

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 9, 1953

FIVE CENTS

ON THE TIGHT-ROPE
A Diagnosis of the
Emergency Civil Liberties Committee

... page 3

Marx, Engels & the 'Russian Menace':
I—From A. A. Berle to Pan-Slavism

... page 6

Wilson's Ancestor

The congressman said to the real-estate lobbyists:

"It has been good being here and I hope to see you all in Washington very shortly. We shall seek your advice on many occasions and I know it will be given to us graciously, although selfishly. I like that term because so long as you are selfish you are going to see that we help you in this selfishness, which to me is the first step toward the building of a sound economy."

That was Rep. Jesse P. Wolcott (Repub., Mich.) chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, speaking to the "Conference of Home-Builders"—a fancy name for a rent-gougers' confab—in Oklahoma City on last Nov. 20.

Or as the new slogan of the American Way of Life goes nowadays: what's good for the real-estate boys is good for the country.

EISENHOWER'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE:

New U.S. Military Policy on Formosa Increases Danger of World War III

By GORDON HASKELL

The sections of President Eisenhower's State of the Union message dealing with foreign policy have given rise to doubts and fears almost amounting to consternation among America's cold-war allies. With regard to domestic policy, it has retained the vagueness and ambiguity which were characteristic of the whole Eisenhower presidential campaign.

The president's pronouncements on foreign policy did not come without previous warning. Before he left for Europe, Secretary of State Dulles had cast gloom over the governments allied with the United States by a speech in which he said that future economic and military aid would be forthcoming in quantities which will depend on the ef-

forts made by the European governments themselves in the field of armament and economic integration. Eisenhower simply repeated this in vague and general terms.

The second point on foreign policy, though also stated vaguely, had also been signaled by the secretary of state. Eisenhower stated it thus:

"We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves. I shall ask the Congress at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution making clear that this government recognizes no kind of commitment contained in secret understandings of the past with foreign governments which permit this kind of enslavement."

The exact meaning of this will remain a mystery at least until the president proposes a specific resolution to Congress. At that point, if such a resolution spells out the secret treaties in detail, we may find out just what is being aimed at.

For the moment, however, this announcement has been received with grave misgivings by the governments and large sections of the populations of most countries in Europe. The point is not so much that they are indifferent to the fate of the peoples who were handed over behind the Iron Curtain at Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam, but rather that they have no confidence that the United States is capable of effectuating a policy which can hope to liberate them without precipitating a major war.

FOOD FOR FEAR

This fear was given much to feed on by the most concrete foreign-policy statement made in Eisenhower's message. This was the announcement that he is issuing instructions to the U. S. Seventh Fleet not to prevent any future forays by Chiang Kai-shek's troops against the coast of Stalinist China.

At the outset it must be said that even if one allows for the loose standards of historical interpretation traditionally permitted to statesmen, Eisenhower's description of the role of the Seventh Fleet was a whopper. He described the order issued to the Seventh Fleet by Truman in June 1950 to prevent attack on For-

For comment on the domestic aspects of Eisenhower's State of the Union message, see page 2.

mosa and at the same time to ensure that Formosa should not be used as a base of operations against the Chinese mainland.

"This has meant in effect," said Eisenhower, "that the United States navy was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China. Regardless of the situation of 1950, since the date of that order the Chinese Communists have invaded Korea to attack the United Nations forces there. . . . Consequently, there is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that required the United States navy to assume defensive responsibilities on behalf of the Chinese Communists, thus permitting those Communists, with greater impunity, to kill our soldiers and those of our United Nations allies, in Korea."

"I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the Seventh Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China. Permit me to make this crystal clear. This order implies no aggressive intent on our part. But we certainly have no obligation to protect a nation fighting us in Korea."

THE FACT WAS—

The facts, to be sure, are somewhat different. In 1950 there were general reports of a massing of men and boats on the coast of China in preparation for a Stalinist attack on Chiang's Formosa. When the Korean Stalinists struck, it was feared that this was to be a coordinated action with an attack on Formosa. Truman ordered the Seventh Fleet to defend Chiang from the Stalinists. But to retain an appearance of neutrality in deference to the wishes and fears of Britain and other allies and in the interest of localizing the war as much as possible, he also ordered

(Turn to last page)

Reuther Gets the XX from Ike On Reopening of 5-Year Contracts

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Feb. 1—There was gloating among the auto barons this weekend. For President Eisenhower came through as expected, and it was a mighty nice feeling for the corporations.

Late Friday the Detroit newspapers carried banner headlines: "Reuther Wins Big Victory. New BLS Index OK'd," and it appeared momentarily that CIO President Walter P. Reuther had successfully maneuvered a reopening of the five-year contracts for the United Auto Workers (CIO) with Ford, General Motors and Chrysler.

Just a few minutes later, an executive order from the White House repudiated the statement of Martin Durkin, AFL man who is secretary of labor, which had announced the acceptance of the new BLS index, and both Durkin and Reuther were left holding the bag.

"Looks like President Eisenhower pulled the rug from under Reuther," commented Harry Anderson, vice president of General Motors. And that's where things stand today.

STALL

Walter Reuther had banked on a clause in his major contracts to permit reopening of the five-year contracts. This clause states that the present cost-of-living escalator agreement depends on the continuation in its present form of the Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living index.

Since the Department of Labor has been working on a new index, the effect of which is not known by the CIO, and this new index was supposed to replace the old one on March 1, the UAW figured it had a good legal reason for opening up the five-year contracts. Reuther had even hinted, "No

predicament of Reuther. "Walter P. Reuther, probably the shrewdest labor leader in the game, found out this weekend that he can be outsmarted," said the Detroit Free Press.

"The UAW-CIO's leader's efforts to bust open the five-year auto industry contracts apparently have been neatly stymied by a powerful combination—the industry and the Republican administration," the Free Press candidly reports.

OFF-GUARD

What makes this turn of events particularly painful to Reuther is that it upsets his hope that the emergence of C. E. Wilson as Defense boss would give him a foothold in the White House. It was this hope that kept the UAW and the national CIO from doing what was otherwise obviously indicated: blasting the appointment of Wilson to that post or at least supporting Senator Wayne Morris in his fight against Wilson's confirmation.

(Continued on page 4)

contract, no work," only to repudiate this statement as a misquotation, since his entire executive board wondered and complained about his one-man way of deciding such basic policy.

Eisenhower's executive order extends the use of the old index until June 1, and also permits the new one to go into effect on March 1. The effect of this, of course, is to stall Reuther's drive until June 1. This is quite embarrassing to Reuther, who had banked on announcing a victorious reopening of the five-year contracts at the forthcoming convention of the UAW on March 22-29.

"OUTSMARTED"?

Perhaps Reuther may argue that the Department of Labor has failed to keep up the old index accurately, since it was working up the new index, and he may insist that he has a legal right to reopen the contracts, but this is a mighty slim argument, as the industry knows.

Sunday's Detroit papers make no bones about their joy at the

The New York LABOR ACTION FORUM

on

Morocco's Struggle for Independence by Dr. Mehdi Bennouni

has had to be postponed a week at Dr. Bennouni's request.
It will take place

Next Thursday, February 12 at 8:30 p.m.
at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

The forum series on War and Socialism is also moved one week.
See ad on back page.

Eisenhower on the Home Front—

'I Will Study These Grave Problems . . .'

By L. G. SMITH

The part of President Eisenhower's State of the Union Message devoted to domestic problems held no surprises for the nation. In content it is almost a duplication of one of his less distinguished campaign speeches. It proposed no drastic changes in present laws or institutions, nor did it suggest any major new policies for the future.

The speech proposed to drop controls on prices and wages when the present law expires in June. Controls on prices have been so riddled through by the last Congress that nothing was left but the name—and the administrators. The labor movement has been demanding the abolition of wage controls in view of this scuttling of price control.

STILL AGAINST SIN

The only thing which could even cause the serious raising of an eyebrow in this connection was the president's failure to ask for any stand-by price-control law. There is some possibility that a group of legislators will seek to pass such stand-by authority despite Eisenhower's coolness toward it.

On civil rights the president said neither more or less than he said when he was running for office. He will try to see that everyone gets together and does the right thing. On changing the Taft-Hartley Act he also stood by his campaign promises, most of which have already been put in legal form by Taft as amendments to his own law.

On taxes Eisenhower beat a

rapid retreat from early promises of speedy reductions. He is now for balancing the budget first, and has only just discovered that unbeknownst to him the budget has got way out of hand and there is little trimming that can be done without stepping on important and sensitive Republican toes.

He had nothing to say on a health service, spoke bravely but vaguely about ending duplication and overlapping in the various government departments, and even said something which sounded like a call for an extension of social security.

BALANCING THE GOP

Actually, the State of the Union message reflected the political balance within the administration fairly well. It is true that all the generalities had about them the air of the United States Chamber of Commerce when its representatives are trying to put their best foot forward. It was slanted in the direction of "free enterprise" and the "initiative" of the market, and so forth.

But it was not a strictly Taffist, let alone a Chicago Tribune, type of statement. It sought to balance much more than the budget. It sought to balance the Republican Party.

Actually the State of the Union message told us almost nothing about the real future policies of the government. The give-away on that was not the empty phrases thrown at the Congress and the nation. It lay, rather, in the type of men Eisenhower has appointed to his cabinet—the men who will actually formulate and administer the specific programs and policies which will be worked out in due course.

Bolivia: The Nationalist Coup Against the Nationalist Gov't

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Jan. 22—The nationalization of the mines in Bolivia produced an increase in the power of the Nationalist party (the MNR) which is in control of the government, and a weakening in the position of the working class generally and of the Central Obrera Boliviana specifically. (The COB is the trade-union center of the organized workers.)

Thus began the attack of the government's organs against the workers' unions and the government's demand that the unions subordinate their own aims and struggle to the policy of the Nationalist party, on the ground that trade-union independence was utopian. Thus began also the attack against "communism" and specifically against "Trotskyist infantilism"; and in this respect the Stalinists and the Nationalists show a united front. Of course all the initiative in the fight against the "Trotskyist traitors" belongs to the Stalinist organization.

ATTEMPT BY RIGHTISTS

The latest attempt at a coup d'état against the government of Paz Estenssoro, the first such attempt since April 1952, took place in this atmosphere of provocation, baiting and incitement.

The most important part in this attempted coup d'état was played by prominent leaders of the government party itself, the MNR—such leaders as Peñalosa, the Nationalist theoretician; Rios Gamarra, the lord mayor of La Paz;

Roberts, a former minister of Paz Estenssoro's; Candia, a secretary in the Ministry of Economics; Cataldi, a prominent Nationalist colonel; and others.

These old militants of the MNR had an understanding with leaders of the military, the common objective being to "liberate President Paz from enslavement to the communists."

The coup began with the arrest of Minister Chavez, who is considered a "leftist." Juan Lechin could not be arrested, since he was not at home. Minister Guevara Arce saved the situation by persuading the officers of the hopelessness of their attempt.

COB MOBILIZES

In reality, the Nationalist coup against the Nationalist government failed because the government is still backed by the majority of the working class, the Indian peasant masses, and the bourgeoisie, while the latter's counter-revolutionary tendencies are isolated. The Nationalist leaders of the coup were backed by high military officials such as General Rodriguez, Cataldi and others; also by the rightist Falanga Boliviana, a pro-Franco organization, and of course by all of the Bolivia right-wing groups and the mine barons. To be sure, it is only the first test and it will be repeated.

The statement that the coup failed because of the strong support of the government by the majority of workers and peasants was confirmed by the great armed demonstration rallied by the workers in support of the government.

In a few hours, the Central

Obrera mobilized this powerful turnout and demanded of President Paz that he "continue and deepen the revolution," especially with respect to agrarian reform and the abolition of feudal relations in the villages.

Lechin, moved by the revolutionary enthusiasm of the workers, demanded that the president take strong measures against the MNR right wing and support the left, that is, the unions and their leaders. He talked about the analogy with the French Revolution, about the Girondists and the Jacobins, etc.

After the defeat of the right wing, after the failure of the Nationalist coup against the Nationalist government, after the radical declarations of Lechin and the other union leaders, one might have expected a strong turn to the left, a reorganization of the cabinet with a majority of "workers' ministers" in power, immediate agrarian reforms and other measures demanded by the workers and peasants.

PRESSURE RISES

But the mountain brought forth only a mouse. The government published a decree about a "commission to study" agrarian reform, with 120 days to prepare an agrarian law for the government.

To be sure, now after the defeat of the Nationalist and bourgeois right wing, there is quite a possibility of agrarian reform because the pressure of the peasants and workers is stronger than ever; but the purpose of the government is a moderate reform with indemnity to the feudal landowners to be paid by the peasants, etc. According to my information it is believed in COB circles that the right-wing tendency still persists in the government, represented by Guevara and backed by the president himself and the same Lechin who has fallen into disgrace.

The right-wing tendency is growing, with the backing of the government party, the military, the old parties now in opposition, the great mine barons and—lastly—the Stalinists also, frightened as they are by "Trotskyist influence"; it is aided by the passivity of the workers, who have a blind confidence in the government and in Paz Estenssoro and who got out into the streets only in moments of acute danger.

DANGER STILL THERE

If the government can manage to sell its tin to Great Britain and the U. S., the right-wing tendency will grow further and the Nationalist party itself will be the bearer of the counter-revolution and the instigator of persecution against the labor movement. Only intensified activity by the working masses, a great peasants' war against the feudal institutions, backed by a growing workers' offensive and a powerful alliance of the workers and the Indian masses, expressed in a workers' and peasants' government, can realize the revolutionary program which the people have set themselves and thus "continue the revolution."

For the president has declared that he is against the "social revolution" and against socialism, that he is only for what he calls "economic revolution" and, of course, for a pro-capitalist policy. The Nationalist party is indeed for the bourgeoisie, and it itself is the best instrument for a new coup d'état against the Nationalist regime as at present constituted and against the "national revolution."

LONDON LETTER

The BLP's Structure: Problem for Bevan

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Jan. 28—It is quite impossible to grasp the import of the changes inside the British Labor movement unless an adequately filled-in picture of its structure is given.

The capitalist press does its level best to convey the wrong impression about the relations between the various component sections of the labor movement. The impression the average reader gets from reading the capitalist press is that the "political socialists" of the Labor Party are continually feuding with the non-political or even anti-political leaders of the Trades Union Council.

LABOR'S TRINITY

Actually, of course, this picture is completely false. At certain periods the trade-union movement has been even more "political" than the Parliamentary Labor Party itself. (The Parliamentary Labor Party is the name used for the association formed by all the Labor Party's members of Parliament taken as a whole.)

The great General Strike of the '20s, for instance, forced the trade unions into the forefront of national politics, with the Labor Party proper taking a backseat in the proceedings. Again, in 1931, it was the political side of the trade-union movement which asserted itself when Ramsay MacDonald decided to cut loose from the Labor Party.

The National Council of Labor is the supreme body representing the three wings of the Labor movement—the Labor Party, the Trades Union Congress, and the

Cooperative Union. It has 24 members, eight from each section. The Trade Union representation is, in fact, duplicated through the fact that the trade unions are also represented on the National Executive Committee of the Labor Party. The Labor Party's NEC has 27 places, divided into three sections. Among these the trade unions have 12 seats allotted to them, the constituency parties (territorial branches of the party) have 7, and the Women's Section has 5.

TRADE-UNION MYTH

The nonsense about the "conflict" between the two most important wings of the Labor movement is thus seen to be groundless. For in fact the trade unions have control of 16 out of the 27 seats on the NEC, since the trade-union vote combined with the much smaller constituency vote elects the 5 women members.

Equally fallacious is the myth that the trade unions are unchangeable, that the trade unions are solidly anti-Bevan. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In fact, in *Going Our Way* (the statement by the Bevan group which followed *One Way Only*) Harold Wilson and John Freeman went out of their way to show that the trade unions had a legitimate share in the control of the Labor Party (even though it was the lion's share). They wrote:

"It is clear from this structure that in theory the trade-union membership of the Labor Party has a dominant voice in its counsels. If this were the case in practice, nobody could reasonably object. Since trade-unionists represent the great majority of the members of the party and since they contribute handsomely to its central fund, it is proper that the party's policy should be fashioned,

in proportion to their numbers, according to their views.

"There could be no case against a trade-union leader casting, by the use of a single card, 800,000 votes at a party conference if he were supporting what he knew to be the views of his 800,000 affiliated members or at least of a majority of them. But equally there can be no justification, in a democratic organization, for the authority given by a mass membership to be used against the known feelings of the members."

'BEVANISM' IN TUC

And this is exactly the state of affairs, and has been for many years. The National Union of Railwaymen, for instance, is Bevanite. But its NEC representative has given support to the party's right wing. The same goes for the Electrical Trades Union representative, Irwin, whose Stalinist-controlled union for reasons best known to them have elected him from conference to conference. The Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers has also had a certain kind of "representative" in Wilfred Burke, who contrary to his union's wishes has voted with the right wing.

The replacement of these false representatives of the trade unions would make Bevan's position on the NEC of the party invincible. This process of replacement will take some time, perhaps years, but the end result cannot be in doubt.

Another erroneous idea about the trade union's attitude to Bevan is that the General Council of the Trade Union Congress is flatly opposed to Bevan and all his works. A careful reading of the facts dispels this idea.

As a matter of fact, the General Council of the TUC has recorded a higher fraction of support for Bevan than the NEC of

the Labor Party! When Bevan resigned in April 1951, only 4 out of the 27 members of the Labor Party NEC were identified as "Bevanites." And yet 6 out of 13 members of the TUC General Council supported Bevan at the time of his resignation. At the time of writing the number has gone to 7.

NUM THE CRUX

Of course, the larger unions—the Transport and General Workers Union; the British Iron, Steel and Kindred Trades Association; the National Union of Municipal and General Workers; and the National Union of Miners—uphold the right wing. However, recent events in the coal fields are likely to completely upset Sir William Lawther's calculations. The NUM may well be "Bevanite" before the next annual conference of the Labor Party at Margate. And it is the NUM's bloc vote which is the decisive vote, as was proved at the Scarborough Trades Union Congress last year.

The Women's Section of the party represents, unfortunately, very little. The National Labor Women's Advisory Committee is elected from only 263 parliamentary constituencies.

Many people in the Labor Party feel that Women's Sections are unnecessary, and are anyhow superfluous to the party organization. This is also said of the Labor Party League of Youth and the National Association of Labor Students Organizations. Undoubtedly there is overlapping. Undoubtedly there is a superabundance of structural forms with imposing titles which represent little but self-perpetuating bureaucracies. But this in no way invalidates the case for a Labor Party which approaches people in their different

(Continued on page 4)

Don't miss a single week of

LABOR ACTION

A sub is only \$2 a year!

ON THE TIGHT-ROPE

A Diagnosis of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee

By PHILIP COBEN

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, founded about a year ago, made its first bid for public attention and mass support this past weekend (Jan. 30-31) with a national Conference on the Bill of Rights held in New York City.

We took the opportunity to attend the conference and assess the character of this organization and its prospects for being or becoming an effective movement in the struggle for democratic rights and against the purge system and witchhunt inquisition which have increasingly become part of American life, as LABOR ACTION readers know.

The case of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee is very simple indeed for those who have greeted it merely with the epithet "Communist front." It happens to be a more interesting group than that.

The "Communist front" cry was, in point of fact, the main item of publicity which the committee did manage to get in the city's press, as a result of the intervention by the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, whose chairman Professor George S. Counts sent telegrams to the sponsors of, and announced speakers at, the conference, inviting their withdrawal. The denunciation served to persuade a couple of the "names" on the ECLC's list to drop out.

But the trouble with the ECLC is NOT that it is a CP front. Its difficulty is something else again, and a discussion of the real difficulty has a certain interest of its own in addition to the need to get acquainted with the organization in any case.

The Political Type

The officers of the ECLC are: Dr. Paul L. Lehmann of Princeton Theological Seminary, chairman; James Imbrie, secretary-treasurer and a Progressive Party leader in New Jersey; Clark Foreman, director. Its Executive Committee includes: I. F. Stone, the Washington columnist of the late *Daily Compass* and *PM*; Carey McWilliams, author and an editor of the *Nation*; Prof. Thomas I. Emerson of Yale, who was prominent in the Progressive Party and contributes to Paul Sweezy's magazine *Monthly Review*; Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild of NYU, ditto; Prof. H. H. Wilson of Princeton, and commentator J. Raymond Walsh.

Among the participants in the conference panel discussions were also Dr. Scott Buchanan, who was active in the Progressive Party in Massachusetts; Matthew Josephson; Ben Shahn; Leonard Boudin, and others.

One will, of course, recognize among these names, and others associated with the organization, quite a number of those who have in various ways been connected with CP front organizations in the past, prominent among them the Progressive Party. It is a good example of how misleading such a simple means of identification can be, even when it is practised by people who claim to be more "sophisticated" and less reactionary than the gentlemen of "Red Channels" and *Counterattack*.

For the median political characteristic of much of the ECLC's leadership is that they come from the non-Stalinist wing of the Progressive Party, the elements who in 1948 and after chafed at the party-line control which the CP imposed—come from such elements and from the kind of Stalinoid-liberals who are to be seen so often in the pages of the *Nation* but who, it should be remembered, are essentially Stalinoid-liberals and not merely Stalinists masquerading as liberals. In 1948 this political type was widely, and with a rough accuracy, referred to as the "Wallace-Wallaceites" as distinct from the Stalinist line-tooters (with or without a party card) who steered the organization.

Such a one was, for example, James Imbrie, who is now secretary-treasurer of the ECLC; such was Dr. Scott Buchanan who was the only prominent personage in the Wallace party who grimly got up on the floor of the 1948 convention of that hapless group to take an open and public slash at the Stalinists (to be booed down for his pains, just as publicly). Such is I. F. Stone who has separated himself from the Party Line on a number of issues, including the Kutcher case. Carey McWilliams, of course, while he has had much experience as a fringe fellow traveler of the *Nation* type, has never been a party-liner.

"Anti-Anti-Communists"

But it is not necessary or possible to call the roll; for the character of the conference as held is the essential confirmation of this kind of political diagnosis.

Far from being a CP front, the ECLC was in fact formed by these men for the express purpose of creating a civil-liberties organization which would not be a CP front! That statement also has an implication: the ECLC, in their minds, is not to be a CP front but still . . . but still, it is not to be anti-Stalinist either.

In short, the complexion of the politically conscious moving spirits of the ECLC is by and large that type of non-CP (even in a certain sense, anti-CP) Stalinoid-liberal who proclaims that he is "neither a Communist nor an anti-Communist"—the famous "anti-anti-Communist"; who, quite sincerely in his own mind, is not a mere stooge for Russian foreign policy (though with all kinds of illusions and apologies for those features of the Russian regime which he just as sincerely dislikes or even holds in horror) but who shrinks from public criticism of Stalinism or the Russian tyrants on the peculiar ground that this "just fans the flames of the cold war"; who looks on the Stalinists, with

all his reservations and criticisms, as "extreme leftists" who are "sectarian" or "hard to work with" or "too red" or just "undemocratic in their procedures." This type, it goes without saying, are sitting ducks for the CP scream that any attack on it, from whatever quarter, is "red-baiting."

I. F. Stone Throws Darts

The conference opened Friday evening with what was to be a mass rally at Carnegie Hall, with Senator Langer of North Dakota as main drawing card and Professor H. H. Wilson of Princeton as the main speaker for the organization. It is to be thought that the sponsors were somewhat disappointed with the mass character of the rally, since the attendance was about 600. This reporter was not present at this evening of public speech-making and his inquiries did not ascertain that much was missed by those who need no agitation about the extent and dangers of the contemporary witchhunt.

The conference proper was launched on Saturday with a battery of four simultaneous panel discussions on (1) Academic Freedom, (2) Freedom of the Arts, (3) The Political Use of Fear, and (4) Loyalty and the Fifth Amendment. Of these the third was perhaps the best attended and the most general in its political content.

Four presentations were given by panelists, of which two need not detain us; these were by a young minister, the Rev. M. R. Evans, who preached eloquently on the necessity of reviving the "social Gospel" of the "orthodox Christian faith which means challenging the status quo"; and by a psychoanalyst, a Dr. Roose, who attempted in quite meaningless fashion to analyze the fears of the population today under the witchhunt by analogy with a case study of psychopathological fears.

The presentations by I. F. Stone and Carey McWilliams were more to the point. Stone was the only speaker at the conference who insistently took open slaps at the CP and the CP line on civil liberties, while directing his main attention at the witchhunters. He was not typical.

Stone opened his talk with the point that "This [the witchhunt] all began with a mistake by us, the effort of the Left and the liberals to regulate opinion" when they demanded that the state use its repressive powers against the reactionary and fascist elements. He was referring to the war days. "Within two years," he went on, "this became a weapon in the hands of our enemies. . . . So it began with certain fallacies on our side . . . it was bound to end up badly."

He asserted that the Smith Act was created to get Bridges but he added, "Some of our friends, the Communists, were foolish enough to applaud when the leaders of the Teamsters Union in Minneapolis were hit by the act because they don't happen to like the Trotskyites." It will be noted that while this is, of course, an open challenge to the CP line, it is put in the terms of the type which we have attempted to describe above. Such things were merely "foolish" in Stone's eyes. (He used the word again in referring to the "detention-camp provisions of the McCarran Act, so foolishly fathered by some liberals in the Senate in order to fight the registration provisions. . . .")

Stone tossed other bricks in the CP's direction, in his own way. He raised his voice with some heat to say that "Those people who are so damn concerned about conditions in Russia and attack us as 'reds' should wake up and see what is happening here . . ." and then added very quickly something like "And many of these things are happening in Russia too." He made a jibe at the ex-post-facto law in the Slansky trial in a parenthesis. He made the point that the U. S. witchhunters follow the same rule which "you can read in Vishinsky's book on Soviet law."

The Uneasy Ghost

When he reported on this panel at the afternoon general session he repeated the above jabs at the CP, adding another, a reference to the "totalitarian societies, whether Communist or fascist. . . ." Yet this statement, however casual, of the totalitarian character of the Stalinist regime had been preceded a few minutes by a panegyric about the "new societies [which] are coming to birth elsewhere" and the "revolutionary times," the "very wonderful times" that we are therefore living in—a reference, plainly, to the "People's Democracies."

It would take us afield to comment on the political ideas which jostle in Stone's mind—essentially it is a question here of the Stalinoid-liberal notion that while Russia is "socialist" and a "progressive new society" and all that, it is unhappily also totalitarian, and this is a combination which is the unfortunate product of backwardness, which should therefore be avoidable in an enlightened country like the U. S. but it shouldn't stop us from being properly sympathetic with the "new society," you see. . . . But Stone's outspokenness about his own "deviations" is not the typical note in the ECLC.

It was Stone also who made a point of introducing Earl Browder, who otherwise sat quietly through the whole conference; when he presented Browder as a man who was under attack by the government and needed defense there was a fair amount of applause, and no reaction from the CP hacks in the audience.

Carey McWilliams was more circumspect. Like the ECLC as a whole, his only reference to the problem of the organization was anonymously put and for the "initiated." We must avoid the previous shortcomings of other movements, he said; we need a new leadership; "too many ad-

hoc committees have functioned for ends other than their announced ones, with stupid and undemocratic procedures." If you knew he was referring to the CP fronts, then you were to be reassured; if you didn't, no harm done.

Since otherwise the complete content of the sessions of the conference was agitational and hortatory, it is this aspect which we wish to highlight precisely because it is not only the reason for existence of the ECLC but also its bedeviling problem. The ECLC cannot really pretend to be only an assemblage of men of good will who have managed to get together; it takes its start from nothing else than the CP-front problem, which indeed represents the past of so many of its leaders.

To help the deliberations of the panel discussion along on this point, this writer felt that someone really ought to squarely pose the problem which hovered on the outskirts of the talk like an uneasy ghost, and to do so in plain English. We therefore arose in the question period to address a question which, much condensed, ran like this:

"Granted the danger from the reactionary witchhunters (and for that matter the Fair Dealers and their subversive lists); and granted that we, liberals and radicals, believe in defending the full civil liberties of people whose views we oppose and even despise—is it not necessary for liberals and radicals who wish to be effective and honest to at least make clear that, in defending civil liberties, they themselves have no sympathy with and are opposed to the anti-democratic and totalitarian ideology of the Communist Party and the Russian tyranny . . . ?"

It turned out that there were quite a few in the audience who had been waiting for someone to bring that out into the open; it also got the first rise from the party hacks present in the audience: one of them arose to denounce "defensive red baiting" though in relatively mild terms. And Stone, in summarizing, commented only: "I agree that you're not going to be effective if you've got to put out a lot of party-line crap in your statements"—and one can note that he permitted himself to express agreement only with the negative aspect of the issue.

The panel chairman, the Rev. Evans, took the occasion to tell the audience that the ECLC had indeed said as much as the gentleman who had asked the question. He was referring to a typically anonymous formulation in the ECLC's declaration, which ran: "We do not want [as members] those who subscribe to any philosophy of authoritarianism. We grant them the right to such ideas but consider them in opposition to our own."

The leaders of the organization and chairmen of the session hastily passed by attempts by CPers to bring up their favorite cases. When one put in a plug for the Rosenbergs (as if it were a civil-liberties case), the chairman informed him that the committee had decided that "two questions likely to come up, the Rosenberg case and the question of Russian anti-Semitism" were not considered within the scope of the gathering. When others plugged the Steve Nelson case and the CP defendants in the current Smith Act trial, the pleas were bypassed. Indeed, the ECLC was determined not to be a CP front.

Atmosphere

But naturally that is hardly sufficient. What is it to be? We are afraid that the ECLC does not quite know.

Notwithstanding talk about unity on civil liberties, it is a particular audience that the ECLC appeals to, with its effort to be neither Stalinist nor anti-Stalinist, walking the tight rope between the dreaded sin of "red-baiting" and CP front. With the best of good will one must note that there was a certain air of futility about the conference, echoed indeed by well-wishers at the general session who indicated that they did not feel that any lead had been given on what to do, or how to do it—a lack not made up by a routine discussion from the floor on "how to build the organization."

Certainly the atmosphere was not helped any by the two "main speeches" at the general session. That atmosphere was heavily enough professorial and clerical (the existence of a labor movement was literally never mentioned), but it became somewhat more than strange when the first big speech, by theological professor Paul Lehmann, devoted more than an hour to a lecture on theology; it was literally just that in long stretches to a degree that the reader may not believe unless he heard it. Professor Lehmann included some cogent discussion of the theological meaning of "the Living Word of God," a detailed retelling of the David and Goliath story in snappy Sunday School style, a trenchant polemic for the thesis that the fight for civil liberties must be based on faith in the Lord God who created the heavens and the earth, and some assorted telling passages from his lectures to Princeton theology students, including several readings from Jeremiah and a profound discussion of the relation of that prophet to Jesus.

He was followed by an honored and courageous old-fashioned liberal, Professor Alexander Meikeljohn, who began by honestly warning his audience that "I'm afraid I have a very dull paper to read to you and one that hasn't very much to do with the subject, but it has the inestimable merit of being brief." He read for about an hour, we believe, and some time we should like to study his erudite discussion of the juridical problems of the Bill of Rights.

These two long presentations, no doubt planned to be inspiring, were followed by brief panel reports and then the desultory discussion on "what to do," after which the chairman adjourned the meeting, not a minute sooner (Turn to last page)

From the STALINIST JUNGLE

Militarization

The extent of military (and militarized) education in the schools of the Czech Stalinist state is revealed in a leading article in *Obrana Lidu*, the regime's army organ.

"Military education," says the paper, "was introduced in Czech schools a year and a half ago. At the beginning there were various short-comings due to a lack of understanding on the part of the teachers and the general public. Military education was regarded as the task of physical-training instructors rather than one for the whole teaching staff."

"Elements of military education," the article continues, "are included in all the subjects of elementary schools. . . . In Czech lessons children read stories about the defense of the fatherland, on the struggle of the workers led by the Communist Party against the fascist occupiers. . . . and on the glorious past of the nation. In Russia they read about the Soviet army, the heroic struggle of Soviet soldiers against fascism and the tasks of the Czechoslovak and Soviet armies. History classes teach them socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism, military morale, loyalty and love for the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, and hatred for all warmongers and enemies of the people. Geography classes show them the wealth and beauty of this country and the Soviet Union, which must be defended. . . . Natural science shows them the biological weapons used by the enemy. . . . In music lessons fighting songs and marches of the Czech and Soviet armies are sung. Physical-training classes are designed to improve physical prowess. . . . responsibility, discipline and cooperation."

"In secondary and grammar schools," the paper adds, "military education includes tactics, shooting, army regulations, military geography, signals and first aid, which are all taught as separate subjects."

In addition, every school is now to have two military exercises a year, and military training sections will be added to school detachments of Sokol (the sports organizations for youth, now controlled by the government).

Slaughterhouse

In East Germany, the *Sächsische Volksblatt* (Chemnitz) hails the progress made in achieving woman's equality with man. Women are now in the slaughterhouse too—we mean, literally:

"The first women's slaughterhouse team is now working there [in the Dresden slaughterhouse]. It is astonishing what these women—who were organized only in January by Joanna Eichhorn, a former tailoress, as the republic's first women's slaughterhouse group—have achieved.

"There are nine of them, each of whom slaughters ten calves a day. At first they had feminine qualms, which were not easy to

conquer. 'Supposing it bellows, what do we do?' they would ask tremulously as they delivered their first death-dealing blows. Nor did the masculine 'lords of creation' help very much to ease them when they came out with 'A woman's place is in her kitchen,' etc. However, feminine pride triumphed, and they have shown themselves as good as men in pulling a calf's head over its ears, in gutting it with a pair of ordinary scissors and cutting it up. . . ." (Nov. 12.)

Holiday

This past summer holiday-makers on the Polish Baltic coast were subjected to special police restrictions, over and above the usual regulations governing frontier zones in the Stalinist empire.

Movement at night was forbidden except in built-up areas. Bathing was allowed only at fixed places in specified localities. Romantic couples might indulge in moonlight bathing, but only at the risk of being shot on sight: access to the beaches was permitted only between sunrise and sunset. At places other than those appointed for bathing no one was allowed to approach nearer than 15 yards from the sea. Boating and canoeing were also subject to restrictions and special permits.

This state of semi-siege was introduced in the endeavor to stem the steady trickle of Polish citizens escaping to Sweden by fishing vessels and other small craft.

Jean Valjean

Reports the ICFTU's *Spotlight* for December:

"Two sentences of 10 years corrective labor, and two of 8 years, were recently imposed on four people in Soviet Russia. Their crime? Stealing 36 kilos (about 79 pounds) of wheat. This was a case reported on July 18, 1952 by the newspaper *Sovetskaya Moldavia*, published in the territory which Russia annexed from Rumania after the war. The sentence was quite in accord with Soviet law, for the decree of July 4, 1947 makes every theft of communal property a felony.

"What is perhaps more interesting than the draconian severity of Soviet law in this case is the sidelight it throws on living standards in 'Stalin's paradise.' For many years now official Communist propaganda has claimed that the grain problem has been solved in Soviet Russia. At the 19th Communist Party Congress held last October in Moscow, Malenkov repeated that the grain problem 'has been successfully solved, solved finally and irrevocably.'

"And yet four Soviet citizens were prepared to risk sentences of from 8 to 10 years forced labor for the theft of 20 pounds each of a commodity which is officially claimed to be in plentiful supply. Are the Russians really so light-hearted, or are they just hungry?"

Remnant

Overtime work without overtime pay is now standard in the Czech textile trades where the

average work week is 62-66 hours. Explaining that "the eight-hour day is a remnant of capitalism," Minister of Defense Zdenek Nejedly has warned workers that it would be an "unpardonable offense" to leave work simply because they had finished their eight-hour shift.

Love

Continuing in these pages our study of the Stalinist party line on love, we find the following item reported by the Berne (Switzerland) *Freies Volk*, a liberal periodical, for December 19, quoting verbatim from a Russian broadcast.

"The Moscow radio recently had a broadcast dealing with the amorous relations between a kolkhoz worker and a young girl tractor driver. The scene takes place in a field, on a night of the full moon:

"The young girl stops the motor for a moment and says: 'How wonderful it is to work on such a night, and to do everything to economize on gasoline.'

"He: 'This night has given me the idea of working more and more to surpass the plan.'

"They fall into each others' arms and he murmurs tenderly: 'From the very first moment I saw you, I was enraptured by your capacity for work.'

There to our annoyance the news item ends. Does some reader wish to take a hand at filling out the script?

Reuther —

(Continued from page 1)

Labor reporters here state that Reuther was caught completely off-guard by the sudden switch in Washington. They suggest that Durkin, the AFL man, deliberately played a double game, and that he knew that in the last minute the White House would repudiate his announcement. (Some AFL unions are against the new index.)

It is significant that thus far the CIO has not yet blasted the White House announcement. The national executive board of the CIO is meeting this week, to take up this and other important matters.

Ed Lahey, a top labor reporter, suggests that the Steel Workers' union leaders have held informal discussions on pulling out of the CIO. It is this prospect that has dictated the AFL strategy of war of extermination with the CIO, he writes, and the constant rebuffs by the AFL to Reuther's suggestions for working cooperation flow from this strategy.

BLP —

(Continued from page 2)

functions, according to their age group, according to their trade, according to their professional occupation, and according to their sex.

What is wrong is not the principle of a multi-strand Labor Party but the failure to make the different sections function effectively. The attendance at ward and trade-union branch meetings is unbelievably small. The problem of how to make the Labor voter a conscious socialist party worker is far from solved.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Know What Concentration Camps Are For? . . . Fresh Air!

Evidence that the Department of Justice has already set up the physical facilities for the McCarran Act's internment camps for "subversives" is contained in an official letter, sent by the government agency in charge, to the New York office of the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act. The letter has been reproduced in quantity by the committee and its text is published below.

The reader will note, of course, that the director of the Bureau of Prisons, writing for the department, is doing his best to underplay the significance of the preparation. It will also be noted, perhaps with grim amusement, that the "concentration camp" aspect of the institutions is passed off as placing "in a relatively open environment prisoners who would otherwise be crowded in idleness in local jails." Along with the "healthful" environment, "healthful" forced labor is also to be a feature.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BUREAU OF PRISONS WASHINGTON 25

March 26, 1952

Miss Olive O. Van Horn
Acting Secretary
National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act
2 Stone Street
New York 4, N. Y.

Dear Miss Van Horn:

This is to comply with your request that we advise you of the pertinent facts relating to the setting up of detention camps under the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

As you are probably aware, under Section 103 of that Act the Attorney General is authorized whenever an emergency is declared by the President to apprehend and detain persons "as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe that such persons probably will engage in, or probably will conspire with others to engage in acts of espionage or sabotage."

Responsibility for this detention program having been delegated to this Bureau, we undertook a survey of facilities that might be available in the event of an emergency. We found that we would have great difficulty in obtaining suitable housing facilities if we waited until an emergency were declared and the cost would reach upwards of \$5,000 per person if new camps had to be constructed. We learned, however, that certain World War I Army and Air Force camps and former prisoner-of-war camps could be made available for this purpose and put in condition to receive any persons committed to us at a fraction of the cost of constructing accommodations de novo in times of emergency. Also, the camps available were deteriorating rapidly and it was therefore thought to be wise to prepare to anticipate our possible needs by rehabilitating these surplus facilities for use in the event of war or an emergency. It was thought to be good insurance.

In the Appropriations Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, \$775,000 was appropriated to the Bureau for the activation and rehabilitation of six camps. It was intended that federal prison camps of approximately 100 inmates each would be established at selected locations to do necessary repair work. A sum of \$300,000 of the total appropriation was allocated for materials needed to renovate and prepare the camps for occupancy and for minimum operating equipment, such as kitchen equipment, beds, and so forth. The remainder of the appropriation was for personnel to operate the camps (\$300,000), a small inventory of food, clothing, and supplies (\$32,000), and maintenance and operating expenses, such as fuel, electricity, water, transportation, etc. (\$143,000).

Under the appropriation we have established prison camps as authorized by Title 18, U.S.C. 4125, at the following locations: Florence, Arizona, Wickenburg, Arizona, Avon Park, Florida, Allenwood, Pennsylvania, and El Reno, Oklahoma, and in addition plans are under way to establish a similar work camp at Tule Lake, Calif.

The camps as now operated are similar to five others which have been operated by the Bureau for many years. They permit us to place in a relatively open environment prisoners who would otherwise be crowded in idleness in local jails. For example, the jails along the Southwest border have been seriously crowded with violators of the immigration laws. The camps at Florence and Wickenburg, Arizona, permit us to remove many of these aliens from jails and place them in a more healthy, normal camp environment.

It is unfortunate that the term "concentration camps" has been used in connection with these facilities since it implies institutions and procedures entirely foreign to our laws, democratic processes and methods of treatment. If the need for their use as places of detention ever arises, they will be conducted humanely and strictly in keeping with the policies of the President and Congress. Certainly the steps taken to provide these standby facilities to meet the responsibilities that may be placed upon the Department by the Internal Security Act should not be construed as anything other than a precautionary measure.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES V. BENNETT
Director

In English — At Last
The Famed 'Vol. 4' of 'Capital'

KARL MARX'S

"History of Economic Theories"

—From the Physiocrats to A. Smith

The Langland Press

337 pages

\$5.00

Order from

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 17, No. 6

February 9, 1953

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address: Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL

Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

SOCIAL UNREST IN FRANCO SPAIN, by Elena de la Souchère.—L'Observateur (Paris), Jan. 1.

L'Observateur is the magazine edited by Claude Bourdet which is more or less the Paris equivalent of the Nation. Its correspondent reports that social unrest in the Falangist dictatorship has increased to the point where the Falange itself is attempting to channelize it.

"... the Falangist press has been conducting for the last few months a demagogic campaign based on two main themes: for an increase in wages and against the slums.

"The housing shortage has become so critical that the Congress of Architects recently held in Madrid proposed an emergency plan providing for 70,000 new living quarters a year. The rate of construction is now 25,000 living quarters a year, whereas the needs of the population are estimated at 70,000. The deficit, accumulating over the years and reaching 800,000 living quarters now, does not primarily arise from the destruction caused by the Civil War and the slow reconstruction, but from an increase in population and from the exodus from the agricultural areas to the cities. The population of Madrid has increased from 953,000 inhabitants in 1936 to 1,667,000 inhabitants in 1952. . . .

"In the working-class districts of the big cities families of 5, 6 or 7 people are crowded into single-room apartments, and these are the fortunates. The majority of the arrivals from the countryside has established itself outside the city limits. Barcelona is surrounded by 12,000 shacks of wood, tin and rags, Pueblo, the organ of the Falangist labor organization, has disclosed that on the periphery of Madrid . . . whole families of modern cave-dwellers live in 11,000 caves. . . .

"Less spectacular but of a wider significance are the articles in Arriba [central organ of the Falange] denouncing the black market in small apartments and pleading the cause of the young people who cannot get married because they can't find a place to live.

"Simultaneously with this campaign, the Falangist press has repeatedly taken up since last spring the problem of a wage increase. The last increase, of 25 per cent, goes back to the first months of 1950 whereas prices rose steadily

up to spring 1950. After a period of normalization caused by an increase in agricultural production, the upward movement in prices has resumed under the pressure of inflation. The index of the cost of living is now rising again to the maximum figure of spring 1950, when the strike wave occurred. Consequently Girón, the Falangist minister of labor, brought up the question of wage increases at the council of ministers last October, only to be faced with the opposition of his conservative colleagues. A compromise solution was then proposed, consisting in the grant of an exceptional bonus equivalent to a month's pay for domestic help and 21 pay-days for workers.

"As soon as the debates in the council of ministers became known, leaflets appeared in Barcelona calling for a general strike if pressures from the employers would cause Girón's proposals to be rejected. In the fall of 1952 as in the spring of 1951 the action of the Falange arises from the pressure of popular discontent, but in turn encourages underground activity. The government retreated from the threat of another 12th of March and the bonus was granted."

The article goes on to describe the tensions between the Falangist and monarchist elements. The Falangists apparently are trying to conciliate the left—Arriba for the first time ever paid homage to the republican soldiers who died in the Civil War. The monarchists, on the other hand, pursue a consistent policy of reaction.

Finally, E. de la Souchère reports a crisis in the army, touched off by a reprimand incurred by an officer in the Barcelona garrison. This officer requested the permission of his colonel to serve as a waiter in a nightclub on off-duty hours to be able to support himself. In response to the reprimand, his colleagues supported him and presented a demand for a pay increase. Munoz Grande, the Falangist minister of war, had to go to Barcelona himself to appease the agitation in the garrison. On his return, he is supposed to have warned Franco that he would resign if a general pay increase for officers were not granted, since he would then be open to the attack of not having adequately defended the interests of the officer caste.

Poland: Bierut Emerges As Satellite Sub-Stalin

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Following the Russian-style election in Poland, important political changes have taken place in the satellite country. In accordance with the new constitution, a State Council was created, and elected as its president was General Zawadski, whom we have already described in previous articles as a very insignificant and gray personality, an obedient instrument of the Kremlin.

Contrary to expectations, Zawadski did not replace Cyrankiewicz as the prime minister, but must be satisfied with his decorative position which has no real political power. His role corresponds to that of Shvernik as the president of the Russian Supreme Soviet.

The composition of the State Council shows that, despite the formal setup of the new constitution, it will be only a decorative organ and that the real power belongs to the Stalinist camarilla headed by Boleslaw Bierut and controlled by the Kremlin's secret police. Bierut resigned from the presidency of the state—that post having been abolished in the constitution—and was in turn elected prime minister, replacing Cyrankiewicz, who is reduced to one of the vice-premiers.

The new government, presided over by Bierut, is composed of eight vice-premiers and 34 ministers. The vice-premiers are: Cyrankiewicz, W. Dworakowski, T. Gede, General P. Jaroszewicz, Z. Nowak, H. Minc, K. Rokossovsky (the Russian-imported general), and S. Jedrychowski, all members of the Stalinist party.

SHADOW-PARTIES

In this government the representation of the "shadow parties" (Democrats, Populists, Christian-Social Party, etc.) is reduced to only three ministers of the pseudo-"Populist Party." The composition of the government is indeed monolithic, and all other ministers belong to the Stalinist party.

The decorative State Council also contains representatives of the "Democratic Party," such as Barcikowski; "Populists" Kowalski, Niecko and Juszkiewicz; "trade-unionists," Klosiewicz, etc. Of course the Politburo has a decisive majority in the council.

The president of the new Polish parliament (still known as the Sejm) is Dembowski, a noted scientist and also a well-known Stalinist puppet. He opened the new session of the Sejm and reported that Prime Minister Cyrankiewicz was presenting the resignation of his cabinet. The Sejm then "enthusiastically" designated

former President Bierut as the new chief of state. The list of vice-premiers and ministers presented by Bierut was also "enthusiastically" and unanimously ratified. As can be seen, "popular democracy" is flourishing in Stalin's Poland.

In his programmatic speech Bierut proclaimed the struggle against all the "agents of Anglo-American imperialism" and especially against saboteurs of production and "Trotskyite-Titoist-Zionist" agents. This makes the first mention of the "Trotskyite danger," up to now unheralded in Poland.

THE WINNER

These changes in the government mean that the reorganization of "Polish democracy" is going along in accordance with the wishes and signals of the Kremlin. It means also that the rivalry among the leading Stalinists for the presidency of the government, going on among Zawadski, Ochab, Berman and Bierut, has been resolved at this time in favor of Bierut, who thereby shows that he has retained Stalin's confidence. This confidence placed in him by the Russian masters endures from the time when Bierut was chief of the "Polish section of the Russian GPU" and in this capacity sent to their ancestors all the leading figures, right-wing and left-wing, of the old Communist Party of Poland.

So Bierut is now Poland's little sub-Stalin. But despite all the confidence which the master may repose in his hireling, it is still true that he is in turn controlled not only by the Politburo, by Marshal Rokossovsky and by the "security" police of Radkiwicz, but also by the Russian ambassador, who has at his disposal a special troop of Russian secret-police forces and who holds the leading strings in the country outside of the normal mechanism of the party, state and Politburo organs.

With these new state reforms, the "popular" Polish republic gets more assimilated to the Russian pattern. The State Council corresponds to the All-Russian Soviet; the president of the State Council, Zawadski, corresponds to the presidency of the Supreme Soviet, held by Shvernik; the role of Bierut corresponds, on the level of the satellite, to that of Stalin. Now Bierut's consolidated regime must go on to struggle against the "foreign agents," the Catholic Church, the peasants, the "Trotskyite-Titoist" menace, the Jewish "cosmopolitans," etc. One can now expect the big show trial for Gomulka, Spychalski et al. as prepared for by the Slansky trial in Prague.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS SPEAKS UP—

That 'Fantastic' Loyalty Oath

The editorial below is one of the most hard-hitting attacks on the new "loyalty oath" for housing-project tenants which has appeared outside the radical press. It is from the Congress Weekly for Jan. 19, published by the American Jewish Congress.

More and more frequently these days, items in the press are so fantastic that we find ourselves rereading them several times to make certain that no one is perpetrating a hoax on us.

One of these items was the recent report that housing authorities in several cities have taken action to comply with a new federal law enacted last July. Under the law, members of "subversive" organizations are to be excluded from federal housing projects. The principal tenant of every apartment is required to certify that neither he nor any occupant of his apartment is a member of any group which has been designated as subversive by the attorney general of the United States. Tenants who refuse to sign or commit fraud in signing are to be evicted. The list to be used in determining eligibility to live in a federal project is the attorney general's roster of 203 organizations.

The law is certain to be tested

in the courts and there are innumerable grounds on which its constitutionality can be challenged. Membership in these organizations per se is made grounds for exclusion. But none of these organizations has ever had a hearing to determine whether it is in fact subversive. Membership in any of them has never been declared a crime. Fundamental issues of deprivation of liberty are involved.

Wholly apart from these issues, however, the law is almost incredible and its implications are staggering. What possible relationship there can be between the law and any legitimate public purpose is difficult to imagine. Will the fight against Communism, for example, be advanced one whit if Communists are evicted from a housing project and move around the corner or across the street?

WHERE IT LEADS

Presumably, the law is based on the assumption that a "subver-

sive" should not be permitted in any way to benefit from federal or tax-raised funds. He must therefore be denied the right to live in a federally-assisted project. The same reasoning would inexorably lead to denying any member of the 203 groups on the attorney general's list any other benefit which comes directly or indirectly from public funds.

On the same grounds which permit the eviction of members of those organizations from housing projects, they should be permitted to starve by being denied unemployment relief. Their children should be kept ignorant by being excluded from public schools. They should not be allowed police protection, the services of the fire brigade, or the use of public highways. The theory is no different from the present law, and any of these applications is hardly less serious in its consequences than eviction from one's home.

A dramatic illustration of the application of the law is the case of James Kutcher of Newark. Kutcher is the legless war veteran who was dismissed from his job in the Veterans Administration because of his membership in the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and whose case is still pending.

Kutcher lives with his aged father in a federal housing project. His father was unable to sign the oath that no occupant of the apartment belongs to any group on the attorney general's list. Under the law, the Kutchers, or at least the legless veteran, will be forced to move. Kutcher has announced that he will file suit in federal court.

We hope that the courts will retain the sanity which seems occasionally to abandon our legislators. Things are coming to a pretty pass when Americans who have been convicted of no crime can be evicted from their homes or may be forced, by application of the same theory, to go to the courts for permission to walk on a public thoroughfare.

ON SPAIN

Homage to Catalonia \$3.50
By George Orwell

Orwell's personal account of the Spanish Civil War.

Revolution and Counter-Revolution In Spain 2.00
by Felix Morrow

The best history of the Civil War—second-hand, good condition. Out-of-print, scarce.

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

The first eight pamphlets listed are by Trotsky, and were published in Ceylon by Lanka Samasamaja Pub.

- REVOLUTION IN SPAIN .25
(January 1931)
- THE LESSON OF SPAIN: THE LAST WARNING .25
(December 1937)
- MARXISM AND SCIENCE .15
(Speech, 1925)
- AGAINST SOCIAL-PATRIOTISM .10
(Open Letter to Jules Guesde, 1916)
- EUROPE AND AMERICA .30
(Speeches of 1924 and 1926 in Russia)
- WHITHER EUROPE? .15
(Speech of 1926, included in the above)
- I STAKE MY LIFE! .15
(Speech on Moscow Trials, 1937)
- IN DEFENSE OF OCTOBER .15
(Speech, 1932)
- THE ZIMMERWALD MANIFESTO .10
(Famous anti-war declaration of 1915)
- THE LAST WORDS OF ADOLF JOFFE .10

Package price for all 10 pamphlets—\$1.50.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City
(Remittance must accompany all orders)

Marx, Engels and 'The Russian Menace'

I—From A. A. Berle to Nineteenth Century Pan-Slavism

By HAL DRAPER

Since its recent publication we have been preparing to review a book of the greatest interest especially to Marxists, a collection of the writings by Marx and Engels on "The Russian Menace to Europe" in the last half of the 19th century. Our main review of the book as a whole will, however, wait for a later article, while we devote this one to one aspect of the rich material, one which has been raised these last couple of weeks (in a certain contemporary fashion) by an erudite professor who also looked into the book and came away with a quotation.

While the professor himself will not detain us long, the discussion leads into an important question raised about a century ago by Marx and Engels, dealing with the attitude of socialists toward demands for national independence by minority nationalities.

Adolf A. Berle, who is not only a scholar but also state chairman of the New York Liberal Party, communicated his discovery in his press release on the new Russian anti-Semitic drive.

As we noted when writing on the same subject in our January 26 issue, there is a whole school of experts on Stalinism whose main qualification as "authorities" on the subject is their unique ability to derive all of Stalinism's crimes from their "roots in Bolshevism," and whose virtuoso skills in root-tracing are never more pleasantly exercised than when they are employed in linking Bolshevism with Stalinism on precisely those questions where they are most plainly incompatible. There is also a sub-school, not to be satisfied with half-measures, which is even more profound and traces them back to the original sin of Karl Marx himself. Berle belongs to the sub-species.

Scholar at Work

Therefore, with the concise erudition of the true-born scholar, Berle needs only two sentences to expose the ancestry of Stalinist racism in Marx. He writes that "Students of Stalinist-Communism have known of this growing racialist trend for years, though it never came openly forth until now," and immediately adds:

"Karl Marx wrote that the peoples of Central Europe were 'ethnic trash,' to be liquidated because they could be used to oppose world revolution. He mentioned specifically Croats, Poles and Ruthenians."

This revelation, based on painstaking research into one whole page of the Blackstock-Hoselitz collection, has a few defects in it, if we wish to cavil about trifles. Namely:

(1) The passage to which Berle refers was not by Marx but by Engels (page 63).

(2) It does not refer to "the peoples of Central Europe."

(3) The term "ethnic trash," which is explained at very great length, has not the slightest connection with "racialism."

(4) The whole discussion by Engels, far from including the Poles, explicitly points precisely to the Poles as being in the diametrically opposite situation, above all other peoples on the continent!

(5) The peoples whom Engels does have in mind are not "to be liquidated." He is predicting that they cannot and will not be viable as nations, and maintaining that their claims to national independence do not deserve support by socialists.

(6) He does so not because they "could be used" but because they were, and had long been, counter-revolutionary pawns of the Russian despots.

(7) Lastly, all of the above cannot have the slightest meaning to anyone unless he first knows that Engels' whole discussion of the question is in the context of, and motivated by, the European revolutionists' hatred of the Russian power, and Russian Pan-Slavism, as the center and leader of all reaction on the continent.

Outside of these peccadillos, everything in Berle's erudite reference is entirely correct—viz., the punctuation.

The Russian Menace

But apart from Berle's pettyfogging malice and perversion, which he does not carry off as cleverly as his bisymmetric opposites, the Stalinists: what is really involved in Marx and Engels' discussions of the Balkan national question of their day?

Their big interest in the question derived from the view, which they held in common with almost all other Western radicals and even liberals of the day, that the

*THE RUSSIAN MENACE TO EUROPE, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. A collection of articles, speeches, letters and news dispatches, selected and edited by Paul W. Blackstock and Bert F. Hoselitz.—Free Press (Glencoe, Ill.), 288 pages, \$3.75.

Russian autocracy was the mainstay of reaction on the continent, that working-class emancipation and even the defense of democracy was impossible as long as tsarism remained alive, that a struggle to the death had to be fought against the Moscow despotism and all of its allies, stooges and pawns.

It is quite well known that in the middle of the century they were calling for war against this Russia as a revolutionary act. In 1914-18 this fact was used by the German pro-war Social-Democrats to justify their own abject surrender to the kaiser's war; the Marxists then had to point out this was a deception: the nature of the war and of the social and political forces in the world were by then entirely different; but it is less well known that even in their own time Marx and Engels' advocacy of revolutionary war against Russia was directed as much against their "own" German government as against the external enemy of the revolution. For German reaction, in their eyes, was inextricably linked with Moscow:

"As long as the Russians stand behind the bourgeoisie and governments of Austria and Germany the force of the whole German labor movement is dulled," wrote Engels in 1874. "The war with Russia would be a complete, public and real break with our [Germany's] whole shameful past, it would mean the real liberation and unification of Germany, the reestablishment of democracy on the ruins of feudalism and the brief dream of ascendancy of the bourgeoisie," he wrote in 1848.

Hessians of the Tsar

For this reason they turned all guns on the main propaganda instrument of Russian expansionism: the movement and ideology of Pan-Slavism; whereby the tsar sought to declare his hegemony over all the Slavic peoples and drag them along as his Hessians of the counter-revolution:

"The immediate objective of Pan-Slavism is the setting up under Russian domination of a Slavic empire from the Erzgebirge and the Carpathians to the Black, Aegean and Adriatic Seas . . ." (1849). "Pan-Slavism is not a movement which merely strives after national independence; it is a movement which aims to undo what a thousand years of history have created; which cannot realize itself without sweeping from the map of Europe Hungary, Turkey, and a large part of Germany. Moreover, it must subjugate Europe in order to secure the stability of these results, if they are ever obtained. Pan-Slavism is now, from a creed, turned into a political program, with 800,000 bayonets to support it." (1855.) And much more of the same.

The main roadblock in the way of Russian "Pan-Slavic" imperialism was—Poland, the revolutionary Poland which was fighting valiantly for freedom from the tsar. And this is why Marx and Engels turned again and again to glorify the struggle of the Poles, to write veritable panegyrics on the courage and valor of the Poles, and above all to insist that the fight for the independence of Poland, its re-establishment as a nation, was the No. 1 task of every European revolutionary.

"There is but one alternative for Europe. Either Asiatic barbarism, under Muscovite direction, will burst around its head like an avalanche, or else it [Europe] must re-establish Poland, thus putting 20 million heroes between itself and Asia and gaining a breathing spell for the accomplishment of its social regeneration," wrote Marx in 1867.

Role of the Slavs

Engels' language was equally unmeasured when it came to the Poles, "the only Slavic nation which is free from all Pan-Slavic desires," the "indispensable people of Europe":

"How entirely differently the Poles behaved [from the South Slavs]! Oppressed, enslaved, exploited for 80 years, they have always placed themselves on the side of the revolution, they have always declared the revolutionizing of Poland to be inseparable from the independence of Poland . . . for this reason Poland has the sympathy of all Europe, and the re-establishment of its nationality is just as certain as is the hatred of all Europe for the Czechs, Croats and Russians, and as certain as the bloodiest revolutionary war of all Western Europe against the latter." (1849.)

"A Slavic nation which prefers freedom to Slavdom demonstrates its vitality by this fact alone, and thus already assures its future." (1849.)

" . . . it is certain that on the day on which Russia loses Poland the [revolutionary] movement in Russia itself will be powerful enough to overthrow the existing order of things. Independence of Poland and revolution in Russia mutually determine each other." (1874.)

For Marx and Engels—in this European world of a century ago—those who fought for freedom against the Russian reaction were soldiers of the revolution. And those who fought side by side with the Russian reaction were enemies of the revolution, of all democracy, of any progressive future, and merited nothing but ceaseless hostility.

Such were the South Slav nationalities whom Engels in particular denounced as vigorously as he extolled the Poles, and for the same reasons. They were playing a deep-dyed reactionary role as the pawns of Moscow, though presumably acting in the name of nationalism. (This kind of diagnosis of a situation assuredly should be familiar to the Berles of today.)

Engels examines the role of the South Slavs in detail that we do not have the space to follow here, of course.

Metternich was "using the religious and national fanaticism of the Ruthenian peasants" to suppress "the democratic Polish movement." (Page 59.)

The South Slavs "rose up in 1848 to establish their national independence only in order to suppress at the same time the German-Magyar revolution. . . . The house of Hapsburg . . . is prolonging the last moments of its existence through the union of the South Slavs in a war against the Germans and the Magyars." (Page 65.)

"In return for the expectation to obtain their miserable 'national autonomy' they sold out democracy and the revolution to the Austrian dual monarchy, to 'the center' of 'the systematic enforcement of despotism in the heart of Europe' . . ." (Page 80.)

"They demand that we set up right in the heart of Germany a counter-revolutionary Czech kingdom, that we break the power of the German, Polish and Magyar revolutions by pushing between them Russian outposts on the Elbe, the Carpathians and the Danube. We will not think of it. To the sentimental slogans of brotherhood which are here offered us in the name of the counter-revolutionary nations of Europe, we reply that hatred of Russia was and still is the first revolutionary passion of Germans. . . ." (Page 83.)

But still, revolutionary or counter-revolutionary, were not the Slavic nationalities entitled to their national independence, one might ask? Marx and Engels were fervent supporters of the right of nations to self-determination up to and including independence, and as we shall see they restated their views right in the midst of this very discussion on the Slavs. But given the social and political context of the Slavic aspirations—they maintained with cogent arguments which surveyed the entire European scene as well as the history of the Slavs—it was not the question of national independence which was the crux.

Reactionary Nationalism

Two aspects of this argument we have already seen in effect:

(1) What happens when a nationality, socially and politically backward with no developed democratic movement in its ranks as yet, ties its aspirations for nationhood to, and becomes the pawn of, the reactionary and imperialist power of the mainstay of European reaction, so that (by its own choice) its victory can be won only at the expense of the democratic, national and revolutionary aspirations of other peoples?

The choice must be made not on the basis of a sentimental love for or hatred of any one of these peoples as such—a criterion alien to socialism in any case—but on the basis of the historic meaning of one or the other struggle. Marx and Engels chose the side of those peoples whose struggle was also the ally of all-human emancipation, whose struggle did not mean the repression of any other people but the greater freedom of all.

(2) Certainly the Slavic nationalities had the right to make a bid for nationhood, but these national struggles (not some national struggle in the abstract but the actual Slavic movements) were in reality covers for Russian domination of Eastern Europe and eventually the whole continent. To support these movements in the name of "national independence" was therefore a fraud and a deception—on the part of many, a self-deception.

And behind the fact that Slavic nationalism became a Russian pawn was the fact that of and by itself it could have and did have no vitality. So Engels argued with great vigor.

He put the spotlight on the jumble of nationalities, confused, entangled, criss-crossing, hopelessly intermixed, which filled the Balkan areas. He traced their histories and surveyed the possibility of drawing any clear lines among them—lines of nationhood. He argued that for centuries they had shown themselves unable to play any independent role in Europe. He ridiculed the claims that there was any "Slavic language" in the midst of the welter of related, but mutually unintelligible, tongues and dialects among the mixed peoples.

"Except for the Poles, the Russians and at best the Slavs in Turkey, no Slavic people has a future, for the simple reason that all the other Slavs lack the most basic historic, geographic, political and industrial prerequisites for independence and vitality." (Page 72.) And more than once he predicted in categorical terms that they would disappear.

The reader will, of course, know that these predictions were wrong. But before adding another element to his knowledge, we can point out now that Engels' analyses of the national position of the South Slavs was an historical one, which sought to explain their "counter-revolutionary character" at this juncture in history by the conditions of their development, by the reasons for their backwardness in developing a bourgeoisie, by the political factors which threw them into the arms of the Autocrat of All the Russians, etc. (To speak of "racialism" in connection with all this is possible only for a professor who knows that anything goes for scholars nowadays if only you attack the right people.)

In any case, Engels' repeated predictions with regard to the national fate of the Slavs were quite wrong, it turned out. Slavic nations were carved out of the Balkans following the First World War, weren't they? But this hardly ends matters for two reasons.

(Next week:

II—Marx, Engels and the "Principle of Nationalities.")

TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF THE 'HOMELESS LEFT' IN THE MIDST OF CRISIS—

France: A New Effort by Left Socialists

Ever since the end of the Second World War France's decaying capitalist structure has been characterized by a chronic state of political crisis. Not the least of the elements in this crisis has also been the homelessness of the French anti-capitalist and anti-Stalinist left.

The detailed picture and background was described in **LABOR ACTION** for September 29 last in an article entitled "France in 1952," and need not be repeated here. With a mass Communist Party subordinated to Russian imperialism, on the one hand, and on the other a Socialist Party which is perhaps the most thoroughly worm-eaten, deproletarianized and reformist in Western Europe (if not the world), there have been a number of abortive attempts to build left-wing militant socialist groups which could offer an alternative to the ineffectuality of the SP and the menace of the Stalinists.

Among these attempts were the RDR (*Rassemblement Démocratique Révolutionnaire*) formed in 1948, and the *Action Socialiste Révolutionnaire*, composed of socialist militants who left the SP some four years ago. More recently, a new attempt (reported in the above-mentioned article) has been under way to regroup scattered formations of independent socialists in France around the monthly national organ *Démocratie Proletarienne*.

Without being in a position to evaluate the prospects before these efforts now, but certainly with the warmest wishes that the Socialist left arrive at a unity of forces and a clear political position, we wish also to bring to our readers' attention another development along these lines.

NEW BREAK

Most recently, a group of some 500 left socialists broke with the Socialist Party in and around the important city of Toulouse in Southern France to set up an independent organization, under the name of *Action Socialiste*.

Their regional group has established liaison with other groups elsewhere in the country, some groups consisting of ex-Stalinists, others dating back to the old French Trotskyist movement or to the *Action Socialiste Révolutionnaire*, and in touch with the socialist militants grouped around *Démocratie Proletarienne* who have taken the initiative in attempting to bring about closer connections between all of these efforts.

In December a national delegated conference of the above-mentioned groups took place, and its results will be reported in **LABOR ACTION** as soon as possible.

The main thing we would emphasize about the new *Action Socialiste* group is not its programmatic shortcomings but rather its attempt to develop, out of its experience and thinking, a genuinely socialist and anti-war movement which can fill the vacuum which now exists in France. The AS broke with the SP over day-to-day problems of the defense of the workers' interests, and certainly, given the situation in France, no one has a right to expect—let alone demand—that a full-blown program of clear Marxist character emerge immediately from the confused swamps of social-democracy and Stalinism which bedevil the French working class.

As these comrades carry out their discussions with their comrades of Paris, Normandy, Lorraine and elsewhere, the bases for a socialist regroupment may be produced. One of the questions before them, with regard to their own orientation, is that which **LABOR ACTION** has emphasized before: Shall the Marxist groups attempt to build another small

independent movement, with hopes for the future, or shall they rather (as we have recommended in this period for European left Marxists generally and also in France) seek to build a left-wing force within the old social-democratic party?

Below we present the programmatic statement issued by the new AS to acquaint our readers with the views with which these ex-SP militants are attempting to grapple. It is true that readers of **LABOR ACTION**, we are sure, will find several portions of this programmatic statement highly inadequate from an Independent Socialist standpoint.

To mention a couple: Backward countries are labeled unready for socialism, thus failing to grasp the idea that while the construc-

tion of socialism in backward countries cannot be successfully completed without the spread of socialism to more advanced nations, nevertheless the establishment of workers' power and socialization of industry in them may precede (and also stimulate) social revolution in the rest of the world.

WEAKNESSES

A second important inadequacy in the AS program is its ambiguity on the question of self-determination, both for the colonial peoples and for the Germans. Advice to these as to how they should associate themselves with a united Europe is gratuitous so long as one does not recognize first their right to their own full sovereignty.

The Program of 'Action Socialiste': For a Third Camp

ACTION SOCIALISTE calls the manual and intellectual workers to organize in order to resume together the pursuit of socialism's traditional ideal: the achievement of a classless society that guarantees the equal possibility of free development to all.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

(1) *With regard to the capitalist regime, based on the exploitation of a class of wage earners by a class of capitalists, AS can have only an attitude of relentless struggle.* The policy of class collaboration followed by the Socialist Party of France has abundantly proved its bankruptcy, leading to a terrible decline in the political strength of the workers' movement.

(2) *With regard to the Stalinist regime, based on exploitation of a class of wage earners by a bureaucratic class, AS can have likewise only an attitude of resolute opposition.* If there has been an intensified loss in vitality of the workers' movement, this is assuredly because its only champions, given the Socialist Party's defection, have been the apostles of Stalinist tyranny.

(3) *The objective of Action Socialiste, on the plane of the social regime, can only be the absolute abolition of the wage system; the collective use of the instruments of production should be put in the hands of the collectivities of workers themselves.* That is perhaps impossible among some very backward peoples. But the European workers are sufficiently educated to assume this task. However, a harmful statist centralization would take it out of their hands in order to reserve it for a caste of technocrats. AS sees in this possibility the gravest danger menacing the future of civilization.

(4) *In the present state of the world, the double struggle to be carried on—against the maintenance of the capitalist regime and against the introduction of the Stalinist regime—has, as its first stage the conquest of European independence with respect to the U. S. and the USSR.* France alone would be too weak to safeguard its independence before these two colossi. AS therefore will not hesitate to promote a real *European nationalism*. It sees, furthermore, the best guarantee of peace in the formation of a world third force.

PRESENT TASKS

(A) On domestic problems:—

The essential objective of AS is the reconstitution of workers' unity. In our eyes the workers are those who live by their labor without any parasitic exploitation of others; the porter, the engineer and the university professor have the same basic interests as the miner in seeing to it that the product of labor be shared only by those engaging in socially useful activity, to the exclusion of all kinds of parasites.

Workers' unity, however, will be achieved only in struggles whose objectives are shared by the whole working class. That is why AS condemns any attempt to involve the unions in actions serving exclusively the strategic purposes of a party, unless workers' unity itself has been realized behind this party. It is only when this unity has been re-forged in real common struggles that the working class will be able to engage in the decisive political struggle for the conquest of power.

In the immediate future, these struggles should center mainly on the following points:

(1) Struggle for genuine application of the *escalator clause*, based on exposure of the so-called Pinay experience and of the illusions spread by this malevolent hypnotist about the real evaluation of living costs.

(2) Struggle against *price rises*; in this connection direct action (boycott of price speculators, development of consumer cooperatives) would be much preferable to awaiting governmental miracles.

(3) Struggle for the reduction of *armament expenditures*, and the assignment of the economies thus effected to a development of *industrial investment, housing construction, and agricultural equipment*.

In these struggles, and in struggles on additional issues, the working class would recover its unity and its combativity, together with an immediate amelioration of its condition. It is divided and discouraged by being asked to demonstrate—without any hope whatever of being effective—over futile things which concern it as little as the replacement of Eisenhower by Ridgway at the head of NATO.

(B) On foreign affairs:—

(1) AS, we have said, wants to be *European*. The era of Franco-German quarrels is closed. The demands of modern economy render indispensable, in Western Europe, the formation of a powerful community which England will join if she so desires.

(2) Our will to construct a "Europe" makes us willing to see it

Thirdly, the formulation on European unity—bourgeois unity first, socialist unity next—is at best misleading since no consideration is given to the question whether a bourgeois Europe which is at the same time fully and really independent of the two war blocs is at all possible under the circumstances. The program tends to view this development as a matter of separate stages, without raising the issue whether workers' power in the national states is necessary precisely in order to achieve a real Independent Western Europe.

There are other weaknesses as we read it, but we have already said that we do not wish to put the emphasis on such inadequacies at this point. In domestic policy the

AS wishes to be a militant class struggle organization which can fight capitalism without succumbing to the totalitarian "enemy of its enemy," Stalinism. In foreign affairs, the AS wishes to develop a clear Third Camp position (as we term it here), directed against both American and Russian imperialism.

The problem in France today, as it has been for several years, is to get into motion a political tendency which can offer such a road of struggle to the French working class, and which surely will develop from that point on. That is why **LABOR ACTION** is interested in all sympathy with keeping its readers informed of the courses which are being taken.

The program of *Action Socialiste* follows.

built first in a bourgeois framework, provided that a common political authority does not leave the direction of the European economy at the arbitrary mercy of high finance. We have faith, then, in the outcome of the struggle which the united European proletariat would then carry on to make the House of Europe its own.

(3) However, if we accept the formation of a united Europe before that of a socialist Europe, we do not accept that it be achieved under American leadership. As this would appear too much as a threat to the USSR, it would increase the danger of a world war. We will struggle, therefore, for a neutral Europe and against any French participation in the formation of a European community that is not accompanied by repudiation of the Atlantic alliance. In this struggle for neutrality we will have at our sides some bourgeois elements as well. Thus we justify our position: Europe first, socialist Europe next.

(4) European neutrality, then European socialism, will ease the irritating problem of German unity. The USSR, which will not allow East Germany to join a West Germany which is integrated into the Atlantic bloc, would find it much less inconvenient to have it attached to a neutral Europe. We will therefore urge our German comrades to rally to this solution, which is slow but wise, and to renounce their demand for a Germany which is immediately reunified and alone neutralized; such a Germany, isolated, would soon become again the danger that it was for the peace of the world.

(5) France, in a united Europe, will not be in an inferior position if she comes to it with all her strength; this obviously requires renunciation of the inept Indo-Chinese war.

(6) And this requires also that France come to the European marriage with African peoples at her side who are associated with her without thought of separatism. This consideration dominates our African policy, which requires that we renounce a few careers as colonial administrators for our children and compel the colonial landowners to accept the proposition that, in Africa as elsewhere, the land must belong to those who till it.

It is on these bases that we address ourselves—

To socialists for whom socialism is something different from a label in the electoral marketplace;

To communists for whom communism is something different from service to a foreign imperialism;

To the unorganized who have seen nothing in any of the existing parties to attract them;

To all those who despair of the fate of humanity because an American future appears as bleak to them as a Russian future.

Action Socialiste is the rejection of this despair.

This Is PERSONAL!

The 1953 fund drive of the Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League was launched last week. It is up to every reader of **LABOR ACTION** to make his or her contribution. We need the money badly, and we need it early in the drive. Please do not wait till the end. Give now, and give as generously as you can. Our ability to continue to put forth the ideas of socialism depends in no small measure on you. We are sure that you will not fail us.

The EDITORS

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL's 1953 Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

New U.S. Formosa Policy—

The ISL Program In Brief

(Continued from page 1)

the fleet to hold Chiang from hostile measures against the China coast.

That much for the facts of history. But what is the real meaning of this change in policy? The difficulty is that before that question can be answered, one would have to know just what the change actually is. And this was left a matter of guesswork for Stalin, the allies of the United States, and the American people alike.

It is evident that Chiang's forces in Formosa are not capable of launching a military offensive against China which would force a major withdrawal of Chinese troops from Korea. Even Chiang's most optimistic propagandists say that it would be "at least a year" before an invasion of China could be contemplated. Actually, if Chiang's troops have to fight without actual American military support, one might as well put the figure at three years or twenty.

The only military measures within their capacity would be commando raids. It is questionable if even these could be carried out without American naval and air support. But if they could, the Chinese Stalinists would have to divert a few divisions, at most, from their forces to meet them, and there is no indication that these would have to be withdrawn from Korea.

GAIN AND LOSS

Eisenhower left open the question of military support to such raids. But much more important, he also left open the question whether the Seventh Fleet still stands instructed to defend Formosa from a possible Stalinist invasion. Actually, no one doubts that this is the case.

What has American foreign policy gained and what has it lost by this "new approach"?

It has gained a possible diversion of some Chinese troops from Manchuria to the coast of Northern China. This could have serious importance only in the event of a full-scale offensive by the Americans in Korea which would seek the reconquest of the whole country as its objective.

It has gained, also, the plaudits of that broad section of the Amer-

ican electorate which voted for Eisenhower on the ground that he was "going to do something" about the war in Korea, without bothering to find out exactly what he proposed to do.

It has also gained the approval, of course, of the militarists and businessmen who favor a "tough" military policy, up to and including the "preventive war" advocates at the extreme right.

And what has it lost from the standpoint of Washington's own arms? First and most obvious, it has lost any chance of an early drawing of India and those other governments of Asia which follow her lead in foreign policy into closer collaboration with the American war camp.

BRAGGADOCIO

Instead of putting iron into the souls of the governments and peoples of Europe, it has obviously made them more fearful of and rebellious against America's course in the cold war than they were before. Although there are reports that Dulles has been assured by the French government that they intend to proceed with steps leading to the formation of a European army, the popular reaction both in Germany and France is such as to cast grave doubts on the ability of the French government to produce in this field, assuming that they have any intention of doing so in the first place.

To date the reaction of the Stalinist leaders to this new policy has been one of silence. In due course it can be expected that they will use it for all that it is worth from a propaganda point of view. The policy does not measurably increase the actual military threat to them, at least for the time being, but they can be counted on to exploit its propaganda potential to the utmost.

In sum, the Eisenhower administration has achieved a major, self-imposed political defeat of the first order with its first attempt at a "new" policy. It has exchanged what Eisenhower called "a posture of paralyzed tension" for one of belligerent braggadocio.

At worst, its new policy can accelerate the speed with which the U. S. gets into World War III. At best, with the passage of time, in which Chiang Kai-shek's military and political impotence becomes

even more obvious than it has been in the past, this action will be forgotten by the world in the sweep of more important and serious developments.

However much bluff there may be involved in threatening Stalinist China with Chiang Kai-shek's power, there is a method in this madness which is probably its chief importance. Even though the action may have in mind chiefly its effect on public opinion in this country, it points to an attitude which the Eisenhower administration shares with and seeks to further develop in the more backward sections of the American public.

This is the idea that the main thing is to go on the offensive, to keep moving, to put Stalin "off balance," to hasten the development of the cold war by "taking the initiative."

Even the saner well-wishers of the new government are impressed by this argument. As they look over the past few dreary years in which Stalin has been marching from one victory to another, they get the feeling that his main advantage has been in the fact that he had the initiative. Hence, the thing to do is to take the initiative from him.

But they do not stop for a moment to ask themselves WHY Stalin had the initiative during all these years—or if they do, they tend to give the answer in terms of the timidity and lack of imagination of the Truman administrations.

"INITIATIVE"

The nub of the matter lies elsewhere, and that is why an attempt by the United States to take the initiative, in its own way, in the cold war can only have fatal results. Stalin has had the initiative because on a world scale he has been fighting a dying economic system which has impelled millions of people into "varying degrees of revolt against it. All he had to do was to channel the wave of revolt in his direction, ride it where he could, or divert it or crush it where he could not control it.

And America's inability to take the initiative has been due primarily to the fact that everywhere it sought to ally itself with those elements who were standing in the way of this revolt. The United States government has been too busy holding back the tide of history to be able to cope with Russian Stalinist imperialism.

And now, a turn to the offensive is envisaged primarily in MILITARY terms.

There are no new social or economic policies available to Eisenhower and the businessmen who surround him which could be effectively counterposed to the demagogic revolutionary appeal which Stalinism makes to those

peoples who have not yet become its victims. The Seventh Fleet is not being shifted to enable Chiang to make an ideological appeal to his countrymen on the mainland. They heard him long ago, when he ran the whole country, and they would not listen to him again.

Thus a policy by America which seeks to "take the initiative" from Stalin is a somewhat different matter from what Stalin's initiative has been. Even though the latter used military means as aids, these were used in the context of situations where Stalin could count on a considerable social force to back him in every country where he sought to advance. A strategy of initiative for Stalin is a social strategy aided by military means. A strategy of initiative for the United States is a military strategy accompanied by propaganda appeals.

STAY THE HAND

The danger of a global war does not flow so much from the particular strategy employed by either side as from the basic conflict of ruling classes and social systems between the two types of imperialism. Yet the Eisenhower-Dulles strategy can be counted on to hasten rather than retard the development of that conflict.

The reaction of the governments of Southeast Asia has been sharply and unanimously against the Formosa turn. From all reports, popular reaction in Europe has been even more negative than the proclaimed positions of the European governments. It is important that voices be raised in this country too, in opposition to this policy.

The Eisenhower administration is hoping to solidify its domestic support by producing a victory on the field of foreign policy, or even an apparent victory. The common people of the world, including the United States, can strike a real blow for peace and freedom by making it clear in every way possible that they stand unalterably opposed to risking the peace on behalf of Chiang Kai-shek's little band of utterly discredited and reactionary millionaires.

Even though the "Third Camp" may not yet be organized for the purpose of striking a blow on its own behalf, it is quite capable of staying the hand of the American generals before they stumble into war in the pursuit of their end of the imperialist rivalry.

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

Labor Action FORUM • New York

Please note that this series of three discussion forums has been moved back a week since the announcement in this last issue.

Problems of Socialist Anti-War Policy

by

Hal Draper

Editor, Labor Action

Thursday, Feb. 19

WAR AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Discussing the national-defense element in the First, Second and Third World Wars.

Thursday, Feb. 26

LENIN'S "REVOLUTIONARY DEFEATISM"

Discussing Lenin's changing formulations of the slogan, and the opposition to it.

Thursday, March 5

WAR AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Discussing problems of anti-war policy in the light of the new elements of World War 3.

LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Tight-Rope — —

(Continued from page 3)

than anyone wished. We do not mean to be unduly derogatory about it; the above summary of the general session is rather underplayed; for we could not but feel that the movement which the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee hopes to be is at best rudderless and rootless; fiercely avoiding a political character even though it itself was born of a certain political tendency; with no place to go and little idea of how to get there.

In a real sense this is to be noted sadly and not with glee—not only because so many of the professors, clerical gentlemen (175 of them, said the Rev. Evans) and other people of good will were filled with the best of intentions, but because the implicitly political character of their movement, which is conscious for some and completely non-existent for others, is such a blind alley. One can hope perhaps that some at least will continue to learn from their experience with Stalinoid-liberalism.

INTERESTED? Get Acquainted —

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE
114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE.....

STATE TEL.....

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE



LABOR ACTION

The Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

- Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL
- Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 - One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS APT.....

CITY ZONE STATE

Bill me Payment encl. (stamps, currency or postal note)