some labor leaders want to conduct their relations with the employers on the narrowest basis of "business unionism," when major struggles erupt they are compelled to frame their arguments in terms of the broadest social interest.

Where the first point is concerned, the record of David J. McDonald is so well known throughout the labor movement that little need be said about it here. He is the most dramatic living spokesman of the Chamber of Commerce attitude in the labor movement. His notorious tour through the steel mills with Benjamin Fairless will long be remembered as one of the most purile stunts a labor leader has been sucked into in many a decade.

But all his brotherly relations with the steel magnates; the fact that their journalistic spokesman in Pittsburgh and throughout the nation have hailed him and pointed to him as the finest example of labor statesmanship and to his attitude as the acme of labor-management cooperation—all that did not prevent the steel strike.

McDONALD LETTER

When the strike was entering its fourth week with no sign of any break in the bosses' uncompromising attitude, David McDonald sent a letter to members of the Cabinet, congressmen, federal and state officials, and other "national leaders." The letter was carried in full in the New York Times for July 23, and presented the steel workers' case in its broadest economic terms.

It summarized two studies made by the United Steelworkers' research staff of the economy of the steel industry. It is exceptionally interesting because of the facts about the steel industry which it presents, and it is exceptionally instructive because of the approach and argumentation it employs.

The cornerstone of the argument and of the facts marshalled to bolster it is that productivity in steel has been rising far faster than real wages. This has meant that despite substantial wage increases over the years, despite a rising standard of living for steel workers, the share of total production going to profits has increased.

This, the Steel Workers say, is dangerous to the whole economy. It has been taking place, they claim, throughout the economy during the past year, but at a steeper pace in steel. The reason for the special case of steel is, once again, the monopolistic character of the industry which has enabled it to increase prices much faster than its costs have increased.

SOME FIGURES

Here is how McDonald's summary of this economic study puts it:

"...labor's share in the economy, as well as in steel, has fallen in the last year and consumer purchases are lagging. Unless corrected, this could spell trouble.

"With confidence in the fundamental strength of our economic system, and with faith in its potential growth..."

Here we have the usual and standard bowing to the capitalist system in a report which actually challenges its premises. The report continues:

"Productivity... has been increasing more than 3 per cent per year. In manufacturing industries, the annual rate has been exceeding 4 per cent. Automation will increase the pace... Real hourly earnings in manufacturing fell behind the rise in productivity at the time of the Korean war and have not caught up yet. This disparity must be corrected through rising real wages."

At another point the report says:

"Taking the years 1939-1956 (more than sixteen years), we find the 'real' productivity increase in the steel industry to be 68.8 per cent. For the same period, the 'real' straight-time average hourly earnings of the steel worker rose only 47.1 per cent."

And elsewhere: "For each \$1 increase in labor costs since 1945, exorbitant price increases have yielded \$3.18 in additional revenues. The figures on material costs are equally startling. Materials costs since 1947 have risen about 28 per cent, but steel prices in the same period have risen 78.2 per cent—an excess of price increases over cost increases of nearly 3 to 1."

The study goes on to say:

"Within the framework of its 1956 operations, the steel industry could absorb for a full year a wage 'cost' increase which would meet the needs of its em-

ployees, forego a price increase, and end up with net profits comparable to the huge profits of prior years. The return on net worth would still be nearly double the fair and reasonable rate of 6 per cent—and the return on sales would be well above the 4.3 cents for all manufacturing corporations in 1956."

And finally:

"...the steel industry's share of the sales dollar in gross profit has risen from 10.9 cents in 1947 to a rate of 16.2 cents in 1956. But in shocking contrast to this, an analysis of the eleven companies on which proper information was available reveals that wages and salaries, as a share of the sales dollar, have been reduced from 40.5 cents in 1939 to 35.5 cents in 1955! In other words... the wage earner's portion of the sales dollar has grown smaller and smaller. The facts reveal, for example, that despite the hourly wage increases (plus pension and insurance improvements) in 1954 and 1955, the actual labor cost per ton of steel produced is less in 1956 than it was in 1954!"

HISTORY: 1946

It is nothing new for a union, even a very conservative one, to work up such an analysis during wage negotiations. These are usually employed for the purpose of bolstering the conviction of the membership and winning general sympathy from consumers and the public for their cause. By sending this open letter to the leaders of the administration, however, McDonald has, in a very mild way, projected the struggle in the steel industry onto the plane of politics.

A bit of history may point up the significance of McDonald's letter further.

In 1946 during the great post-war strike wave which consolidated the position of the modern labor movement in America, Walter Reuther put forth the famous "GM Program." The salient features of this program were a demand for wage increases without price increases, and a demand that GM open its books to the union so that the workers and the public could verify the validity of GM's claim that it could not give a wage increase without increasing the prices of automobiles.

Reuther's program was a bold new departure for the labor movement. It was so bold that it got little response

from the rest of the labor leadership.

As a matter of fact, Philip Murray, then leader of the CIO and the Steelworkers, undercut Reuther's struggle at GM by settling the steel strike which was going on at the same time on a basis which accepted the industry's demand for a price increase. It was widely known in the labor movement at the time that Murray thought very little of Reuther's "highfalutin'" theories about the relations of prices and wages to the health of the economy as a whole, and even less of the social leadership for the labor movement implicit in his program. "There is nothing wrong with this economy that a dollar a day in the paycheck won't cure," he is reported to have said at that time.

Now, it is true that the steel union's demands in this strike did not fully reflect the argumentation in the economic studies publicized by McDonald. The union did not make opposition to an increase in steel prices part of its demands. That is too much to expect from McDonald's leadership.

But the fact remains that even this, conservative leadership is compelled to justify and explain its struggle in terms which go beyond Phil Murray's narrow "a dollar in the paycheck" economies. In so doing, they have been compelled to educate the workers and the nation to a broader understanding of labor's role in this society.

STALINIST RUSSIA

A MARXIST ANALYSIS

By Tony Cliff

\$2.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Strategy for Labor

To the Editor:
The job of LABOR ACTION should be to destroy the illusions remaining within the labor movement about the role and potentialities of the Democratic Party—not to pander to those illusions as does the article by R. M. and B. S. (July 16) entitled "A Convention Strategy for Labor."

The article is devoted to advising those labor bureaucrats who will be delegates to the Democratic Party convention to "oust the South from the Democratic Party." Nowhere does it mention those obviously sectarian and dogmatic socialist beliefs—that the Democratic Party is a capitalist party (i.e., a party dominated by the capitalist class through its political representatives), that the very presence of labor leaders in such a convention is a class-collaborationist betrayal of the interests of the labor movement, and that the first thing these leaders should do is to walk out.

And how does this article propose to "oust the South?" By adopting a militant civil-rights plank in the Democratic platform! But aren't the writers of the article aware that the platform promises of capitalist parties are pure demagoguery—that there is no intention of carrying them out? The Democratic Party had, once before, a militant civil-rights plank—in 1948. The Dixiecrats split and the Democrats won the election. Whereupon the party immediately reunited and not the slightest portion of the brave civil-rights program was enacted.

The "strategy" suggested by this article would at best lead to a repetition of the 1948 fiasco. In this field as in every other, labor will start to follow "a progressive policy" only when it leaves the Democratic Party.

In sum, this article is permeated with the spirit of "tail-ending" the labor bureaucrats and of support to the Democratic Party. What business do socialists have arguing against something because it "would lead to the defeat of the Democratic Party at the polls?" Why interpret the efforts of hypocritical liberal politicians to capture the Negro vote as "an historically crucial role?"

The authors' total lack of an independent class perspective is nowhere better indicated than in their statement that "In the long run labor must free itself of its alliance with the right-wing Fair Deal Democrats" [Italics mine—S. M.]. Thus the idea of a class party of labor, free from the embrace of Humphrey, Lehman, Douglas et al., (the "left wing" Fair Dealers) is not even envisaged for the "long run," and till then labor is consigned to a class-collaborationist swamp including everybody but the Dixiecrats.

Such an article doesn't belong in LA. It would fit better in the Daily Worker. Independent Socialists should concentrate on pointing out the immediate need for a Labor Party and the fact that there is only one "progressive policy" open to workers in this election—a socialist protest vote.

SHANE MAGE

The approach to this question which is taken by LABOR ACTION was clearly explained in our June 25 issue on "Labor and the Democrats," in the article "A Challenge to Labor's 1956 Politics," by our labor editor Ben Hall. He wrote in conclusion:

"Such a genuine fight for labor's program inside the Democratic Party is the least that can reasonably be expected from anyone who claims to believe, as so many do, that it is possible by supporting Democrats and other old-party candidates to further the workers' interests and the needs of progress.

"We ourselves believe that these aims can be achieved only by taking the first step of breaking with the old parties, forming a labor party. We even venture to predict that labor can find out that this is true through making a real fight inside the Democratic Party. Or if this opinion is false, it can be disproved in the same way: by carrying on the fight to the end.

"But first of all for its own reasons, not for ours, the labor movement is pushed into conflict with the conservative and reactionary machines of the old parties. It is only a question of whether it will

truly hold up its own end in this conflict, whether it will stand by the Michigan platform and draw all the conclusions there from."

This was also the concluding and orienting thought of the chapter on "Labor and the Democrats" in our May 14 pamphlet-issue on "Labor Politics in America," which argued that labor cannot reform the Democratic Party or get anywhere by throwing its support to Fair-Dealers (left or right) but must break with all wings of this party and form a labor party. It addresses a challenge to those who disagree with this aim and this evaluation of the capitalist parties. It proposes a road of action which, in our opinion, will show them in practice that they too must move in this direction.—Ed

SP and Mollet

To the Editor:

I read David McReynolds' letter on the Socialist Party convention and related matters in the July 23 issue of LABOR ACTION with considerable interest. One section of it, however, that dealing with the Socialist Party and Guy Mollet, I read with amazement. Comrade McReynolds seemed to say, if I understand him, that the SP's silence on Mollet's Algerian war was due in part to "essentially healthy unwillingness to attack those we consider to be comrades."

I agree that it is understandable and even healthy for socialists to be unwilling to attack those they consider to be comrades. That is a general proposition. But it is surely evident that under the cover of this proposition one should not include the actions of comrades, however honorable their past record may be thought to be, which are bringing dishonor and discredit on the socialist movement as a whole.

I am also sure that all of us prefer to work with people who "are slow to believe bad reports of those they consider comrades, than with people who are so speedy as to seem almost eager to find points of disagreement." But what in the world has this to do with the Socialist Party's reaction to the brutal imperialist war France is waging, under a Socialist premier, against the Algerian people?

The "bad report" in this case is not some corridor gossip spread by malicious persons, or even some vague rumor which should be thoroughly checked before it is given credence. It is a war which is being conducted by Mollet in the sight of the whole world; for which he has asked the French Chamber for additional appropriations; for which tens of thousands of French youths have been called to the colors. It is a war, further for which Guy Mollet has sought the sanction of the Russian Stalinist government!

I do not doubt for a moment that there are many in the Socialist Party in this country (as there are in France itself) who are dismayed by Mollet's action. But I suspect that the reluctance of the party leadership to make a public criticism of Mollet's action requires a different explanation than a reference to a commendable slowness in believing "bad reports" about their comrades.

LARRY O'CONNOR

Scientists Report

(Continued from page 1)

with nuclear weapons. As reported in the N. Y. Times his reply was:

"Current planning estimates run on the order of several hundred million deaths that would be either way depending on which way the wind blew. If the wind blew to the southeast they would mostly extend into the Japanese and perhaps into the Philippine area. If the wind blew the other way they would extend well back into Western Europe."

Horrible as is the aftermath of atomic weapon explosions, the menace of radiation death and sickness is not confined to these alone. That the disposal of radioactive wastes from atomic power plants is a vast potential hazard has been known to physicists and biologists for some time. This is true not only to those immediately exposed but also through the damaging effect on the reproductive organs to succeeding generations.

POISON DOSES

The whole problem of radiation sickness is covered in the just-released report of the Genetics Committee of the U. S. National Academy of Science, "Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation." H. J. Muller of the University of Indiana, a member of this committee, gives a clear picture of many of its findings in the June 9, 1956 issue of the Saturday Review in his article "Poisoning by Radiation."

Dr. Muller explains that in the atomic bombing of Japan many more people were killed by the blast, fire and heat rays than by high-energy radiation. Today, however, the H-bomb emits radioactive dust, or fall-out, that is lethal over an area of thousands of square miles, more than one hundred times that ravaged by the blast alone.

In the surrounding areas of a bombing some survivors of the physical blast may receive a total of 1000 roentgens in the ensuing week or two. (The roentgen is the commonly used unit of radioactive dosage.) Even in a well-protected basement 100 miles from the blast, 100r might be received during the first week. A dosage of 1,000r is several times enough to kill if received all at once; over a week's period it would cause pronounced radiation sickness.

Such radiation sickness results in loss of resistance to all diseases, failure of blood to clot, internal bleeding, and other fatal malfunctions. Dr. Muller states that even dosages of 50 to 100r delivered to a young fetus can give rise to permanent physical abnormalities such as occurred with some children at Hiroshima several months after the bombing.

The delayed effects of even minor dosages over a long period of time is one of the most insidious effects of radiation sickness. It has been established that for each roentgen received by the whole body, even if not more than a few per day, there will be a loss of five days to two weeks of a person's life. No specific ailment is produced by such exposure; the victim is merely more susceptible to death from all causes.

GENETIC EFFECT

This scientific fact clearly negates often repeated government statements that various people who have been exposed to radiation of 100 to 1000r are suffering no ill effect. It can be expected that such people who are 30 years of age, after exposure to 1000r, will probably die within 10 years even though they appear normal now.

Aside from the life-shortening effect, Dr. Muller points out that there is also a harmful effect on the reproductive cells which results in changes or mutations in the genes of our children. These mutations, which occur naturally to a small degree, always tend to result in a physical weakness or defect. In major cases our children may be monstrosities; in minor instances they may have a lower intelligence or be more susceptible to disease.

The Academy of Science report goes into considerable detail on these mutations and how much radioactive dosage can be tolerated. The conclusion is that, on the average, if in the course of a generation (30 years) an individual receives 30 to 80r, the number of mutations among his offspring is doubled. The chance of defectiveness in his children is thereby doubled.

Dr. Muller's analysis also discusses the occupational hazards of atomic-energy installations such as power plants. In government-sponsored projects an officially permissible dosage of 0.3r is set. Actually the usual exposure is about one-fifth of this amount. At this lesser quantity a worker would receive 15r in five years.

In the future private atomic industry the worker, particularly in times of skilled labor scarcity, would undoubtedly continue on his job for a much longer period. Also private industry would unquestionably crowd the permissible limits of dosage and in the first ten years a worker might receive 150r. This not only would materially increase the chance of harmful mutations in his children but his own life would be shortened one to two years for each 10 years of work in such a plant.

Muller estimates the cost of preventive safety measures as small, not over \$4000 for 40 years of a man's work. This is a small price for four to eight years of life. An energetic and enlightened safety program by the unions involved will be necessary to prevent a disastrous waste of life.

TOWARD PROTECTION

Such has been the concern of scientists as well as the general public over radiation sickness and atomic weapon tests that on July 19 the Atomic Energy Commission was forced to issue an ambiguous and vague soothing statement. This was to the effect that more recent Pacific bomb tests have indicated that it is possible by "operational procedure" to minimize the "widespread fall-out hazard." No details or proofs were given and the statements appear to have allayed little the growing horror of radiation sickness.

The above reports sometimes motivate a reaction that not only weapon-testing but all work and development on atomic energy should immediately cease. To the enlightened socialist the proper conclusion is rather that we should replace the military misuse of atomic technology by its application to useful peaceful purposes alone. The problem is that under capitalism the balance between the use and misuse of most scientific advances is always stacked against the interests of the working people and the long-range goals of mankind.

As the world moves forward into the atomic age the people, to fully protect themselves and their children, should demand the immediate stoppage of the testing and production of atomic weapons. Also, as the technology of atomic power plants and other uses of nuclear energy develops, more than adequate safety precautions, regardless of cost, should be incorporated in each installation. There should be an end of secrecy, with periodical investigations and reports by scientists of the hazards in the application of new knowledge.

We simply cannot permit capitalism to exploit nuclear energy in the way it has exploited all of our resources in the past. Time is running out unless we can soon forge a society which can safely and democratically apply its scientific and technological advances for the benefit of all rather than the profit of the few. Mankind just can't afford to muffle this one.

To Understand Russia & Stalinism

Is Russia a Socialist Community?
Debate between Earl Browder & Max Shachtman 50

Stalinist Apologists: A Review of Isaac Deutscher,
by Max Shachtman. In three issues of New Internationalist..... 75

The New Course, & The Struggle for the New Course,
by Leon Trotsky & Max Shachtman 1.50


Stalinist Russia,
by Tony Cliff 2.00

Stalin, A Political Biography,
by Leon Trotsky 4.00

The Revolution Betrayed,
by Leon Trotsky 2.50

The Case of Leon Trotsky. Verbatim Report of Dewey Commission Hearings on the Moscow Trials 4.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.



LABOR ACTION

July 30, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 31

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
Associate Editors:
GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Marine Corps on Trial Before the Nation

By SAM TAYLOR

Last April six Marine Corps recruits were drowned while on a disciplinary night march in a South Carolina swamp. A nation-wide protest was raised over the death of the six-teen-agers, and Marine Sergeant McKeon who led them on the Ribbon Creek death march is now facing court-martial for involuntary manslaughter.

Who was responsible for this tragedy at Parris Island? The sergeant? the Marine Corps? or was it just a horrible accident?

The initial protest was raised against the well-known brutal training procedures of the Marine Corps. But then the sergeant was reported to have been drunk; perhaps he was a drunken sadist? Or perhaps the drill instructor had abused the Corps' training instructions and therefore the Marines themselves were not to blame?

Now accidents during training are not infrequent occurrences. As long as men engage in the art of war, some will be killed learning this art. If it was at all humanly possible, the Marine Corps would have liked to deal with the sergeant in an intramural family affair. But once the news was out and the outcry raised, there was only one course of action: The proud and arrogant Marine Corps had to find a public scapegoat—Sergeant McKeon.

In a certain sense the Marine Corps like the FBI occupies a special niche in—or rather above—other institutions. It possesses the proudest tradition as the shock troops of the armed forces. It claims to have fought the toughest battles and conquered the most stubborn adversaries. However, a part of the truth closer to fact is that it has been the darling of every jingo publicist who has puffed up forays against Tripoli pirates and weak Central American republics

N. Y. YSL Conference One of Its Best

By BOGDAN DENITCH

The New York Young Socialist League held a highly successful two-day membership conference on the week-end of July 14-15. Both units of the YSL in New York participated in the conference, which was highlighted by a very high level of membership participation on the many points of YSL work and program that were under discussion.

The major emphasis of the conference was placed on the various current arenas of socialist youth work; that is, participation in the struggles of the Negro people for equality, work with liberals in defense of civil liberties, and efforts to educate supporters of Stalinism on its true nature. In addition, the conference discussed ANVIL, YSL activity on the campuses, and the problems of the N. Y. YSL organization.

The close fraternal relations between the YSL and the Independent Socialist League was underlined by the presence of ISL fraternal delegates, who brought fraternal greetings to the conference and participated in some of the discussions. A general feeling of optimism and of renewed possibilities for socialist activity and organizational growth was evident among the delegates, many of whom had been only recently recruited to the YSL.

This conference had in general a very good effect on the members of the N. Y. YSL, demonstrating as it did the high level of internal democracy and membership participation on which the YSL prides itself.

into exploits of superhuman bravery.

While the Marine Corps has attempted to try Sergeant McKeon in the press, the reaction to the Ribbon Creek death march has spread to the Corps itself. As the court-martial opened, the Marine commandant General Randolph McC. Pate knew that not only McKeon was on trial. The general is reported to have said that "The whole country has interested itself in the cause of death of these marines and the Marine Corps is, in a moral sense, on trial as to its responsibility."

But while the Marine Corps may have a talent for recognizing the obvious, it is also adept at producing a pat answer absolving itself of any real responsibility. The letter from General Pate to Navy Secretary Charles Thomas (the Marine Corps is technically part of the navy) contained the central core of the Marines' argument. It contains a paragraph which is a gem—every phrase contains a lie or a distortion:

"Since World War II some practices have crept into the handling of raw recruits which are not only unnecessary, but do not comport with the dignity of the individual or his self-respect. Such practices were extremely rare in the past. While they are still relatively rare, I attribute their increasing appearance in recent years to the lack of judgment on the part of a certain few drill instructors."

The issue in this case is not whether a "certain few drill instructors" have corrupted the Marine Corps' dignified training program. The issue is whether it is the Marine Corps which is responsible.

PRODUCING KILLERS

The Marine Corps is in the business of producing killers. Its job is to take more or less normal youth and, within the shortest period of time, brainwash them of every decent sentiment and change them into highly proficient automatons. Self-respect and dignity of the individual have to be destroyed under the whiplash of blind unswerving obedience to the orders of the commanding officers.

This is the meaning of the notoriously

YSL CAMP

The Young Socialist League national office has announced its 1956 Camp and Summer School, to take place from Sept. 3 (beginning with supper) through Sept. 9, at the Mountain Spring Camp in Washington, New Jersey.

A class will be led by Hal Draper, on Capitalist and Stalinist Imperialism; by Max Shachtman, and others. There will be swimming, sports, games, socials, and sunshine.

Rates for the full camp period are as follows: Room in Lodge \$40; in cabin \$38; in dorm \$35. Rates for the weekend of Sept. 8-9 alone are \$14, \$13, and \$12 respectively. Rates for other periods pro-rated; advance reservations required. Reservations should be sent in immediately to the YSL at 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C., with \$5 deposit for full reservations or \$2 for weekend reservation. (Make checks payable to Max Martin.)

rough Marine training, or else it has no meaning. The drill instructor was only carrying out his job as he understood it. It is difficult to believe that the Marine Corps itself was unaware of the practices at the boot camps. Or perhaps the drill instructors had terrorized the Marine commandant along with the raw recruits and it is only now at long last under the publicity of this tragedy that the Marine commandant and the Navy Department are able to speak out against the breaches of "Marine legality."

From the beginning of the court-martial the official Navy Department posture has been to impede the legal defense of Serg. McKeon. But it appears that the Marine Corps has a divided heart.

On one side they have to placate public opinion over the death of the six recruits, and on the other they have to placate the professionals who make up the backbone of the Marine Corps; the latter protest that McKeon is being made to take the rap, and a "there but for the grace of God go I" feeling permeates their ranks.

The main line of defense for Sergeant McKeon, as stated by his attorney Emile Zola Berman, is to prove that McKeon was only carrying out standard operating procedure for a drill instructor. He is raising questions like: Were such mass punishments relatively rare? Wasn't mass punishment practiced by drill instructors prior to and during training for World War II? Did officers of the Marine Corps tacitly condone such practices?

To any one who knows anything about Marine Corp training practices there is no doubt that McKeon's lawyer will be highly successful in answering these questions to his client's advantage. But when he concludes that McKeon is then only guilty of a tragic mistake in judgment, it will be difficult to swallow.

QUESTIONNAIRE

One of the interesting features of the court-martial thus far is the scramble for the mantle as defender of Marine Corps traditions.

The initial response of the Marine Corps after the drownings was to justify Marine training practices. It sent out a questionnaire to over 27,000 former Marines inquiring about their attitude toward the training they received—mostly whether or not it prepared them for battle. From all indications, an overwhelming majority seem to have replied that they thought their military training was adequate or they thought it was necessary, and some thought that it should have been tougher. Now it is difficult to know just which aspect of their Marine training they were commenting about—the training in the use of weapons and combat tactics or the brutal treatment to which they were often subjected.

The Marine Corps then proudly announced the results of the questionnaire—the overwhelming approval by ex-Marines. However, when McKeon's lawyer demanded access to the questionnaires, since their result fitted into the main line of his defense, Secretary Thomas refused. He replied that "in the absence of a showing that the information so gained may be material and relevant to the issues, I do not see fit to make the questionnaires available for your inspection." However, the legal officer or judge at the trial ruled that the navy had to make the questionnaires available to the defense.

Once backed into this position by the clever maneuvering of McKeon's lawyer, the Navy Department has reluctantly

yielded, and only under the pressure of adverse publicity.

ON A LIMB

The Marine Corps has climbed out onto a limb where it is virtually declaring that it had little control over the activities of the drill instructors, that virtually all the drill instructors are violating the Marine Corps' rules for treatment of recruits, and that now the rules will be enforced, changed, or something.

In defense of Sergeant McKeon, his lawyer is able to assert:

"The mission of this command is to produce Marines. The methods by which that mission has been fulfilled are the very warp and woof by which this corps has formed its tradition. These methods require no apology, either by the Corps or by Sergeant McKeon. Even if there are others who think there should be an apology, that apology should not come from Sergeant McKeon."

It is little wonder that Marine General Pate said that the Marine Corps is on trial, but he did not know that it would be the defense and not the Marine Corps who would do the defending.

Since both sides agree that the Marine Corps' training methods are to be defended, although it is by no means certain that they are both talking about the same thing, does it follow that Sergeant McKeon is only guilty of a tragic mistake in judgment?

In a sense the important thing is not the error in judgment, real or alleged, in this particular disciplinary measure. It is the reason why they were being disciplined, which shows that Marine brutality has very little to do with battle training.

According to one of the participants, Pvt. Melvin Barber, in testimony at the trial, McKeon decided on the discipline (which started with cleaning the barracks for an entire day) for two reasons: (1) during a smoking break some of the recruits sat down on the grass, and (2) at chow some of the fellows had seconds. It was these two "major" infractions of Marine discipline and a day-long bout with a bottle of vodka which led to the tragic events in which six lives were needlessly lost.

Sergeant McKeon is both the victim and participant in the vicious training methods which characterize the Marine Corps. It is a system where thousands of raw recruits and teen-agers are placed at the mercy of a debasing process and under the command of an organization that has more than its share of sadists.

While Sergeant McKeon and the Marine Corps are on trial at Parris Island, the responsibility is much broader. It extends to Congress where political cowardice solidifies into inaction. In a time when everything is investigated from airplane crashes to authors who write books with which certain Congressmen disagree, no one in Congress has moved a finger to investigate what goes on at these Marine camps.

N. Y. YSL FORUM
FRI., Aug. 3 at 8:30

A HISTORY OF THE
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST
MOVEMENT

by Albert Gates

Followed by discussion, refreshment,
folk-singing.

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

NATALIA TROTSKY Broadcasts to Russian People: New Regime of Lies— But Stalin's Old Methods

TEXT OF THE SPEECH
BY NATALIA TROTSKY
RECORDED IN MEXICO CITY
AND RECENTLY BROADCAST
TO RUSSIA VIA RADIO
LIBERATION

This is Natalia Ivanovna Sedova, widow of Leon Davidovich Trotsky, speaking from Mexico City. I am addressing myself to the workers and peasants and, in the first place, to the young people in Soviet Russia.

The present rulers, Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan and others, having inherited the Stalinist dictatorship, are conducting an intensive propaganda campaign so as to distract from themselves the powerful wave of dissatisfaction and hatred for the thieves of the victories of the proletarian revolution, a wave which grew in your hearts.

They are the same men who supported Stalin in all his bloody massacres, the aim of which was to frighten you with terror and thus to retain power in the hands of the Stalinist bureaucracy. The very method of the campaign through which these men hope to absolve themselves of responsibility for their heinous crimes bears witness to the fact that the ruling clique is Stalin's faithful successor.

Stalin always followed the "scapegoat" method for failures of plans and orders arbitrarily enforced from above. Local bureaucrats tagged the blame on helpless workers and peasants and the GPU (secret police) did the rest.

Stalin himself did not spare even his most devoted servants, especially if they betrayed any trace of indecision or doubts. Stalin forced them to confess uncommitted crimes and heaped on them the blame for the decay and corruption of the regime. This method was already devised during the period of the old struggle against the Left Opposition headed by Leon Trotsky, and this method subsequently became the chief characteristic of the Stalinist system.

What then is the present campaign if not a continuation of the same method, but with one serious difference—today's scapegoats are really guilty of crimes of which they are accused.

Beria was first. Then three years passed—three long years—before the present bosses dared to expose the criminal in the corpse of their leader. Now they declare to the entire world that in the process of building up the "cult of personality" Stalin lost his mental balance. His ailment, it appears, consisted in lacking complete confidence in the Molotovs, Khrushchevs, Kaganoviches and their like who were nonetheless completely devoted to him.

THEY CAN'T LAST

Just try and think: Who are these direct heirs of the unbalanced Stalin who declared themselves collective leaders of Soviet Russia? They admit, they admit to the entire world, that for many decades not one among them, among the collective leaders, dared—for fear for his own life—to come out with a proposal for steps which would have saved the lives of millions of workers and peasants who were banished to concentration camps.

These are the nonentities who dare to demand from Russian workers and peasants unimaginable sacrifices in the struggle for a great cause.

How long will they hold on under the pressure of great events? All their lives they showed no interest in improving the lot of the toilers; they were interested

only in holding on to power and to all the privileges that go with power.

Besides, the training they received from Stalin makes the realization of a collective leadership unlikely even in the imperfect form they have in mind. How can they trust each other knowing full well that while Stalin was alive each one among them would have been happy to sacrifice all and everything just to hold on to his own power and position? Events unfold slowly but it is unlikely that this leadership will last long.

I realize with bitterness that many of my listeners were brought up completely in a Stalinist spirit. Young people were taught history which was thoroughly permeated with lies. Even those grains of truth which the rulers were forced to admit now make impossible the use of old history textbooks.

Yet the new textbooks which are now being prepared, will they be more truthful than the old ones? The rulers of Russia are in a dilemma: which lies to admit and which lies to retain intact?

WHAT THEY WON'T TELL

How can Khrushchev admit that the campaign of annihilation of the Stalinist leadership in the Ukraine, including Kossior, Antonov-Ovseyenko and others—a campaign which Khrushchev himself conducted while Stalin was alive—was based on lies?

How can Voroshilov, this venerable chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, dare to admit openly that while signing the death sentences of the Red Army commanders Tukhachevsky, Yegorov, Gamarnik and others, he knew full well that all this was nothing but lies and frameup?

And the statesman Molotov—will he tell of the beautiful friendship with Hitler and Ribbentrop which culminated in Stalin's signing of the Hitler pact and which gave a green light to a world war?

The murder of Kirov in 1934 gave impetus to an unequalled campaign of executions and slander directed against entire strata of the Russian population. Will the leaders of the present regime tell us who is guilty of this crime? Will they admit that behind this bloody affair and all its consequences stood the sinister figure of the "father of the people" who organized Kirov's murder?

Should they admit this fact, then the entire campaign of slander which was directed at that time against Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and hundreds of others will fall to pieces and the entire affair will reappear as it was in reality, as a nightmare and a frameup.

BASED ON LIES

The government leaders are in a dilemma. Where should they stop? They have already begun to put the brakes on further unmasking of lies.

The reason for this is clear: their own power is based on this truly monstrous tissue of lies—of lies of the bureaucracy against Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and hundreds of other members of the Opposition. They dare not continue repeating the lies nor denounce them.

Here they try to divide the Stalinist period into two periods: the first period during which they enthusiastically elevated Stalin to the dictator's throne, and the second period when Stalin elevated himself to the status of a deity and thrust on his followers the "cult of per-

sonality." The world press is full of quotations from the old speeches of Khrushchev, Mikoyan and others. It is impossible to repeat these speeches without revulsion. Besides, I am sure that you in Soviet Russia are familiar with these quotations even better than the world press.

No, the crimes began not from the moment the leader became mentally unbalanced. The so-called "cult of personality" was a natural consequence of the entire period after the death of Lenin and the banishment of Trotsky.

LENIN WARNED

Everything you were taught about Trotsky since that time is vile slander. Those who participated in the revolution and went through its first heroic stages could not believe those lies. But serious changes in the balance of social power will be required before you, young people, will be able to uncover historical truth.

In his testament Lenin warned the party as follows: "I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin from that position and appoint to it another man . . . more patient, more loyal, more polite and more attentive to comrades, less capricious, etc." These lines were written on the 25th of December 1922. Further, on the 4th of January 1923 Lenin condemned Stalin's position on the Georgian problem and entrusted Trotsky with launching a fight against it. And in a third document Lenin declared that he breaks off all personal and comradely relations with Stalin. While Lenin was still alive Stalin concentrated in his hands tremendous power by placing his men in important posts. Lenin's testament was not carried out and its publication was forbidden.

Lenin and Trotsky not only recognized collective leadership within the party but also acted in complete accordance with this principle. To them collective leadership meant not only discussion in upper party echelons where decisions were made by a majority of votes after a broad exchange of views. They could not envisage collective leadership without an active, democratic party organization, from top to bottom.

TROTSKY FOUGHT

And not just in peacetime, either. Animated discussions sharply expressing different views existed even in the most critical periods. It was the suppression of party democracy, and the subjugation of the weakened party to the Stalinist sham of a monolithic party organization which tolerated no disagreements, which resulted in the destruction of the party as a Bolshevik party and in the establishment of a dictatorship on the summit, that is, in the "cult of personality."

Leon Davidovich [Trotsky] understood that by continuing the exposure of the counterrevolutionary regime he was undoubtedly risking his own life. Yet this consideration did not prevent him from merciless criticism [of the regime]. Day after day, until the last hour of his life, he continued to appeal to revolutionary workers of the world to rise against these oppressors.

The plan for the industrialization of the country was worked out by Trotsky. However, at that time Stalin and his clique put their stakes on the peasants and fought this plan. Only after Trotsky was exiled to Alma-Ata and after the opposition was suppressed was Stalin forced to begin the industrialization of the country. He did it in his own manner, with unheard-of cruelty and at the cost of tremendous sacrifices on the part of the population.

Trotsky sharply condemned this method, as well as the forced collectivization of the peasants which was accompanied

by savage repressions, mass deportations and arrests, and which resulted in the general famine in the Ukraine during which millions of peasants died. Trotsky also fought against the system of slave labor in the concentration camps.

His unmasking and condemnation of all these evil-doings of Stalin, and finally his eloquent response to the sham Moscow Trials, enraged the Stalinist clique, which decided to get rid of Trotsky. This was done by the dictator's henchmen on the 20th of August 1940.

It is unlikely that the news of the famous commission which investigated the Moscow Trials, the chairman of which was the noted American philosopher John Dewey, has reached you. This commission, which heard the testimony of Trotsky and others, which carefully examined all the accusations, arrived at the conclusion that Trotsky and his son, Leon Lvovich Sedov, who were accused during these trials, were innocent. The press throughout the world closely followed the work and the verdict of the commission.

From my distant exile where I have already spent so many years I find it difficult to estimate the number of people in Russia who would believe the accusations against Trotsky and others. Abroad no one believes any longer in the vile slander that Trotsky allegedly was linked with fascists, foreign powers, espionage and the like.

THEY WILL FALL

Russia's present rulers look into the future with some confidence. They know that during the reign of the Leader all the heroic figures of the proletarian revolution were done away with. They believe that nowhere in the world are there any forces that might threaten them. Among themselves they have signed a temporary truce under the guise of collective leadership, since the only danger they see is discord among themselves.

But they are wrong. Even a weak blow to the myth which they themselves created, even a partial unmasking of the falsehood of the regime on which their rule is based, cannot but sow doubts and discord among the new, growing generation. Idealism was always the characteristic and the strength of youth. I am convinced that the doubts will crush the hard convictions and that youth will not abandon its search for truth until it will find all the truth. Woe then unto the false leaders!

Lately the press throughout the world has been busy with the so-called anti-Stalinist speech of Khrushchev, which he made at a closed meeting before the end of the 20th Congress. Foreign delegates were not permitted to attend and the speech itself was not published in Soviet Russia and hence you are not familiar with it.

In his speech, which lasted for a few hours, Khrushchev continued the downgrading of Stalin. It was a terrible and at the same time a pitiful speech. The enumeration of crimes could not fail to shaken the listeners, and later also readers.

How could this happen? How could one reach such a monstrous downfall? "Cult of personality" they say. . . . Yet an individual is linked to the environment which supports him. And the environment, devoid of lofty ideological motivations, was unable to say no to the master in the Kremlin, to criticize the totalitarian regime of decay and falsehood in front of the Leader.

Stalinist bureaucrats are now forced to rid themselves at least of part of the load by passive admissions, and out of fear of the masses, by the slogan "back to Lenin." Stalin also claimed verbally Lenin's mantle, but in his actions he contradicted Lenin.

In the end no admissions and promises can save the decayed Stalinist oligarchy. The task of overthrowing Stalinism is the task of the Russian workers and peasants.

I send you my greetings and fiery confidence in your victory.

NEW YORK

LABOR ACTION FORUM

THURSDAYS at 9 p.m.

Aug. 2—Julius Falk

AMERICAN STALINOIDS
& THE 20th CONGRESS

Aug. 9—A. Kimbay

Automation: Its Impact on
The U. S. Economy

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

BOOKS AND IDEAS

C. Wright Mills Dissects The Rulers of America

By LAURA GRANT

With a wealth of documented detail, Professor Mills has put the "Power Elite" under a glaring light. They are the "men behind the scenes" who now control the scene; they are the men who under the Democratic administration held the "silent power" to which has now been added, under the Republican administration, the "loud voice."

They are the representatives of the corporate rich, embracing also the propertied wealth of an older rich who are now seated in the corporate world.

They are the spokesmen and chief executives of the giant corporations. They are the military bigwigs who, having risen through a closed and disciplined order where one either obeys or commands, now help to command the political scene and to administer the corporate world itself.

Mills dissects an interlocking directorate of corporate owners, corporate executives, generals and admirals who, in an uneasy alliance with a remnant of professional politicians, recognize their clear and present need to organize for mutual benefits within the political and economic apparatus of the U. S. and to control it. This, he says, is a process that was initiated during the First World War, speeded up by the Second World War, and consolidated during the Cold War.

According to Mills, the two houses of Congress have been virtually stripped of all decisive bodies that now make the key decisions, it would come into conflict with the whole security structure now used by the government, which deprives even the country's elected representatives of the information necessary to arrive at decisions.

POLITICAL DIRECTORATE

Decision now rests with the president, who can autocratically make war decisions and executive agreements which have the force of treaties but do not have to be ratified by the Senate; with the secretary of State, who is a New York representative of a leading law firm which does business for Morgan and Rockefeller interests; with the secretary of the Treasury, a Midwest corporation executive who was a director for a complex of over 30 corporations; with the secretary of Defense, former president of one of the three or four largest producers of military equipment in the country; with the rest of a cabinet composed primarily of the representatives of the corporate rich; and with the top men of major departments, bureaus, agencies, and commissions who are not inhibited by the civil-service tradition. Mills stresses that the atom bomb was dropped without the consent or even knowledge of Congress.

The restraints of civil service have been greatly weakened or abolished by declassifying an estimated 34,000 jobs, and by a security procedure which has used the test of "reasonable doubt" to force out thousands who were not directly committed to the administration in power.

Mills further emphasizes that the vital relationship of this "political directorate" with the corporate and military world is not dependent on any particular party program but rather stems from the institutional alignments characteristic of the present order and its needs. Long before the Republican Party came into power, he notes, even those agencies established to control the excesses of the corporations had become their outposts.

Even under the Roosevelt administration the dollar-a-year men loaned to government by business were not the latter's production men but its financial experts, who acted as representatives for its needs in the government and who even padded the War Production Board with their lesser financial representatives.

THE POWER ELITE, by C. Wright Mills. Oxford Univ. Press, N. Y., 1956, 423 pages, \$6.

He points out that the largest proportion of professional politicians are dependent on holders of great wealth in order to maintain themselves in the House or Senate long enough to gain a position on the committees where power rests with tenure.

BREAKING MYTHS

The psychology and social character of the members of this "power elite" are analyzed in considerable detail. Mills explores what it means to train men to be "the ones to decide"; he examines the economic and social position of those who rise to the top. His conclusions are a far cry from the various protective colorations which they assume: "small-town boy who made good"... "industrial statesman"... "the great inventor who provides jobs but yet is just an average guy"... He shows in minute detail that for the most part those on top started there.

In ideology these men are not "conservatives." They provide no fertile ground for the renaissance of "conservative" thought which has been so agreeable to many ex-radicals and ex-liberals. For the most part they have no explicit ideology, and they find the liberal rhetoric far more useful than the conservative techniques of control.

Mills completely destroys the "balance of power" theory so dear to the heart of impressionists who see power canceling itself out in the interest of all, through the pressure of divergent interest groups. He points out that the balance of power theory implies equality of power, that not all interests are equally organized at all, that not all interests are in an equal position to express or realize what their interests really are. He approves E. H. Carr's comment that "The doctrine of the harmony of interests... serves as an ingenious moral device invoked in perfect sincerity by privileged groups in order to justify and maintain their dominant position."

In effect, Mills has written a notable documentation in contemporary terms Marx's conception of capitalism as the social rule of the bourgeoisie.

THEORY OF ELITE

Mills makes explicit both his approach and his method. He derives his conception of class from Schumpeter, who saw a class primarily as a status group; but Mills connects status with power. His conception of an elite stems from Pareto, who saw it as consisting of those members of a society who are in possession of most of a given "value." Mills limits the elite to those who possess the most of that "value" which is most valued in the society—in ours, this being hard cash.

What or who, then, determines the rise of a "power elite?" Mills answers: the powerful institutions. The power elite consists of those who have made their way to the pinnacles in our hierarchic institutions, or birth. These institutions are the large corporations and the military, interlocked with some sections of the professional political leadership.

His idea of a power elite rests upon "the decisive institutional trends that characterize the structure of our epoch, in particular the military ascendancy in a privately incorporated economy... the several coincidences of objective interests between economic and military and political institutions... the social similarities and the psychological affinities of the men who occupy the command posts of these structures... increased interchangeability of the top positions in each and the increased traffic between the separate orders in the careers of men of power... the ramifications to the point of virtual totality of the kind of decisions that are made at the top and the rise to power of a set of men who are professional organizers of considerable force and who are unrestrained by democratic party training."

BEHIND THE ELITE

But this, cogently phrased though it is, is not a method. It is a description of what Mills goes on to prove is the real state of things in society.

He elaborates further: A power elite can be determined from several compatible angles: what they have—statistics of selected values; what they belong to—membership in a clique-like set of people; who they really are—the morality of certain institutional types; what they head up—the sociology of the institutional position and the social structure that these institutions form. He chooses to define the elite in terms of the last—what they head up.

This is serviceable for him: it allows him to locate the power elite in terms of the powerful institutions in society.

But when Mills discusses the institutions themselves, he appears to abandon his own method. For if the power elite must be viewed in terms of what institutions they head up, then why not view the institutions themselves in terms of what they head up—the particular social, political and economic organism that is capitalist society?

But for no stated reason he chooses to analyze the institutions themselves in terms of "what they have," "what they belong to," "who they really are." Not, however, in terms of "what they head up"—namely, the sociology of capitalism itself.

FURTHER QUESTIONS

It is this abandonment of his method, or refusal to carry it further, that leads to serious weakness in Mills' book when, having discussed the Corporate Rich, the Very Rich, the Warlords, the Military Ascendancy, and the Political Directorate, he opens a chapter entitled "The Power Elite." One expects a synthesis of the preceding material and an examination of who or what rules. Instead of attempting an appraisal of the elite in terms of the over-all society, the politics and economics of capitalism, the chapter presents a *précis* of the salient points that have already been set forth.

Yet, if no man of power exists unrelated to the institutions of power (as Mills explains), then surely no institution of power exists unrelated to the particular society itself. If status rests on power and the source of power is institutional, then what is it in a society that determines the power of a particular institution? If an elite is determined by the maximum possession of a "value" which is valued by society, then what is it in a particular society which determines what is valued?

But Mills fails to follow where these questions point. The sweep of the book is lost at this stage.

Perhaps it is Mills' failure to relate social institutions with the society they "head up" that leads him, despite excellent moral indignation, to weakness in the realm of social alternatives. It leads him to a dim view of a politically un-

conscious and inarticulate mass who "lose their will for rationally considered decision and action because they do not possess the instruments for such decision and action, lose their sense of political belonging because they do not belong, lose their political will because they see no way to realize it." This mass is seen as dependent on the mass means of communication, which are controlled by the "power elite" and which are essentially manipulative in character.

WHOSE IMMORALITY?

The concluding chapter, entitled the "The Higher Immorality," is a searing moral indictment of this "power elite." Mills concludes:

"The men of the higher circles are not representative men; their high position is not a result of moral virtue; their fabulous success is not firmly connected with meritorious ability. Those who sit in the seats of the high and mighty are selected and formed by the means of power, the sources of wealth, the mechanics of celebrity, which prevail in their society. They are not men selected and formed by a civil service that is linked with the world of knowledge and sensibility. They are not men shaped by nationally responsible parties that debate openly and clearly the issues this nation now unintelligently confronts. They are not men held in responsible check by a plurality of voluntary associations which connect debating publics with the pinnacles of decision. Commanders of power unequaled in human history, they have succeeded within the American system of organized irresponsibility."

This closing statement is filled with persuasive passion. But a reservation obtrudes.

Mills has shown throughout that the "power elite" themselves are nothing if not responsible. While not responsible to a public, they are fully responsible to the institutions they head and represent; the fabric of even their personal lives is interwoven with the corporate world and the military machinery.

Why then are they "irresponsible"? It must be the institutions themselves which represent "the higher immorality." If so, then why? The questions can be pressed further, but in any case we are left in Mills' unexplored territory: the connection between the institutions of power and capitalist society itself.

One has a right to suspect that if Mills were to analyze the institutions in terms of the social order which subsumes them, he would be forced either to relate them to the particular class structure of capitalism, or else develop a contribution of his own to the theoretical problems of capitalism. In either case, he would have to go beyond the point, or behind the point, to which he is taken by his concept of institutions.

Within this limitation, *The Power Elite* is an immensely valuable descriptive study of the rulers of American society today.

District 50's Story

THE MINE WORKERS' DISTRICT 50, by James Nelson.—Exposition Press, 1955. 158 pages, \$3.50 (special union ed. \$2.75).

When the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union was formed, one of the two CIO unions that joined to create it was the Gas, Coke and Chemical Workers Union. This book records its origins.

District 50 of the United Mine Workers was set up in 1936 to provide a national setup for scattered Gas and Coke Workers locals which had been denied a national industrial-union charter by the AFL. Later, they became an autonomous international union.

The author was first president of District 50. He began as a maintenance mechanic and ended up as an employee of the Department of Labor. His philosophy, presented in chatty fashion, is best summarized in his own words: "It has always been my experience that mutual trust can settle any labor problem. It is necessary however, to earn this trust by a record of cooperative activities and practices." His account has some value as a detailed story of the frustrations of a group of workers who sought to create and defend a union against the craft nibbling of the AFL.

B. H.

Poisoning the Atmosphere — —

(Continued from page 1)

Secretary Seaton is quoted as making exactly three points, or, if you wish, revelations. To report them fully, they are as follows:

(1) He "said that his department's main concern in the simulated attack was the likely damage to electric power installations and to the normal movement of coal, natural gas, petroleum and minerals."

It would seem that a merely human casualty will do best to disguise himself as some form of carboniferous material in order to gain this department's sympathetic attention.

(2) "Mr. Seaton reported discovery in the exercise that such power installations as Hoover Dam were 'vulnerable both to bombing and to peacetime sabotage.'"

He had to find this out sooner or later, and so it is reassuring that the discovery has been made this early in the century.

(3) "We had a bad moment on Saturday . . ." he told the press conference.

One's heart naturally goes out to this man as he bravely bears up under his terrible responsibilities of life and death, but before a tear wells forth and splashes down, let us go on with the interrupted quotation.

"We had a bad moment on Saturday, when we discovered that one of the 'bombs' had demolished Fort Knox and distributed the nation's gold supply all over the adjacent landscape. The panic didn't last for long, however, because our experts assured the government that gold is one of the few metals which is readily recoverable wherever it may fall. If a bomb does land on Fort Knox we'll go to work in the richest gold field in the world and have the bullion back in government hands in a comparatively short time."

So what are you worrying about? *Pecunia non olet*, the Romans used to say, which roughly translated means: Gold may be radioactive as the inside of a reactor but it is never never "contaminated."

SIMULATED ACTIVITY

While our minds were being eased of their major anxieties by Secretary Seaton, Chairman Strauss of the AEC was, as mentioned, making headlines with his new found if still mysterious mastery of the fallout problem, at which Chairman Anderson of the congressional watchdog committee raised an eyebrow in the public prints.

The CD administration also had a different story:

"Federal officials [said a Times dispatch from Operation Alert headquarters] have found only partial solutions to the problem of protecting the nation against 'fall-out' . . . Spokesmen for the Federal Civil Defense Administration, as well as officials of other government agencies participating in the third annual exercise, said they hoped to be able to report solutions when the 1957 test is held in June 1957."

(That is also the year when Secretary Seaton is due to report the discovery that carboniferous people are as "vulnerable to bombing" as Hoover Dam, or even Hoover himself.)

The Department of Labor showed that it was on the ball by announcing a simulated order "creating a new Office of Wage Administration to apply wage and salary controls which would be needed in an emergency."

There was no announcement about emergency price controls. (Perhaps that depends on how much of the Fort Knox bullion had been picked up.) However, George Meany, AFL-CIO president, joined in the good clean fun by issuing a simulated no-strike pledge.

LAPP WARNS

It is hard to avoid the conclusions that most people regard all this as a going-through-the-motions. There is no evidence whatsoever that the government authorities (in any country) know of any way to limit the effects of all-out atomic war short of the destruction of the fabric of society itself, not to speak of the destruction of the human units who constitute the society.

Short even of war, however, the forces of destruction are already loose as the U. S., Russia and Britain continue to poison the atmosphere of the

planet with H-bomb explosions designed as dress rehearsals for the ultimate.

One of the most solemn warnings came last month when nuclear physicist Ralph Lapp issued another of his Cassandra-like admonitions. Like the Trojan princess, Lapp has been proved consistently right and has been as consistently ignored by the official soothing-syrup purveyors—until they could no longer becloud facts that had become too well-known. Lapp was already telling the public much of the truth about the dangers of atomic radiation at a time when the AEC was next-door to claiming that it was good for what ails you.

THE DIE WILL BE CAST

On June 21, addressing a New Jersey medical society meeting, Lapp said that if the nations go on with their present increase in atomic-weapons tests, the population of the world will be in deadly danger.

He adopted "the very conservative assumption" that the big powers will steadily accelerate their weapons tests until they are doubled by 1970. On this basis, he said, there will be enough radiostrontium in the atmosphere "to produce a 100 per cent MPA in every person on the planet"—i.e., give every person the Maximum Permissible Amount.

"Due to the holdup of the invisible particles in the upper air," he said, "this radiostrontium would not show up in full amount in the human body until the late 1970s. However, by 1962 the die would have been cast irrevocably."

Radiostrontium, the radioactive form of the element strontium, is especially deadly because it tends to accumulate in the bones, causing bone cancer, and because it is relatively long-lasting.

"Lapp accused the AEC of refusing to give the full facts to the public and said the government unit had let a full year go by before releasing details of the fallout from the initial Bikini atomic tests. . . ."

"Lapp told the medical society that staying under cover for several days during a period of fallout may not be enough. In many cases, he said, a year may pass before it will be safe to come outside, particularly in the open coun-

try." (AP dispatch, June 21.)

(For more information along these lines, particularly the warnings of Nobel Prize winner Herman J. Muller on the genetic effects of the radiation danger, see the accompanying article in this issue by Gene Lister.)

LAKE OF DEATH

Radiostrontium was again in the news at the beginning of this month when a joint study initiated by the AEC and TVA showed that the dangers of radioactive wastes from atomic plants were greater than envisaged—and gave no indication that the problem had been solved.

The Oak Ridge (Tenn.) atom plant has been discharging its radioactive wastes into White Oak Lake, which had been enlarged in 1943 precisely in order to delay the flow of the "hot" liquid waste into the Tennessee Valley until some of the materials had time to become inert. During the last three years the effects on the fish life in the lake have been investigated.

"If it could be shown," explains a Times story (July 1), "that no harm were done by the present waste from Oak Ridge, a considerable amount of money could be saved by discharged 'hotter' water into the river and lake system."

Instead, the survey showed that two species of fish had been completely wiped out, and that two others had absorbed and concentrated in their bones large quantities of radiostrontium. "The skeletons of these fish contained radiostrontium in quantities 20,000 to 30,000 times as great as that of the lake water itself."

The news report says nothing about what conclusions are to be drawn from this; whether any major effort will be made to find a safer mode of disposal; whether the contamination of this lake of death has yet affected, or will affect, the farther waters of the Tennessee Valley.

A United Press dispatch the next day, from Hiroshima, showed—not for the first time—that short-range surveys are entirely inadequate, besides:

"Hiroshima reported today its eighth fatality of the year attributed to the

atomic-bomb blast of August 6, 1945.

"Mrs. Rai Morihiro, 56, died last night. She lived about 4500 feet from the center of the explosion and escaped without apparent bodily injuries at the time.

She became ill and entered a hospital last April. She was suffering from a bloodstream ailment attributed to the effects of the radiations of the bomb."

CINDERS

But the poisoning of the international atmosphere continues. Parts of the earth have already been rendered uninhabitable: "The problem of soil contamination by radioactive elements . . . is dramatically emphasized by reports that atolls in the Marshall Islands may have been rendered permanently uninhabitable by the fallout from nuclear weapons tested near Bikini and Eniwetok." (N. Y. Times, June 24.)

(That same week, incidentally, "A UN visiting mission reported to the Trusteeship Council yesterday that 10-year-old claims of [Marshall] islanders displaced because of [bomb] tests had not yet been settled by the U. S., the administering power."—N. Y. Post, June 20.)

Other parts of the planet's surface are no doubt being turned into radioactive cinders, wherever it is that Russia is setting off its Big Bangs in the competitive race of nuclear imperialisms.

The British have announced their own bomb tests in the Pacific for early next year, and Western Samoans have protested to the UN.

Japan's people are caught between the American and Russian testing grounds. With notable callousness and typically chauvinist ethnocentrism, American press comments speak smugly of the "sensitivity" of the Japanese on this score, as if it were something they really should get over. This cropped up especially last month when it became an anti-American issue in the Japanese election:

"Many Japanese, still sensitive over the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, were aroused by the fact that the [Congress] subcommittee mentioned with seeming casualness, in its report, that Okinawa could be a convenient place for storing nuclear weapons for use in a Far Eastern war." (Times, June 24.)

THIS IS FOR REAL

Okinawa, or at least its whole population, can be wiped off the map five hours after a war starts, in exchange for the honor of serving as H-bomb depot for foreign occupiers. How many Americans would hold still as shooting ducks in a comparable situation?

We are reminded that some time ago, when Britain announced germ-warfare naval maneuvers in the open Atlantic, Senator Smathers of Florida indignantly called upon Washington to protest and put an end to this imminent peril to his state. He was mollified by finding out that only simulated "germs" were going to be used for the British maneuvers, like the simulated "bombs" that massacred five million people in New York City.

But the H-bombs that have been dropping in the Pacific in the now-concluded 1956 series of test shots have not been simulated. Being nice people, the American authorities have tried to time their blasts so that air currents and weather conditions will not carry too much fallout over other people's inhabited areas; but they cannot predict these conditions with much confidence; they cannot even always guarantee to drop an H-bomb closer than five-miles from its appointed target, it now transpires. And the unpredictable fallout is not simulated but real and deadly.

The AEC has refused even to tell the world how many bombs it has exploded in this recent series (it admits two at least, and Japanese scientists report evidence of ten) just as if this contamination of the planet were simply a national affair and of no concern to "outsiders."

Socialists join their voice to the demand that the powers immediately put a stop to all further explosions of nuclear weapons. That means all the powers concerned—Russia and Britain as well as the U. S. Americans can act to realize this in the case of their own country, at least; it is an international sanitary duty.

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

recent Supreme Court decision in the Cole case. This bill, incidentally, is sponsored by a Democrat, Rep. Walter.

Cain said the bill takes "an entirely new and Fascist" view of the security problem. To grant to government agency heads "absolute" power to dismiss employees without a hearing, he added, "would destroy us as it has every other country" that adopted such a system.

"Fascist" is strong language, of course. But while no doubt Cain was not using it in a scientific sense, a senator did his best to prove that Cain is right.

Sen. Curtis (R., Neb.) was Cain's opponent on the TV program where these remarks were made. Describing the Supreme Court decision as a "mistake," he argued that a new law was needed because "a non-sensitive job may become sensitive in an emergency" and because many known Communists got their start in government service in non-sensitive posts.

This is indeed the logic of totalitarianism. It obviously demands to be carried further. For example, innumerable private jobs can become sensitive in emergencies, and hordes of "subversives" can get their start in private posts. So soon as vague-and-potential dangers are used as determinants instead of clear-and-present dangers, there is no convenient stopping-point.

But there is, fortunately, a long way possible between "fascist views" and fascism.

Kin in Sin

When Ceylon's new Prime Minister Bandaranaike took office, he told American newsmen, "How could I be hostile to a country that produced Mark Twain?"

Vera Micheles Dean recently summarized, in the *Foreign Policy Bulletin*, those aspects of Mark Twain that are better known to freedom-loving people abroad than they are to most Americans.

Best known, perhaps, is the humorist's hatred and scorn of race prejudice, as expressed in *Huckleberry Finn*, for example. But he was also "in the vanguard of the group of intellectuals at the turn of the century who feared that the U. S., by embarking on a policy of expansion—notably in the Philippines—would lose its soul, its dedication to democracy and to morality in world affairs."

He was appalled by Britain's Boer War and by the imperialism of the West in the Chinese Boxer Rebellion. "Why shouldn't all the powers withdraw from China," he said in a public address, "and leave her free to attend to her own business? It is the foreigners who are making all the trouble in China. . . ."

Introducing Winston Churchill at a banquet in 1900 he said: "England and America: yes, we are kin; and now that we are also kin in sin, there is nothing more to be desired."

He denounced American policy (and Theodore Roosevelt) on the 1906 massacre of Philippine Moros.

It is a pity that we cannot see him in action before the House Un-American Committee.

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.