

Question of the day

Question: Do the results of the 1950 elections increase the war danger?

ANSWER: They certainly do. The 1950 elections, generally speaking, were a victory for reaction. The GOP trend, election of such extreme reactionaries as Nixon, Dirksen, Taft, etc., bode no good whatsoever for the people of our country.

The basic reason for the losses of the labor movement in this election is the abject support given to Truman's war program by the leaders of the CIO and AFL. This servile reliance on the Democratic Party weakened the influence of labor, disoriented, divided and demobilized its great potential independent political strength.

The complete bankruptcy of the labor bureaucrats is shown by the post-election statement of Jack Kroll, national head of CIO-PAC. Bewildered by the results, he draws no lessons for the urgent need of real independent political action against both capitalist parties as the only road to peace



GATES

and progress. The only concern for the future he shows is that the Republicans may pursue a so-called "isolationist" policy and may not support the administration's war program.

He has little cause for fear. The GOP supports Wall Street's drive for world domination. As the New York Times said editorially on Nov. 9: "We see no evidence of a swing toward 'isolation' in the results of Tuesday's voting. . . . Republicans and Democrats alike have pledged themselves to the completion of the task begun in Korea. . . . It should not be forgotten that it was during a period of complete Republican control of Congress—in the recent famous 80th Congress—so frequently and so unfairly abused by Mr. Truman—that every one of the present major American foreign policies took shape: for it was this Congress, a Republican Congress, which first approved the Marshall Plan, first adopted the Greek-Turkish Aid Program and voted the Vandenberg resolution that sparked the whole idea of the North Atlantic Pact."

The government's war program has been and is fully backed by both capitalist parties. The elections do not change that. The effect on foreign policy of the new strength of the GOP in Congress will be expressed in pressure for even more provocative and widespread aggression in the Far East, and for putting a greater squeeze on the governments of Western Europe to place more of the burden of the armament program on the workers of those countries.

We can be certain that the more the GOP takes

the offensive on a more openly belligerent policy and on a more rapid drive toward fascism, the more Truman and the Democrats will try to outdo them in their dirty game.

Labor must break with the pro-war and pro-fascist policies of both capitalist parties. That is the main lesson of the 1950 elections. Labor must begin to make a genuine fight for peace. There can be no question but that the overwhelming sentiment of the American workers is for peace.

Jacob Arvey, Democratic Party boss of Chicago who quit the day after Election Day, said this about his party's defeat in Illinois:

"The war has made people nervous and unhappy. They're afraid their boys are going to war, and they took it out on us."

The unpopularity of the Korean war played a big role in the election results. The people don't want war. They were dissatisfied with the Truman Administration and unfortunately voted for the Republicans because they seemed to be in "opposition" to Truman. The people were very confused and divided, but the sentiment for peace stands out. How to organize and unite that sentiment into real independent political action and steer it along genuinely anti-war channels is the great problem that faces progressives today.

(Editor's Note: This column is a weekly feature. Readers are urged to send questions to John Gates, 35 E. 12 St., New York City.)