

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 7, 1952

FIVE CENTS

PROSPERITY WITHOUT WAR?

Prof. Galbraith Proves a Point

... page 6

The NAACP Warns Both Parties

... page 3

Murray's Strategy Didn't Pay Off

... page 2

How Many More?

Congress on a Rampage: Hits Aliens and Consumers

The new twist this week in the case of Owen Lattimore is only incidentally connected with the controversy about Lattimore himself. We are interested in what it publicly displays about the procedures and administrative processes of the government authorities.

Any government agency is entitled to make an honest mistake; and it would in fact be encouraging to find that it is capable of acknowledging its mistake publicly and making an apology to the aggrieved victim. If this adequately summed up the case of the false tip on Lattimore, it would be a count in favor of the State Department. But it doesn't sum it up. Rather it leaves out the most important aspects of the case, which shed a harsh light on one of the most sinister developments in U. S. government practice.

Jarvinen, the Seattle travel agent, secretly tipped off the Central Intelligence Agency that Professor Lattimore had secured tickets to go to Russia. Thereupon the State Department issued a secret stop-order warning Customs to prevent Lattimore from leaving the country. This secret order was exposed by reports in the press, thus bringing it to light against the wishes of the officials. When it developed that the tipster was lying and that he had been drunk when he gave the information to the intelligence agency, the State Department was on the spot. It could hardly brazen it through, as it has done so many times in cases which do not develop in the glare of national publicity.

(1) The case highlights, first of all, the ease with which the American people have been conditioned to the psychology of the informer and to the free-and-easy morals of the typical informer. Travel agent Jarvinen's criminal irresponsibility can scarcely be considered an individual quirk. It was Truman himself who called on the people to become watchdogs for the FBI and inform on "suspicious" subversives on a big scale. Jarvinen's reaction to his indictment is illuminating in this regard:

"Whether the charge against me is true or false is beside the point," he said, "but I think the government is wrong to indict me. Few people will risk their necks giving information to the government now."

We don't think Jarvinen is alone in his impression, gained from government exhortations as well as Hollywood spy movies and the press, that the informer is somehow immune, as long as his secret charges are directed against unpopular characters.

What Fills the Dossiers?

(2) It turned out that Lattimore was not intending to take a trip to Russia. But what if he were? We could hardly imagine a more stupid thing for him to do, from his own point of view, regardless of his motives; but that is his business. What makes it the government's business? Does anyone suppose that he would be carrying secrets in his briefcase?

The fact is, according to reports, the State Department was equally determined to stop him from going to India—or for that matter anywhere else. The fact is that the stop-order was part of the State Department's policy of preventing travel abroad by anyone who, it thinks or surmises (or is tipped off to believe), will talk abroad contrary to the "American party line." Its action was in implementation of the government's general passport curtain.

(3) But most important of all—because this case sheds the newest light on this, whereas the other two points have been better known—it demonstrates the way in which the agencies of the government act on secret tips from concealed informers to put into effect administrative decisions which cannot be checked by the citizen victimized. Were it not for the prominence of the case, the delicacy of the Lattimore question, the interest of the press in anything bearing upon it, the chances are that the facts would never have come to light and the administrative decree would have stuck. Not only might the facts never have been adequately checked by the State Department, but even if it were, the chances are that it would not have backed down.

The big question is: How many more of the confidential tips and denunciations that fill the dossiers of the FBI, of the CIA, of the State Department's Passport Division, are of the Jarvinen type? Of what nature is the information on the basis of which the attorney general drew up his notorious "subversive list"? What must we think of this whole expanding structure when—almost accidentally—we find out the readiness of the authorities to take action on a drunken tip, in a politically important case?

We remind our readers that it is not only the American State Department which gets mad when it finds that its tipsters are unreliable, and turns upon them. In the land where the secret denunciation is glorified most, in Russia and the other totalitarian Stalinist states, much publicity is given every now and then to cases of false informers who get put away in the freezer. For the system of stool-pigeons and secret denunciations can be a Frankenstein monster even for the regimes which encourage it.

That goes a hundred times more for the American people.

By MARY BELL

The Sunday editorialist, in pleading for more international understanding, writes, "... Washington is the capital of the world and we are the nation on whom the future largely depends."

The august legislative bodies in Washington last week demonstrated what manner of world capital it is and what kind of future it envisages by their actions on price control and immigration, the effects of which are only beginning.

Virtually all price controls were wiped out, including those on fruits and vegetables—11 per cent of the housewife's grocery bill. Rent controls will go in September of this year, except for a few critical areas and unless local option decides otherwise.

But wage controls were upheld. They are to be continued for one year beyond the June 30 expiration of the Defense Production Act.

Materials allocations were continued under pretext of the continuing "emergency," but the jurisdiction over disputes by the

tripartite Wage Stabilization Board—urged by organized labor—was withdrawn.

Congress thus opened the till to the profiteers, speculators, chiselers and lobbyists and slammed the lid on the fingers of housewives and consumers.

CRAWLING WITH LOBBYISTS

The House had voted to scrap controls altogether: The New York Times (June 29) reports:

"All last week the corridor across the back of the House chamber was jammed with representatives of industrialists, retailers, real estate men and other anti-controls groups. During the hectic House debates Wednesday and Thursday, the lobbyists buttonholed their congressmen friends and handed them anti-controls amendments which in some cases were submitted on the House floor without even a prior reading by the sponsoring representatives."

The CIO News (June 30) portrays the mood of the House, as it "during its rampage acted with far less dignity than the

(Turn to last page)

British Labor Left Wing Attacks Yalu Bombings

By GORDON HASKELL

The political storm raised by the American government's new "get tough" military policy in Korea has continued to build up during the past week. The mass bombing of the power plants along the Yalu river, and the statements accompanying it issued both by officials in Washington and by generals in the field, have given emphasis to two major issues in the war in Korea which have remained alive under the surface from the beginning:

First, under what conditions will the American generals be free to extend the war to the territory of China through

the air? Second, what control do the Allies have over the military and political decisions of the American government concerning the war in Korea?

As soon as it became known that the Yalu bombings had become a major issue in British politics, spokesmen of the Truman administration sought to explain them as a purely military action with no political significance. It should be noted that the same kind of explanation was given when MacArthur ordered the crossing of the 38th parallel

On the Spot



In the past, both American and British public opinion has generally tended to accept this idea. But this time, the

political implications of the bombing are so obvious that almost NO section of British opinion has been willing to accept the explanation that the Yalu bombings were a more or less "routine" military operation. Most British newspapers published since the bombings have denounced the failure of the Americans to consult the British before taking such action, and this applies even to those who tend to belittle or justify the action itself.

The political storm in Britain (Turn to last page)

Congress Goes on a Rampage —

(Continued from page 1)

average union convention, no matter how wild. Hoots and shouts, catcalls and boos were frequent, and Representative Cole (R., Kan.) forgot himself so far as virtually to call Price Stabilizer Ellis Arnall a liar."

It was only a last-minute flurry of the usual telegrams from organized labor and consumer groups, always at a disadvantage against the high-paid lobbies of wealth, that effected the compromise which retained any measure of controls.

The wages of 50 million workers have been clamped down; the prices of the decisive 75 per cent of commodities formerly controlled has been sent spiraling; the 40 per cent of residential housing which remained under control is doomed to decontrol and rent increases.

This victory over the majority of the people was achieved by a gangup of the Democrats and Republicans—the Diehogs—in the "capital of the world," which calls itself democratic, which is opposed to tyranny and dictatorship and which is to lead the world to freedom.

We have been treated to all kinds of graft and corruption scandals in the year past. But what compares with this legislative robbery perpetrated in Washington? This is a pure-and-simple theft from the pocketbooks of the poor to the bankbooks of the rich, and all done legally, too, by the highest lawmaking body in the land.

RESTRICTIVE

While the president signed the riddled controls bill, the Congress overrode a presidential veto on the McCarran Immigration and Nationality Act.

Aside from removing racial bars to immigration and naturalization, the McCarran Act takes the provisions of the law of 1924 and straitjackets them with restrictions unparalleled in American history.

With the idea of quotas, the president has no quarrel. As he pointed out in his veto message, the 1924 quota limitation restricted annual immigration to about 150,000 or one-seventh of 1 per cent as of 1920 population figures. The current law would now allow about one-tenth of 1 per cent, and with the larger national quotas incompletely used, it would boil down to about one-fifteenth of 1 per cent.

Truman would propose additional immigrants to the number of 300,000 over a three-year period be allowed to enter. Aside from this infinitesimal percentage, he would distribute among them Greek nationals, Dutch nationals, Italians from Italy and

Trieste, Germans and German nationals as well as religious and political refugees from Stalinism in Eastern Europe.

Truman's proposals are piddling in contrast to the solemnity of his oratory and invocation of sacred symbols—to say nothing of the number of peoples who desire and need to emigrate to this country and its enormous capacity to absorb them. He calls to memory the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal"; the inscription on the Statue of Liberty so dear to the hearts of tourists; the Pauline creed of the brotherhood of man—"for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

But—no "tired, poor, huddled masses" for the McCarran-led congressmen. Some English, Irish and Germans, since these are deemed to be more easily "assimilable," being more numerous in the United States already. The latter are allotted two-thirds of the quota. The remaining third is divided up among all other nations.

THE MCCARRAN MIND

The provisions of the 1924 act stand, which deliberately, arrogantly and stupidly discriminate against all other countries—Italians, Greeks, Poles, Rumanians, Yugoslavs, Ukrainians, Balts, Austrians, Chinese, Turks, etc.

Today, this stubbornness, arrogance and stupidity is doubly compounded in view of the United States position as "capital of the world." The ignoble prejudices operate largely against Eastern Eu-

ropeans, those victims of Stalinism who are seeking asylum and refuge outside the Iron Curtain. The mental set of the framers of the McCarran Act is that type which is "against all kinds of Communists, including anti-Communists."

The traditionally American discriminatory policy against Orientals is upheld in a changed form. While Asians are permitted entry, if nationals of other countries are 50 per cent Asian, they will be charged to these quotas. This is the way to sue for the allegiance of the Koreans, Chinese, Japanese and Indians to the "capital of the world."

WHAT ACT DOES

The act makes it more difficult than before to enter the country; makes deportation and separation of resident aliens from their families easier; makes admission to citizenship more difficult; makes expulsion from the same easier; excludes people who have been convicted by courts of Stalinist "justice"; bars entry to those who have made misrepresentations in obtaining their visas, for whatever reason, and makes them eligible for deportation at any time; empowers the attorney general to deport an alien who has engaged in activities "prejudicial to the public interest" or "subversive to the national security," with standards undefined; makes findings dependent upon "opinion" or "satisfaction" of immigration or consular employees; restricts opportunities of citizens and alien residents to save their families from

deportation; discriminates against native-born Americans who are dual nationals; limits judicial review of administrative acts; etc., etc., etc.

In short, the McCarran Act would effectively reduce immigration below the senator's constituency in Nevada, which stood at slightly above 150,000 in 1952.

The effect of Truman's indignation over these reactionary, nationalistic restrictions in the act is highly diluted not merely by the quality of his objections but by the knowledge that he was the initiator of the "loyalty" program, by the behavior of the State Department in dealing with foreign visitors, by the conduct of the Immigration officials prior to the passage of the McCarran Act, by the actions of the Passport Division, by the silence of Truman and his administration leaders on the innumerable violations of decency and democracy by all these government agencies.

THE FORKED TONGUE

One passage in his veto message must strike the careful reader as a mockery. In it Truman writes:

"Some of these provisions [in the act] would empower the attorney general to deport any alien who has engaged or has had a purpose to engage in activities 'prejudicial to the public interest' or 'subversive to the national security.'"

"No standards or definitions are provided to guide discretion in the exercise of powers so sweeping. To punish undefined

activities departs from traditional American insistence on established standards of guilt. To punish an undefined 'purpose' is thought control. . . .

"Such powers are inconsistent with our democratic ideals. Confering powers like that upon the attorney general is unfair to him as well as to our alien residents. Once fully informed of such vast discretionary powers vested in the attorney general, Americans now would and should be just as alarmed as Americans were in 1798 over less drastic powers vested in the president."

The denunciatory language in this section applies with double force to Truman's own directives under which the attorney general's "subversive list" and the government's purge programs have been carried out. The only difference does not speak for Truman: where the new McCarran Act hits at aliens—and that is bad enough—Truman's administrative steps "to punish undefined activities" and to put "vast discretionary powers" in the hands of the attorney general are directed at citizens.

Two major blows were thus dealt a week ago in the "capital of the world"—one against economic democracy at home, one against political democracy in the field of international relations.

The blows were dealt in a bipartisan gangup of a majority of Southern Democrats and Republicans, who rushed through the last session of the 81st Congress to go to their separate conventions—to maintain the two-party system, of course.

Attacks Yalu Bombing —

(Continued from page 1)

ain rose to the point last week where Secretary of State Dean Acheson found it necessary to seek to soften some of the blows raining down on the Tory government by a personal intervention. He addressed a meeting of some 200 to 300 members of both Houses of Parliament in an informal "off the record" talk.

IMPLICIT ADMISSION

Acheson told them that the bombings had been ordered because the Yalu river plants supply many airfields and radar stations with power. He went on to say that the American government had intended to inform the British government of the impending raid, but that a "snafu" in high places had resulted in a failure to carry out this intention. While in Britain, he further sought to mollify the people there by making arrangements for closer liaison between the military staffs of the two countries in Korea.

This clearly reverses the claim of the State Department that the bombings were "purely military." Acheson is here admitting that the action was also political in its import—a change in the political component of the U. S. strategy in Korea. By recognizing that he owes the British an apology for not consulting them, he is also in the position of owing the American people (as well as the European) an EXPLANATION of the new political turn. This has not been forthcoming.

The reaction of the British press indicates that Acheson's statement failed to mollify the widespread apprehension in that country that if the Americans continue to exercise complete control over military operations they will sooner or later drag Britain into a general war in Asia.

Left-wing Labor journals used the terms "crime" and "disaster" to describe the bombings. *The Spectator*, described by the *New York Times* as a "moderate week-

ly" stated that "Britain must insure that henceforth United Nations strategy is not exclusively an American product," and the *Observer*, "an independent Sunday newspaper," said that Britain should have a larger say in strategy because a political mistake might "touch off a general Asian war, in which the British, not American, troops would at once find themselves in several front lines in Southeast Asia."

The *Economist*, independent Liberal (almost independent Tory) weekly, commented that the bombings once more demonstrate that "the Americans, a civilian people if ever there was one, nevertheless do not seem to know how to keep their soldiers under civilian control. Yet they will have to if they wish to enjoy the full confidence of the rest of the world and keep the alliance of the free nations alive." In this statement the *Economist* ignores the fact that the bombing was expressly approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that Truman and the State Department had been informed of it in advance. Thus the "civilians" had ample opportunity to control the military in this instance.

CHURCHILL'S LINE

The Conservative government has attempted to give the impression that the bombing on the Yalu was within the confines of policy agreed to by the former Labor government. Herbert Morrison, former foreign secretary, denied this. He said that he had agreed to "certain measures" being taken on two conditions: (1) that the truce talks had broken down, and (2) that serious large-scale military operations had been resumed. "Neither of those circumstances obtains today," he said in a formal statement.

On June 27 the Labor opposition submitted a motion to be debated on July 2. The motion states that "this House, while appreciating that the government and armed forces of the United States have borne the major share of the burden of resisting armed aggression in Korea, regrets the failure

of Her Majesty's Government to secure effective consultation prior to recent developments, including consultation on the timing of certain air operations, and considers that improved arrangements should now be made to enable such consultations to take place between the Governments principally concerned on issues of United Nations policy in the Far East."

In the House of Commons, the government was upheld 300 to 270 in defeating the Labor Party's motion. From newspaper reports on the debate, it appears that Churchill's chief line of argument was to charge the Labor Party with endangering the alliance with America rather than to defend the Yalu bombings as such.

Preceding the debate in Commons the Labor Party caucus held a meeting in which it is reported that the Bevanites charged the majority leadership with going back on a previous promise to condemn the Yalu bombings in their resolution. Attlee and his colleagues denied that such a promise had been made, and on a vote the Bevanites lost 101 to 52. However, between 60 and 70 members abstained on the motion.

THE REAL ISSUE

Although much has been made of the question of whether or not the American government should have informed the British of the impending change in military-political policy, this does not meet the problem squarely. The fact is that the British Labor Party, and probably the vast majority of the British people, oppose a "get tough" military policy in Korea. They hope for a political settlement of the conflict over the conference table, and they consider the attempt to put pressure on the negotiations by major military operations to be a provocation which could launch World War III.

Further, they feel that their government is helpless in the situation. Although it, along with a number of other governments, has sent troops to fight in Korea, it has no control over the major policy decisions in the war there.

It is the American government, and it alone, which makes these decisions. The UN commander in the field is appointed by the American government, and can be removed by it at will. The only limitations on American action are those decided on by the American government itself, with or without regard to the views of its allies, as the case may be. Acheson's statement to the members of Parliament made it clear that although in this particular case it had been felt desirable to inform the British of the plan to attack the power plants, there was no compulsion on the American government or its military command to do so.

MORE SENSITIVE

Reports to the American press on the British reaction to the Yalu bombings have sought to emphasize the idea that the British people are almost completely ignorant about what is going on in Korea, and that their reaction can be attributed to this ignorance and the apathy which has accompanied it.

We are in no position to comment on the adequacy of the British press in informing the people of that country on what has been going on in Korea. But it is quite clear that whether they be well informed or not, their political reactions are far more sensitive and sophisticated than those of the American people. In this country the chief public reaction seems to be one of quiet satisfaction at the idea that the American air force has "turned the heat" on the Stalinist negotiators at Panmunjom, coupled with some irritated bewilderment at the reaction of the British people to this event. At least that is the way our major newspapers have reacted. Rather than listening to them, the American labor movement would do far better to inform itself on why their brothers in Britain are convinced that the Yalu bombings were evidence of an American policy which can be as dangerous to the American people in the long run as to the British.

For living Marxism—read

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Next —

A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty Presentation of the Need

for an

Independent Labor Party

25 cents Order from:
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.