

State Department Scraps Chiang—

U.S. White Paper Writes Finis To Futile Policy in China

By JACK BRAD

The long-awaited White Paper on China has been issued this week by the State Department. While its major outlines have long been clear, many of the details and special reports appear for the first time. At this time a full appraisal of the huge mass of material is not yet possible and must await further study.

This is the story of the decline and fall of an entire social class—the nationalist capitalists of China who took power in 1927 through their party, the Kuomintang, and under their leader, Chiang Kai-shek. Unable to supply the answers to the most pressing needs of the nation, they likewise lost the key to their own continued rule.

Acheson states the case a bit oversimply but realistically enough: "The first problem which every Chinese government has had to face is that of feeding this population. So far none has succeeded. The Kuomintang attempted to solve it by putting many land reform laws on the statute books. Some of these laws have failed, others have been ignored. In no small measure the predicament in which the Nationalist Government finds itself today is due to its failure to provide China with enough to eat."

HOLDING UP DEAD HAND

In other words, the victorious Nationalists of the late '20s failed to abolish the oriental feudalism of tra-

The Background of the White Paper by Jack Brad

See Page 4

ditional China. They kept the masses of peasantry chained to the old order and thereby strengthened the dead hand of the past and repelled the people.

When the world economic crisis set in in 1929 and later the Japanese war broke out, this ruling class, cut off from its 450 million peasants, made an alliance with the very reaction against which it had earlier fought. As the White Paper puts it: "The tragedy of these years of war was that physical and human devastation to a large extent destroyed the emerging middle class which historically has been the backbone and heart of liberalism and democracy."

The capitalist class of China was crushed between the Japanese imperialists and the native landlord class. Deep in the interior of China during the war, cut off from industry, trade, finance and their properties, the state dominated everything; and the state and the Kuomintang were taken over by the overwhelmingly superior landlords and warlords whom the republic had failed to cope with earlier.

The Kuomintang became the party of warlord factions and the fabulously corrupt Four Families (of which Chiang was the first), who took over the hardly functioning economy as personal domains to be looted and robbed. With the failure of the capitalist class, the U. S. lost its chief instrument of policy in China. Henceforth its policy was makeshift and tentative.

The White Paper makes clear that,

from Pearl Harbor on, relations between the KMT and Washington were strained. It had always been uncertain as to just when the turning point was reached. The inner corruption of the Nationalists seems to have been already well advanced by 1941.

Since it is not possible in this space to cover the entire range of the White Paper, some outstanding points will be reviewed.

WALL STREET VERSUS KMT

(1) Three weeks after Pearl Harbor, Ambassador Gauss informed

Washington that Chiang wanted a billion dollars to buy the support of the "self-seeking and, I fear, fickle elements intimately associated with the government."

The threat was always peace with the Japanese. It was large-scale political blackmail. The British paid 100 million pounds sterling while Roosevelt sent \$240 million in gold bullion. No accounting was ever made of the gold except that in 1944 the Treasury analysis of the deal was that "somebody was making a profit from it (selling the gold on

(Continued on page 4)

DUMPED BY WASHINGTON



CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Truman Pushes Arms Bill; Independent Western Union Is Europe's Need

Israeli Government Plays Politics with Arab Problem

By AL FINDLEY

For a number of months the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission has been meeting at Lausanne in an attempt to work out a peace settlement for Palestine.

Nobody, except possibly the U. S., has been in any great hurry to reach an agreement. The Arab governments wanted to delay formal ratification of their defeat as long as possible. The issue they seized on was the question of Arab refugees who had fled from their homes during the fighting in Palestine and now were stranded in DP camps. They demanded a settlement of the refugee question be made before any peace discussion. "We are not against peace, but, after all, human suffering comes first," was their implied position.

The Israeli government, although headed by the Mapai (Labor Party), did not utilize the negotiations to advance proposals that would appeal to the Arab masses, as the Bolsheviks did at Brest-Litovsk, for example. Instead they attempted to play the TRADITIONAL diplomatic game. But even in the diplomatic game they failed. The Israeli government that had outmaneuvered the Arab states in all other diplomatic questions, this time played right into the hands of the Arab leaders.

By taking the attitude that Israel owed nothing to the refugees and everything it would do in a final

peace treaty was only charity, they alienated public opinion. But the government was not too much concerned. They believed that time was on their side and the mass immigration would give them greater bargaining power in the final negotiation.

GRUDGING REFUGEE POLICY

The U. S. until now was in no position to crack the whip. The State Department still had to decide what kind of peace it would accept, to what extent it could keep its ally England in line, and, above all, how much it would be willing to "contribute."

The sharpened British economic crisis, England's need for Iraqi oil refined at Haifa, and U. S. adoption of the McChes plan finally enabled the U. S., by "pressure and promise" to break the ice and make the negotiations begin to move. Under U. S. pressure the Israeli government announced it would accept 100,000 Arab refugees as its share of the Arab refugees under the following conditions:

(1) Arabs who had already returned and those to be returned under Israel's policy of uniting families are to be deducted. (2) Israel is to do the picking—no members of Hussein's family or any other participant in anti-Zionist acts, are to be admitted. (3) Arab refugees would

(Continued on page 2)

By EMANUEL GARRETT

President Truman last week withdrew Section 3 from his military assistance program proposals to Congress. The program itself can now be expected to wind its way through the various congressional channels toward approval—if not on the billion-and-a-half-dollar level proposed immediately by the administration, then on some lower level pending fuller enactment at the next session of Congress.

Section 3 was the unprecedented, and highly controversial, request that discretion on the disposition of MAP funds be given the president. It is doubtful that President Truman actually expected to put Section 3 over; it is more likely that he put it forward as a kind of trial balloon, a test of how far he could go in the atmosphere of cold war.

The implications of the request were, of course, enormous. Given the size of the funds, and their purpose, and the context of planetary cold war in which the MAP is framed, they would have extended executive authority to a point hitherto unreached in peacetime.

However much Congress as a whole is united in principle behind the concepts that underlie MAP, Section 3 stretched that agreement beyond its tensile strength. Opposition, naturally, was particularly strong from the Republican benches of Congress—from its "internationalist" Vandenberg wing as well as from its isolationist remnant.

ARSENAL OF CAPITALISM

With Section 3 withdrawn, there is nothing in the way of principle to impede the enactment of MAP. Such congressional opposition as exists is based primarily on reasons of economy, and it is quite possible that the sums now asked may be whittled down for the present, only to be replaced in larger quantity at a later time. Whatever wrangling may ensue, Congress and the administration must necessarily agree that the U. S. as arsenal of world capitalism is the concomitant of the U. S. as political and economic master of the capitalist world.

MAP is but a concretization, in one area, of the North Atlantic Pact. It provides, in its essential planks, that a billion and a half dollars be appropriated to bolster the military machines of the non-Stalinist nations. Specifically:

- About a billion dollars in military equipment to Atlantic Pact nations from current production and reserve stocks.
- \$300,000,000 in arms and technical aid to Greece and Turkey, and other nations that may be specified.
- \$45,000,000 in U. S. arms for any nation in an emergency—by which is meant a nation faced with the emergency of Stalinist victory. (It has been rumored that Truman had Austria in mind in seeking discretionary powers.)
- \$155,000,000 in such equipment as is necessary to boost arms production among favored Atlantic Pact nations (with France and England primarily in mind.)
- Arms at cost to Canada, Latin America and nations in Southern Asia, the Near and Far East.
- Military missions supplied gratis to nations willing to cooperate.

These are the essentials of the (Continued on page 3)

UAW Prepares for Action at Ford; Ranks in Fighting Mood

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Aug. 7.—Behind the big strike vote among Ford workers this coming week—and every sign points to a large strike vote—is a story of utmost importance to the labor movement as it reaches the crucial stage of its 1949 wage negotiations. For what is happening at Ford is largely an indication of the situation everywhere.

Even the Ford Motor Company now believes that the workers will vote overwhelmingly to authorize a strike by the United Automobile Workers (CIO) over the issues involved in current negotiations. This was demonstrated yesterday when Ford sought vainly to block the secret strike vote being held under the auspices of the state mediation board. A Michigan Supreme Court justice refused to grant Ford an injunction restraining the balloting.

If one recalls that only recently the strike vote taken by the UAW under its constitutional provisions showed a small minority of workers even participating in the balloting, the shift in the over-all situation is clear.

What has happened? What comes next at Ford?

PREPARED FOR ACTION

Many months ago UAW spokesmen were saying that unless Ford granted a pension by July 16, Ford would be shut down. That was before the strike over speedup in May. That was before it was clear to even the dullest union bureaucrat that the Taft-Hartley Law would remain on

the books. That was before Philip Murray, CIO president, insisted on a "responsible attitude" and a "unified strategy," which meant the UAW tailing after the conservative steel union officials.

Nevertheless, the UAW through its convention did one very important thing to strengthen itself in the impending crisis at Ford. It was able to establish a special strike fund; it set up the machinery to collect millions of dollars if a lengthy strike occurred.

As a matter of fact, the delegates to the Ford national conference, held the day after the UAW convention ended, were told to get ready for the big events. They assumed that a quick crisis and strike were at hand, even though many of them were very worried because of the small strike votes and the lack of an over-all strategy. Everyone knew that the average Ford worker felt that the 24-

day strike over speedup was either inconclusive in results or was lost, in spite of all the insistence of the Reuther leadership that important gains were made.

Ford officials rightly interpreted this feeling as confusion and uncertainty in the mind of the workers, and they began to press for changes in the contract which were truly astounding. As for a pension plan or other economic objectives, the Ford officials either laughed at or just ignored the union.

Meanwhile, the status quo was retained in the shop through a day-to-day extension of the contract. Likewise, the appointment of a fact-finding board in steel, which gave some hints of granting Murray and the steel union some concessions, caused the Reuther leadership to decide to take plenty of time before precipitating any showdown.

(Continued on page 2)

N. Y. Liberals OK Wagner; Fusion Upset

Liberal Party Maintains Bloc with Repubs on Top Offices but Supports Dem for Borough President

By WILLIAM BARTON

NEW YORK, Aug. 8.—Municipal politics in the city this year is as mixed up as the wandering streets of Greenwich Village.

Not only have there been deep-going internal schisms within three of the parties (Liberal, American Labor and Democratic, as previously reported in LABOR ACTION), but now, this past week, the Republican-Fusion-Liberal coalition, which is running Newbold Morris for mayor, has gone pff-t-t in at least one direction.

Here's the week's record, and any resemblance to the famous "two-party system" is entirely coincidental.

The R-F-L coalition had begun by uniting on a slate for the three top city offices, mayor, president of the City Council, comptroller. The Liberal Party got the third plum. The big stock in trade was to be the old warcry of Tammany domination.

ON THE SPOT

But the Democratic candidate for re-election, O'Dwyer, immediately set out to weaken any effectiveness of that appeal by clearing the old Tammany crowd out of leadership in the Manhattan machine and putting a new crowd in. Manhattan Borough President Hugo Rogers was not only removed as county leader (i.e., Tammany head) but was also "persuaded" not even to run for re-election to his public office.

Reporters say the result has been a changed atmosphere: if you phone Tammany, the switchboard operator now announces "New York County Democratic headquarters" instead of the time-blighted name of the Hall.

To succeed Rogers as borough president, the Manhattan Democrats have named Robert Wagner Jr., present chairman of the City Planning Commission and son of the resigned New Deal senator. O'Dwyer & Co. were thus able to achieve that measure of identification with the national administration which is assuring them the support of most of the city's labor movement.

The Liberal Party was on a spot. Its leaders had declared themselves violently against some of the wheel-horses earlier suggested as Demo-

cratic successors in the borough presidency, not concealing their sympathies for Wagner. With his nomination, they were in a position of either opposing a leading namesymbol of the New Deal-Fair Deal tradition which means much to them, or else breaking the Fusion coalition.

They chose the latter.

Favoring the former was Liberal State Chairman Adolph Berle, an original member of the FDR brain trust and still a leading Fair Dealer. Berle versus Wagner symbolizes the confusion reigning in Liberal-labor circles.

Sees Spellman Trying to Collect Reward for Vatican Aid in Europe

By MIKE STEVENS

When Cardinal Spellman viciously attacked Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in his letter of July 21, he was calling upon American capitalism to make payment for his church's services on behalf of American capitalism in Europe. This is the main reason for the letter, its viciousness and its contents.

Mrs. Roosevelt, in her syndicated newspaper column, had upheld the principle in the Barden bill now before Congress. This bill provides for the spending of federal funds on public schools but forbids the use of such funds to private and religious schools.

This is what Spellman attacked her for. But from Spellman's language one would think that Mrs. Roosevelt had suggested that all Catholic schools should be burned down. Why this vehemence? And why directed against Mrs. Roosevelt? And why at this time?

A CATHOLIC SPOKE UP

Many Catholics are against the use of federal funds for religious schools. They, along with the rest of the population in this country, stand for the separation of church and state. They know they have the freedom to send their children to any school they choose; and some send their children to religious schools. In addition to the Roman Catholic schools there are Protestant, Jewish and Eastern Orthodox parochial schools in this country. But only the Catholic hierarchy demands school funds from the government.

It is interesting that Spellman did not attack Congressman Jacobs of

Indiana, a Roman Catholic. Congressman Jacobs, a member of the Education Committee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in an open meeting of the committee declared:

"I am a Roman Catholic and have three children educated in parochial schools. But I do not believe that church schools should get a single cent of tax money. I am even against carrying the pupils in school buses paid for by taxpayers. To my mind it violates the principle of [separation of] church and state."

Congressman Jacobs then made the proposal: "If the Catholic hierarchy feel that they can no longer support their school system without tax money, I would favor buying their school plants and put them out of business."

This is certainly far stronger language than Mrs. Roosevelt used, but the Catholic hierarchy did not denounce Jacobs. There were many reasons, but the main one was that they wanted his speech hushed up. They wanted the country to think that all the Catholics were behind the bishops.

Another prominent Catholic, Supreme Court Justice Frank Murphy, who died three days before Spellman's letter, wrote the Supreme Court decision in 1948 against the use of public school facilities for giving religious instruction. Murphy saw this as a first move to break down the wall existing between church and state in this country. The hierarchy was hopping mad at Murphy but said nothing. Then why Mrs. Roosevelt?

(Continued on page 3)

The Republican and Fusion partners of the Liberal Party have feigned great indignation at this official break in the coalition. They threatened to remove the Liberal man, Harry Uviller, from the top slate. The Liberals responded by a plan to remove the Republican candidate, Matthew Diserio, from their own ticket. The benign peacemaking of Newbold Morris patched it up.

The anomaly of Wagner as a Democratic-Liberal candidate is underlined by the question mark which hangs over him: if elected borough president, will he or will he not clean out the pork-barrel appointees packed in by Rogers? The Liberals say that Wagner is pledged to do so; the Democrats give out that he agreed to go easy when he accepted their nomination. No one, of course, knows—least of all the voters who will be asked to plump for him by both parties.

In this five-party city melee there is, naturally, nothing left of a "two-party system" which is supposed to be THE reason why labor shouldn't form its own party. The Liberal Party had the opportunity to act as that party, at least in this election. Instead of uniting the city's strong labor movement behind its own banner by running an independent labor candidate, it chose to get lost in the maze of party maneuvering, in which it is rapidly outsmarting itself.

Stalinist President of UE Beaten In Home Local Ballot on Delegates

LYNN, Mass., July 24.—The discreditment of Albert J. Fitzgerald, CP fellow traveler president of the United Electrical Workers (CIO), in his own home local was made official this week when a special election of delegates to the coming UE national convention resulted in the swamping of his slate by a 2-to-1 margin.

All three delegates named to stand for Local 201 in this election are supporters of the anti-Stalinist opposition to the national leadership and are pledged to vote for Frederick M. Kelley for the presidency. This is the

national opposition which a few months ago organized its forces at a conference in Dayton, Ohio. The local delegates elected are: Thomas Gilroy, James Kelley, Herman Carter.

The national convention of the UE, biggest international in the CIO still controlled by Stalinist forces, promises to see a hot fight, and every indication of which way the wind will blow is eagerly sought. The incumbent administration will be coming to that convention with its standard-bearer thoroughly repudiated by the men who first gave him a hand up.

Freudian or Titoist?

Reports have it that Bulgarians are reading their newspapers more avidly than usual, and it's not because of greater love for the regime. At any rate, the solid substance is the fact that the official sheets have lately been plagued by subservive typographical errors.

Sofia readers of the Fatherland Front daily Rabotnichesko Delo, a couple of months ago rubbed their eyes when they saw in black and white: "The shadow of Vishinsky looms over Greece." The editors had to apologize, explaining that the shadow was Washington's, not Andrei's. (The editors can't really be blamed too much, since they're in the dark most of the time.)

One of the Bulgarian Telegraph Agency's handouts, reprinted in the entire press, contained the following passage: "The Treaty of Friendship with the Soviet Union is based on the principle of interference in internal affairs." Again an apology was printed: "naturally interference ought to have read non-interference." (As if everybody didn't know that!)

On June 3 the official Fatherland Front daily Otchestven Front announced jubilantly that "the building of capitalism is progressing satisfactorily thanks to the enthusiasm of the masses." This time no correction was published in type, (it may have been administered by a firing squad).

As a result of these misprints, all editors have been warned by circular letter that they would be held personally responsible for the correct wording of their articles. (The editors of the New York Post have now redoubled reason for rejoicing that they are on the hither side of the Iron Curtain.)

(Note to LABOR ACTION'S proofreader: Please read this galley very carefully!—Ed.)

UAW Prepares—

(Continued from page 1)

Since the UAW strike votes were so small, the union was exposed from another angle—it could not be certain that any strike it called would be popular. Besides, if it by-passed the revised Bonine-Tripp Law of Michigan, this danger would be trebled, for Ford could charge that the union was afraid of a secret strike vote held under state mediation board auspices.

UNION-BUSTING PROPOSALS.

That is why the UAW executive board, reversing a stand they took in the Chrysler strike in 1948, announced they were filing intention to strike under the Bonine-Tripp Law. Actually, this was not a reversal, for the laws are two different things. In 1948, a union had to have a majority of votes of all employees, voting or non-voting, to call a strike. Under the revised law, it requires only a majority of ballots cast.

The constitutionality of the first was obviously questionable, while the objection to the present law rests on a different and more fundamental basis, even if it has to be complied with. The law represents an intrusion into the rights, functions and duty of the union. It should be repealed, just as the Taft-Hartley Law must be repealed. Meanwhile, the union movement must learn to squeeze whatever advantage it can from a disadvantageous set of laws.

Ford officials, knowing the state of confusion in the Ford plants, became overconfident once the UAW had announced it would comply with the Bonine-Tripp Act. Even among the better militants, the only interpretation that seemed possible of this action by the International Executive Board was that it was another retreat. (They failed to grasp the point that instead of a retreat, any other course would have been a disaster.)

Pressing their advantage, Ford officials, headed by ex-FBI Agent John Bugas, insisted on a set of outrageous revisions of the contract. A few examples:

On seniority: Bugas wanted Article 4, Section 7, revised to say that in all future layoffs and recalls, the basis should be on efficiency, rather than seniority!

In Article 8, Section 1, dealing with plant-wide seniority of tool-and-die, maintenance and other skilled classifications, the company proposed building seniority instead!

On transfers, in Article 8, Section 5, the company proposed to change the present clause to read that it would have the right to transfer any worker, to any job, at any time, in any building!

The company proposed to cancel seniority rights for employees on sick leave as now outlined in Article 8, Section 20.

The company proposed to eliminate shift preference for men with seniority. They proposed to tamper with overtime provisions. They wanted to lengthen probationary periods!

And all this time the company was issuing smooth statements in the press, telling how it was concerned with the employees' welfare!

FIGHTING MOOD AROUSED

Last and by no means least, the Ford company was going back to the old policy of farming out work in smaller shops where lower wages were being paid, thus laying off many of its own employees!

In this situation there was no choice for Walter Reuther and the UAW. It was necessary to arouse the Ford workers to the grave dangers, to the real crisis in which the union found itself at Ford!

At a city-wide meeting of secondary Ford union leaders, committeemen and others, Reuther outlined the problems in negotiations, and sought to arouse the active unionists into a fighting mood. He succeeded easily, because his denunciation of the poor features of even the present contract coincided with the sentiments of the committeemen from the shop.

OHIO LABOR NOTES

AFL Accused of Violent Tactics in Fight Against Rival Lewis Union

By JOE CLARK

CLEVELAND, Aug. 8.—Between battles with their employers the painters in Cleveland find time to fight among themselves, which is more than unfortunate. Recently some houses have been smeared with penetrating stain and a union president's car was found to have a stick of dynamite hidden under the seat.

The union president is Roy Jackson, who was elected last June to the presidency of the United Construction Workers, Local 151. This is a local of painters who are affiliated with the United Mine Workers. The AFL painters in Cleveland have been fighting the UCW for a long time—a matter of years. About two months ago there were several stainings and stench-bombings of houses that were being painted by the UCW.

F. A. Luchino, who is district business agent of the UCW, was complained to police about non-protection of his men and the houses they have painted. The police department replies that they have not the men necessary for the job; that it is just impossible to keep zone cars parked

When pointed criticism was made from the floor about the policies which had caused confusion, and blunt statements were made that the ranks were in a poor frame of mind, Reuther did not jump on the critics. Quite the contrary: he endorsed some of the ideas and utilized the criticism to clarify issues better and get a more solid degree of militancy. In passing, it is interesting to note that among some of the top Reuther leaders the criticisms didn't sit so well—the usual mutterings about "critics" were heard. But about this aspect of the UAW, more on some other occasion.

The UAW then began a series of local union, department and district meetings in the Ford setup which drew thousands of workers and which have been featured by very militant speeches by Walter Reuther, arousing the workers to defend their union. It was the old UAW preparing for action.

How much the atmosphere in the Ford plants has changed was shown Saturday at a Ford 400 meeting. When Reuther entered the hall a spontaneous cheer was heard. Throughout his speech he was interrupted by vigorous applause.

The UAW publicists have been doing a splendid job on leaflets and other material. Buttons telling the workers to vote yes on the strike issue have been worn by the thousands in the plants. (And in Ford plants buttons have a special symbolic value: no old-timers will ever forget the first day that UAW buttons were worn in the Rouge plants in 1941 before the big strike.)

RANKS RESPOND

Today, Detroit's newspapers carry full-page ads by Ford urging the workers to vote no on a "long and costly and useless" strike. Over the radio there are spot announcements by the Ford company, telling the men to vote no. For the UAW, Reuther is speaking over various radio stations; his speeches are in his best oratorical manner and carry an irresistible appeal.

What is Reuther saying? Mainly he tells the workers what Ford wants to do to the union. He outlines the Bugas proposals. They alone are enough to create bitterness, anger and hostility toward the Ford Motor Company. Then Reuther reminds the workers of the pre-union days. He describes the shop without a union.

Reuther assures the workers: "No one wants a strike; we are exhausting every effort to bargain our differences." Many workers cheer this statement. Then he tells them how last year Ford said no to everything until the NLRB election showed the workers wanted their union by voting for a union shop!

Reuther demands contract improvements, protection against speed-up, and last, almost last—we repeat, almost last—a pension plan.

The UAW line, in a word, is "Defend the union. It is your only instrument of protection. It is your only hope!"

The response of the ranks has been overwhelming.

What comes next? In terms of the economic issues, the likelihood is that any pattern set in steel will have a big bearing on a settlement on that issue in auto. It is now possible to say publicly what has been said often in private. The outlook for a pension plan is dim. It no longer occupies the No. 1 spot in UAW publicity. Interesting? It doesn't get the big applause among the workers. The major interest of Ford workers seems to be shop conditions and a better contract.

"COMPANY SECURITY" AND WILDCATS

Certainly if steel gets a package of from six to ten cents, as Edwin Lahey and other well-informed reporters insist, UAW ranks will settle for that, provided there are also improvements in the contract!

The big strike vote at Ford will,

of course, strengthen the hand of Murray and the Steel Workers Union; fear of a "radical and militant" UAW busting loose on the national scene is obvious in Washington and will have a good pressure effect.

From the hasty shifts in policy of Ford officials, it is evident that they wish they hadn't gone quite as far as they did, for now the contract is a real issue, and improvements in the contract are far more advantageous to the union than a cent increase, one way or another. Today, Ford says: Let's not change the contract!

But there is one big and basic flaw in the present Ford contract about which very little if anything has been said, and which should prove consoling to the Ford company if it has to retreat on other things. "Company security" clauses are not one of the big issues right now. At the UAW convention, the resolutions committee unanimously adopted a strong resolution demanding that company security clauses be eliminated from all contracts. We don't know if the convention adopted it.

But any real improvement in shop conditions depends fundamentally on eliminating this clause, for the key to answering speedup, the key to stopping abusive foremen, the key to keeping seniority rights rest in the ever-present THREAT of a walkout when the company gets out of line.

We are against "irresponsible wildcats": they are too costly and often are over minor issues that could be settled with good bargaining. But we are for walkouts over speedup and other key issues. Not the least of the reasons why auto workers often walk out on what seem to be or really are minor issues is precisely because on some major issues they are impotent under the contract.

In one of his speeches Reuther blasted the slow Ford bargaining procedure, pointing out that some cases have been before the umpire and not settled for the past FIVE YEARS. If the company security clause were eliminated, the threat of direct action would quickly bring results from company officials.

OTHER LOCALS HELP

The question of "discipline" and "observing contracts and going through bargaining procedures" should be an internal problem to be solved by the union itself. If you have good shop conditions, no speed-up and an adherence to seniority rights, the vast majority of workers would be satisfied and they would be able to handle any walkouts caused over trivial matters by a tiny minority.

Under company security, the UAW gives this right to the company. It abdicates its independence and authority. And when the union goes

You're Excused— For the Language

Philip Murray, CIO president, permitted himself to get a bit mad at the hearing held by the Truman fact-finding board which is charged with finding out whether the steel workers ought to get a raise.

Pointing to the representatives of the steel magnates sitting across the room from him, he said:

"There they sit over there, looking holier than thou—the most sanctimonious band of racketeers I ever saw in my life—and I don't care whether you object or not!"

"They're the industrial statesmen"—they're the fellows who say it's nice for me to get it, but to hell with the other guys! Excuse the language." (CIO News, August 1.)

Murray permits himself outbursts like this only when he's negotiating for a raise. On other occasions he's bubbling over with praise for the "free enterprise" system—which is run from top to bottom by capitalists only slightly better or worse than the steel tycoons: "THE MOST SANCTIMONIOUS BAND OF RACKETEERS I EVER SAW IN MY LIFE."

class-collaborationist (as one UAW official recently said: "I'll back the company in firing any man involved in a wildcat"), then the results are the lousy conditions which prevail at Ford and are spreading elsewhere.

During the present Ford crisis, the UAW did something else which has helped. For the first time in over a year, every local union was called to help in the Ford vote, and many local union activists visited their neighbors who work at Ford to talk over the issues, in order to get a good strike vote.

If the UAW had called a city-wide meeting of all its activists and there had been the kind of discussion that took place at the Ford meeting we reported, even more cooperation and better results would have been possible.

The present crisis has again demonstrated that the strength of the UAW does rest in the rank and file, and exists basically only to the extent that the union leadership directly involves them in making their own destiny. For that is the basic democratic tradition of the UAW and it is the root of its militancy.

Meanwhile, at Chrysler, where negotiations are just moving along at a snail's pace, the same kind of problems will arise after any Ford settlement, unless the UAW leadership quickly begins to repeat the techniques used so effectively at Ford. It's about time the UAW quit "waiting for Walter," for Walter Reuther can't be everywhere at once nor is his strategy infallible.

Israeli Government —

(Continued from page 1)

not be allowed in certain border areas and could not be guaranteed the return of their homes, but would have to make their opportunities like other immigrants to Israel.

The announcement of the Israeli position brought a spurt of hope to the Lausanne conference. While the possibility of cash from the U. S. has made the Arab states accept Israel's position as a basis for decision, a great deal of haggling will take place before even this question is cleared away and the delegates get down to discussing borders. The McGhee plan that the U. S. supply money for the settlement of refugees is not in definite form as yet. A great deal depends on how much it offers in final form.

The compromise position of the Israeli government on the question of Arab refugees received a hostile reception by most Israeli parties, including parties of the coalition government and right-wing elements of Mapai itself, such as the Misrahqi, who criticized the number as too high. The Mapam (left-wing but pro-Stalinist labor party) attacked the government for submitting to American pressure and, secondly, for publicizing its decision and thus reducing Israel's bargaining power. The Heiruth (party of the former Irgun) opposed admission of ANY Arab refugees.

LOOK TO FRANCE

While Independent Socialists can take some satisfaction in this halting partial step in the right direction toward the solution of the Arab refugee question, the Israeli labor movement really missed the boat on this issue. This could and should have been a vital step in creating an alliance between the Jewish labor movement and the Arab masses. Had the return of refugees been allowed before and above all voluntarily, with a conscious acceptance of its responsibilities and significance, it would have given the Jews a real appeal to the Arab masses and served as a beginning in the necessary process of driving a wedge between the Arab masses and their warmongering governments.

But by declaring their unwillingness and submitting only to pressure, the Israeli labor movement has violated most of the progressive content from this move. It only again points up the fact that the Israeli government led by the Labor Party (Mapai) is relying exclusively on intergovernmental maneuverings and ignoring the potential actions of the people for peace.

This fundamentally wrong approach to peace and the problems of the Near East is further emphasized by the reports that Israel is negotiating

an alliance with France in the Near East. The first to advocate such an alliance was the Heiruth party; it has now become the pet project of all sorts of politicians. Having no concept of appealing to the Arab masses for an immediate alliance, the Israeli government is casting about for a "big power" associate, and believes it has found one in France. Russia is excluded since an Israeli-Russian alliance is against the interests of Israel and would also antagonize the U. S. In addition, the anti-Zionist acts of the entire Eastern bloc and the anti-Semitic developments in Russia have reduced the appeal of such an alliance.

Since England remains the chief opponent of Israel in the Near East, an alliance with England's Near East rival, France, appeals to the "Realpolitiker" of the Israeli government. France, which was completely eliminated from the power politics of the Near East, is making a comeback. The "power politicians" feel that neither the U. S. nor Russia will object too seriously to such an alliance. This remains to be seen.

VATICAN INTERVENES

Final peace in Palestine, however, is far off. The big question, of course, is that of boundaries. The Arab states cannot accept anything less than the partition boundaries if they are to save a little face. The attitude of the U. S.—the determining power—is still undetermined. The U. S. is officially committed not to accept any changes in boundaries not acceptable to Israel.

At the same time, the State Department insists that any addition to the original partition boundaries must be "compensated" by concessions in other areas. Israel, however, has officially and categorically rejected the original resolution of November 29, 1947, and insists that the present boundaries be the basis for discussion.

The question of Jerusalem is another, and perhaps the most difficult, obstacle. Were the matter left to the Jews and Abdullah, the issue would easily be settled by dividing the city. However, the Vatican has begun a world-wide campaign for internationalizing the city. This has caused a number of shifts.

Russia, which had insisted on in-

Books Received

Published July 29:

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION, by A. N. Whitehead. New American Library, a Mentor book, 168 pages, 35 cents. Originally published by the Macmillan Company.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

CIO Representation

To the Editor:

In LABOR ACTION of July 25 Frank Harper has a letter in which he corrects the figures I gave on the voting strength of CIO councils at national CIO conventions as compared to the voting strength of most of the big internationals.

I am very glad that Brother Harper has corrected me, as it proves two things: first, that someone reads my articles, and second, that we have readers who are alert to correct errors, particularly when they relate to important problems in the labor movement.

Now, Brother Harper is quite right as far as the constitutional procedures governing the voting at CIO conventions are concerned. But I would like to point out that the preponderant strength of the internationals as against delegates from councils would show up only on a rollcall vote.

My error was due to a failure to check the CIO constitution. Further, it was due to the fact that I covered the last CIO convention at Portland, Ore., for LABOR ACTION and that at that convention not a single rollcall vote was taken on any question. On most matters vote was by voice, and I think it can be assumed that delegates from the councils can shout just as loudly as delegates from the internationals.

On the most important matters in dispute at the convention, a standing vote was taken. These were foreign policy, an increase in per capita assessment, and the resolution under which the national executive board was given the right to go into fields in which existing international unions weren't doing a good job.

On these three extremely important questions there was a standing vote, and no effort whatever was made to distinguish between delegates representing councils and those representing international unions.

Of course, if there were a knock-down-drag-out fight in the CIO between relatively even forces, it's certain that one or the other side would be demanding rollcall votes on all important issues. That would cut down the weight of the delegates from councils and small internationals to size. It might also involve a very enlightening look into the

claims of membership of some of the unions.

So, technically, I was wrong. But, as Brother Harper points out, even though their votes wouldn't amount to much, 150 delegates from councils sworn to support an existing leadership against all opposition could certainly throw a lot of weight around on the floor and in the corridors. That still leaves open the propriety of prohibiting the councils from discussing matters in dispute between the powers that be and opposition tendencies in the CIO.

Gordon HASKELL

UAW Convention

To the Editor:

In an article on the recent UAW convention (LABOR ACTION, July 25), Ben Hall seems mainly concerned with trying to reassure himself that Reuther remains militant, democratic and radical.

The article begins with the convention's discussion of the two resolutions on political action. The advocates of the majority (i.e., Reuther's) resolution insisted that there was no difference between their resolution and that of the minority. The minority, after being persuaded of the similarity, withdrew its resolution. Consequently, the delegates overwhelmingly adopted the majority resolution, a resolution which, according to Hall, "simply restated official CIO policy with special emphasis on building rank-and-file PAC clubs as a machinery independent of all parties. And there seems to have been no significant difference between the two resolutions. For Hall laments that the minority resolution would have made sense only if it had said: "against the policy of supporting Democrats and Republicans—for a new party based on the unions."

Without a resolution calling for a Labor Party, Hall believes that "the fight for wage increases, pensions and health plans in 1949" is scotched before it is begun. To stress this point, Hall asks: "Will Truman utilize the emergency-strike provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law? Will we have to compromise our demands in order to avoid embarrassing our administration in Washington?" And, since the questions are rhetorical, the answer to both is, "Yes!"

form of bureaucratic collectivism in which state intervention as the appropriate means for settling a strike is a fundamental premise.

Consistent with the absurd belief that Reuther is merely striking a momentary conservative pose is the statement that Reuther's "radicalism and his democracy propose a subtle transformation of the UAW. That change could be summarized as follows: "Militancy must come from above, stimulated and organized by the leadership." If this statement means anything at all, it surely means that Reuther, that subtle democrat, is going to be the arbiter of whether the rank and file is acting responsibly.

Hall does not condemn this subtle democratic transformation. He regards it as a necessary step that Reuther could not avoid. In fact, the only danger seems to be that "a big gap exists in the upper leadership," a gap between Reuther, that subtle democrat, and all other UAW officials, who, without exception, are, according to Hall, potential despots. But the danger can be avoided, Hall insists, by filling the gap with militant, democratic and radical men who will support Reuther, allowing him once again to reveal his own militant, democratic and radical personality.

Nevertheless, especially because Reuther's momentary pose as a conservative is a permanent fact, Hall's method of avoiding the danger seems nothing more than an ingenious verbal display. Instead of cooperating with Reuther, it seems obvious that the danger can only be avoided by working independently of him, by relying on the rank and file.

Tom CONLEY

"Ingenious verbal displays" are, to be sure, not bad things in themselves; but while Comrade Hall's report on the UAW convention was markedly lacking in them to a greater degree than many other LABOR ACTION articles, it is the editor's impression that our correspondent's letter seems to revel in them. The ingenuity of Comrade Conley, however, seems to consist primarily in discovering remarks or ideas in the Hall article which (a diligent search reveals) do not exist there even by implication. The Hall article, which in our opinion was an outstanding example of

internationalization, now, as a result of its struggle with the Catholic Church, may favor partition, even though the Old City would probably go to Abdullah, an English puppet. The U. S., having made the Vatican its ally in Eastern Europe, is under great pressure to reverse its previous position, from favoring division to favoring internationalization.

MISS CALL TO NEAR EAST

Another problem is the fate of Arab Palestine. Arab Palestine is now occupied by Abdullah, who has proclaimed the Hashemite Jordan Kingdom, with the obvious intention of incorporating Arab Palestine into his realm. But now it is reported that Abdullah's "protector," the British Foreign Office, is opposed to the deal. They fear that Abdullah will be strengthened too greatly and will be better able to pursue his own dynastic ambitions, even when they do not coincide with British imperialist interests.

The proposal currently receiving the blessings of the imperialists is for an independent Arab Palestine with Abdullah as monarch of both Transjordan and the new Arab state. This has another plan of to some extent complying with the letter of the original partition plan.

The lack of a clear-cut proposal by the imperialists for the fate of Arab Palestine offers a real opportunity to the Israeli labor movement to "awaken" the Near East by a proposal for a People's Federation of the Near East. Unfortunately, the labor leaders are so addicted to diplomacy that they do not even think in these terms.

The bankruptcy of this "diplomatic" and "realistic" policy becomes obvious when one realizes that the "Realpolitiker" of Israel's Foreign Office despair of peace in the near future. This was indicated by Foreign Minister Sharret's statement that Israel "does not feel that signatures on a pact are necessary before peace conditions begin to take effect, as long as those states involved make a public declaration, attested to by the United Nations."

Byrd Lays Egg

Senator Harry Byrd of Virginia demands that Congress (or somebody) investigate the reading material that is being studied by the three men who make up the president's Council of Economic Advisors. He says their latest report contains "foreign ideologies" and he wants them checked.

He's starting too late. Should have begun with a fellow named Jefferson who read a lot of Frenchmen about "liberty, equality, fraternity," the right of man and similar foreign claptrap.

sober and balanced judgment of trends in the UAW, in no way showed Hall "trying to reassure himself that Reuther remains militant, democratic and radical." With carefully stated qualifications, it DOES discuss the extent to which the UAW and particularly the UAW ranks remain militant, democratic and radical. The identification of Reuther with the UAW will not help Conley understand what's going on.

Much of the rest of Conley's letter consists of remarkably carefree paraphrases of the article:

"Without a resolution calling for a Labor Party, Hall believes that 'the fight for wage increases, pensions and health plans in 1949' is scotched before it is begun." (Only the words actually quoted have any relevance; the rest is a free creation of Conley's.)

"... to assume that the compromise will be made because of the fear that Truman will utilize the emergency-strike provisions of the T-H Law seems fatuous." (No such assumption is made anywhere in the article, which says: "But nobody pointed out certain DIFFICULTIES of the fight for wage increases, pensions and health plans in 1949.") And the even more important difficulty—the fatuity of which Conley doesn't discuss—is the labor leaders' fear of embarrassing their "friends" in Washington.

Hall nowhere suggests that Reuther is "posing," "joking," etc. (to use Conley's verbal displays). In this and other articles, the point has been made many times that Reuther is adapting himself, yielding himself, accommodating himself to the conservative pressures upon him. This is a serious way of putting the question, and it makes Conley's comment on the point quite pointless.

The "subtle" bureaucratization trends of the UAW are NOT "a necessary step that Reuther could not avoid" and which "Hall does not condemn." If the deduction were not so wild, and if we were not so convinced of Conley's best intentions, righteous wrath at this rather slanderous statement would be in order.

Further examination of Conley's letter would not be very useful. With so many important and interesting questions to be discussed about the UAW, it is a pity that our correspondent drew exclusively on his imagination.—Ed.

Book Review

Novel Explores Theme of Negro GIs in Germany

By JAMES M. FENWICK

LAST OF THE CONQUERORS, by William Gardner Smith. Abridged. Signet Books, 25 cents.

In the meeting of U. S. Negro troops and German civilians lies some of the most highly charged literary raw material to come out of the war.

William Gardner Smith, a young man of nineteen when he wrote Last of the Conquerors, has taken this raw material and fashioned a very moving story out of it.

Its emotional intensity derives in great part from the experience of the Negro encountering a non-Jim-Crow world in actuality, with all the ironies and paradoxes which the German milieu affords. The average white reader, as well as many of us in the socialist movement, can read this work for the insights which it gives into the generally unexplored psychology of the Negro.

The book centers around a love affair, fated from the beginning, between Hayes Dawkins, a Negro occupation soldier, and Ilse Mueller, "a blond German girl." Against this background are cast the Southern cracker officer; the enlisted man who attempts to shoot him and flees to the Russian zone; the captain who is against Jim Crow but is anti-Semitic; the ruin of occupied and partitioned Germany; the dreamlike interludes of beach parties at Wannsee and nights with Ilse; and then the sudden railroading of the trapped and infuriatingly helpless Dawkins out of Germany—and out of paradise.

PART OF TREND

How account for the recent series of books, fiction and non-fiction (and, latterly, movies) on the Negro-white theme? Of course, in the case of the novels it is in part a literary trend,

with an increment of tabooed sexuality making the stories tantalizing. But how account for the trend itself? Here it is impossible not to see these books as part of the tendency clearly manifested nowadays toward grappling with the Jim Crow problem.

The expressed aims of Operation Dixie, the president's various committees on Jim Crow, the breaking-up of all-Negro units in the air corps, the projected laws against the poll tax, the attacks on segregated universities, and these novels themselves—all must be seen as part of a process tending toward the weakening of Jim Crow.

Reasons behind the trend are the political necessities of the war with Russia, the industrialization of the South, the trade-union organizing drive currently going on down there, the desire by sections of the capitalist class for an expansion of the consumers' market.

These are tendencies, of course, but they are powerful ones. The weight of tradition predominates, however, as can be seen from this AP dispatch from Frankfurt on June 23, which forms a neat epilogue to Last of the Conquerors. How true to art life is! Even the name of the soldier is similar:

"An American Negro said today he believes Germany offers him a better future than the United States.

"Walter Dawson, 30, of New Orleans, pleaded guilty in an American court, to being in Germany illegally. He said that he remained after his permit expired because he wanted to marry a blond German girl he lived with while in the United States Army and legitimize their baby.

"The court sentenced him to eight months, with five months suspended, and stipulated that he return to the United States within a day after being released from jail."

WORLD POLITICS

Imperialism, Ousted from Asia, Turns to Africa for Green Pastures

With the collapse of European imperialism in Asia, what we may term its centre of gravity has shifted to Africa. "The Dark Continent" has now become the last hope, "the brightest jewel" of European imperialism. We are all "Africa-conscious" nowadays! Conservative politicians now talk of "our solemn responsibility" towards our African fellow citizens—shades of the old slave-traders who first acquainted "us" with "our solemn responsibilities!"

Labor ministers go touting round the African continent as commercial salesmen. (The ex-Communist, Mr. Strachey, is the star turn in this new comedy.) His Majesty the King, no longer emperor of India, is photographed alongside of Negro potentates. Special African conferences are held in London to discuss the future of Africa.

The Fabian Society, the "Brain Trust" of the Labor Party, now issues pamphlets on our duties towards "our African fellow citizens." By and large, the same phenomena can be witnessed in other imperialist countries "interested" in Africa. To be sure, "French Union" represents the opposite political number to the British Commonwealth where, as it has been shrewdly remarked, everything is "common" except the "wealth!"

AFRICA, THE NEW "INDIA"

All of which indicates that, as far as British imperialism is concerned, Africa has now become the "India" of the 20th century, Britain's "brightest jewel."

I should not be at all surprised if, one fine day, H.M. George VI finds Mr. Attlee or Mr. Churchill placing upon his august brow an African crown: "Emperor of Nigeria," for instance, in lieu of his lost Indian Crown? For what India was to British imperialism last century, Africa is now. The West African emirs and sheikhs have succeeded the nizams and rajahs as the feudal vassals of the British crown.

And in her numerous African possessions, with a population larger than that of the British Isles, Britain hopes to find both the raw materials and the manpower which she has lost in India. Is the next step going to be the formation of a Negro army (already existing on a small scale) in place of her lost Indian army? France, next to Britain, the greatest African power, already possesses such an African army, and Britain may follow suit? . . .

Broadly speaking, one can say that, politically, Africa is now on the threshold of nationalism, and seems destined to repeat in the second half of the 20th century the similar political evolution of Europe in the 19th century and of Asia in the first half of the 20th.

The current process of intensive industrialization which the Labor government, in particular, is, at present, busily pushing forward in British Africa, cannot fail to hasten the African political movement.

By and large, I would say that African nationalism is

now in much the same stage of political development as was Indian nationalism in the early years of the Indian National Congress in the '80s of the last century.

That, at least seems to be the case in British and French West Africa, and in Madagascar (the great African island); at present, the focus-points of rising African nationalism. Paris, where the "Color Bar" does not exist, and where African representatives sit in the French parliament, is already a hotbed of Negro nationalism. . . .

AFRICAN UNION FOR IMPERIALISTS?

However, the capital of the (non-Communist) world is now Washington, not London or Paris. And Africa undoubtedly falls inside the purview of the American strategists in the "cold war." To prevent Africa, with its vast resources in raw materials and its 200 million colonial slaves, plus the Negro lands across the ocean (relies of the slavetrader) from falling into Communist hands, is a major objective of American post-war strategy.

We may, accordingly, expect to see arise a demand backed by Washington and Wall Street, for a military "African Union," on the lines of European Western Union.

Both the European African powers, Britain and France, and their satellite states, Belgium, Portugal, Spain, and (if her colonies are returned?) Italy, and the native African states, Egypt, Ethiopia and Liberia, would be bribed, or coerced, into such a union; of which the already projected Pan-African Conference would be, presumably, the first step.

The only snag in sight would seem to be the Union of South Africa under Dr. Malan, a semi-fascist state, loosely attached to the British Commonwealth (vide its recent nationality bill) and based on a herrenvolk racial theory of a super-Nazi type.

The racist Union could never accept the wholesale militarization of the African races which "African Union" would imply. An African army on the Indian model would represent a permanent danger to a fascist state, where the Negroes in a majority of four to one are held down permanently by the Iron Heel. Fabian and Fascist theories of colonization clash directly.

Africa, today, is the last refuge of imperialism, along with the island dependencies in Madagascar and in the West Indies. International socialists should therefore pay special attention to African problems upon which we are, in general, ill-informed. In Britain, we should bestow upon Africa the attention that India has exacted during its national struggles against imperialism in the recent past. We should study the African question carefully and scientifically.

F. A. RIDLEY

Sex Education in Russia

NEW OFFICIAL LINE TURNS CLOCK BACK ON PROGRESS

To the wiping out of all advanced and progressive ideas in social fields like education and the status of women, in Stalinist Russia today, add now the concepts of sex education. The Stalinist state announces that it is going back to the 19th century on this question.

"Soviet Education," monthly organ of the Russian Academy of Educational Sciences, makes the about-face official in a new manifesto article (reported in U. S. News and World Report, July 22). As in all totalitarian countries, the government emphasis has been for a long time on the necessity of large families, etc., tending to convert women into child-bearing animals; and the new line on sex education is to be understood in this context.

The article in "Soviet Education" contrasts its new pronouncement with previous theories. The following is the old line, to be rejected:

"The principal concern was somehow to prepare the child especially for sex life, teaching him not to regard anything as 'shameful' or secret. For this purpose, they tried as soon as possible to explain sex and procreation to the child. Naturally, they pointed with genuine horror at those 'simpletons' who deceived their children with stories about storks and other fictitious sources of life. They supposed that if sex were explained and interpreted to the child, depriving it in his mind of shameful implications, correct sex education would thereby be achieved."

Of this, which is approximately the progressive view today, the article says: "Such advice must be regarded with great caution." (It isn't clear whether the Kremlin thinks little Ivan should be told that the stork brought him.) The article goes on to develop the latest advice:

"The fact that the child often asks where children come from does not mean that one must explain it through and through when he is so young. . . . There is much he does not know about other life problems, and we need not burden him prematurely with knowledge beyond his understanding. . . . The proper time will come for such knowledge, and there is no danger involved in answering him: 'You're still a little tyke; when you grow up, you'll find out.'"

FOR "PRUDENT SILENCE"

Naturally no one has ever advocated explaining sex "through and through" to youngsters of any age, regardless of their ability to understand, and the argument against this is simply a hedge for the purpose of stressing the quite opposite conception represented by the typical words: "When you grow up, you'll find out."

This element of mystification and secrecy is underlined in other passages, for example:

"There is absolutely no need to worry that the child will discover the secret of procreation from his friends and keep his knowledge a secret. In such a case, the secret is not at all terrible. A child must learn that many aspects of human life comprise an intimate, secret realm which need not be shared with or exhibited to all. Only at a later age, when the child has already developed this understanding of people's intimate life and a habit of prudent silence about certain things, can he be told about sex."

Again—since no one is in favor of imprudent loquaciousness on sex—the emphasis on "prudent silence" is an attempt to swing the helm toward old-fashioned reticence and the sacred-mystery approach.

In several other passages, a proper attitude toward sex and love is tied up with a "proper" attitude toward love of country and society, and—by immediate implication—toward love of the regime.

U. S. Licenses Pro-Nazi German Book

The following exchange on the floor of the British House of Commons speaks for itself. It reveals that while continuing to hamper and suppress publications and books by socialists and left-wingers, the American occupation in Germany permits the publication of a book justifying Hitler's war policies.

The exchange in the British parliament took place on the question whether this book should be suppressed in the British zone. While socialists oppose any censorship over the German press by the foreign occupation, this being the right of the German people alone, we point to the nature of the discretion exercised by the late "fighters for democracy."

Reported in Hansard, the official parliamentary record, June 27: "MR. BRAMALL asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what action he proposed to take about the circulation in the British Zone of Germany of the book entitled *Hitler As War Lord*, by General Heider, which justifies Germany's invasion of Allied countries and the part played by the German army in the late war.

"MR. MAYHEW: This pamphlet was recently published under American licence in the United States Zone. There are no restrictions on the distribution of publications between the British and American zones, and my right hon. Friend does not think circumstances warrant any departure from our normal practice.

"MR. BRAMALL: Does my hon. Friend think that the purpose of our occupation in Germany are well served if we allow publication of a book which records as the only dissatisfaction with the Nazi regime the fact that Hitler was inefficient enough to lose the war, and which justifies the German invasion of Allied countries?

"MR. MAYHEW: I agree with my hon. Friend that there are bad parts on the balance suppression would do more harm than good."

Arms Bill and Western Union

(Continued from page 1)

plan. To them we should perhaps add this: the atom bomb, and in general all weapons developed since the end of World War II, are to be lent to no one. United States imperialism is willing to help its friends, but doesn't quite trust them beyond the limits required by the great conflict with Russia for world control. It apparently is cognizant of the fact that friendship among peaceful capitalist allies is a tenuous thing.

Apart from possible congressional quarrels over details of MAP, there remain also various kinks that must yet be ironed out. From a practical point of view, they are major problems—such as how replacements and spare parts shall be provided. However, these problems exist on the periphery of general purpose and outline of the plan.

On the premises of U. S. imperialism, there is no doubt that the pro-

gram is a necessary one. Solid, incontrovertible facts support it. The European nations are incapable, by their own separate efforts, of building their defenses. Their individual resources are insufficient to stand off the encroachments of a giant imperialism like Russia. Or to stand off the demands of a giant imperialism like the U. S. Separate, no nation can easily resist the drag of the two great imperialist orbits.

That the European nations recognize this is evidenced in many ways. Whatever their several ambitions may be, they are increasingly forced together in various arenas of cooperation.

There was first the Benelux union. There is at the moment of writing a meeting of something that goes under the name of Council of Europe which, with the admission of Greece and Turkey, now includes most European nations outside the iron curtain. And there is also in session as we write a meeting of the military

chiefs of the Atlantic Pact nations, with the U. S. joint chiefs of staff in attendance. The deliberations are top secret.

The point is that they HAVE to act in concert. And the United States, promoting its own aims, sees that too. The separate nations of Europe are insufficient to HER purpose; they have to be coordinated. Unfortunately, while these moves recognize the need of Western Union in Europe, they do not advance the independence of the European people nor free them from the fear of war. On the contrary, they in many ways drive the point of that fear deeper.

IT'S IN THE AIR

There is no desire stronger among the European people than the desire for peace. As separate nations they cannot assert their demand for peace. To pool their interest in peace in a union which can have the economic and political strength to make the objective realizable is the clearest

kind of sense. The question then becomes, what kind of union?

There are, as we have already pointed out, various kinds of western union in process of shaping—not the least important of which is that union which the U. S. is promoting for efficient operation of its plans.

The Council of Europe is an explicit form of western union—a union in which Britain would like to see itself as the dominant force, France likewise, etc. Military union, which already exists in considerable measure—though Britain and France have sharp differences over orientation based on British reluctance to commit itself as strongly to continental intervention as France wants it to—is a form of western union.

Churchill is hot for western union. He is, in fact, a British representative to the Council of Europe. De Gaulle is hot for western union; he is reported to be demanding sweeping parliamentary organization in which presumably France (with himself as its quasi-dictator) would be the major power.

Western union is very much in the air. Though it may for the moment be the property of discredited and discreditable rulers, each intent on national ambition, it is based on the reality of need. Europe, divided, can do nothing to stand off Stalinist aggression—or, therefore the threat of war. Europe, united, can be a bulwark for peace by asserting the strength it gains through unity. At the moment western union in Europe is the manipulation of the United States, or the plaything of capitalist politicians. It requires the intervention of the people to enforce a Western Union which by its very premises can promote the health of Europe, encourage the spread of socialism, and direct the world toward peace.

INDEPENDENT AND DEMOCRATIC

The first premise is INDEPENDENCE. Western Union without independence from the will of the United States, is merely a recognition of the weakness contained in sep-

aration; it does not augur peace, but does indeed guarantee embroilment in war. The same goes for western union which is the instrument of ANY one of the leading European nations who seek to revive dead-as-a-dornail imperialist ideas.

The second premise is DEMOCRACY. Without the fullest democratic principle in application, western union can develop into little more than an efficient device for intrigue. How far the Council of Europe is from the kind of western union required by the peoples of Europe is indicated by the fact that to it comes Foreign Minister Tsaldaris representing the outrageous, U. S.-financed Greek tyranny. The Greek rulers have about as much place in an independent, democratic union of the Western European nations as Nazis have in a synagogue.

Democratic, Independent Western Union presupposes that the peoples of Europe choose their representatives; and presupposes as well that in unifying their resources, the nations commit themselves to the defense and extension of democratic liberties. Independent Western Union while customs barriers divide country from country is ridiculous; Independent Western Union, bringing the promise of peace and stability, while the participants enslave their own people or others, is a fiction. The participant nations have to be committed to democracy in practice, else it can only develop into another power bloc—which is what certain European politicians, ardent proponents of unity, have in mind.

In the present circumstances, the effective answer to the North Atlantic Pact and to MAP, which is conceived as part of the same global plan, in Independent Western Union, to which the peoples of Europe—and this is most important, including those of Germany and Austria—can bring their resources for economic and political advances, and for peace. A genuinely Independent, Democratic Western Union would not, of course, be welcomed with MAPs. Which is precisely the point!

Spellman Collecting Reward

(Continued from page 1)

Mrs. Roosevelt in the eyes of Cardinal Spellman was an easy person to attack. Hearst and Pegler and many politicians have been trying to cut down her prestige for years. Spellman figured that many persons must be convinced by now.

GUNNING FOR MRS. ROOSEVELT

She is a political figure but holds no important office and is not too closely identified even with the official Democratic Party, although she is part of it. To attack her would not be attacking an important figure in public office or a political party. By telling Mrs. Roosevelt that being in favor of the Barden bill was being "anti-Catholic," the cardinal was telling every congressman and every newspaper that by favoring and voting for the Barden bill they were "anti-Catholic," and that the Catholic Church was watching them and their position.

These are the main political reasons why Spellman chose to attack Eleanor Roosevelt, but there are many other reasons why he did so.

The entire history of the Catholic hierarchy has been one of keeping woman "in her place"—the home. Mrs. Roosevelt is taking a prominent spot in many places that are not exactly the home. The idea of a woman making decision, or even criticizing decisions made by bishops—is something that must make a bishop cringe to the very marrow of his bones. Spellman's formula in his letter, that her writings were unworthy of an "American mother," meant nothing more than that.

Mrs. Roosevelt's defense of what she considers correct, no matter who or what is involved, has won for her

the admiration of many persons, whether or not they agree with her politics. The bishops object to many things she defends or argues against and they know that thousands upon thousands of Catholics agree with her. So it was important that they destroy some of her prestige and try to arouse the suspicions of her Catholic admirers.

FOR SERVICES RENDERED

The main point about the cardinal's outburst, however, is that he feels the Roman Catholic Church is bearing the brunt of the battle in Europe right now, and especially behind the Iron Curtain. The Vatican is helping to keep the pot boiling and is in constant touch with the U. S. State Department. If the Vatican is doing this for American capitalism, then why should not the Catholic Church collect something for these services? That is Spellman's feelings.

It all adds up to a bill that Spellman is presenting to American capitalism for services rendered by his superiors.

The Catholic hierarchy has always fought the bills for federal funds to schools. They knew that federal funds would make the public-school system stronger. There would be more schools, better schools with better teachers. It represented a strong possibility that Catholics would not contribute to and support parochial schools if that was the case.

But the Barden bill seemed to have a chance of passing; Spellman decided that the bill should include parochial schools or else every effort should be made to kill it.

By his attack on Mrs. Roosevelt he said just that: Either Catholic schools receive funds or else don't

dare have that bill passed! Interestingly enough, very few capitalist newspapers commented editorially on the Spellman letter, and those that did mention the affair as much as said: Please patch things up. Ex-Governor Lehman of New York was the only capitalist politician to come out in support of Mrs. Roosevelt.

MIDDLE AGES GONE FOR GOOD

Politicians eventually prevailed on the cardinal to come out with a more "sober" statement. These politicians were worried about votes in coming elections. The cardinal, being a political man, understood and made a statement "clarifying" his position. It was essentially the same thing all over again, but with no personal attack against Mrs. Roosevelt.

It is known that the cardinal has received tens of thousands of letters from Catholics throughout the country objecting to his stand, but we can be sure these did not move him. Perhaps they only convinced him that the Catholics in this country should be tied closer to the priests than they are.

But that is where he would be wrong. Catholics may attend their churches and hold to their faith, but the Middle Ages are gone.

Some suspicion and tenseness may have developed between Catholic, Jewish and Protestant workers over the cardinal's blast. But it had no depth. The workers will remain friendly with those they have been friends with up to now; they will vote for the best man without asking his religion—and will let the cardinals and the ministers scream their empty heads off. Fewer are listening all the time.

INTERESTED? Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

I want more information about the ideas and principles of independent socialism and the Independent Socialist League.

I want to join the Independent Socialist League.

Name Tel.

Address Zone State

THE BRITISH POLITICAL SCENE IS PORTRAYED EACH WEEK
— IN —
THE SOCIALIST LEADER
Britain's Foremost Weekly
Yearly Subscription—Three Dollars
Shorter Periods Pro Rata

Order from:
SOCIALIST LEADER
318 Regent's Park Road
Finchley, London, N. 3, England

Next-A Labor Party!
by Jack Ranger
A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party

25 Cents for Single Copies Independent Socialist League
20 Cents ea., bundles of 10-50 4 Court Square
18 Cents ea., bundles over 50 Long Island City 1, N. Y.

LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
Published Weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Co.
114 West 14th Street, New York City 11, N. Y.
GENERAL OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.
Tel.: IRonsides 6-5117

Vol. 13, No. 33 August 15, 1949

Editor: Hal Draper
Editorial Board: Hal Draper, Albert Gates, Emanuel Garrett
Business Manager: Joseph Ross

Subscription Rate: \$1.00 a Year; 50c for Six Months (\$1.25 and 65c for Canada and Foreign)

Re-entered at Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1874.

Washington Imperialism Gives Up China but Draws Line on Rest of Asia

U.S. White Paper Depicts Kuomintang Collapse

By JACK BRAD

As if to confirm the worst charges in the State Department White Paper on China, and providing a background as if by prearrangement on the very same day of its issuance, the governor of Hunan province and the commanding general, who had been assigned to replace him both deserted to the onrushing CP army at the head of their ninety thousand troops. By this act they opened the way to Canton, the last possible important seat of government the Kuomintang will have on the continent. What could more adequately underscore the case of the State Department?

And what could give greater urgency to the issuance of its White Paper than this step toward the final curtain? For it is just this imminence of collapse that makes the timing of publication so important. Having decided to write off the Chiang Kai-shek regime, Acheson hastens it on its way with a shove.

This is not a new attitude in the State Department. For the past year, under Marshall as well as under Acheson, the policy toward Chiang has been extremely cool. In effect the U. S. has been fighting a cold war against the Kuomintang. This was made abundantly clear by two incidents of recent times: the failure of Mme. Chiang's charm to obtain an interview of state for her, and the open rejection by Truman of a request for a public statement of moral support at the time of the fall of the capital, Nanking. What the White Paper does is to supply the background and development for this attitude.

End of a Road

Seldom has so bitter a polemic been issued by one "friendly" government against another. With unrelieved blackness the picture is drawn in language so caustic as has only appeared in the pungent prose of General Stillwell.

The wartime KMT is described as in the "grip of the reactionaries who were indistinguishable from the warlords." There was "atrophy of the central Chinese administration," which resulted in "the ineffectiveness of the Nationalist forces which was to be tragically demonstrated." This government was "weakened, demoralized and unpopular at war's end." And the failure of the Marshall mission is ascribed to "the absolutist control wielded by the reactionaries and the militarists."

This is the end of the road for the U. S. in China. Relations that began over a century ago with the New England Clipper ship trade have reached a climax of frustration. At the very moment of its emergence as a world power after the Second World War, after successfully defeating its chief rival in the Pacific, and taking over the reins of former British rule, the fruits of victory have been snatched away by the inadequacy of America's instrument.

The failure of the Kuomintang is a historic one for the U. S. Since 1927 Washington supported Chiang against all other contenders for power only to find that he and his party had turned to dust in the meanwhile and could not be used to implement any policy. That is the source of their bitterness.

For the dream of a Pacific empire has become a nightmare of helplessness. The great planners of America's future in the world, men like Brooks Adams, the geophysical school of John Spykman, and Admiral Mahan—all had included China in the American sphere as the key to domination in Asia.

Multiple pressures have gone into the writing of the White Paper. The need to answer critics like Governor Dewey is one of these. Only two weeks ago the titular head of the Republican Party declared for immediate full-scale military intervention by the U. S. in support of the Chiang regime. (Incidentally, it was not a secret

that Chiang favored Dewey's election in 1948 over Truman, and even went so far as to engage in preliminary negotiations on the assumption of a Dewey victory, using a MacArthur attaché as a go-between. This did not serve to endear Chiang to the Democrats.)

Counter-Thrust Against Repubs

Dewey's speech was the climax to a campaign of publicity and congressional lobbying that included several well-placed articles in leading popular magazines, a plea by General Chennault, an extensive editorial campaign in scores of newspapers and a special appeal by Chiang himself for U. S. assistance via a syndicated interview with a Scripps-Howard reporter. He also used the last occasion to announce his unimpeachable emergence from "retirement" to head a new and ever more determined supreme war council.

Even the AFL was induced to intervene in shabby fashion so that labor was put on record in favor of supporting Chiang. The fine hand of some not-so-recent converts from Lovestonism, now engaged in nothing less than the shaping of world policy, is perceptible in the latter disgraceful commitment.

Inside Congress, demand for a review of Asia policy was mounting and was bound to reach a crescendo at the next China disaster. Acheson could no longer continue to "wait it out till the dust settles" without some justification larger than the plea that nothing else was possible at this time. If the final collapse of the KMT in China found the two capitalist parties divided, the split on policy could become irremediable.

With the declaration for a Pacific Pact jointly with Chiang by the U. S.-puppet Korean government and the U. S. dependency of the Philippines, the policy crisis was brought to a head even sooner. The entire administration foreign policy could be placed in jeopardy if a substantial opposition alignment could form behind such a pact. The Republicans would have a policy and an instrument to support while the State Department called for patience.

Yet Acheson-Truman could not support any pact involving additional military commitments to Chiang without denying their entire thesis of the past five-six years that China never suffered from a shortage of arms, that the fault lay in the corruption of the regime and not in anything the U. S. did or failed to do.

Bipartisan Wall Streeters

Recently Acheson appointed a three-man committee to study Asiatic policy. The composition of the committee indicates its importance. For in American politics the term "non-political" (i. e., non-partisan) has come to refer to something of such great importance that everybody is expected to go along—and this committee is definitely "non-political."

Its chairman is a career diplomat, Ambassador-at-Large Jessup, who will represent the administration. Raymond B. Fosdick is a former president of the Rockefeller Foundation, while Dr. Everett Case, president of Colgate University, is a former member of the board of General Electric. None of these men, it is proclaimed, is an Asian expert—this is considered a recommendation of the highest order. This committee, with its representatives of both the Rockefeller and Morgan interests, is indeed from the highest echelons possible. Its purpose is to try to arrive at a bipartisan policy which all or most of the important political factions in both parties could support.

The White Paper has as its object, among others, to clear the ground for such bipartisanship in the future. By challenging the critics with full documentation, a balance sheet on the past has been presented which puts these critics on the defensive.

Never again, for example, will Dewey be able to call

for full-scale arms to Chiang, Acheson hopes. The record now made public shows that the Nationalists never lost a battle because of shortage of arms. On the contrary, "a large proportion of the military supplies furnished the Chinese armies by the U. S. since V-J Day has, however, fallen into the hands of the Chinese Communists through the military ineptitude of the Nationalist leaders, their defections and surrenders and absence among their forces of a will to fight." Almost three billion dollars was given, more than 50 per cent of the Nationalist budget.

While critics have already begun to find loopholes, they will not be able to present a case strong enough to overcome the tremendous documentation of the White Paper, it is expected. Extreme pro-Chiang groups will be reduced to carping and become by-passed splinters.

The "non-partisan" committee will also be spared the necessity of a review, over which there would be bound to occur many recriminations, so that any policy conclusions reached would no longer have the desired bipartisan character. As the New York Times put it editorially: "It is felt presumably that only in that way can we escape being trapped in futile controversy."

Hope of Titoism Put on Shelf

One other factor has made the White Paper necessary at this time. If U. S. policy was rendered helpless by the inner rot of the Kuomintang, recent events have exhausted still another hope. Under the influence of men like Owen Lattimore, John K. Fairbanks of Harvard, most of the administrators of the State Department's China Division and even Paul G. Hoffman of the ECA, the Truman administration made a tentative orientation on the basis of the possibility of Chinese Titoism. What was bruited with loud joy in "liberal" circles was whispered in the department, for fear of congressional reaction.

Now the U. S. has been deprived of this final straw. On June 30 Mao Tze-tung declared in Shanghai: "We belong to the anti-imperialist front headed by the USSR. . . . We also oppose the illusion of a third road—one either leans to the side of the imperialism or to the side of socialism." Since then the anti-American campaign in CP-held China has been extended to all spheres of interest. The State Department has accumulated evidence that Mao's declaration was being implemented in secret negotiations with Russia, of which the recent Manchurian trade pact is one open result.

In the White Paper Acheson renounces the Titoist hope. "The foreign domination [of Russia] is masked behind the façade of a vast crusading movement" is his description of the CP. He considers the CP a tool of Kremlin policy: "However ruthlessly a major portion of this great people may be exploited by a party in the interest of a foreign imperialism. . . . and again: 'The Communist regime serves not their [Chinese] interest but those of Soviet Russia.'"

Like all Western imperialism in Asia, the U. S. is left in China without the great prize. At the moment of her emergence as the greatest capitalist colossus, half the Asiatic continent is snatched from her. In this she has fared far worse than the other capitalist powers, all of whom have retained SOME measure of control—even India has returned to the Empire. But in this direct test between U. S. and Russian imperialism it is the latter who has won. The White Paper is an admission of this.

"This Far and No Further" What then is the probable future of American policy in Asia? The White Paper does not have as its object an excursion into the future. To do this would be to trespass on the field assigned to the "non-partisan" committee. Some elements of the new direction are indicated. While China is assigned to the Russian sphere of influence, if any force should show itself capable of serious opposition the State Department could still be interested. If for the moment it is incapable of intervening in China's affairs it is not from change of heart but because there does not exist any means to do so.

Barring an unforeseen change either here or in China, the Kuomintang is written off. It may still be used on occasion for legal maneuvering, as when the Chinese Stalinist government will demand recognition. But it will not be accorded any support simply because it has been found bankrupt of all support in China and incapable of ruling. It has no future as a government in exile, except so long as its own resources last. Certainly it will not get guns or large amounts of money to continue the China war, for the U. S., the war in China is over.

The positive side is a bit less certain. The only clear statement in the White Paper on this occurs in the final paragraphs of Acheson's letter: "should the Communist regime lend itself to the aims of Soviet Russian imperialism and attempt to engage in aggression against China's neighbors, we and the other members of the United Nations would be confronted with a situation violating the principles of the United Nations Charter and threatening international peace and security."

After yielding up China Acheson has drawn a line. He will not even bother with an appeal in the UN on the China issue, although the White Paper openly accuses Russia of treaty breaches and hidden intervention in China. But the rest of Asia is in turn to be inviolate and free from machinations by Russia or by the Chinese CP. A kind of Monroe Doctrine is declared. It is the avowed policy of the U. S. to prevent any other part of Asia from falling into the Stalinist empire. A line is drawn around the borders of China and Acheson says: no further without the risk of war.

His immediate concern is with South Korea and Viet Nam. The former lives in fear of momentary invasion from the Northern Russian puppet government, The U. S. is already committed to support of the reactionary regime of Syngman Rhee. As to Viet Nam, it is difficult to see what the U. S. can do to hinder Chinese collaboration unless the U. S. intervenes on the side of the colonial peoples—of which there is no indi-

Pat and Joe: Not a Funny Story
The State Department's White Paper on the China mess gives very gentle treatment to the case of Major General Patrick Hurley, but this gentleman's escapades as amateur diplomat make an interesting footnote to the Chinese tragedy.
It appears that the general is from Texas. Roosevelt had never been able to cement diplomatic relations with Texas (at least not with cattle-and-oil Texas) since his split with John N. Garner. A deal was made for a rapprochement, and as part of the package Pat Hurley became Ambassador to China. It was wartime and the hatchet had to be buried.
On his way to Chungking, the general decided that all this nonsense about Communists with private armies could be straightened out. So, like a straightforward, straight-shootin', straight-brained Texan, he went straight to the source. He had dinner with Joe in Moscow, and asked Joe point-blank if he had anything to do with those Com-MU-nists in China. To which Joe replied that he was interested only in the reg'lar sure-nuff government there and had nothing to do with the Communists—who, me?
But Pat Hurley could not be outsmarted. He knew just what to do. He asked Joe to put it in writing and Joe (who knows how now) said: Why not?
That's how the Sino-Russian pact of 1945 was born.
Meanwhile the Yalta conference had taken place. Naturally, the agreement arrived at there, giving Russia a sphere of influence in Manchuria, was put into the pact. As a result, the boys considered that Chiang might not understand some of the things they had agreed to; it was decided that FDR was assigned to unleash his charm on the Gissimo and break the news to him, to persuade him to sign.
But when Chiang got to Moscow, Joe had upped the ante, and now FDR had to persuade him, in turn, that such was not cricket. Or as the White Paper puts it: "The U. S. felt obliged to remind both parties that the purpose of the treaty was to implement the Yalta Agreement—no more and no less—and that some of the Soviet proposals exceed its provisions." A bargain is a bargain.

cation in the White Paper or elsewhere in U. S. policy. This may, however, take the form of increased support to the recently refurbished French puppet, Bao Dai.

Alternatives: None Good

A policy of containment is an ersatz expedient. There may yet be some tinkering with Point Four as an economic complement to political policy. India is certain to receive new consideration as the base for any new policy. The U. S. is certain to shift its interest in this direction. A Far Eastern Pact has many drawbacks. Chiang is one fly in the ointment. There is also uncertainty on the extent to which the U. S. can carry out any commitments to such a pact. After all, the U. S. could not hold the Philippines after Pearl Harbor. Factional animosities rise when the possibility is broached of extending the domain of the imperious MacArthur. And Nehru has indicated that he would feel ill at ease in the company of Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-shek and Quirino.

Then there is the lesson so clearly drawn by Acheson: "attempts at foreign domination have appeared quite clearly to the Chinese people as external aggression and as such have been bitterly and in the long run successfully resisted. . . . the only alternative open to the U. S. was full-scale intervention in behalf of a government which had lost the confidence of its own troops and its own people. . . . intervention on such a scope and magnitude would have been resented by the mass of the Chinese people."

The people of Asia can no longer simply be trampled on and disregarded. The very fact of U. S. intervention would condemn any government on whose behalf it were attempted. That is part of the China lesson.

It is still difficult to accept the idea but the day of imperialism in Asia is over. Stalinism may still be able to make gains for the Russians because it is disguised as the bearer of social change and because it operates with native forces. Capitalism has not developed an alternative by which to retain its hold on Asia. Wherever the people rise up for national freedom and social reform capitalism is put on the defensive.

Epitaph for Chiang—and the U. S.?

The U. S. has not developed a program toward the colonial world. In this field American capitalists are as timid as the most backward in the world. The day of "venture capital" is over in the U. S. as elsewhere. The form of imperialism which Lenin wrote about is also a thing of the past. There are few capitalists who are attempting to export large quantities of capital. They prefer the government to do it for them, or at least to make such guarantees as to make them state charges.

It is interesting that Truman had to project Point Four; U. S. capitalists did not rush into the colonial world at war's end to fill the economic void left by the defeat of Japan and the decline of every other power. Only in a few strategic fields, closely related to the state, has any initiative been shown: e. g., oil. Nor have they shown any undue enthusiasm for Point Four itself even with its various guarantees. Half the countries of the world have delegations in the U. S. begging for investments without result.

American capitalism for all its domestic vigor is timorous abroad. That is why American foreign policy has become more exclusively concerned with strategy. That is why China can be yielded without a war. China always remained a potential field for market and investment but at its peak U. S. investment never amounted to more than \$150 million. And the total trade with China was never more than 3 per cent of total U. S. trade. The fact is that the loss of China will have a negligible effect on the American economy.

It has long been customary to speak of the decline of the British empire and undoubtedly it is so. While America may be one of the undertakers of that empire, it is not the heir. The world has moved too far for that. It may very well be, then, that the U. S. may not be able to develop a positive policy toward Asia. It is certain that she will never be able to establish so ramified a policy as did colonialism in its heyday.

The White Paper is the epitaph of the Kuomintang. But it may prove to be no less than that for American capitalism in Asia.

Congressmen See Philly Slum Area

By KARL CRAIG

PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 6—Housing conditions in Philadelphia, the "City of Homes," have been featured in the local press recently in connection with an inspection team of ten congressmen investigating slum areas.

It isn't exactly news that Philadelphia is noted, among other things, for some of the worst housing conditions to be found anywhere in the USA.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., a member of the inspection team, stated: "I visited all the overcrowded DP camps in Europe during the last six months, and those dreadful conditions don't even compare with these." Another member of the delegation, Wm. T. Granahan (Phila.), stated: "These conditions are the worst we have yet seen."

SLUM EXHIBITS

At 322 Christian Street, representatives of the Philadelphia Housing Association pointed out five families crowded into the building where there are plumbing facilities for three families, and these in poor repair. The wiring in the house, they also reported, was so defective as to be a serious fire hazard.

At 112 Christian Street, the inspection team found that outside plumbing facilities had been out of order for five years.

At 428 Lombard Street, the congressmen found five families crowded into an unlicensed tenement where all floors were unsafe and the stairways dangerous.

At 809 Leithgow Street, the Washington representatives saw seven houses grouped around a narrow court with outside plumbing which has also been out of order for several years. The houses are of three small rooms each, one room above the other, reached by narrow stairways.

Mrs. Dorothy S. Montgomery, director of the Philadelphia Housing Association, informed the inspection team that there were 90,000 substandard homes in the area like the ones visited by the congressmen.

SCRATCHING THE SURFACE

Under the recently enacted national housing legislation a total of 810,000 public housing units are to be constructed during the next six years. Philadelphia's share of this housing program, according to the Philadelphia Housing Authority, will amount to 10,000 within the next three years and "probably" 19,000 within six years.

Thus it is easy to see that only a little over one-fifth of the 90,000 substandard homes in Philadelphia will be torn down under the first legislation "delivered" by President Truman and hailed as such a great victory by organized labor and such liberal organizations as ADA and AVC.

The January issue of Consumer Reports, monthly organ of Consumers' Union, which cannot be described as a radical organization, reports: "A housing program geared to present need and population should assure 5,000,000 new low-cost housing units in 1949 and 1950; plus 2,000,000 a year thereafter."

Contrast this with the 81st Congress program of 810,000 houses in six years. This goal should be the aim of the CIO and AFL as well as organizations such as AVC, NAACP, etc. A step toward the solution of the housing problem would be taken if the political allies of the AFL and CIO (PAC and LLPE) organized a political party of their own—a labor party—to campaign for this type of federal housing program.

Writes Finis to Policy—

(Continued from page 1)

the black market) and it was not the Chinese government."

(2) A real conflict had developed between the military interests of the U. S. and the social interests of the KMT. The landlords had more interest in keeping their peasants under control and keeping the Communist Party troops behind a cordon so that the peasant movement did not spread than in fighting the Japanese.

The U. S., on the other hand, poured gold and arms into China to develop a continental front behind the Japanese rear. Thus the war in China had become a part of the world imperialist war and had ceased to have any significance as a war of national independence. The war against the Japanese was conducted by and under the inspiration of the U. S. and of the CP, the latter following Russian policy. It was this conflict of basic interest which led to the Stillwell incident.

(3) Not all of the corruption was on the side of the KMT. How else is one to characterize the cynical deals at Teheran and Yalta? Marshall Stalin limited his "price" with reference to Manchuria substantially to the position which Russia had occupied there prior to 1904. We for our part were prepared to and did pay the requisite price."

However, Acheson makes clear that the U. S. did not really give away a part of sovereign China, whose territorial integrity has been as much their diplomatic concern as the chastity of white womanhood is in the South—that is, the other fellow had better not take it. For our loyal Russian ally "could in any case have seized all the territories in question and considerably more regardless of what our attitude had been."

MARSHALL NEVER SAW IT

(4) When the Yalta agreement was arrived at, it was decided to keep it a secret—from the Nationalist government. "For reasons of security and for those only it was considered too dangerous to consult with the Nationalist government regarding the Yalta agreement." One might normally wink a cynical eye and note that the true reason is a bit more obvious.

But the White Paper offers evidence that "security" may really have

been the reason. "It was felt that that there was a grave risk that secret information transmitted to the Nationalist capital at this time would become available almost immediately." For just as gold, ammunition, gasoline, everything that was down over the Hump or otherwise brought to China at great effort, was available to the highest bidder, including the Japanese and the Communist Party, so was intelligence. The Japanese hardly needed spies. Chinese government officials were ready to supply the necessary information.

(5) There is the sordid story of General Li Tsung-jen, would-be American puppet and acting president after Chiang's retirement last year, who offered in effect to hand over his army to American officers so that the U. S. would take full responsibility for the government's conduct of the civil war and in that way satisfy the U. S. desire for efficiency and an end to corruption.

(6) Because the U. S. could neither abandon China entirely nor intervene in full-scale war, the only possible alternative was: "While assisting the Nationalists to assert their authority over as much of China as possible and endeavor to avoid a civil war by working for a compromise between the two sides."

So while the air force was ferrying whole KMT armies to Manchuria, Marshall was trying to play the neutral at Nanking. He failed to convince the CP, which was bad enough for his purpose. But he also failed to convince the KMT, which saw in the actual physical support that the U. S. was giving full validation of that assumption that Washington simply could not abandon them.

Marshall never could understand why Chiang was so "unreasonable." He could not see that a social cleavage separated the contenders which would not permit them to live side by side peacefully. He approached the matter as if he were negotiating between two state powers.

This was true insofar as both had armies and governments. But they were in competition over the same territory and people. And each stood for a completely different kind of rule, both domestic and foreign. Marshall simply failed to see that a Stalinist society and a semi-feudal one could not live together.

(7) There is much in the White Paper on the inefficiency, corruption, spinelessness, nepotism, self-seeking, etc., of the KMT leaders. And equally there are numerous suggestions from the U. S. on how to straighten out finances, keep an accurate budget, make officers responsible for the pay the soldiers were to receive, streamline and make efficient all sections of the administration—in short, to Americanize the way of doing things. Of course, none of this was ever carried through. Stillwell broke his head trying.

WASHINGTON COULDN'T DO IT

It could not be done because modernization in the manner of doing things is alien to a traditionalist, Confucianist, semi-feudal society. What possible difference could it make if each general had to send an accounting for funds assigned to pay his troops when that officer had the power of life and death over his soldiers and the peasant-conscript had been dragged to the army in chains, subject all the way to whippings and starvation?

However, there is one field in which the White Paper does not record proposals for change and that is in social relations. Washington does not seem to have had any ideas about agrarian change other than possibly increasing agricultural efficiency. Yet without this nothing else mattered. So long as the peasant had nothing to fight for and the KMT was the party of the landlords, he would listen to the CP. Yet Washington could do nothing about this.

In the first instance, it meant tampering with private property—another! Second, if landlordism were destroyed, the KMT would also be through. While a "liberal" group might eventually replace it, this would take time. Third, the KMT had become too corrupt by 1941 to do what it had been unable to do 15 years earlier. And it was impossible for the U. S. to carry through such a program directly.

This is not dealt with in the White Paper but it is crucial. Capitalist penetration had caused a degeneration of Chinese feudalism without eliminating it. It was the very effect of capitalism on China which created the American dilemma there, making the KMT unsuitable for U. S. policy.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE
LABOR ACTION
A Paper in the Interest of Socialism
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.
Please enter my subscription: [] NEW [] RENEWAL
[] Six months (26 issues) at 50 cents
[] One year (52 issues) at \$1.00
NAME.....(PLEASE PRINT).....
CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....
ADDRESS.....APT.....
[] Bill me [] Payment enclosed (stamps, currency or postal note)

The Ineffable FBI

"In the FBI's development of a file on a person, all sorts of information goes into the folder. Some of this is reliable, some is not. The accumulation may go on for years. Some of the information may be absurd. One woman reported to the FBI that a government employee was a Communist because he ignored 'keep off the grass' signs. This person was proved to be loyal." (U. S. News & World Report, July 8.)

The punch line is the last sentence. Apparently the FBI investigates people accused of treading on the grass—otherwise they could not have proved "this person" to be loyal. We wonder how much this particular anti-subversive operation cost.