

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 17, 1950

FIVE CENTS

WALLACE'S CAPITALIST CREDO—
How His Politics and Economics Link

... page 6

Michigan: War on Academic Freedom

... page 7

Claude Pepper Boosts Jim Crow

... page 2

The 'Escalator Clause' Today

... page 2

Bridges Conviction Hits Labor, Liberty

By GORDON HASKELL

The Truman administration won another battle last week in its war on civil liberties when a federal jury declared Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, guilty of perjury and conspiracy. On Monday, April 10, the court sentenced him to prison for five years, two of his associates to two years each, and the government is asking for the revocation of his citizenship in order to obtain his deportation.

The government has wanted to "get" Bridges because he is and has been a follower of the Communist Party line for many years. It is anxious to rid the waterfront of the influence of the Stalinists as part of the cold war. So it hauled him up on the charge that when he was naturalized in 1945 he falsely swore that he had never been a member of the CP.

The charge of perjury is simply the hook by which the government hopes to hang Bridges. In the course of the 85-day trial Bridges' attorneys were able to

prove that more than one of the men who testified against him had perjured himself also. But no one is fool enough to think that the government is going to haul its own witnesses up for the same offense for which it is trying to deport Bridges.

This trial was a political trial, from start to finish. And the whole history of the government's proceedings against Bridges proves it.

Bridges' own policies have tacked and veered over the years with the policies of the American Stalinists. When they were supporting F. D. Roosevelt, Bridges did too. When they turned against FDR during the period of Stalin's pact with Hitler, Bridges supported Willie. When Hitler attacked Russia, Bridges and the CP became the most ardent supporters of the no-strike pledge and of the government. When the cold war started, Bridges went right down the Stalinist line.

And the government's attitude toward Bridges changed as

(Turn to last page)

Truman-Dulles 'Bipartisan' Deal on Foreign Policy Spotlights U.S. Imperialism

By HAL DRAPER

The meaning of bipartisan politics was spotlighted in a bright and crude glare this past week. President Truman appointed John Foster Dulles to be the Republican overseer of the administration's foreign policy, as a "consultant" to the State Department.

It has come to be taken for granted even in labor and liberal circles that this should be so. "Politics stops at the water's edge." We're in a cold war and everyone has to rally around the flag. "Partisan politics" is a luxury we can't afford.—So goes the theory.

The theory and practice of bipartisanship is not beginning with the appointment of Dulles, to be sure. No new principles are being introduced by the appointment. But those well-intentioned people who accept bipartisanship as a necessary accompaniment of "defense of democracy" and other excellent things ought to be brought up short.

We address ourselves to the Fair Deal laborites in whose eyes the Truman administration represents progress or even liberalism, while the bad, bad Republicans represent reaction, Taft-Hartleyism and points right. They divide political policy and even liberalism itself into two watertight compartments: domestic policy and foreign policy—and never the twain shall meet.

Now one thing is clear: bipartisanship in foreign policy means that the good Democrats and the bad Republicans must have the same foreign policy. This means in practice: the Democratic Fair Deal must follow a foreign policy satisfactory to the Republicans. Still more specifically: the Republicans shall have the right to exercise a veto on Fair Deal foreign policy. And the veto is to be swung by John Foster Dulles.

What kind of foreign policy is this which satisfies the Fair Deal's urgent cry for bipartisanship? For it is Truman and the Fair Deal which has taken the initiative in wooing the opposition into the arrangement. The Republicans, as the men who are out of power and

(Turn to last page)



HARRY BRIDGES

NAM, CIO vs. MAY DAY

We are going to have a "National Loyalty Day" in America. And it is planned that this National Loyalty Day will be on or about May First. . . .

Maurice Tobin, secretary of labor, has accepted the chairmanship of the National Loyalty Day Parade Committee, an organization the purpose of which will be to "show the world that activities and May Day Red demonstrations by subversive groups do not reflect the sympathies of the American people."

May First has been the traditional holiday of militant and socialist labor all over the world ever since the struggle for the eight-hour day was launched in the United States in the last century. Since then hundreds and thousands of ordinary workers have been shot and clubbed by police and thrown in jail in dozens of countries for daring on this one day out of the year to demonstrate for their rights. In the old days, before the first world war, reactionary governments of all kinds sent their cops and their soldiers to prevent, by physical force, the massed demonstrations of workers for the eight-hour day, for the right to organize, against child labor, etc.

Since the rise of fascism and Stalinism the rulers have adopted different tactics. Fearing that the workers would demonstrate against their rule, they have usurped this holiday of militant labor and filled the streets with regimented humans, usually in storm troop or military uniform, and thus denied them to the self-mobilized workers. One of Hitler's first acts as dictator was to proclaim May first, 1933, the "Day of German Labor."

So it is fitting, it is most natural for the reactionaries in this country, and with them the liberal architects of the regimented "welfare" state, to pick up this idea and to attempt to turn May Day into "Loyalty Day."

But to the everlasting shame of the American

labor movement we record that for the first time in history in any country, to our knowledge, the leaders of a free labor movement have voluntarily joined the sworn enemies of labor in such a venture.

The National Loyalty Day Parade Committee has nine vice chairmen. They are: Herman W. Steingraus, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion; Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Claude A. Putnam, president of the National Association of Manufacturers; A. J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists; Arthur A. Schuck, national director of the Boy Scouts of America; W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; and Clyde A. Lewis, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Every American worker who has a spark of self-respect and pride—who knows anything about the glorious tradition of the workers' May Day—who knows of the martyrs who have died and languished in jail because they dared to dream of a better future for their class brothers—because they dared to demonstrate for that future on the May Days of the past—should burn that list into his memory.

The labor leaders who have joined with the heads of the NAM and U. S. Chamber of Commerce have disgraced the movement which they head. And they have done one thing more: they have given into the hands of totalitarian Stalinism a propaganda weapon of tremendous force which the socialist movement of Europe will feel on its back in the weeks and months ahead.

Isn't it high time that the workers of America put a stop to the damage these gentlemen are doing the cause of labor and of freedom?

BOOK-BURNING!

Two well-known scientific publications recently issued statements indicating that the government's drive for secrecy is seriously curtailing the freedom of the scientific press.

The March issue of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* reprinted a portion of a book written in 1946 by the distinguished Austrian physicist Hans Thirring. The reprint dealt with the theory of the thermonuclear (hydrogen) bomb and originally appeared as Chapter 42 in *Die Geschichte der Atombombe* published in Vienna. The *Bulletin* states that, although Prof. Thirring did not have access to any secret information, they had refrained from reprinting the material for four years because they "feared that any discussion of this subject in the *Bulletin* might foster the belief that America was actively engaged in developing thermonuclear weapons, and that this might stimulate the atomic arms race and further exacerbate international relations."

The above example of voluntary censorship forced upon scientists by the troubled nature of these times was closely followed by an instance of compulsion. On March 31, the *Scientific American* announced that they had stopped their presses while the Atomic Energy Commission deleted material in an article on the H-bomb. This article appearing in the April issue was written by the former physics chief at Los Alamos laboratory, Dr. Hans A. Bethe of Cornell University. The censorship hit material of a technical nature which was said to be widely known to nuclear physicists the world over. In a press release the magazine said:

"While there are certainly areas of information which must be protected for reasons of national security, there is a very large area of technical information in the public domain which is essential to adequate public participation of national policy and on which the American people are entitled to be informed."

Truman-Dulles Bipartisan Deal --

Not in the Headlines

Rain Today, Cloudy

It was pushed as the "Best Investment in the World"—if you can hold on to it. That was the Series "E" war bond, the \$25 and \$50 denominations peddled via the pay-deduction route during the war.

Of the \$56.7 billion of these bonds, 63 per cent have been cashed in. The rainy day is here, with unemployment and inflated prices.

One for the Book

Little attention was attracted by the recent congressional battle over library service. It took place over a bill which would merely permit the federal government to send traveling libraries around to areas where there are no public libraries and where children and adults have a hard time getting a book to read. The service would be discontinued after five years in the hope that state and local authorities would carry on. Surely a modest enough proposal!

A couple of facts came out which may be startling to some. Out of 3070 counties in the country, only 820 have county-wide library service today. "There are 35 million people in this country without adequate library service," said a supporter of the bill in the House.

Opponents attacked the measure on economy grounds and also as a "vehicle for socialistic propaganda." In any case, by determined action the reactionaries killed the proposal by a hairline vote, 164-161. Those other 2250 counties will not see the books—they might get smartened up. . . .

Wonders of T-H

The National Foreman's Institute, a commercial organization which advises employers on how to grind workers scientifically, recently got out a promotion letter. It read:

"Relatively few companies are profiting as they should from the application of this law [the Taft-Hartley Law]. . . . Do you, for instance, know how a union election can be a wonderful bargaining tool for your company. . . . the bargaining tactics that can save a great deal for your company. . . . the myriad other pointers that can mean profit or loss to you? Yes, the Taft-Hartley Act can work greatly to your company's advantage, but only if you understand the practical do's and don'ts involved."

Using Imagination

The government estimated that unemployment reached a post-war high of 4,680,000 in February but the March 20 issue of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly says that the unemployment is "part real, part imaginary." A man who's out of work and looking for a job only LOOKS unemployed; actually he's just part of an "entirely normal" labor "float" which is "in some ways necessary to the functioning of the economy."

They Done Him Dirt

Senator Taft recently told a civil-rights delegation from Ohio that he believes in a voluntary FEPC, not the compulsory kind. He cited Cleveland's voluntary system as his model.

A few days later, the Cleveland City Council voted 25-7 for a compulsory plan after admitting the voluntary system was a failure. Taft was left holding the bag.

(Continued from page 1)

thirsting to find an issue to get in, have been understandably reluctant and restive: it deprives them of a stick to beat the administration, in spite of the fact that no important difference in line exists. But "politics stops at the water's edge" and even office-hungry Republicans must be "patriotic" when the "interests of the country" are involved. That, again, is the theory.

John Foster Dulles is a bipartisan patriot and has been suitably rewarded. U. S. foreign policy is his foreign policy as much as it is Truman's or Acheson's. So let us take a closer look at this man to whom America's role in the world is tailored.

Who is John Foster Dulles?

He is a "tight-lipped calculating Wall Streeter" who "makes Taft look pink by comparison."

We're not quoting from LABOR ACTION. Those are the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., on October 28, 1949. What is the nature of this American foreign policy, with its Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, Point Four and all, which is satisfactory to the gentleman so described?

Try it again: who is John Foster Dulles?

He is "a spokesman for entrenched Republican reaction, a man who has stubbornly opposed every social advance of our time . . . and a man who spoke for and represented powerful Nazi-dominated cartels."

That is not a Kremlin-inspired slander against him. Those are the words of the New York State chairman of the Fair Deal party itself, Paul E. Fitzpatrick, on October 28, 1949. What is this American "defense of democracy throughout the world" which is at the same time right up the alley of such a man? Can it have anything to do with any "social advance of our time"?

Take another: who is John Foster Dulles?

He is an "old-fashioned Republican reactionary whose concern is only for the rich and the well-born . . . he knows nothing and is little concerned with the hopes and aspirations of the plain people of New York State."

And that was CIO President Philip Murray on November 5, 1949. How can the Fair Deal world mission, which is all progressiveness and light to Murray and his fellow bigwigs of the CIO, be reconciled with unanimity with this man? Does Murray think Dulles is any more concerned with the plain people of England or France or Germany or Greece than he is with the plain people of the state which rejected him for the U. S. Senate under Murray's urging?

Words Come Home to Roost

We have scarcely begun to cite the opinions of this newly adopted architect of Washington's angelic role in international affairs which are held by the same people who, in the other compartment of their minds, insist that we must all get behind the Commander in Chief of the West's cold war.

Dulles and his ilk "represents big business, monopoly, Wall Street and the financial interests. The issues are clearcut."—Oh no, Mr. W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen! How "clearcut" are your issues when the devil with the cloven hoof who tried to get into one seat in the Senate suddenly sprouts wings in a position of immeasurably more power than is possessed by one senator's vote?

"The Ku Klux Klan, the political hoodlums, are for Mr. Dulles—they enthusiastically endorse him." That was October 31, 1949, Mr. Harold L. Ickes! What has Fair Deal world politics got to do with political hoodlumism and the Ku Klux Klan mind now?

"He has denounced everything the AFL stands for with scarce words such as 'statism' and 'Marxist socialism.' . . . That could be Stalin or Hitler talking, but it isn't; it's John Foster Dulles, the supposedly great statesman."—That's the director of the AFL's Labor League for Political Education, Joseph D. Keenan on October 5, 1949. Is there an AFL worker in the house who will ask Keenan: Can this man represent anything labor stands for or should stand for in this country's relations with the peoples of the world?

The appointment of John Foster Dulles is bipartisanship in practice. Dulles took the job explicitly only on the basis that he have a hand not only in carrying out and putting across policies formulated by the State Department but that he also "be allowed to help formulate policy" to a greater extent than did even Senator Vandenberg. His appointment explains the meaning of the theory that "politics stops at the water's edge."

But political differences do NOT stop at the water's edge. This may be a wish on the part of certain elements but it is not a fact. The struggle—of which we are plentifully told by Americans for Democratic Action, the Liberal Party and the liberal-labor "statesmen" of the CIO and AFL—between progress and reaction, between the interests of the people and the interests of those who would turn the clock back, is even more relevant to world issues than it is to domestic issues.

The U. S., holding the pursestrings of the capitalist West can throw its weight against the British people's desire for socialist change, or it can try to block it—and Dulles has made no bones about his own opinion.

The U. S. can support reaction in Greece or throw its weight on the side of the people—and it has in fact been doing the former.

The U. S. can use economic aid to Europe as a weapon to bludgeon the people back to "free enterprise," as it has in fact been doing with its Marshall Plan. The U. S. can use its control over Germany to present the people with the choice of recartelization and renazification on the one hand and the arms of Stalin on the other—as it has been doing. And so on.

So the wheeze that "politics stops at the water's edge" does not.

in fact, correspond with any reality. The same lines of difference are there as in domestic politics. What then is the basis of Democratic-Republican bipartisanship in this field?

To see this, let's leave for a while the liberal-labor myth of the general progressiveness of Fair Deal politics. Let us look at Dulles' appointment in the light of another view, the socialist view.

Which View Jibes with Facts?

The aim of Washington in world politics is not the general welfare of the peoples of the world and of democracy. It is fighting a back-to-the-wall struggle for the defense of the capitalist profit system in the world, not only against the monstrous totalitarianism of Moscow, which is a rival contender for world oppression, but also against the people's desire for socialist democracy.

It aims to organize the whole capitalist world for the greater glory of Wall Street, not because of a Napoleon complex or simple desire for power and sway, but because its capitalist economy needs this to survive. Based upon its capitalist ruling class at home, it recognizes its friends only among the weakened and demoralized capitalist leaders abroad—but abroad in particular this means: it recognizes its friends only in the extreme reaction.

At home, the capitalist class can permit itself the luxury of scrapping over differences of approach WITHIN their own ranks on how best to preserve the system. As against rival ruling classes abroad, the basic interests of U. S. imperialism need a united front. Bipartisanship is the face of American imperialism policy.

With which view can John Foster Dulles' new role be best squared? With the liberal-labor idea that a dyed-in-the-wool, blown-in-the-bottle, "guaranteed unshrinkable, rockribbed reactionary can act as the formulator and collaborator in policies, aimed at world democracy—or with the Independent Socialist view that Truman and Dulles are perfectly justified in getting together (from their own points of view) because the needs of imperialism are the common denominator of foreign politics for both?

There are no two ways about it for us. The theory of bipartisanship is squarely based on U. S. imperialism, and the practice of bipartisanship means—Dulles.

This is the inevitable line of U. S. capitalism on the basis of which Stalinist expansion has been making hay. This is Washington's gift to the Kremlin, one of a series of gifts.

Dulles is not an unknown character in Europe. The Stalinists have seen to that for their own nefarious purposes. And here, for once, they need not lie! For what important lies could they tell which are more telling than the characterizations of Dulles so truthfully made in the 1949 campaign by the Fair Dealers and liberal-labor men themselves?

What the European people are looking for, in various ways, is an alternative to both capitalist imperialism and Russian imperialism. The Truman-Dulles cartel offers them more of the same old world of which they have had their bellyful. Only the goal, the fight, the hope for a new world of socialist democracy can open the road to progress and peace.

Bridges --

(Continued from page 1)

Bridges' attitude toward the government changed. We have documented this in detail in LABOR ACTION of July 11, 1949. And now, in the midst of the loyalty-purge hysteria, the government has finally been able to get a conviction against him which, in all probability, will be made to stick.

POLITICAL INTIMIDATION

But why, if this is really an attempt to get rid of a Stalinist, should LABOR ACTION, which has opposed Stalinism as a reactionary anti-labor movement which serves the interests of the Kremlin slaveholders, describe it as an attack on civil liberties?

Because that is what it is. Stalinism is a political movement in the United States. It is a movement which misleads the workers who adhere to it or follow its leadership. It is a movement which seeks to impose on American workers and American society the kind of totalitarianism which prevails in Russia. That is why we fight it tooth and nail.

But to legalize it, to place it outside the law, is to deny the rights of civil and political democracy to its members and followers, which means to deny political democracy even to its enemies.

The Bridges trial is a political weapon of intimidation against all who oppose capitalist exploitation. It is a signal to the FBI and the rest of the government and non-government machinery to go full steam ahead with the loyalty purge and the whole witchhunt hysteria.

Twice before the government has held extensive deportation hearings against Bridges. Both times it was finally held that no proof had been adduced that he

was or had been an actual member of the CP. It seemed that his case was closed after he was naturalized. But by taking up the whole matter once more under the perjury charge, the government wants to make it clear to all that, in the war against Stalinism, anything does; and that every legal technicality will be employed to the utmost to deprive the Stalinists of the remnants of their civil liberties.

UNION IS INVOLVED

There is another aspect to the Bridges case, and it is an important one. Bridges is the president of a great union. At the last election he was re-elected by an overwhelming vote of the membership. His record of following the CP line for years was known to all who could read or hear. The membership of that union is not Stalinist, but it re-elected him.

Independent socialists believe they made a mistake, but as people who firmly believe in workers' democracy we also believe they had a RIGHT to make that mistake. That union and all other unions will only be rid of Stalinism in a healthy and progressive and DEMOCRATIC manner when the workers themselves decide they have had enough of the Stalinist tactics and take the unions back into their own hands. That job cannot be done for them by the government DEMOCRATICALLY any more than a nation can be governed DEMOCRATICALLY by a dictator, be he benevolent or otherwise.

The higher courts have yet to be heard from, but in the present witchhunt atmosphere we doubt that they will reverse the verdict. If Bridges is thrown into jail or deported it will not be because he perjured himself, but because he is a political opponent of the government.

The Standard Biographical Work—
"KARL MARX"
by Franz Mehring
British edition, cloth-bound—\$3.00—while they last
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.