

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

DECEMBER 4, 1950

FIVE CENTS

**FROM BOYCOTT TO BUNDLING:
The Crooked Line of Washington's
Reversal on Fascist Franco** ... page 3

Sidney Hook's Double Standard ... page 7

How CIO Discussed Political Action ... page 6

The Gray Report and Europe ... page 2

SPREAD OF WAR TO CHINA LOOMS: WHAT LED UP TO THE WAR CRISIS?

Moscow-Peiping Axis Solidified As Mao's Aims in Korea Emerge

By ABEL BAKER

The mystery over Chinese Stalinism's objectives in Korea has become a little clearer. Indeed, it now has already achieved several major objectives.

(1) Mao is seeking nothing less than the reversal or defeat of the Asiatic military policy launched by Truman on June 25 in Korea and proclaimed to a lesser extent for Formosa and Viet-Nam (Indo-China). The Moscow-Peiping axis has, in its turn, also linked up these three problems and has succeeded in coordinating the Viet-Minh struggle with that of Stalinism in the rest of Asia. The Truman policy enabled Stalinism to extend itself as never before in Asia.

(2) From the beginning the coordinated diplomatic strategy of Peiping and Moscow called for the admission of the former, Stalinist China, into the UN, thereby enhancing Stalinism's world position and forcing universal recognition of the new China regime. By linking the Korean issue with China in the UN this strategy has made great advances.

Since most Asiatic nations have recognized Peiping, they were receptive to the line that the "UN police action" in Korea was illegal because Peiping was not on the Security Council. Even India, which formally supported the U. S.-UN military intervention, retained more than a shadow of suspicion. By implication, this propaganda line means that if Mao's representatives had been present at the UN the Korean war or at least intervention could have been prevented. This too has hit home and has marked a great political victory for Stalinism in Asia.

Washington has now been forced to acknowledge the validity of the Stalinist premise. It has been forced to invite Peiping's delegates to the UN, backtracking completely from the adamant position of "not rewarding aggression by recognition." With one foot in the door of the UN, it is doubtful if the Chinese will be pushed out again so easily.

MACARTHUR'S BOOMERANG

(3) American troops were halted at the 38th parallel for consideration of policy by Washington and Lake Success. MacArthur and Rhee plumped for a march to the Manchurian border. While Acheson and Truman pondered, Chou En-lai, Peiping's foreign minister, let it be known through the Indian ambassador in his capital that any crossing of the parallel would be considered inimical to Chinese interests. That was when Nehru warned against the crossing. But MacArthur and Rhee won their "calculated risk" and Truman received assurances that the Chinese would not move.

But the Chinese did march. Peiping carried out its threat, and by so doing asserted its definitive interests in Korea. It is not merely a matter of hydroelectric plants but, as Peiping constantly reiterates, China has a direct in-

terest in "a friendly government" on the Korean peninsula. That is, Peiping considers a Stalinist Korea to be indispensable. Washington's "calculated risk" has boomeranged; Acheson has become a petitioner beseeching Peiping to have faith that he will take care to guarantee its rights.

Peiping has proclaimed insistently that it can have no faith in any policy originating in Washington because U. S. Far Eastern policy is actually made by MacArthur. Certainly, the Korean events since the crossing of the 38th parallel confirm this idea. MacArthur appears determined to undermine any conciliatory elements in Acheson's approach to the Chinese. His military-political program is extremely provocative. Whatever Washington may propose at Lake Success, it will have great difficulty in translating it realistically where MacArthur rules. This is one reason Peiping has continued its military plans for Korea in spite of assurances from the State Department and President Truman.

(4) Riding high on the crest of its UN majority, the U. S. insisted on its plan to make Korea "the showcase of democracy in Asia" by excluding China from the picture. But Peiping has changed all that. Acheson belatedly undertakes to guarantee China's electric supply; Assistant Secretary of State Rusk and Britain's Bevin offer a "buffer zone"; and Trygve Lie proposes an "international authority" over the frontier area and the watershed.

The entire initiative on the diplomatic and political fronts has fallen to the Stalinist camp.

(Turn to last page)

MacArthur-Truman's 'Calculated Risk' at 38th Parallel Set Stage

By ABEL BAKER and H. D. SPECTOR

As we go to press, three developments confront the world with the possibility of a fateful extension of the Korean war into a war between the U. S. (plus its UN allies) and Stalinist China—i.e., at best, not the third world war but the next thing to it. There is reason enough to believe, and compulsion to want to believe, that the brink will not be passed—this time—though no one, not even the cold-war directors, will ever know till it is too late which brush with the flames will explode the powderkeg.

In a mass attack, Mao's Chinese troops have poured across the border to drive the U. S. forces back behind the starting point of MacArthur's "home by Christmas" offensive.

General MacArthur has, implicitly but in clear effect, placed before the UN the question of deciding whether to carry his military operations into China across the Manchurian border of Korea. It is an "entirely new war," he said.

The U. S., in the person of spokesman Warren Austin, has stood up before the UN to accuse

Stalinist China of open aggression.

At the same moment, Mao's representatives appear at the councils of the UN for the first time. The stage is set for a tug-of-war either by diplomacy or by arms. But it was never clearer that imperialist diplomacy is a continuation of war by other means, and vice versa.

What is also entirely clear is

(Turn to last page)

On the Big Question Before Labor: Lessons of Its Electoral Defeat—

Mum's the Word at CIO Convention

By BEN HALL

The representatives of the powerful mass unions assembled in Chicago for the CIO convention can boast only that their placid deliberations were not disturbed even by the flutter of a serious disagreement. From all accounts, one word describes its sessions more fittingly than any previous CIO national gathering: unanimity. The voice of its timorous more radical wing was barely audible—and then not through the medium of the delegation from the United Auto Workers which adjusted itself comfortably to the dominant conservatism of Phil Murray, but from George Baldanzi, vice-president of the Textile Workers Union.

The only vociferous opposition came, only momentarily and on a single point, when die-hard conservatives of the Utility Workers Union resisted a resolution for public power. The last convention of the Utility Workers had denounced "socialist" trends toward public ownership in the United States, and its delegates revealed that the wage levels and union rights of workers in government-owned public utilities were undermined by government bureaucrats.

But Murray was able to smooth away this little point of contention. No one seemed embarrassed by the fact that Truman's administration, supported by labor, bears responsibility for working conditions in such projects.

The unanimity of the sessions was not the enthusiastic unity which arises spontaneously out of battles won. It was not that total agreement that is sometimes to be expected when no new problems have arisen to demand new answers. It was the unanimity of labor officials offering one another a mutual amnesty in evading the questions of the day, in dodging the key problems that face the labor movement and the American people.

The last CIO convention initiated the peremptory expulsion of all unions controlled by the Communist Party. A total ignoring of all safeguards for inner-union democracy, a resort to the methods of authoritarian decree, were justified on the grounds that the CIO, once freed of Stalinism, could move forward in unity. Professional and government workers could be organized; the drive to organize the South would speed forward; without carping criticism or outright opposition, the political program of the CIO would be strengthened and elections won.

But none of these blessings seems any closer to realization. Quite the contrary, labor has just been set back at the polls. Why? The convention agreed to ignore such matters—unanimously.

On the eve of the convention, the United Auto Workers published its statement on the "Lessons of the Elections" analyzing the results of the 1950 campaign. It criticizes many of the candidates of the Democratic Party; it takes issue with their method of campaigning and in effect calls for an aggressive, bold fight by labor together with its liberal friends inside the Democratic Party as a substitute for relying upon corrupt, conservative or ordinary machine Democrats. This conclusion did not come to grips with the basic problems of American politics.

It proposes that the working class continue to rely upon and ally itself with so-called friends of labor within the Democratic Party. In this respect, it is fundamentally in line with current CIO policy; but it would carry out the accepted policy in a more militant, more aggressive manner. It would bring into the open what is now simmering beneath the surface; it could lead only to organized faction fights within the Democratic Party between a labor-bourgeois Fair Deal coalition on the one hand and the conservative Democrat-Dixiecrat grouping on the other.

Say what one will about the validity of such a program—and to us it seems totally inadequate—one thing is certain: while labor would

(Continued on page 2)

How CIO Delegates Discussed 1950 Vote

By R. F. SARGENT

CHICAGO, Nov. 27—Convening against the immediate background of a stinging defeat for CIO-PAC in the recent elections, the CIO delegates' discussion on the resolution on political action, which contains only a reiteration of previous such resolutions, brought forth not a single new idea or proposal for lessening CIO's dependence on the "liberal candidates," not to speak of the urgent necessity for a declaration of independence by labor from all capitalist parties and politicians.

PAC Director Jack Kroll found that although PAC received a "licking" he didn't need to "re-argue it too much" since there were more PAC workers than ever before, "we'll bounce back hard," and there'll be "no retreat from our objectives."

He continued: "We haven't any alibis to offer. We don't seek to put the blame on the shoulders of candidates who trimmed and tried to appease the opposition. We won't waste time lamenting the caliber of some candidates or the effectiveness of their organization. We will be taking a look at our structure to see where it can be improved upon, to see how we can do these things better. We will be in there pestering you about your voluntary collections, we will be building our PAC better and stronger continuously to get a year around functioning organization."

In other words, "we won't waste time" trying to draw any lessons at all from the political disaster suffered by labor in 1950 but just go on as if nothing had happened.

BALDANZI CRITICIZES

Baldanzi of the Textile Workers started out bravely enough in the discussion:

"We must clarify our role in the last campaign, re-examine our own position, our role, and the principles upon which we must stand if we are to go before the electorate and have them accept the idea that our political action is independent of either party. . . . There should be some lessons we ought to learn, and one of the lessons that is very vivid is that the workers and citizens of America will no sooner follow PAC-CIO in an attempt to elect a lot of racketeers than they will if the Democratic and Republican Party sponsors them. . . . Some Democratic leaders gave us a lot of political hacks. . . .

"We had a lot of so-called New Deal representatives who, before the campaign was over, conducted themselves in such a way that you could not tell whether they represented the Republican Party in its reactionary phases or the Democrats. They kept compromising until the last day of the campaign. . . . We must be more discriminating in our selection of people who will receive the endorsement of this organization. . . . present candidates who can stand on their own feet and defend their program and their conduct and their thinking. . . . support those candidates who support the program of the CIO. . . ."

This may sound as if Baldanzi was fed up with the CIO policy of tail-ending the Democratic machine, but his only conclusions were: "We must get behind Jack Kroll" and "I agree with our illustrious friend, the secretary of labor," who had made a speech to the delegates.

Delegate Despot of the California CIO went all out for Helen Gahagan Douglas and said that CIO and AFL had done more in 1950 than 1948, but the results weren't as good. Delegate Felleck of the Textile Workers concluded that the American Medical Association and the NAM are "doing a better job" than labor when the people fall for reactionary propaganda or are not "up in arms" against no legislation on excess profits or on the question of equality of sacrifice." He stated:

"We take pride that there are those in our organization who are among the best thinkers in the nation. Let us use these people to take the messages to the public so they understand."

ONE GLIMMER

There was little indication in the discussion that the "best thinkers in the nation" had been doing any thinking at all about the need for independent political action which the labor defeat on November 7 obviously pointed to. Any who did kept their thoughts to themselves.

Delegate McDonald, secretary-treasurer of both the United Steel Workers and the national CIO-PAC, edged in for several minutes to make a pompous declaration in behalf of "more work and less breast-beating, less crying in our beer. . . . basically we need organization." Not a glimmer of an idea of anything more than the PAC routine of the past.

Delegate Della of the Maryland CIO, who stated he has "been noted for saying things that were wrong at the right time; I step on people's toes, and I don't mind, because it seems to wake them up"—stressed the need for electing labor unionists to office. He criticized the poor PAC setup in Maryland and the lack of interest and aggressiveness of union officials in it, ending up with an appeal "to elect some working people to promote legislation for the benefit of the working people" in the 1951 Baltimore City Council elections.

This brief talk came the closest of any to awareness that labor can rely only on itself for its own salvation. There was no other discussion.

At CIO Convention —

(Continued from page 1)

not become independent in politics, it would have to be more self-assertive and more demanding even while remaining in the Democratic Party.

But there is a singular difficulty: Walter Reuther, ideological author of this policy, remains totally silent at the CIO convention. His thoughts are confined to the pages of the UAW press and his actions to Michigan politics.

Before labor and its friends begin to act boldly and bravely in the Democratic Party, Reuther will have to muster his courage to act boldly in the CIO. To expect Reuther to fight in the CIO for the formation of a Labor Party would be somewhat optimistic. But the militants of the UAW have the right to expect their leader to fight FOR HIS OWN PROGRAM within the labor movement. This he shows no signs of beginning.

Although Reuther kept his thoughts to himself, Baldanzi mildly suggested that labor begin to act "more independently," that it refuse to allow "a lot of racketeers and political hacks" to be foisted upon it as candidates. These modest opinions, which fell in line with UAW thinking, were enough of a violation of the unanimity-etiquette, tacitly obeyed by all speakers, to cause a definite chill in atmosphere.

By tabling the real political discussion, the convention did not simply leave things as they were before the election. A shift to the right by the labor-liberal Democrats is already perceptible. How continuous and far-reaching it will be is not certain.

Senator Paul Douglas, invited to address his labor allies, suggested that it would be wise to modify the hitherto uncompromising opposition to the Taft-Hartley Law, perhaps by adapting some of its more acceptable provisions into some new law. The convention rejected this ad-

Electrical Workers One Year of Split Unionism in Philly

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 18 — The end of one year of split unionism in the electrical industry comes just as the Westinghouse Electric Corporation here has settled with the last of the three big unions which represent its employees.

In September the company came to terms with the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (IUE-CIO) in a contract covering about 45,000 employees. More recently terms were reached with the Federation of Westinghouse Independent Salaried Unions (covering 15,000) and the Stalinist-led United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (UE) which bargains for only 14,000 employees.

The split, forced by the UE, has hurt the labor movement in Westinghouse. Even if the year is judged solely by contract gains, it has been an unfortunate year for the employees. The general cash wage increase, the first in over two and a half years, was only 10 cents per hour. Coupled with this was an involved and unsatisfactory social-insurance package and features curbing union strength and prestige. No one except the most hysterical UE backers even pretends to like the new contracts.

Nor are the contracts the entire story. The employees are even more seriously split than the representation figures indicated. Both UE and IUE-CIO have at least a paper (and sometimes actual) locals in almost every plant. The FWISU has its eye on all salaried workers now represented by the industrial unions and various AFL crafts have split off skilled workers here and there.

There is no need to dwell on the

inadequacy of the 10 cent increase. Prices in the two years have certainly climbed higher. The income-tax-withholding increase has wiped away part of the cash gain; and the partly contributory social-insurance package, with its average deduction of 5 cents per hour, has taken practically all of the remainder.

INSURANCE INADEQUATE

All contracts permit a wage reopener in six months and it is clear now that every union will have to take advantage of it. During the year the company has sharpened discipline, demanded speedup, cut time values for incentive workers, and riddled the "merit review" wage structure for salaried people. Both the IUE and UE were forced out on numerous strikes during the negotiation period. The new contracts indicate that Westinghouse continues to proceed along these lines.

Inequities in the wage structure from plant to plant have long been a source of dissatisfaction. The Federation contract for salaried workers does not even mention this problem and the IUE-CIO and UE provisions are not very desirable. These set up a special fund of 1 cent per hour per employee which is to be jointly administered by unions and company to alleviate inequities. The fund will be inadequate and the union people will have to be a party to spreading the grease to the union membership which squeals the loudest.

The social-insurance package includes group life insurance, partial income in periods of prolonged illness, minimum pension of \$100 per month (including government old-age payments), and reimburse-

ment for certain hospital and surgical expenses.

On first glance the amounts of group life insurance appear to be adequate. However, only 25 per cent of this insurance is given to the employee as paid-up life insurance upon retirement. It is unlikely that any retired employee, on his very limited income, will be able to continue to carry much of the other 75 per cent, since rates for insurance written at age 65 are extremely high.

The pension amount seems low both by comparison with gains made by other unions and on an absolute scale. The older employees feel that very little credit was given to them for payments made by them in several contributory pension plans sponsored by Westinghouse in years gone by. The younger employees feel that continued inflation will make the \$100 monthly income not only insufficient but ridiculous 20, 30, or 40 years in the future. A pension plan coupled with a severance-pay program would have been more acceptable.

"SUPER-SENIORITY"

The income to employees during periods of prolonged illness amount to about one-third of their normal income of 26 weeks, maximum period. Hospital and surgical costs are partially reimbursed. Payments for hospital room seem more liberal and other hospital and surgical reimbursements are less liberal than the Blue Cross-Blue Shield protections previously available in most plants. Coverage can be had for the employees' dependents but all this protection ceases at retirement, the time when such assistance may be most needed.

In its entirety the social-insurance package is the most unpopular portion of the contract.

The company was also able to strike a serious blow at union security even though the unions were given the checkoff and maintenance of membership. Westinghouse was able to secure super-seniority for selected employees on the basis of "outstanding" performance and suitability for training for higher posts.

In the IUE-CIO and UE contracts, this super-seniority list cannot contain more than 1 per cent of the employees in the bargaining units, but in the salary workers' Federation this percentage has been set at 5 per cent. Since the company is to keep its preferred list "up to date" at all times, this super-seniority for company men is apt to prove a thorn in the side of even the industrial unions.

The present state of union health in the Westinghouse chain is none too good. There are two main possibilities for improvement in the future. At the end of six months all unions can reopen the contracts and present a united demand to the company for an adequate wage increase. In the more distant future there is the possibility of closing union ranks.

Next spring will see new NLRB elections in most plants. It is to be hoped that all units will then grasp the opportunity to return to the CIO. There is no reason why the FWISU should not become part of the white-collar council of the IUE-CIO.

If the IUE holds a fruitful and democratic constitutional convention next month and if it proves a militant union in the units it represents, then Westinghouse workers will be able to look forward to a united labor organization to fight the united forces of the corporation.

falsify were denied to capitalist parties during election time what would they have left?)

In the confusion, said Murray, domestic policies were never presented to the people "in a proper way." But what would prevent the Republicans from lying and deceiving in their discussions of domestic questions? Murray could reply: "But we could answer them." And this is the key to the recent elections. The people were concerned with foreign policy; they were worried about the dangers of a new war; they were uneasy over the setbacks in Korea for the U. S. forces. On these and related matters the CIO had nothing to offer.

The people were acting not in response to Republican lies but in reaction against traveling the road to war. It is hardly adequate to tell voters who are worried about foreign policy that you have a fine domestic program. The convention, of course, did nothing to fill this gaping hole in its program. The CIO remains the apologist for Truman's foreign policy.

Nor did the UAW offer its program. Its election statement read: "America needed during this period, more than ever, a bold imaginative and constructive program to check Communist aggression that would have filled with positive values the moral vacuum created by these real and human fears." Reuther himself has widely proclaimed a new plan highly touted in UAW circles as a means of preserving peace and stopping the advance of Russian Stalinism. We need not discuss this program here because Reuther did not see fit to raise it at the convention. For a man who is profligate with trillions of dollars to aid democracy throughout the world, he displayed a miserly caution in spending his time on the floor of the CIO convention.

The artificial calm, the mechanical unity that prevailed at the CIO convention were admir-

ably suited to soothe the nerves of tired and disappointed union officials. But is it enough to make the labor movement the "vanguard of America"?

From Boycott to Bundling: The Crooked Line Of Washington's Reversal on Fascist Franco

By MARY BELL

In the space of five years since the conclusion of the war against the Axis, whose only living leader was the "silent" partner of Hitler and Mussolini, the Truman administration has made a complete about-face in its policy toward Franco, the latest move being the government's \$62½ million trans-fusion to the badly ailing Spanish economy.

The reversal has not been so sudden as it might seem. Important signposts of a drastic shift were visible several years ago. It has only been the double-talk traditional in high government places when an unpopular policy is being prepared that has sown confusion and made the change seem abrupt. We refer to such things as the statement of President Truman when he signed the original appropriation bill, which Congress passed over his supposedly "bitter" opposition (not bitter enough to veto the bill): "I do not regard this. . . as a directive." His statement was generally interpreted to mean no loans to Spain.

But anyone who had been following the moves of various American diplomats, senators and military men could not have taken Truman seriously.

In May of 1948, the United States government arranged that Franco should get three-quarters of German assets in Spain, which was flagrantly in actual, if not textual, violation of the intent of the 1946 UN resolution against Franco.

It also cleared the way for a \$250 million loan to Madrid by the Chase National Bank of New York City.

STRAWS IN THE WIND

In the fall of 1948, the then Secretary of State Marshall declared at the Paris meeting of the United Nations that the 1946 resolution of that body "no longer corresponds to the present situation."

These were straws in the shifting wind of United States policy towards Spain, and no outcry was heard from Truman.

The ground was laid for the more outspoken comment of the new secretary of state, Acheson, in a press conference in December 1949 in which he stated he felt that the entry of Spain into the specialized bodies of the United Nations could be prepared. Republican Senator Vandenberg at that time expressed the opinion that Spain was a "bi-partisan question" and called for the sending of an ambassador to Madrid and the inclusion of the "Spanish bastion" in the organization of the Atlantic strategy.

Then in January 1950 came Acheson's infamous letter to Senator Connally in which he boldly called for the changes recently carried out by the UN and for loans to Spain via the Export-Import bank.

During 1948 and 1949 Franco Spain was host to many prominent U. S. visitors of high degree including Senators Thomas, Chavez, McClellan and Russell (Dem.); Bridges, Ferguson and Maybank (Rep.), as well as admirals, generals and air force brass. They were virtually unanimous in calling for diplomatic recognition and immediate economic aid to the Falangist dictator.

On the economic front, the "Franco-Peron Protocol," whereby the Spanish dictator attempted to effect an industrialization of Spain to the accompaniment of a diminution in agricultural production to be made up by Argentine wheat, has failed signally on account of the inability of Spain to pay when Argentina demanded cash. This was the occasion of the first resort to a Chase National Bank loan in order to buy American and Canadian wheat.

Today serious crises exist in housing and electric power as well as food. Restrictions on electric power are more severe than in many another country at war. Madrid gets electricity from nightfall to midnight and for three hours in the morning on some days. At the same time, Spain is also experiencing a rise in its birth rate. So great is the strain on the economy managed

by Franco that it is generally conceded that the American loan, if it is not to be thrown down the drain, must be only the first of a series.

Franco is on the way up, helped by Uncle Sam. He has only one more step: full diplomatic recognition by the U. S. and full entry into the UN and Atlantic Pact. Given the continuation of diplomacy-as-usual, we anticipate that this step will be accomplished. Totalitarianism is so vile, you see, that one must use any means to fight it, even the means of totalitarianism itself. Was not this principle validated in the late war against totalitarianism?

HELPING STALIN

Surely few will succumb to the shabby arguments made by some administration supporters. It is urged for example, that since the administration will ask for a loan for Yugoslavia, a Stalinist-totalitarian, even if anti-Russian, country, how then could one argue against a loan to Spain? It must be apparent to anyone of modest intelligence that a loan to Yugoslavia merely serves to drive the wedge more deeply between that country and Russia, whereas the loan to Spain serves to resuscitate a dying regime.

The big, overwhelming aspect of the gestures to Spain is the indirect, but no less substantial, help rendered to Stalin. We have written of this before. As reported in The Nation, a conservative Spanish Republican charged that the policy "is forcing millions of Spaniards who are against Franco — republicans, monarchists, even former followers of Franco who now oppose him because he is ruining the country, be on the side of the United States, Great Britain and France — to turn their eyes towards Rus-

sia as the only big power here at Lake Success which has defended the cause of the Spanish people."

Thus the sights of U. S. diplomacy are trained on meeting force with force, by the witchhunt domestically and by reactionary allies externally. The eyes of the cotton-state Senators are on easy profits in Spain. Those of the militarists are on bases in Cartagena, the Pyrenees barrier, the Castilian plateau. Their eyes are not on the men and women in prison and the tyranny of the regime.

LABOR LAY DOWN

The U. S. labor movement has seemingly become a silent partner to the actions of the Democratic administration.

In December 1949, at the founding conference of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions held in London, the American labor organizations represented by William Green, Meany and Woll for the AFL, Haywood, Kyne and Quill for the CIO, and Reid for the United Mine Workers all came out in a ringing denunciation of the Franco regime, called for a boycott of Spain and especially opposed any attempt to bring the Spanish totalitarian tyranny into the UN.

They said at that time: "We inquired how labor could support the Marshall Plan, which aimed at strengthening democratic regimes, and then see our own country deal with a dictator in Spain. We said that if our policy were changed it would encourage Franco and that should be the last thing we should do."

Secretary of State Acheson, he it noted, complimented the American labor leaders on their "fine diplomacy" at the time. He then proceeded to write the above-men-

tioned letter to Senator Connally, Louis Stark in the New York Times reported that the U. S. labor leaders reacted with "chagrin" and "deep disappointment" to Acheson's maneuvers.

Fervent opposition on paper, expressions of dismay, then the silence that gives consent—such is the evolution of policy of the U. S. labor leaders. They have been so busy supporting the same Truman administration that brought its Spanish policy to full bloom in the shadow of the elections that they have not given a word or thought to their Spanish comrades-in-arms and brother unionists who languish in prison, face the firing squads, or lament in exile their isolation and lack of help.

Wilebaldo Solano, general secretary of the Spanish POUM, writing a year ago, hoped that the "labor movement of the U. S. will not be found wanting in militant solidarity in these ominous times." U. S. Labor could have indeed turned the tide if it were not bound to the Democratic Party. The U. S., remember, led the fight for the pro-Franco resolution in the UN. Many of the abstentions, such as those of Great Britain, France, and Australia represented a retreat from opposition.

It is above all the failure of the American labor movement to champion the anti-Franco cause which is most disturbing. We expected U. S. diplomats to behave in the manner of U. S. diplomats. U. S. militarists in the manner of U. S. militarists and Truman in the manner of a capitalist politician. But of labor and its leaders we had a right to expect more. It had once pronounced itself in clear and unmistakable voice on the issue. Even to have gone down fighting on the issue were better than not to have fought at all.

ISRAEL Elections Show Protest Vote Against Government Parties

By AL FINDLEY

Israel's first country-wide municipal elections, held on November 14, produced a marked victory for the conservative General Zionists, who campaigned on a platform of free trade in economic policy and for alignment with the United States in foreign affairs.

While it had been expected that the General Zionists would make gains, the extent of their victory was a surprise to everyone. They are now in a position to take the lead in an attempt to build a bourgeois coalition with the possibility of capturing governmental power for the Israeli bourgeoisie.

The General Zionist victory may have far-reaching consequences, but the election did not indicate a marked swing to the right, as the bourgeois press (both Jewish and non-Jewish) have tried to make out.

The election did reveal a protest vote against all the governmental parties. The greatest losers were the other bourgeois parties and the religious bloc. The General Zionists and Mapam, both opposition parties, gained—the first greatly, the second slightly. It is also significant that the extreme right, the Heiruth party, lost heavily, dropping almost one third of its voting strength.

WHICH VOTES SHIFTED?

The result is as follows: Mapai (Labor Party, the present leading government party): 92,000 votes (28 per cent)—loss of 6.7 per cent from 1949.

The abandoned Arab towns of Romleh and Lydda, now inhabited by new immigrants, gave the labor parties heavy majorities. This seems to indicate a trend among the new immigrants.

RELIGIOUS ISSUE PALED

The other surprise of the election was the defeat of the religious bloc. All sections of this bloc, which was splintered in this election, lost heavily. While they are still a powerful factor in Israeli political life, they have lost their power of "blackmail" backed up by the votes of the Oriental Jews who are extremely religious. Political and class questions achieved supremacy over religious issues.

The result of the municipal election, of course, increased the clamor for a new national election. The parties of the cabinet coalition had cold water dashed on their electoral hopes and are in no hurry for a new vote. The present coalition is likely to limp along for a while. The cabinet has brought in a bill to fix the term of the present parliament as extending till 1953.

The Mapam, unlike Mapai, did not drop but rather made a slight gain. This was primarily a result of the protest vote against the government coalition, but it points a lesson: the road to victory lies not in the direction of appeasing the bourgeoisie. The victory of the General Zionists will make that party more attractive to the middle-class elements. If Mapai is to maintain its position, it will be forced to make more of a turn toward its working-class following.

General Zionists: 80,000 votes (25 per cent)—gain of 18 per cent.

Mapam (pro-Stalinist labor party): 37,300 votes (11.28 per cent)—gain of one third of 1 per cent.

Communist Party: 7,385 (2.23 per cent)—loss of one third of 1 per cent.

Heiruth: fell from 15.4 per cent of the vote to 10.4 per cent.

Religious bloc: fell from 15.4 per cent to 12.8.

Progressives: dropped from 5 per cent to 3.

Thus it is seen that the greatest part of the General Zionists' gains came not from the labor parties but from the other bourgeois parties. Mapai, however, seems to have lost some of its middle-class support, at least temporarily.

In evaluating the results of the election, we must remember that it took place in the cities and towns of Israel where the population is engaged to a great extent in trade and commerce rather than in manufacturing. The government's economic controls irk these sections much more than others. It is significant that in Haifa, which is more of an industrial city than Tel-Aviv, Mapai lost only 4 per cent, while in Tel-Aviv it lost more than 10 per cent.

A national election, however would also include the colonies and kibbutzim (collective settlements) where Mapai and Mapam have an overwhelming majority, and would therefore give an entirely different picture. Only half the citizens entitled to vote in national elections voted in these municipal elections.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED? Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League— 4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL. I want to join the ISL. Name Address City Zone State Tel.

LABOR SCOPE

A UAW LOCAL ON THE 1950 ELECTION

"Nothing succeeds like success and nothing teaches like failure. And it appears that the labor movement should learn a great deal from its failure in the November 7 election." That's the beginning of an editorial in the "719 News," newspaper of the United Auto Workers Local 719 (Illinois), which is headed: "Stop the March of Reaction by Building a Labor Party."

The 719 News goes through the disaster on election day and comments: "The problem is: What do we do next? "Labor can't retire from politics, even if some people want to. "Labor has tried the policy of supporting so-called pro-labor candidates for nearly 20 years. Isn't it about time that we questioned the basic wisdom of this policy? Suppose labor had a candidate with the public-appearance leadership qualities of President Walter Reuther [of the UAW] debating Senator Taft instead of a nonentity named Ferguson . . .

"Suppose labor had its political independence and was not tarred with the brush of all the scandals that rocked the Democratic Party? . . . The miserable performance of the Democratic Party on such problems as inflation, housing, war, taxes and civil rights drove the workers to choose the only other alternative, the Republican Party. . .

"Labor can gain back its old reputation of being a leading and positive force in American society when it breaks with the present horrible state of politics. It can rally the people to its banner when it declares its political independence from the past policies. British labor tried it and succeeded. The time is present for a new fresh start in American politics, and the

Reading from Left to Right

BIG CITY MACHINES AND LIBERAL VOTERS, by Irwin Ross. (Commentary, October.)

Ross, the author of Strategy for Liberals, points out the tie-up between the Fair Deal and Democratic Party machines in the major cities. Starting with what he calls the "Chicago pattern," Ross indicates the tactics of "perfuming the ticket" used in several of the large Northern cities—the use of Fair Deal ideology to prop up the sagging Democratic Party machines.

"Until recently, William O'Dwyer, a long-time Roosevelt follower, dominated the Hall [Tammany]; and the Democratic organizations in the other four boroughs dotted on the Truman program. The bulk of the AFL and CIO unions as well as a great many professional liberals who have always looked askance at Tammany supported the city administration rather than the reformers. All this did not remove the atmosphere of discreet corruption which surrounded the O'Dwyer administration, but it buttressed it with a strength which Tammany itself never possessed. It was difficult to muck-rake O'Dwyer because fundamentally he was

running a labor government," the editor of a New York liberal publication recently remarked. What's the solution for this dilemma of the liberals and labor leaders? Ross, the man with the program in Strategy for Liberals, has none. In fact, he is fascinated with the idea of the power of "social democracy" to make the machines adopt its program.

As for the bosses, they are like the weather—they will always be here and Ross is prepared to live with them: "the prospects for local 'clean government' are not too promising, for the liberalism of the bosses in national affairs buttresses their position on the local scene." "We will probably always be plagued by a measure of old-fashioned machine politics. . . . Even if a successful third party should ever emerge—an unlikely development given the structure of American politics—it would unquestionably be infiltrated by the followers of the old city machine."

The "strategy for liberals" would therefore seem to be to infiltrate the old city machines. We wonder what Ross thinks of the strategy after the recent election.

Anti-CP Group Wins 1st Round In Fight for Philadelphia NAACP

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, November 20—An anti-Stalinist grouping in the local branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People made a complete sweep in the election of the nominating committee (nine members) at the November 14 meeting.

Since this nominating committee will on December 12 "present nominations at the annual meeting for all officers and the Executive Committee" in the form of a printed ballot, last week's action probably heralds the end of more than five years of Communist Party control. Candidates on the winning slate polled from 88 to 70 votes while the highest vote cast for a candidate of the present administration was 53.

The victorious caucus had carried on a campaign during the year for the restoration of democracy and efficient functioning in the branch. It had criticized the incumbent administration, nominally headed by the Reverend E. Theodore Lewis, for excluding various individuals and groups from participation in branch activity. Financial reports failed to show the substantial indebtedness to the national office, memberships were held for long periods before being forwarded to New York, the executive committee functioned poorly, and most of the standing committees were defunct.

Last week it was announced that the national organization had decided to play a limited role in local affairs; after January 1 an executive secretary will be furnished by the national office at its expense. Unlike the other officers, the executive secretary will not be a member of the branch executive board.

The nominating committee, headed by Father Jesse Anderson, has an important task. It must draw up a slate for the four top offices and thirty executive committee posts. The new officers will need to be resourceful, competent, and industrious for it will be difficult to rebuild the branch. The Stalinists will undoubtedly be very vocal critics of the new regime.

The candidates, chosen by the committee are printed on the ballot and thus enjoy a considerable advantage over write-ins nominated from the floor at the annual meeting. Thus the committee's slate should represent not only all viewpoints in the caucus but also all interests in the Negro community. Because of its principled stand against the Communist Party influence in the NAACP, the committee will not be expected to endorse any consistent followers of the CP line.

In order to give the membership a meaningful opportunity to nominate candidates which the committee had overlooked or rejected, a limited number of vacancies for executive committee posts should be left on the printed ballot. Despite the overwhelming mandate given the nominating committee in last week's election, it is still necessary that the December election be carried out as democratically as possible under the given election rules.

THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—19 The Fate of Trade-Unionism under Tito

By HAL DRAPER

The setting up of the "workers' councils" in Yugoslavia, far from instituting a higher level of workers' democracy, has been the pretext on which the Tito government has formally shorn the trade-unions of their important functions as trade unions.

This fact is little known, even though the Titoists announced it officially, perhaps because it has been difficult for the socialist pro-Titoists to fit it into their euphoric view of Yugoslav development. (There have, in fact, been scarcely any references to the trade unions under Tito from the pro-Titoists. One did come from Will Balantine, a leading trade-unionist of the British Independent Labor Party, who came back from a trip to Yugoslavia to express his personal opinion that "workers' control in industry" in that country was controlled by the trade unions, according to the Socialist Leader of August 19. There is not an iota of truth in this, as the workers-council law makes clear; nor do the Yugoslavs make this claim. Comrade Ballantine's sincerity is beyond question, but it illustrates the pitfalls to be met by the "radical tourists" in Belgrade.)

The following statement will not seem extreme if the official announcements below are read carefully: trade-unionism as such has been abolished by decree in Tito-Yugoslavia. Organizations called "trade unions" will continue to exist, of course, but the role officially assigned to them will have nothing in common with the name. This is, of course, in addition to the fact that "trade unions" under Stalinist totalitarianism can only be a mockery in any case. We are stressing that the Tito government has made the emasculation of the trade unions a juridical fact.

Ending Trade-Unionism

Tito announced this change in his speech on the law at the National Assembly on July 18:

"The participation of the workers in the management of the enterprises will have the effect of reducing the role played up to now by the trade unions in the defense of the workers' interests, for these questions will henceforth be resolved by the workers themselves, by means of their councils and the management committees of the enterprises. But by that fact alone the task of the trade unions will be facilitated, since up to now they had, on the one hand, to defend the workers' interests, and on the other also to watch over the interests of the people's state and the interests of the community as a whole."

The task of the trade unions will now be "facilitated" in the degree that they can now devote their time to watching over "the interests of the people's state" rather than over the workers' interests. This will indeed make things much easier—for the state.

Tito went on: "The law also provides that the management committees will also include representatives of the trade-union section of the enterprise, which will thus have its share of responsibility in the management of the enterprise, instead of playing a purely consultative and irresponsible role."

The reader will note Tito's description ("purely consultative and irresponsible") of a trade union which does not share in management—that is, which acts as a trade union. Incidentally, the law says not a word about trade-union representation on the management committee, despite Tito's statement (not that it makes any difference).

"Reduced" to Propaganda Outfits

To what will the role of the trade unions be "reduced," as Tito puts it? Belgrade's No. 2 newspaper, Politika, had been more explicit a few days before the speech. As reported by Tanjug the paper stated that the new workers' council setup—

"changes essentially the role of the trade unions in the economic tasks and in the protection of the interests of the employees and workers. In the future, it will be the workers themselves who, through their workers' councils and their management committees, will independently solve all questions, taking upon themselves the economic functions and the role which the trade unions held in the solution of these questions. The task of the trade unions will in the future be first of all, to strengthen their activity in ideological, political and cultural education of the working class, develop socialist relations among the workers in labor and in the public domain, to awaken their socialist consciousness and a sense of the responsibility they are assuming in undertaking the management of economy." (July 15.)

One day after Tito's speech, the Central Committee of the Federation of Trade Unions acted:

"Belgrade, July 19—At its plenary meeting, the Central Committee of the Federation of Trade Unions of Yugoslavia has decided that the central field of work of the trade unions will in future be raising the cultural and political level of the workers. . . .

"It was also decided at this plenum that, in conformity with the changes in their tasks, the structure of the trade-union organization would also change. The central and republic committees in the future will concern themselves especially with questions of principle and will make decisions of general importance, while the principal tasks will be given effect by technical councils by republic and section. They will be reinforced by new non-professional trade-union workers, while the central and republic committees will reduce their administrative apparatus as well as the number of their paid functionaries." (Tanjug, July 20.)

The "trade unions," then, will be mainly a propaganda apparatus, with a big saving in bureaucratic overhead, once the pretense of defending the workers' interests is formally buck-passed to the "workers' councils."

Sample Agenda

Only one other comment is necessary. Even if it were true that the workers' councils were set up to defend the workers' interests, as is not true, they could be no substitute for trade unions. For the workers' councils may exist in each enterprise but are not linked up with each other. (This is sometimes vaguely referred to in Yugoslavia as a future aim.) It is as if trade unions were to be limited only to plant-wide organizations. Even in the U. S., the abolition of industry-wide bargaining is seriously proposed only by the extreme union-busting wing of reaction.

Not that the trade unions did much defending of the workers' interests before the boon of workers' councils was decreed for the workers. I note that at the trade-union central committee plenum in December of last year, the agenda read as follows:

- (1) Trade-union organizations in the struggle for a high productivity of work; (2) Immediate tasks in the propaganda and ideological activity in trade-union branches, and

MURDER IN MEXICO The Assassination of Leon Trotsky

by General Sanchez Salazar in collaboration with Julian Gorkin

The story of the assassination of Trotsky written by the ex-Chief of the Secret Service of the Mexican police who was in charge of the investigation.

235 pages \$2.50 Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y. (Orders must be accompanied by payment)

LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Pacifist Organ Banned by P. O.

The radical pacifist monthly "Alternative" has had its September-October issue banned from the mails, according to an announcement by Albert Goldman, New York postmaster, received in a letter to the editors. The issue, which contained a discussion of disarmament and a plea for resistance to the draft, was banned under a postal regulation dealing with "advocating or urging treason, insurrection or forcible resistance to any law of the United States." Goldman's letter said.

The policy of the magazine has been to advocate conscientious objection to the draft. The editors are pacifists who, their statement says, believe in non-violence and attempt to promote the methods of peaceful change as developed especially by Gandhi in India even if it means defying the laws of the country when they conflict with principle. This is the first instance of the banning of a publication for political or anti-war reasons since World War II.

Gerald Smith Hails McCarren

By JESSIE KAAREN

Gerald L. K. Smith is exultant. The fascist "crusader," in a confidential memo to his patrons, takes credit for the passing of the McCarren Law.

"You doubtless know," says he in his memo, "that I was one of the six men who met confidentially years ago and brought pressure upon Congress to form what is now known as the Un-American Activities Committee, which has doubtless done more to expose and unearth Communism than any other single enterprise."

He also boasts of cooperating with the Republicans by bringing the dirty wash out in public in places where the Republicans didn't dare mention certain "facts" in "fear of being accused of anti-Semitism and for fear of being smeared by the Jew-controlled newspapers." This is mentioned in connection with the "Stop Roosevelt" campaign in California during which, these fascists say, they mailed out one and a half million pieces of literature.

There is another morsel in this confidential memo. "The big job we have now is to expose the secret government operating behind and behind our President and Congress. The passing of the McCarren-Woods bill to outlaw Communism is the first blow to this Jew-cabal." Fascist Smith, of course, is trying to ride the wave in order to back up his ailing "Christian Nationalist" movement; but the "anti-subversive" hysteria has given him a wave to ride, made to order for his hate propaganda.

"(3) Budget for 1950." [For the Defense of Peace, a Yugoslav propaganda organ in English, Jan.-Feb. 1950.]

That agenda need not be changed under the "new" course. But a worker need no longer ask why there was no place on the agenda for defense of the workers' interests. It goes without saying that strikes are, in effect, seditious under Tito. A previous article quoted the statement by Rankovic, the secret-police minister, boasting that "in Yugoslavia there are no such hardships as . . . work stoppages." At the same plenum of the trade-union central committee quoted above, a blast was also issued against the Cominform which, among other things, indignantly denies the Cominform "inventions" about the existence of strikes in the country as "a serious insult and a slander against the working class of Yugoslavia."

One can imagine that the official reduction of the trade-unions to the role of speedup and-propaganda instruments will not improve the sad situation described by Nova Makedonija, the Tito government's organ in Macedonia:

"In the organization and holding of annual meetings by trade-union branches, sub-branches and groups, a number of weaknesses and omissions have been noted, thus preventing the regular holding of annual meetings. In many trade-union branches, no previous conferences were held to explain the importance of holding annual meetings. . . ." (Skopje radio, Feb. 5.)

Yugoslav Stakhanovism

A note on Yugoslav Stakhanovism: This speedup system is the same in Yugoslavia as in the Moscow-controlled states, though the Russian term is not used. Yugoslav Stakhanovists are "shock workers," "rationalizers," etc., and the national counterpart of Stakhanov is one Alija Sirotanovic, a miner.

Otherwise the same picture holds. Attempts are made to build up Stakhanovists into a favored labor aristocracy, though there is very limited leeway for this in present-day Yugoslavia due to the extreme poverty of the whole country and the general lack of consumption goods. (The "radical tourists" who report conversations with "a worker" on a tour through a factory could profitably ponder over similar reports by radical tourists in Russia during the '30s. . . .)

Trotsky had occasion to comment on Russian Stakhanovism: "As a result of these flagrant differences in wages, doubled by arbitrary privileges, the bureaucracy has managed to introduce sharp antagonisms in the proletariat. Accounts of the Stakhanov campaign presented at times the picture of a small civil war. 'The wrecking and breaking of mechanisms is the favorite [!] method of struggle against the Stakhanov movement,' wrote, for example, the organ of the trade unions." [The Revolution Betrayed, page 127-8.]

Should not this be kept in mind when Tito reports, as he did in an address at the end of 1948, that crimes against persons and crimes against private property have decreased but that—

"On the other hand a certain increase of criminality is registered, emerging from the sharp class struggle against the capitalist remnants in our country, manifested through sabotage, speculation and all kinds of willful damage of state property."

Tito ascribes this increase to "enemies of new Yugoslavia [who] have managed to make their way into the economic and state apparatus!"

Super-Industrialization Squeeze

Unless we turn to reports of doubtful reliability in the U. S. press (doubtful in the sense that there is no way to verify them), we cannot go further in tracing this question through unassailable documentation. The same holds for peasant forms of resistance on the countryside. During the election campaign in March, the election speech by Tito at Drvar clearly enough indicated the existence of police coercion against peasants and peasant antagonisms to the regime. Tito promises to stop "excesses," "forcing," etc. (Not in the sections of this speech spread by the Belgrade propaganda organs in various languages but in the more complete text of the speech given over the Belgrade radio.)

What is beyond doubt, however, is the fact that there is a tremendous economic squeeze on the Yugoslav workers and peasants. It is by no means all accounted for by the backwardness of the country, its general poverty, or by the Cominform blockade. These account for a great deal, but over and above all that is the fact that the Tito regime's frenetic industrialization program is based on super-exploitation of the people. It could not be otherwise.

Superficial socialist observers will no doubt point out that a socialist Yugoslavia would also have to set industrialization as fast as possible as its goal. This is, of course, true but not the point. What is "possible" is considered differently by different regimes. The Yugoslav program was and is possible only at the expense of super-exploitation of the people, as was Stalin's super-industrialization program. Trotsky's attacks on the latter apply with full force to Tito.

Peasant discontent is, therefore, without doubt based on the effects of this industrialization program as it acts on the background of Yugoslavia's general economic and political situation. The Tito regime has announced that one-third of the population now live in the cities and towns, where 80 per cent were previously on the land. They have to be fed from the land—without there having taken place a sufficient development of light industry, consumers' industry and agricultural mechanization to make this a natural development. ("Our main task is to restore large-scale industry; and in order to approach the task of restoring large-scale industry at all seriously and systematically we must restore small industry," was Lenin's answer to the super-industrializers in his day.)

(Next week: The positive outcome of Titoism.)

They Need Your Help!

Local New York of the Independent Socialist League has been regularly mailing packages of food and clothing to needy workers in Europe. The relief committee has especially urgent need for clean, wearable clothing for children of school age, particularly in the 12-14 age group. Please bring or send your contributions to the city center of the ISL, at 114 West 14 Street, 3rd floor, New York City.

The Gray Report and Europe's Will to Fight

By SAM FELIKS

The Gray report besides being a primer on what the U. S. hopes the world to look like in the unforeseen future, is also a statement of plans for today. Unlike previous official statements outlining foreign economic and political policy, it marks a break in that it explicitly points out that the cold war is part of foreign economic policy.

The Harriman report of 1947 which inaugurated the Marshall Plan was formulated in terms of the eventual easing up of the cold war. This was also the line of the European Marshall Plan Council's annual reports.

In fact, one of the preconditions laid down for the success of the Marshall Plan was the resumption of East-West trade—that is, the hope of re-establishing the traditional trade relations between agricultural Eastern Europe and industrial Western Europe. With the recovery of Western Europe and the resumption of East-West trade, the cold war would ease up, or so it was thought, and a period of "peaceful coexistence," even if an uneasy one, would exist in which the United States could whittle away at Russian strength.

But the Gray report does not contain any trace of the myth of "peaceful coexistence." It recognizes that the U. S. first is going to have to clean up the Stalinist threat to capitalism, and then it will be able (so it hopes) to organize the world according to capitalist standards. For the report states:

"Increasingly, however, we have been forced to recognize, as the dominant factor in world affairs, the deterioration of relations between the free world and the Soviet Union. We have acted on the principle that this underlying conflict has been political in the broadest sense."

Allies for "Underlying Conflict"

Along with the heightening of the awareness of "this underlying conflict" has been the proportional acceleration of the building up of the war economy and what this entails. It means marshaling economic resources and manpower, securing strategic raw materials and their sources of supply—and arming allies. For no more than the U. S. can exist economically isolated from the rest of the world can the U. S. militarily prepare for a third world war without allies all over the world.

In the first chapter of the report, entitled "The Significance of Foreign Economic Policy," there is a statement of this problem: not only finding people who are broadly sympathetic with the U. S. but also getting them to prepare for a third world war. In face of this problem the Gray report reveals bankruptcy, and all it can do is make a feeble attempt to paint the U. S. as the camp of democracy.

"The objective of our foreign economic policy has been, and is, to encourage among the nations of the free world those economic conditions and relationships essential for the development of stable democratic societies willing and able to defend themselves and raise the living standards of their people. The objectives are to the benefit of all peoples; their national interests are bound up with our national interests; our security and well-being are clearly connected with their security and well-being."

Pie in the Sky

This states the ideological objective. But the fulfillment of this objective is clearly at odds with the actual economic policy set forth: "in economic terms, the long-range conflict between Soviet Communism and the non-Communist world will center on their relative success, not only in protecting, but also in efficiently utilizing and developing the economic resources available to them. This, then, should provide a keynote for our foreign economic policies." [My emphasis.]

The keynote of this foreign economic policy is the building up of the military strength of the U. S. and its allies. The keynote sings a tune different from the objective: it heralds a decreasing standard of living in the capitalist world

(and the same applies to the millions living in the Stalinist world).

But what is to be offered in terms of a concrete proposal? The Gray report hortatorily announces the need for a positive political and economic program. Here is the sum total of its political program:

"In this approach, economic betterment must obviously have a central place, but since results can accrue by and large only over a considerable period of time, the immediate need is to generate hope and a promise for the future that carries conviction of fulfillment." [My emphasis.]

It is the promise of pie in the sky. The most powerful capitalism in the world on the very eve of a struggle for its existence can only offer "a promise for the future." It makes this appeal to the great mass of the peoples throughout the world who are anti-capitalist (and it is this anti-capitalism that Stalinism has been able to exploit) when almost all, including even the Americans, recognize the future dangers of misery and war for themselves.

Why Europe Stalls

It is possible for American capitalism only to talk like this today—that is, to offer, or even think in terms of, a perspective after the war for capitalism. Such a *beau geste* is not possible anywhere else in the capitalist world. This is the problem that faces the U. S. in the rearming of Western Europe. For Western Europe, a third world war will not solve any problems, and above all, even to the bourgeoisie, it does not offer the perspective of a new era of capitalist expansion.

To the U. S., Western Europe has been "dragging its feet" on building up its military strength. This has brought forth essentially two types of reactions: (1) that the U. S. ought to stop sending aid or perhaps get a little more tough and force them to hurry up; and (2) amazement that Western Europe does not see the danger and make the necessary preparation to defend itself.

Of course, one of the elements in this reaction to rearming is the stalling on the part of many of the Western European governments in order to get a bigger slice of U. S. military expenditures. But at bottom it is due to the antipathy of the people to fight another war. Drew Middleton, reporting on the U. S. occupation's response to the Social-Democratic victory in the recent German state elections, writes: "In view of the results of the U. S. elections on November 7 there are many, Americans and Germans alike, who expect to be told 'you must rearm and German political differences are not important.' Such a program would be disastrous in the eyes of those who are in close touch with public opinion. The French and the British are not the only peoples who are restive under U. S. leadership in the great struggle for power with the Soviet Union." [N. Y. Times, Nov. 22.]

Neon Lights Won't Do

The Gray report, while posing the problem of the need to build up support, views the problem as merely one of misunderstood interests: "We have often failed to adjust or to translate our purposes and actions into the contexts of their major interests—of the issues as they see them. The fact that many governments may at the moment lend us their support should not deceive us regarding the extent of this basic weakness."

To be sure, there is the conflict of interests. But it is not the kind of conflict that the U. S. can resolve by putting up neon signs in Western Europe to tell the people that the U. S. is really democratic, as one ECA report on information suggested. And it is not that the U. S. is misunder-

stood, but rather that many in Europe and Asia too well understand the war drives of American capitalism.

The conflict of interests springs from the fact that Europe does not see any prospect of gaining anything out of a war. Russia or the United States may win or lose; that much is in doubt; but it is guaranteed that Europe loses. As one correspondent reports, "the broken people on the front lines simply do not wish to fight."

Built-In Militarism

To problems of this magnitude the Gray report does not even address itself, much less present a solution. It is this that reflects the crisis in U. S. foreign policy. For the solution of the social, economic and political problems of our time U. S. foreign policy does not have an answer. U. S. capitalism cannot deal with the revolutionary upsurge in many parts of the world, nor with Stalinism which distorts and eventually destroys its progressive character—except by military means.

It is on the military level and with respect to the building up of the American war economy that the Gray report does come to grips with a problem. It is entirely in keeping with the military bias in U. S. foreign policy. Here is something which it can take up with a sense of competence and ability; it is its inability to solve the social and economic questions that gives rise to the built-in military bias.

The Gray report illustrates this: "As success is achieved in broadening the unity of purpose, based on mutual interest among free peoples, we may reasonably expect a greater sharing of the burden of security and development requirements. Where this unity is now lacking and where there is no willingness to participate adequately in the common effort, the difficulty is likely to appear in the realm of ideas and values, or of internal policies, rather than in any economic capacity. Where economic deficiencies are a major element of the difficulty, however, an investment in aid now may pay large dividends in growing collective strength."

Promises, Today and Tomorrow

The Marshall Plan, three years ago, was able to put forward the prospect of an increase in the living standards for the peoples of West Europe because U. S. foreign policy was not yet entirely geared to the accelerated pace of "this underlying conflict" and it was still based on the hope for a peaceful solution. The Gray report today, on the other hand, offers no such inducement to Western Europe, for—by explicitly revealing the dominating military orientation of U. S. foreign policy—it points rather to a consequent lowering of the living standards.

The promises of the Gray report are the "promises for the future." It promises pie in the sky if you will fight and die today. The immediate objective sought by the report is the strengthening of the U. S. war economy primarily through the securing of foreign supplies of strategic raw materials. The aid promised to Western Europe is the creation of the armies needed to fight tomorrow and for the closer integration of Western Europe's economy into the American war machine. The Point Four program for the underdeveloped areas is designed to pilfer their raw materials. It demands the subordination of the non-Stalinist world to American hegemony.

For all of these sacrifices by the peoples of the world, the U. S. offers a future in the "free world"—the world of free enterprise, free trade, free competition and free access to markets. But today it offers a society that is rapidly becoming more undemocratic and bureaucratic, and one that is increasingly forced to adopt many of the characteristic behavior patterns of its totalitarian enemy.

This is the program of American imperialism, today's promise. Its promise for tomorrow is the A-bomb, the H-bomb and the destructiveness of the third world war. But the future does not belong to either American imperialism or Stalinist totalitarianism. It belongs to the people—the oppressed and exploited peoples all over the world.

Sidney Hook's Double Standard

"Ideological Spying" Is Very, Very Bad—but Only When the Other Fellow Does It

By GORDON HASKELL

Every couple of months the New York Times magazine section (Sunday supplement) carries an article by Professor Sidney Hook dealing with some aspect of Stalinism in the United States. For the last few years Hook has been the foremost advocate among the liberals of devising ways and means of preventing Stalinists from teaching in our schools and colleges.

In the issue of the Times for November 26, however, he has wandered into a more intriguing field: the field of Stalinist espionage.

Hook attempts to explain to the layman why it is that men like Alger Hiss, Fuchs, Carr and others became spies for Russia. He seeks to explore the psychological mechanism involved in a shift of loyalties from their own government to Stalinism and thence to Russia as the embodiment of Stalinism. And finally he seeks to present a program for combating the "strange" and "new" phenomenon of "ideological" spying.

Of course, the article deals specifically with Stalinist spying, and does not pretend to cover the field. Yet curiously enough, whenever Hook makes a generalization on any of the psychological traits or dominant attitudes of Stalinist spies, he does not seem to be aware of the fact that what he describes is equally true for all people who become spies for ideological reasons.

This is not important primarily because it gives additional insight into the development of the thinking of Sidney Hook, who can be taken as a pretty good spokesman for a whole generation of socialists-turned-defenders-of-capitalism. It is important because it is one more example of a specific type of miseducation which plays a role in preparing the American people for a war in which no holds are barred.

It is part of the whole process which seeks to portray the enemy as outside the pale of humanity. He, the enemy, thinks differently from human beings (especially good Americans); feels differently from them; has a different psychology, etc.

How About American Spies?

First of all, it is obviously incorrect to convey the idea that ideological espionage is something "new" or peculiar to Stalinism. Every German, Italian, Bulgarian et al. who gave information or aid and comfort to the OSS or British Intelligence during the last war free of charge was an ideological spy and a "traitor to his country" in the narrow patriotic sense.

Certainly most members of the OSS and other espionage organizations of the Allies during the last war were ideological spies, and the American government is, we can safely assume, seeking to develop as many ideological spies as it possibly can behind the Iron Curtain at the present time. Further, hundreds of them are working for the FBI inside the Communist Party in this country.

To justify the activities of these people while condemning the activities of the Stalinist spies can be done logically only if one stops talking about spying as a peculiarly vicious kind of activity and starts discussing the relative merits of the causes on behalf of which the spying is done. But Hook doesn't like that kind of treatment of the subject, as it would run contrary to his whole approach.

"No human being, irrespective of the original high-mindedness of his intentions," he writes, "can fail to be affected in some way by the

means he uses to achieve his goals. When the pattern of duplicity, lying and betrayal becomes habitual, moral sensibilities are gradually blunted and character itself becomes transformed. Not infrequently the idealist becomes a brutal cynic to whom the early ideological rationalizations are ritualistic chatter."

That, of course, is quite true. It obviously applies to every operative of the FBI in the Communist Party, or in other organizations, as much as to the Stalinist spy. Hook deals with the problem of the growing multiplication of government agents and spies of all kinds in our country—but not mentioning it at all.

Source of Stalinist Espionage

Even though his one-sided presentation of the question is misleading in the sense indicated, Hook has a good grasp of the source of the Stalinist spy machine. He says that the Stalinist parties of the world are an excellent recruiting ground for all kinds of secret agents, and that from among the mass of Stalinists the Russian MVD (GPU) selects either people who are particularly naive or particularly vicious for full-time espionage. The naive ones are gradually hardened and corrupted. They can be effective because they come from all walks of life and because they have a fairly wide social base—the Stalinist movements—from which to operate.

Of course, Trotsky pointed this out during a whole decade when broad liberal strata were more intent on cooperating with the Stalinists than on defeating them. As a socialist internationalist, he discussed the problem not from the standpoint of assisting governments to protect themselves against military and industrial espionage, but rather because he was concerned with protecting the labor movement from infiltration and corruption by the GPU apparatus.

Hook attempts to devise a defense against Stalinist espionage on the basis of his analysis of the nature of the phenomenon. And it is precisely at this point that he is both closest to saying something significant about it and yet necessarily wide of the mark.

"Here, as elsewhere," he ends his article, "continuous education and continuing social reform, if not the only, are, in the long view, our most formidable defense."

And a bit before that he writes: "the most effective way of meeting the threat of ideological espionage is to dry up its sources by public education on the nature of the Communist Party. The ill-advised McCarran-Kilgore Internal Security Act is no more appropriate for this purpose than is a pitchfork for lading water."

Compartmentalized Minds

Stalinism in the United States and elsewhere outside the Iron Curtain does not draw its strength primarily from ignorance about the nature of the Communist Parties or Russia. It is possible for Stalinism to attract millions chiefly because they are so disgusted with the realities of the social system in which they live that they are willing to turn to any ideology, backed with visible power, which struggles against it.

Of course, they are blind to the true nature of Stalinism. They do not want to believe that it is a brutal totalitarian society. To prevent the truth from penetrating their minds they are compelled to fix them in rigid compartments in which all terms like "democracy" and "peace" and "freedom" have different meanings when applied to the Stalinist world than when applied to the world of capitalism.

To the Stalinist ideology Hook wants to oppose something better. "There is implicit in the American ideal of 'equal opportunity for all' a revolutionary dynamic sufficient to meet and overcome every domestic challenge to our own ideals," he writes. Yet it is precisely the disparity between this ideal and the social facts which is one of the chief sources of all ideological revolt against our society.

And here we find that the idealistic apologists for capitalism are also compelled to compartmentalize their minds in order to maintain their

ideology. They too must concentrate on the "implicit ideals" and the "social reforms" while either ignoring the gradual encroachment of authoritarian thought and practice in our society or explaining it away on grounds of necessity imposed by military danger... just as the Stalinists explain away the lack of democracy in Russia.

The Real Trend

Capitalism itself, reformed or unreformed, with or without good public education on the nature of the Stalinist parties, has proved itself incapable of defeating Stalinism ideologically. There is good reason to believe that the tendency is away from continuing the effort, and in the direction of defeating Stalinism with repressions at home and military might abroad.

One might think that the consequences of this trend would be clear, particularly to people of Hook's philosophical persuasion. The means, it goes without saying, will prevail over the ends in due course. Yet instead of raising his voice in full cry against the actual trend of events here, Hook is willing to propose as a substitute for active revolutionary opposition to these trends a "revolutionary dynamic" the reality of which exists only in an ideal—and only implicitly, at that.

The whole point is this: neither Stalinism nor its particular aspect of espionage will be eliminated by public education on the nature of Stalinist Russia. Nor will it be eliminated by reforming capitalism. It can only be defeated politically by the development of a broad social movement which is as determinedly opposed to capitalism as are the Stalinists; which struggles against all its manifestations in the name of a better social order, as do the Stalinists; but which conducts this struggle by means of the democratic, conscious organization of masses of people, as the Stalinists do not do.

This is the objective of the Independent Socialist League.

DEAD GIVE-AWAY

In his article in the N. Y. Times discussed on this page, Sidney Hook attacks "political espionage" as a means which leads to moral degeneration, brutal cynicism, etc. While his article is specifically on the Stalinist spies, his strictures against the practice are made in general fashion. It is therefore intriguing to learn that it was Sidney Hook who made the following public proposal—which can only mean, possibly among other things, the organization on a large-scale of "ideological spies," saboteurs, fifth-columnists and others who would necessarily have to practice duplicity, lying and other vices on a systematic basis.

"I speak in the first person only for purposes of expository emphasis. Give me a hundred million dollars and a thousand dedicated people, and I will guarantee such a wave of democratic unrest among the masses—yes, even among the soldiers—of Stalin's own empire, that all of his problems for a long time to come will be internal. I can find the people. . . ." (Politics magazine, Winter 1949. Emphasis in original.)

As Hook writes in the Times, "ideological espionage originates from a mixture of misguided idealism and Messianic zeal." (Few Messiahs, however, have predicated their world-saving mission on a hundred million dollars.)

The question of espionage is not in itself politically interesting to us; it is only one of the many means employed by both war camps (and other powers), both ideological and non-ideological, to further their own purposes. What is interesting, as Comrade Haskell points out, is Hook's dead give-away of his double standard of judgment in approaching Stalinist and American imperialism.—Ed.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own labor and socialist library. . . . Write for free book list. And remember: we also supply books of ALL publishers. Get ALL your books from

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

MacArthur - Truman Set Stage

(Continued from page 1)
 the direct responsibility of both war camps, not only for the general international situation which has produced this explosive moment and which is decisive in evaluating it, but also for the immediate crisis. Stalin and Mao, on the one side, and Truman and MacArthur on the other have cooperated to bring it about, in a bisymmetric pattern.

For a detailed discussion of the aggressive aims of Stalinist imperialism via the Peiping regime, see the accompanying article in this issue, written before the present critical point. The Chinese Stalinists are defending neither Chinese nor Korean independence but only the power of the Moscow-Peiping axis in Korea. Their offensive, if provoked, was not provoked because U. S. airplanes bombed the wrong end of bridges over the Yalu River border. They have been fully prepared for this offensive. **And just as it was inconceivable that the North Koreans should invade the South without a green light from the Kremlin, so the present mass entrance into the fighting by Peiping's troops is inconceivable without Stalin's nod.**

As a consequence of the mass intervention by the Chinese, Peiping's delegates appear before the UN holding their military successes like a sword over the rest of the world—or like a gun on the bargaining counter. Like

the capitalist imperialists, they do not want war — they want peace on their own terms; and for both the distinction is in the long run only tactical. Each aggressive step is a "calculated risk," and the third world war will likely break out as the result of a miscalculated risk.

If Mao's present mass offensive is one of these calculated risks, the starting point of the present critical phase of the Korean war was another calculated risk—decided by Washington and plugged by MacArthur: the crossing of the 38th parallel by the U. S.

Although MacArthur speaks of an "entirely new war," the Chinese in fact committed themselves from this point on. They announced this to the world at that time through the Indian ambassador in Peiping. The U. S. chose to believe that they were bluffing; India did not. It was, indeed, for this reason that Nehru has since steadfastly refused to assume responsibility for UN "liberation" activities in North Korea, in spite of his general support to the U. S.-UN war.

The U. S. chose to accept, or pretend to accept, Mao's double-talk about Chinese "volunteers" in Korea, or to believe that Chinese forces would be limited to tokens in any eventuality.

On the basis of this hope or belief, in the past months Washington and London have been speaking in terms of how to head

off the danger of Chinese intervention: assurances for China's hydroelectric interests across the border, buffer zones, internationalized areas, etc. The "calculated risk" for Acheson and Bevin—for peace on their terms—aimed at taking all Korea but not at war with China.

Even THIS "calculated risk" policy, which in any case overlaps the "calculated risk" area of Peiping, has been torpedoed by MacArthur.

MacArthur has used every instrument of his military position to try to set up a kind of reactionary "dual power" in his own bailiwick in the limited field of foreign policy, a "dual power" to the State Department, representing the pro-Chiang elements in American imperialism determined on following a more openly aggressive policy to maintain complete hegemony in the Far East, which they view as more decisive than Europe.

The State Department, following a different course in the same interests of U. S. world power, held its collective head when the general with the specially tailored cap flew to Formosa to chin with Chiang, and groaned when his cohorts here published his pro-Chiang appeal after it had been officially banned. There is plenty of reason to believe the speculation that Truman's still-mysterious trip to Wake Island (following the flurry here of open

preventive-war exhortations by influential names) had mainly the purpose of curbing MacArthur's obvious desire to "settle" with Mao's China forthwith.

MacArthur did in truth sign the "treaty" with Truman, putting his name down in signature to the minutes of the meeting as if he were an independent potentate, however sullenly as the press reported, but he still possessed his "dual power" as the warlord in the East.

The Acheson-Bevin line ended up with these gentlemen agreeing to invite Stalinist China to the UN, in order to facilitate the entrance of the Korean war into a diplomatic phase. Three days before Mao's men were due to appear at Lake Success, MacArthur launched his "end the war" and "home by Christmas" offensive, the accompanying label being greeted with un concealed dismay by Washington.

In the MOST immediate sense, without lessening the importance of the preceding events by a whit, it is this irresponsible adventure by the proconsul in Tokyo which has led to the present pass.

Just as the stage is set for the possible resolution of the war on the diplomatic field, albeit over the inter-imperialist bargain counter, MacArthur has dumped a military crisis into the UN's lap.

He did not "bring the boys home by Christmas." Moreover,

the navy has in bitterness made clear that his quack promise was an imposture from the start, since it was physically impossible even if the fighting ended.

He did not give the boys Santa Claus at home. He has only given them the opportunity to fight for his latest "calculated risk"—a gift which distinctly possesses no advantages over their more general privilege to fight for U. S. hegemony over the Far East.

His plunging adventure has been a "calculation" not only with the lives of his men but with the third world war and consequently the fate of civilization.

We are not interested in deciding whether MacArthur's policy or Acheson's policy is a more consistent or "realistic" corollary of the original decision to cross the 38th parallel or of the original Truman decision on military intervention in Korea. The consistency and realism are both within the framework of the same imperialist policy. A government interested in peace would not have a MacArthur on its hands in the first place, even if his generalship were twice as "brilliant" as the Hearst press puffs it up to be—any more than a government interested in defending democracy in the world would prop up a Rhee in Korea.

It is Washington and Moscow that set up the deck which Mao and MacArthur have dealt out in their own way.

Mao's Aims in Korea Emerge --

(Continued from page 1)
 (5) U. S. representative Warren Austin was forced to withdraw the "Formosa question" from the UN agenda, acknowledging Peiping's premise that the UN had no jurisdiction. Even Chiang Kai-shek denied UN jurisdiction. Peiping can bargain for Formosa now. It has linked Formosa to the Korean issue in its own way.

THROW OF THE DICE
 How has it come about that the hard-won victories of the American forces are turned to dust in the bitter winter snows? A perspective on past U. S. war policy indicates the reason.

America is alienated from the great popular movements of Asia. Because it became estranged from the great social upheavals which have been the prime dynamic in Asia, the U. S. lost its position on the continent and in Southeast Asia. In Korea, U. S. policy led it to identification with the anti-popular Rhee government. On the military plane, Acheson had originally drawn the perimeter of U. S. strategic interests to exclude Korea and Formosa. North Asia was acknowledged as an area of Russian power, sanctified as such by treaty, U. S. military withdrawal and political failure.

On June 25 Truman, in effect, proposed to reverse these deep-seated tendencies by a single throw of the military dice. A U. S. army was to recapture all that had been forfeited during five years. But reality was not amenable to such sudden attack.

All Asia, the peoples of North and South Korea and the massive might of Stalinism were arrayed

against the effort. Given these conditions, especially the overwhelming Stalinist power, even a military victory would create more problems than it could solve.

The invasion of South Korea was a combined operation by international Stalinism. Details on the military preparations have become public through the defection of a member of the Russian military mission to Pyongyang and the publication of his report.

According to his account, the North Korean army was built around three elements: (1) the Korean brigades of the Russian army, which had fought as far west as Stalingrad; (2) 1500 tank technicians from Mongolia as the nucleus of the armored divisions; (3) Chinese Korean troops of the Manchurian command. Russia supplied all the arms, using the Chinese and Mongolian railroads for transport.

BLEEDING POINT
 Korea became the bond for the integration of Stalinist diplomacy and strategy in North Asia under Russian hegemony. The Chinese were definitely subordinates in this relationship, much to their chagrin. American military action strengthened this dependency.

The combined Stalinist power is sufficient to make the U. S. position certainly untenable. MacArthur's command and Rhee's social policies will only make the Stalinists' task simpler. Stalinism is in a position to exert the greatest pressures for a favorable deal, and then nullify it through new pressures.

It can make Korea a bleeding

point of American strength by continuing the agony of war through guerrillas, regular units or "volunteers" as it sees fit, dooming all efforts at reconstruction to failure. Such is the nightmarish prospects for the U. S.

What are the Chinese intentions and intentions? Their hit-and-run tactics seem to indicate limited aims. Their "volunteers" have already achieved the political results noted above. However, there is a reported 500,000 troop army on its border; curfews have been instituted in Manchurian cities; roads have been cleared for military traffic; key installations are being camouflaged; nation-wide propaganda has reached a hysterical war pitch.

What do these portents signify? Full-scale war or precautionary measures? The point is that Peiping holds the initiative and is geared to move in several directions as events may dictate to achieve its ends. And its aims are the same as Moscow's, as part of their integrated program for North Asia.

There are indications of differences between Moscow and Peiping, but difference is a long way indeed from conflict. There is no reason to believe that these differences cannot be contained within the present Russian-dominated axis. Washington's policies have nullified any hope that its influence might bring about a schism, for a long time to come. As a result of Korea, the Chinese stake in Stalinist international policy has increased.

PEIPING'S AIMS
 This policy has as its immediate aims:

- (1) The establishment of a Stalinist North Korea. Initially this might be by way of a "buffer zone" or some other arrangement. But it is clear that Moscow-Peiping have not altered their aims in Korea; and to take all of Korea they must first re-establish the power of Pyongyang.
- (2) The negotiated conquest of Formosa or a free hand to take the island.
- (3) Acceptance of China into the UN and as a member of the Security Council.
- (4) The modification of American aims in Japan by forcing

recognition of Peiping's right to membership on the Far Eastern Council and in this way build up the combined Stalinist pressures so as to modify the proposed Washington "peace treaty" for Japan.

None of these is a defensive aim. They form part of the warp and woof of the larger world struggle in which both camps are aggressive. Stalinism seeks the final elimination of U. S. influence in North Asia as the culmination of the process which has been developing since Yalta, as described above. This would be a step toward the termination of U. S. influence in all Asia.

Peiping has taken the lead for this in South Asia. Mao's alliance with Ho Chi Minh, leader of Viet-

Minh, is one aspect of the drive. The invasion of Tibet and the deliberate flouting of Nehru is another aspect of Peiping's deliberate aggression. The Communist Parties of Thailand (Siam) and Malaya are even now being reorganized under Chinese guidance. Peiping has a powerful tool in the huge Chinese minorities living in the area, most of whom are loyal Maoists now and inspired by patriotic motives.

Far from being a defeat for Stalinism, Korea may have opened a period of initiative for Stalinism, via Peiping, in all South Asia, possibly reversing the setbacks it has suffered there in recent years. That depends on the events of the next few weeks in Korea.

Reserve the date for the
New York ISL
NEW YEAR'S EVE PARTY
 Sunday evening, December 31
 Labor Action Hall
 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

"THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"
 A Novel of Modern Russia
 by VICTOR SERGE
 \$3.00 Order from:
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

NEW YORK PUBLIC FORUM
The Korean War: Social and Political Lessons for The American People
JACK BRAD
 Labor Action's specialist on the Far East
Thursday at 8:30 p.m. December 7
LABOR ACTION HALL
 114 WEST 14 STREET, N. Y. C.