

# SALT AND PEPPER . . . By JOEL BRADFORD

## THE WORLD IS A GLOBE

Now that news of battle has vanished and the works of peace, such as murders, thefts, divorces, and elopements, have resumed their wonted reign upon the front page, one is tempted to sit once more by the fire and revel in the old parochial environment. The old parish was pretty large. At one's fireside one knew what happened in New York and San Francisco. One knew of the existence of two oceans and of lands beyond: of England, Mother of Parliaments and of the Labor Party; of Czechoslovakia, "that far-away country," as Neville Chamberlain once called it; and of The Enigma which sprawled from the Baltic to the Pacific. It was an easy-uneasy parish, to which one might willingly return, with the added satisfaction that The Enigma, one-sixth of the world's surface, is now considerably less mysterious than an ounce of uranium.

There is, moreover, a lot to be done at home. War gave us a kind of abundance in the midst of death; peace gives us a kind of death in the midst of abundance. We have learned that destruction provides full employment; shall we tolerate the reverse, that construction provides famine? Obviously we cannot tolerate it, though that is the condition toward which everything will tend, unless there is resolute struggle against it. The United Automobile Workers, with excellent militancy, offers leadership in the decisive theater, and the Full Employment Bill is a proper companion-in-arms.

The opposition has not been slow to manifest itself. The auto tycoons, who seem imperfectly acquainted with the Teheran line, reject the thirty percent wage increase. They are plainly resolved that, so far as they can manage it, there shall not be enough purchasing power to buy their own automobiles or any sufficient part of the whole stupendous output of modern industry. That is to say, they have set out upon the shortest possible path to the next depression.

And why should they not? Depressions have their advantages for tycoons. Under such circumstances, union treasuries decline; the organizations and their members are poorer in money, in health, and in hope. All the divisive forces work with greater potency: racists thrive and alien-baiters batten upon the general misery. Out of that gloom can ride the man on horseback who is to "save" us from ourselves. The struggle against the next depression is, therefore, a struggle for the unity of all workers, for an alliance of the workers with the farmers and small businessmen, for the rights of all minorities, for a solid front against monopoly capital. There is no doubt that, if such a struggle were at all successful, capitalism would be seriously weakened, and America would be recognizably nearer its socialist goal.

But whatever Ford and General Motors may do, there is a section of capital which has a much subtler approach. In all the present maneuverings one discerns a scheme by which liberality at home is to be recompensed by extreme exploitation abroad. Surely this is the secret of Labor government policy in England. It is Churchillian abroad and "all-but-socialist" at home. While it "gradually" approaches

socialism in England with exquisite tentativeness, it continues the old modest flirtation with Admiral Voulgaris and King Michael. The flirtation with King Peter remains, I take it, clandestine. We do know, however, that the Bulgarian government is insufficiently democratic for Mr. Bevin's taste, and that the Yugoslav claim to Trieste is "imperialism." Not for nothing was it once observed by a witty Frenchman, "In England everything moves to the left except the Labor Party."

WELL, England's secret is our secret too. What else explains the joining of a liberal domestic policy with a foreign policy which steadily intrigues against the Polish, Austrian, Yugoslav, and Bulgarian governments? Is there no connection between De Gaulle's visit to America and his proposal of a Western European bloc? Surely it cannot be supposed that men who sponsored the admission of Argentina into the United Nations have any real concern for democracy in the Balkans or anywhere else. But, under such conditions, the liberal domestic policy acts as a kind of bait which is to lure the nation toward the reactionary foreign policy. The benefits bestowed at home are to be sweated from labor abroad. The German people were in a somewhat similar situation when they made their fatal choice: they could share the spoils which their imperialists proposed to reap elsewhere, or they could master their imperialists and make themselves true citizens of the world. It is of all choices perhaps the most difficult to make correctly, for it requires much imagination to perceive that the world is a globe, that we all live in it, and that no man ever freed himself by adding slaves to his master.

A valid program for the present time must unite the campaign for full employment with a campaign for world democracy. This latter phrase may seem a catch-all, but it denotes some startling things. It denotes Poland, Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, where the transfer of land to the peasants has been accomplished, where feudalism is thus at last obliterated, where governments intend to develop the national resources without intrusion of private monopolies. It means France, where the leftward tide is soon to overwhelm De Gaulle; England, whose people never intended the foreign policy they have been given; and the two colossi of the East, China and India, which are nearer to nationhood than ever before. We must explain to Americans what is really going on in these regions, the tremendous events which the press vulgarizes as "Soviet influence." I shall miss my guess if Americans do not respond heartily and effectively to the sight of other peoples winning some victories which we won long ago and some victories which we have yet to win.

This is the way to recoup the losses I referred to, not long ago. This is the way to demonstrate that one is not parroting a line, but pointing to certain empirical facts and to the conclusions which those facts yield. It is not accidental that, while American Communists never got to first base with the Teheran line, they previously did a splendid job of unmasking Mikhailovich—and this was, moreover, a job which only they undertook.

It is the fate, and doubtless the glory, of Communists to get just as much prestige as they earn. I do not know, for

*(Continued on page 30)*

# THE MACARTHUR BETRAYAL

By THE EDITORS

THE American government's current political role in the Far East is a barefaced sell-out of the interests of the American people which can be ranked only with such notorious events as those attending the so-called non-intervention policy toward the Spanish War, the arming of Japan during the 1930's and Munich. What is being done in the Far East today—in China, in Japan, in the southern half of Korea, in the colonial world—cannot be dismissed as a series of errors or even as confusion accompanying the difficult process of occupation and surrender. It is policy, deliberate policy, and it is being carried out consistently in all Far Eastern sectors reached by the American government.

Sharp criticism has been voiced of General MacArthur. The general's arrogance, dictatorial manner, his pomposity and personal conceit are widely resented. Acting Secretary of State Acheson's public reprimand of some of the methods employed by MacArthur was belated though welcome. Some of the more able State Department Far Eastern experts are on their way to Tokyo, apparently to put into effect the Department's and White House's "views" on the treatment of Japan.

Nevertheless, there is little reason to suppose that these recently stated views differ in terms of essential policy from those of the strutting general. That they differ as to method there can be little doubt. For one thing, the State Department always fights back when any other government branch encroaches upon its jurisdiction. This MacArthur has done. As a result, even the cookie-pushers have been spilling their tea. For another thing, the Department likes to do things, whether good or bad, more delicately, with more finesse. If you're going to back Japanese reaction, you don't, according to the Department's etiquette, come out openly and say so. You back it under the slogan of "promoting democracy."

This, we fear, is just what the Department is up to. MacArthur is going to be rebuffed—for method, not for policy. The rough edges will be rubbed

off. A bold attempt will be made to make the public believe that changes in method mean changes in policy. A policy which is now causing international nausea will henceforth be served on a dainty silver platter.

If it were to be otherwise, we should long since have seen policies instituted which were designed genuinely to implement the Potsdam Declaration. One such step would be the formulation of a coalition policy toward Japan, a policy jointly arrived at by the nations, including the Soviet Union, Australia and New Zealand, which had defeated Japan. If steps were being taken to arrive at such a policy and to work out the details for carrying it out, and if administrative arrangements were then agreed upon and put into practice for ruling Japan in accordance with those decisions, we would be less skeptical of the State Department's role.

The main proof of the Department's unwillingness to institute a truly democratic policy toward Japan lies in China. For there the Department through Ambassador Hurley is known to dominate the policies of the US Army. Yet in China the United States only supports reaction by armed intervention. Our representatives in China boast of transporting 80,000 troops of the Kuomintang dictatorship into the major cities, thereby making it difficult and often impossible for China's democratic forces to accept the Japanese surrender. To give the State Department credit for consistency, even though it is on the side of reaction, we must admit that this policy toward China is of a piece with that toward Japan. In both cases the American government is backing reaction.

These policies must be defeated. There is an excellent chance that they can be defeated in China, and speedily, because of the tremendous democratic movement already existing in that country. The role of American anti-fascists and anti-imperialists is supplementary to what the Chinese people can do for themselves. Yet it is vital and must be given vigorous expression. China is the main key to the Far Eastern situation.

Because of the relative weakness of democratic forces in Japan the problem is more difficult. The coalition of American and Japanese reaction should nevertheless be fought at every step, for in no other way is there any prospect for the rise of a substantial Japanese democratic movement. One of the most effective demands that can now be put forward is for the adoption of a United Nations policy to supplant American unilateral control.

## New Words, Old Music

THE British Labor Government has now declared India practically independent, but the Indians, skeptical people that they are, refuse to believe it.

Prime Minister Attlee says that following provincial elections this winter, steps will be taken to set up a constituent assembly with the responsibility of framing a new constitution. But the Indians say, in effect, that this is unmitigated hogwash because the group that is to frame the constitution is as democratic or as representative as Chiang Kai-shek's hand-picked delegates to his proposed constituent assembly.

The delegates to the Indian constituent assembly would not be chosen in a free election. They would be nominated by the irresponsible governments of the princedoms. Furthermore, the resurrection of the already rejected Cripps offer is proof once more that London has no intention of bringing together all Indian groups to prepare the constitution. Instead, Mr. Attlee is merely doing again what Mr. Churchill attempted—to keep the Indian parties divided while the British government retains the whip hand.

Actually if the Attlee offer were to be accepted, the gulf between the Congress party and the Moslem League would be widened with the net result that there would be neither a united, independent India, which the Congress desires, nor a free Moslem state, for which the League is working. More and more we wonder whether Mr. Churchill really lost the British elections.