

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 23, 1953

FIVE CENTS

## Women in the War Economy

... page 2

## The Committee for Cultural Freedom: An Exchange with Bell & Schlesinger

... page 7

## FRANCE: F. O. Pushed Left

... page 3

## GERMANY: The Neo-Nazi Revival

... page 3

## BOLIVIA: Balancing Act in La Paz

... page 4

## Moscow Finds a Pretext For Foul Blow at Israel

By AL FINDLEY

The latest episode in the Stalinist war against the Jews is the Kremlin's sudden rupture of diplomatic relations with Israel. The government of Israel had offered the Russian embassy police protection once it had become clear that Israeli public opinion was highly incensed at the Stalinists. The embassy refused police protection. Last week a bomb was thrown in the courtyard of the Russian embassy, wounding the ambassador's wife and a few embassy employees.

The ambassador Yershov acted as if he completely believed the slanders about the Jewish doctors in Moscow. He checked all medicines administered to the wounded, was present or had someone present at the bedside all the time, and questioned every medical move made, in the most vicious MVD manner.

It took but a few days and Moscow announced its break with Israel. As its main basis it used the charge that the government of Israel had connived in the throwing of the bomb and had been conducting an "anti-Soviet campaign," and was therefore responsible for the bombing.

### RABBIT-PUNCH

The audacity of using this as a pretext for breaking off diplomatic relations is truly monstrous. Here is a great power with a totalitarian controlled press carrying on a mass campaign of denunciation of Israel and its leaders as warmongers, fascists, mad-dog killers, etc., but when the free press and parties of the small state dare to answer and defend themselves, they are charged with hostile propaganda to justify breaking off relations!

The quickness of the break plus the events leading up to it may suggest that the Russians were glad of the incident and were looking for a pretext. The possibility that the Russians themselves, or their agents, threw the bomb also suggests itself by their attitude and their use of the act. However, it is reported that an amorphous group commonly referred to as the Canaanites has taken "credit" for the bombing.

### THE CANAANITES

Who are the Canaanites? This is a tendency among Israeli youth and young intellectuals, with little organizational form, that has been growing since its inception in 1943. Its ideology is a mixture of various ideas taken from different sources.

From Bergson, prominent member of the semi-fascist, revisionist and terrorist Irgun who established a "Hebrew embassy" in Washington, it has taken the idea that the native Israelis have nothing in common with Jews elsewhere, that the Jews are not a nation but a religious community.

These views are in direct opposition to all Zionist teachings.

They express contempt for Jewish culture and even of Hebrew literature which has been produced outside of the borders of Israel. This is expressed in nihilistic terms that almost encompass all of previous culture created outside of the Near East.

They oppose Jewish immigration to Israel and denounce the immigrants as foreigners who have come to conquer the country and create bad blood between the Hebrews and Arabs. They are

completely cynical of all political parties, denouncing all from right to left and declaring that "the old leadership of all tendencies have lost standing among the youth and the youth will not follow them."

They maintain that a time will come when the people of Israel will have more in common, culturally, linguistically, etc., with their neighbors the Arabs than with the Jews of the world. They see that the peace and prosperity of the Near East depend upon

(Turn to last page)

## Agnes Meyer Blasts School Witchhunt

A scathing denunciation of congressional investigations of schools was the highlight of the 79th convention of the American Association of School Administrators held at Atlantic City on February 17. The speech was delivered by Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, wife of Eugene Meyer, owner of the Washington Post.

It was vigorously applauded by the 17,000 teachers, superintendents and key educators who attended the convention.

Mrs. Meyer said that the investigations of the schools are not only a threat to education and academic freedom but to democracy in general. She referred to Senator McCarthy as "our modern grand inquisitor," a "political adventurer," a "dangerous and ruthless demagogue," and a "psychopathic character."

"His record as an investigator is shameful," Mrs. Meyer declared. "He has accused innocent people of communism on mere hearsay evidence, thus traducing our American principle of law that a man is presumed innocent until proved guilty. By such methods he has weakened the morale of our federal service and spread suspicion and fear throughout the nation. He has stirred up hatred and used every device to destroy the confidence of Americans in each other. He has used the technique of insinuation against innocent people and debauched the Senate's power of investigation by introducing authoritarian practices that are akin to the communism which he professes to hate."

### "SICK TO THE STOMACH"

Mrs. Meyer pointed out that McCarthy and his like would not dare to challenge education now if the American public had organized a nation-wide defense of academic freedom when it was first subjected to congressional attack. She included the investigations of Senator Jenner and Congressman Velde in her attack.

"I have been present at the Jenner hearings," said Mrs. Meyer. "They are of a character to make any honest American sick to his

stomach regardless of whether he thinks the victim may or may not have been a fellow traveler. . . . The plan is to expose any teachers who look suspicious and may even be guilty of Communist affiliations. Then with the support of an aroused public opinion behind them, our congressional inquisitors will attack any or all professors

(Continued on page 5)

### In Answer to Company Chiseling—

## Wildcat Strikes in Detroit Spreading

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Feb. 15.—Storm signals were up for the United Auto Workers (CIO) this past week, as a series of rank-and-file walkouts from various auto plants indicated.

Although the strike at Ford Local 900, over the discharge of a shop committee man and the piling up of many unsolved grievances, was authorized, in many plants the resistance to company pressures took an immediate and more direct

form: walkouts in key departments.

At the Briggs, Budd Wheel and De Soto plants, the rank-and-file walkouts took place following the discharge of chief stewards involved in disputes over speedup with the companies.

In each case, the corporations insist that the union representatives live up to the contracts and send the discharge cases through grievance procedure, including the final step of the umpire.

The secondary leaders of the UAW oppose such action because there is a whole series of umpire precedents ruling against shop committeemen and chief stewards.

(Turn to last page)

WE RAISE THAT GOOD OLD GOP SLOGAN:

## Let the People Know, Mr. Eisenhower!

By GORDON HASKELL

Adlai Stevenson's Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner address has given further impetus to the "debate" in this country on the Republican administration's line in foreign affairs. The reason the word "debate" appears in quotation marks is that so far, at least, the voices from the Democratic camp which question, let alone oppose outright the "Formosa" policy in Asia and the big-stick policy in Europe have been very soft indeed.

In his speech Stevenson made a number of general observations about the desirability of America being "the good neighbor, the good partner, the good friend—never the big bully" in its dealings with its allies. He did not criticize any specific action of the administration, and he did not deal with the implications of the Asia policy at all.

Looking back at the record of the Democratic administrations in this question of how to deal with allies, one can heartily endorse one of Stevenson's phrases, made in another connection, that "it is easier to express these lofty sentiments than it is to practice them."

### "PSYCHOLOGICAL"

The rest of Stevenson's speech was devoted to fulsome praise for the Democratic Party, its past and its future. He took a few well-aimed shots at the big businessmen who are running things under Eisenhower, though he urged his fellow partisans to give this "new experiment" of running the government with businessmen a chance to prove itself.

Actually, the speech was not so important in itself as have been some of the observations made in connection with it by others. Max Lerner, writing in the New York Post for February 16, made an excellent point in observing that at best what the Eisenhower administration has been aiming at is a victory in "psychological warfare" as distinguished from "political warfare."

The former term is used by Lerner to describe "a short-range war of nerves and surprise, prepared in secret. . . . The second is political warfare, which is long-range in scope and utterly open in its methods. It is basically a war of ideas."

The first, Lerner points out, "has meaning only within the frame of a shooting war or in preparation for it, after the opposing camps have been lined up and there is no chance for changing the line-up. The point about political warfare is that, if successful, it makes a shooting war unnecessary because it convinces the enemy that he cannot win it."

Even though the relation between the two may be somewhat over-simplified for the purpose of the discussion, it is a valid distinction. Even the most enthusiastic claims for the Eisenhower policy have boiled down to the idea that now the Stalinists will be "kept guessing," that it is their nerves which will be frayed, that they will have to shift troops to meet possible attacks from Formosa, and so forth.

### MacARTHUR IDEA

The whole idea seems to be based on MacArthur's well-known theory that "Asians" are more impressed by the application of power than are other people, and all that needs to be done is to give them a firm lead and they will come flocking to the leader.

A "psychological" war, or rather battle, of this type must be prepared in secret. A political war, cold or hot, is one in which nations and classes within nations are offered a program for which to fight, and a leadership which demonstrates in deeds that this program is a reality.

Thus in the present cold war for the allegiance of those peoples and classes which are still outside the systems of firm allies and satellites built up by both the

(Continued on page 6)

# Legless Veteran Appeals to Eisenhower For Reinstatement

James Kutcher, the legless veteran, has appealed to his wartime commander, President Eisenhower, to help him win reinstatement to a clerical job with the Veterans Administration in Newark from which he was removed under the loyalty program in 1948.

In a letter which charged the Truman administration with political discrimination, the veteran urged Eisenhower to recommend Kutcher's reinstatement to his job with back pay and seniority, and to outlaw the "subversive list" issued by the attorney general.

Kutcher also expressed a desire to meet with the president and explain his case further.

"I appeal to you," he wrote the president, "for an act of justice that has been denied me by the preceding administration.

"I am a veteran of World War II, who served under your command as an infantry rifleman in the invasion of North Africa and subsequent battles on that continent, the invasion of Sicily and the invasion of Italy. I lost both my legs in the Battle of San Pietro in November 1943, was honorably discharged after learning how to use artificial limbs in September 1945, and went to work as a clerk for the Veterans Administration in Newark in August 1946. I did my work satisfactorily for two years, and then, suddenly in 1948, simply because I believed the same thoughts I believed five years earlier at San Pietro, I was removed from my job and subjected to a stigma on my good name and honor."

Kutcher pointed out that he

had been dismissed solely because of membership in the Socialist Workers Party, denounced the arbitrary violation of democratic procedure represented by the attorney general's "subversive list," and summarized the history of his case:

"I was one of the first victims of this blacklist. Losing my job and my reputation, I have been appealing for the last 53 months through administrative channels and then through the federal courts to be reinstated to my job. In September 1948 I asked President Truman to meet with me and intervene to obtain justice for me, but he never even acknowledged my letter. Finally, on October 16, 1952, the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington ruled that my discharge was improper because membership in the Socialist Workers Party is not by itself sufficient cause to warrant discharge from federal employment under the 'loyalty program.'

"The government wasted another three months deciding whether to appeal my case to the Supreme Court, but finally on January 16 announced they would not appeal, thereby admitting they had wronged me. On January 31 my attorney, Joseph L. Rauh Jr., wrote the Veterans Administrator asking for a meeting to discuss my reinstatement in light of the court action. On February 6 the Veterans Administrator replied and refused me even the courtesy of a meeting to discuss this matter. . . . I hope that you will not tolerate in your administration such bureaucratic callousness to the needs of the individual citizen."

## Gerald Smith Tries a Comeback In Los Angeles on UN Red-Herring

By VICTOR SAYAGE

LOS ANGELES, Feb. 14—Fascist rabble-rouser Gerald L. K. Smith has again come to town for a rally.

Smith's "Christian Nationalist Party" held a conference in San Francisco on February 5-6 on the theme of abolishing the United Nations. His Los Angeles meeting on February 9-10 was a report on this conference. Both meetings got token publicity in the local press and radio but evoked no reaction from labor, which once fought him successfully in this city.

Along with Smith on the platform were also California State Senator Jack Tenney, this area's homegrown two-penny McCarthy, and Dr. Wesley A. Swift, a local church leader and reactionary demagog who yells his speech in a high-tensioned monotone.

Smith—who has learned perhaps from Poor Richard Nixon how to use his wife for interlarding homey references—"revealed" that his San Francisco conference discussed plans for a rally in Washington to present "one million signatures" on a petition to abolish the UN. The fuhrer's conference also set up a Henry Ford [Sr.] Memorial Plaque, which this year has been awarded to Jim Crow Judge George Armstrong of Mississippi.

Smith painted the UN as a bunch of foreigners and traitors led by Alger Hiss and Dalton Trumbo. He complained of being in the same doghouse with Syng-

man Rhee, the South Korean despot.

State Senator Tenney, who only last April had denied any connection with Smith when speaking before a UCLA audience, made a distinction between "International Jewry or International Zionism" and individual Jews—no anti-Semite he, of course! He closed by saying, "God is on our side because God never attended a session of the UN."

### LONDON LETTER

# The British Floods: Who Was to Blame?

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Feb. 11—Our American readers will already have read about the devastating floods which swept through the sea defenses of important sections of Britain's best farmland, as well as of the Netherlands. Tens of thousands of people have been rendered homeless and nearly 1300 are known to have lost their lives.

The consensus by all, including the Conservatives, in this country was that this was a national emergency and responsibility. Wartime billeting (if necessary compulsory) was reintroduced; requisitioning of houses to place the homeless was ordered; a flood-warning system was instituted. A beginning was made toward distribution of the flood aid fund money which had come in.

With these measures well in hand and the main shock of the floods now over, the public began to consider the "responsibility" for the floods. One newspaper suggested an "act of God," some people thought it was a Labor Party

# LABOR SCOPE

## WOMEN IN THE WAR ECONOMY: WHY THEY GO TO WORK

By ELIZABETH FRANK

Industry, says a recent article in the *New York Times*, "will find safe, reliable, efficient employees among women workers . . . women can do practically any job that a man can do and do it well."

Why these insistent assurances of women's industrial capabilities? Because "additional manpower for further industrial expansion must come primarily from three sources—women workers, the physically handicapped and older persons." (Howard A. Rusk, M. D., in the *New York Times* of January 4.)

The Permanent War Economy has "solved" the problem of unemployment. But a tight labor market is a dangerous state of affairs, quite apart from the need for more labor in the case of further industrial expansion. A reserve of labor is therefore doubly needed: to guarantee the elasticity of industrial production, and to exert pressure on the existing labor force with respect to wages and the intensity of work. It is no accident that the call for women echoes precisely the "defenders of women's rights" behind the Iron Curtain, where the need for new sources of labor is even greater.

### ONE THIRD OF A SEX

Such a reserve of more docile labor has played an important part in the development of American industry, from the Chinese who worked on the railroads and the chiefly peasant immigrants from Europe who went into the factories, to the absorption of Southern whites and Negroes into the industrial working class during the past decades.

We understand, therefore, why managers should have become champions of "women's equality." But what makes the women themselves answer their call?

Women in the labor force are, of course, nothing new. Their proportion of the active population has been increasing steadily since the first census in 1870. But there are trends within this general rise in employment that throw some light on women's motives for working and, at the same time, on their role in the economy.

A few essential figures, to begin with: In 1952, 19 million women, one third of all women over 14, were economically active. They

constituted 30 per cent of the total labor force.

Half of the women working have clerical jobs, 19 per cent work in factories, and only 11 per cent do professional or technical work, although this category includes teachers and nurses. We can say right off that very few women go to work to develop their personalities in "interesting" jobs.

The most striking change in the female labor force has been with respect to its age groups. As recently as 1940, half the women working were under 32, half older. By 1952, the median age rose to 37. This rise in the average age of the working woman must be coupled with the fact that there has been a great increase in the number of married women since 1940.

The result: the number of working couples has doubled in the decade from 1940 to 1950, from 11 per cent of all married couples to 22 per cent. This, of course, does not count the many women widowed, divorced, separated, or deserted, who have family responsibilities and are part of the labor force.

### VICIOUS CIRCLE

Half of the married women working—which means 25 per cent of all women in the labor force—have children under 18; one-tenth of all working women have children under six. In this connection, the pressure of sheer material need is especially evident: where the husband is at home, 21 per cent of mothers with children under 18, and 14 per cent of those with children under 6, go to work; where for some reason the husband is not with the family, the figures are 51 per cent and 37 per cent respectively!

The married women have neither time nor money for lengthy training. More of them are working in factories and fewer in professional or clerical jobs than is the case for single women.

To the pattern of a girl working until she is married must be added a new "typical case": the middle-aged woman who goes to work to supplement the family's earnings, in spite of her duties as housewife and mother. Excepting the few cases of career women who can afford help at home, the working wife has two shifts a day, one at the plant or office, one at home. If she is taking on that double load, especially if she has young children, hard economic necessity is driving her.

There is a vicious circle: inflation has cut into the real wages of the male worker; because he cannot get higher real wages, he sends his wife to work. The women in the labor force, willing to work in low-paid jobs or even at the same jobs for less pay (only 13 states have equal-pay-for-equal-work laws) keep the men from asserting their own demands successfully. Two people are now working to maintain the family on the social minimum standard, and the tendency will be to reduce their combined income to what the man previously earned alone.

This tendency is no mere abstraction. Statistics show that the lower the husband's income, the greater the percentage of wives who work, and the lower their income. Thus the median income of working couples is only about one-fifth higher than the income of families with only the husband working.

### FULL-FLEDGED WORKERS

The competition of women in the industrial labor market is increasing. Although their proportion among industrial workers has come down from the war peak of 38 per cent to 29 per cent in 1952, this figure is 3 per cent higher than in 1940.

The male workers, more or less clearly aware of the profound effects of this competition, are not delighted. According to the *Times*: "prejudices among . . . fellow workers frequently must be broken down." No amount of griping, however, will rid the men of their new co-workers. For the women to go back to their kitchens, too many economic gears would have to be put into reverse.

But in spite of a continuing upward trend in the number of women workers, the vicious circle of competition could be broken. With more experience in the plant, women may cease to think of themselves as housewives making a few extra dollars, and begin to react as full-fledged members of the working class. In that case, they may even turn out to be particularly militant fighters for better wages and working conditions.

An increase of wages for the men on which to maintain their families would mean—given the continued need of women in the labor force—an important rise in the standard of living of the working class. And it would mean time at home for those women whose place really is there.

responsibility, others that the Conservatives were responsible, and most that it was the war.

Certainly since the war the government has been unable to lay out the capital for the very expensive coastal flood defense. Labor had planned vast and costly schemes but had abandoned most of them for lack of funds at the time of the Korean war.

Still, it has been admitted by all parties that even if sea defenses had been improved, they would not have been able to withstand the inroads of the waters, which took place simultaneously at so many points on the coast. In the Netherlands, where sea-defense engineering has traditionally been so good, the waves broke through the weakest points of the sea wall and washed past the many defenses.

This was a national emergency in which Churchill properly thought the government should intervene. It is unfortunate that he does not recognize the same necessity for the national economy as a whole.

### NO GAS WAR

Two other important changes have occurred in Britain this week.

For the first time in ten years sweet rationing has been abolished. A slight modification ought to be made in this statement: In 1949 the government abolished sweet and chocolate rationing but miscalculated the pent-up public demand. There were enormous queues outside shops, and hoarding started. Within three months rationing had to be reintroduced. This time, however, there are larger stocks, as the ration of six ounces per week has not been fully taken up by the public for the last few months.

Last week, also, the government reallowed the selling of branded gasolines. All during the war manufacturers marketed a "pool" gasoline, made by blending various qualities. Now the large gasoline companies, mainly Standard Oil and Anglo-Iranian, are being allowed to market their own products.

It had been hoped that a price war might produce advantageous results for the consumers. Instead most prices have gone up by about 2 cents per Imperial gallon (which is one-eighth larger than the American gallon). Gasoline companies have started to try to woo car owners by offering them crossword puzzles and revolving pencils, and other inducements to buy which Americans know about better than we.

Dr. Summerskill, the Labor MP, pointed out in the House of Commons that it would be of more advantage to the consumers if these companies reduced prices rather than offered other incentives which are only paid for by the consumers anyway.

### You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of LA. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views.

Keep them to 500 words.

### LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor and Socialist Library.

SEND FOR OUR FREE BOOK LIST. 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

**FRANCE**

# F.O. Unionists Push to Left

By SAUL BERG

Readers of LABOR ACTION are familiar with the fact that, in France and Italy alone among the countries of Western Europe, the free labor movement is weaker than its Stalinist-controlled rival organizations. Undoubtedly its weakness in France is due in large part to the dead hand of its reformist leadership, which, instead of placing the defense of the workers' interests first, thinks mainly of maintaining its friendly relations with the Marshall Plan (now Mutual Security Administration) officials and of integrating the labor movement into the strategy of the Western imperialist war bloc.

For this reason it is encouraging to report that the opposition within Force Ouvrière—the best known of the reformist labor federations of France—made by far its best showing to date at the convention of F. O. which was held last November. This can be said even though the opposition was still not well organized nor entirely united.

**ANTI-WAR WING**

This F. O. opposition includes independent socialists, anarchists, dissident members of the Socialist Party and the syndicalists grouped around the magazine *Révolution Proletarienne*. The issue that unites the entire opposition is, broadly speaking, the question of class struggle versus class collaboration in the daily activities of the federation. This left wing is not united on issues of foreign policy, being divided between revolutionary internationalist advocates of a Third Camp policy and critical supporters of the Atlantic bloc. The latter, however, make it clear that they are against subordinating the interests of the workers to the needs of this bloc.

It is therefore especially noteworthy that on the foreign-policy issue, where the left-wing opposition is least united, a clear-cut Third Camp resolution received 20 per cent of the convention's votes.

On the issue of Force Ouvrière's attitude toward French repression in Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia, the opposition could have been in a position to seriously threaten the majority. The F. O. majority leadership had been guilty not only of opposing self-determination for the North African peoples, but also of opposing admission of their trade unions into the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, on the ground that these unions were nationalistic!

**COMPROMISE**

The left wing's resolution called for Tunisian independence and for friendly collaboration with the Tunisian General Workers Union, whose leader, Farhat Hached, was assassinated that very month. But this resolution was withdrawn in committee in favor of a compromise resolution to send a commission of inquiry to Tunisia, the commission to include equal representation for the majority and minority of the F. O.

Although the right-wingers on the commission will find themselves on the spot when they are confronted with the abundant evidence of French atrocities, nevertheless this compromise forestalled an adequate floor discussion of the pro-colonialism of the F. O.'s leaders.

The most striking event of the convention was the repudiation of the leadership on an important issue for the first time since F. O.'s foundation. What was involved was the problem of productivity in French industry.

Primarily because of better capital equipment, U. S. man-hour productivity is several times that of France. Furthermore, in the U. S., despite the workers' justified suspicion of "incentive" systems which are really speedup plans, there is more genuine incentive to produce than is to be found among French workers, because the American workers' slice of the pie is bigger. That is, corporation profits in the U. S. are in general at a much lower percentage than in France, despite their larger volume in absolute terms.

**LEADERSHIP BEATEN**

Naturally, then, the French workers are absolutely opposed to the experiments in increased productivity being carried on by French industry, in cooperation with American technical experts, unless genuine guarantees are obtained that the workers will benefit fully from the results. The F. O. leadership, however, had entered a joint body with industry known as the C.I.E.R.P. which had assigned money received under the Marshall Plan to plants with notoriously bad conditions and without any collective contract with the unions.

The F. O. convention, by a vote of 5903 mandates to 4327, with 1422 abstentions, decided on the withdrawal of all F. O. representatives from the C.I.E.R.P., and forbade F. O.'s association with any other productivity projects unless proper guarantees were obtained.

This repudiation of the leadership does not, of course, solve the basic problem—that of reorganizing the workers' unity needed for a successful struggle for increased real wages. It is, however, a step toward making F. O. the kind of organization in which the mass of disillusioned workers can have confidence.

**GERMANY**

# Nazi Revival Battens on U.S. Policy, Rightist Parties

By GABRIEL GERSH

The documents confiscated by the British during their swoop on the seven Nazis of the Naumann circle may or may not reveal further evidence of the neo-Nazi revival in Germany. But already enough is known to confirm that a real danger from a new form of militant Nazism exists, and this has aroused much alarm among anti-Nazis.

General Remer's "Socialist Reich Party" has been dissolved, but its former members are still at large and are still faithful to the Nazi cause. The recent revelations about the so-called "Technical Service" of the Bund Deutscher Jugend (League of German Youth) gave startling evidence of a well-organized gang of future partisans preparing to murder West German Communists and Social-Democrats. In addition, there is a growth of "organizations," "circles," "leagues," and "fraternal orders" which specialize in restoring the Nazi ideology under the guise of romantic comradeship.

There is evidence that Nazi groups, over the past two years, have been infiltrating the so-called respectable parties, including the Free Democratic Party and the German Party, which are in Adenauer's coalition government. The FDP's policy is to capture dissatisfied ex-Nazis for an outspokenly reactionary "National Rally" on Gaullist lines.

**FDP IMPLICATED**

Dr. Middelhaue, the leader of the right-wing section of the FDP, has for a long time surrounded himself with prominent former Nazis. He admits the charge that his new "German Program" was written by Hanns Fritzsche, a leading official in Goebbels' Propaganda Ministry, and Werner Best, the former Nazi commissioner for occupied Denmark.

The editor of Dr. Middelhaue's party organ, *Deutsche Zukunft*, is a former leader of the Hitler Youth. His personal secretary in the Dusseldorf headquarters of the FDP is Wolfgang Diewerge, formerly editor of the material issued by the Nazi party's political education center and a close collaborator of the recently arrested Dr. Werner Naumann.

Herr Diewerge and other prominent members of the FDP have frequently participated in the meetings of the Naumann circle. It is known that this group had access to the secret files of the FDP.

Another prominent Free Democrat, Dr. Achenback, has offered himself as Naumann's defense counsel. Achenback was a leading defense counsel at the Nuremberg trials and a prominent legal figure in Nazi Germany. He is one of West Germany's most successful lawyers, a great power with the Ruhr industrialists whom he defended on war-crimes charges, and an extreme exponent of nationalist policies.

**RUSSIAN FINGER**

This list could be extended indefinitely and similar examples of Nazi penetration could be shown to exist in the Refugee Party, now known as the All-German Block.

But the real danger of a Nazi revival lies elsewhere than in these parties. After Germany's defeat in 1945, most of the big Nazis who escaped execution were imprisoned or escaped to Spain and Argentina. When they were released a few years afterwards, they did not openly join or organize political parties. Their activities have been carried on inside small private circles that have established links with overseas Nazi groups, and with the Waffen SS.

between some of these Nazi circles—including the arrested Naumann group—and the Russian Zone. Although they are anti-Communists, many of these Nazis see an advantage in dealing with the Stalinists. They do not approach the German Stalinists, but rather ex-officers who are serving the Russians in the East German army. The Naumann circle is said to have been in touch with the Bunderschaft, a group of ex-officers in Hamburg that split over the question of contacts with the Russian Zone. The military groups that favor an alliance with the Stalinists are much smaller than the organizations of former regular soldiers who support a Western alliance for Germany.

**BEHIND THE NAZIS**

The growing activities of the reactionaries have been accompanied by nationalist and militaristic propaganda that has become increasingly bold. Books and magazine articles glorifying German soldiers and generals are now pouring from the German printing presses. Most of them tell the story of how the German generals always fought against Hitler, how they were on the point of removing him altogether in 1938 and how, alternatively, if it had not been for Hitler's stupid intervention they would have succeeded in conquering Russia and the world.

The financial risk involved in publishing these books does not seem great, either because their sale is big enough to meet costs or because some of the funds that the generals collect from business firms are available.

The menace to German democracy comes from the old German Right which used to fill the ranks of the German Nationalist Party and the German People's Party and which is now backing and calling the tune of the new right-wing parties. It is the Krupps, Schachts and Ruhr industrialists who need to be watched as much as or more than the neo-Nazis.

Naumann and the others arrested recently acquired directorships in Ruhr concerns. This is a relief plan which the Ruhr industrialists are providing for deserving ex-Nazis who are unemployed. The underlying motive of the Ruhr industrialists is clear: to restore the Ruhr industry to its pre-eminence in Germany and to create from it a political force similar to Hugenberg's Nationalists in the Weimar republic, which will run Germany on fiercely nationalist lines.

**FREE HAND**

The resurgence of Nazism in Western Germany proves how right were the left-wing socialist critics of the British occupation policies in Germany from 1945 to 1949. The Ruhr industrialists' financial support of neo-Nazism confirms that the socialists were farsighted in demanding that the Labor government nationalize the Ruhr. But even Ernest Bevin's half-hearted gestures toward nationalization in the early years of the occupation became obscured or negated by the counterweight of American policy in favor of the status quo. For the last few years, America has been giving the Nazis and the Ruhr industrialists a free hand in Western Germany in return for their support in the cold war.

Aided and protected by America, the tide of Nazi revival in Western Germany is gradually but surely advancing.

**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.

**ISL FUND DRIVE**

# Drive Gets 10% Boost for a Starter

By ALBERT GATES

Fund Drive Director

The ISL 1953 Fund Drive is officially opened with this issue of LABOR ACTION and although a first report is not scheduled until the next week's paper, several of the branches have jumped the gun and we are able to record that 10 per cent of the national quota has been received.

This should be a good omen, since we have still to hear from a majority of the sections carrying quotas. If we manage this percentage of payments, the drive should be successfully concluded at the end of the ten weeks allotted to it.

Streator, Ill., has opened its drive with a first payment that gives it 40 per cent of its quota. But experience has already taught us that it will complete its quota before any other section of the country.

The New York organization of the ISL turned in the greatest sum in preparation for its local

campaign. The amount of \$832 gives it over 20 per cent in the campaign. This is a great improvement over its campaign a year ago when three weeks passed before it turned in any collections. A running start like this should carry New York to its quota—which happens to be the largest in the drive.

**GOOD START, BUT—**

Detroit, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, which lagged last year, have started off much better and these branches have promised that they will complete their assignments. It won't be easy for them, but we have the feeling too, that they will make it this year, with perhaps a little to spare.

We are a little surprised at the slight showing of the Socialist Youth League. Although its quota is less than 1952, with \$1250 to go, the sum is quite formidable. But if we know anything about the youth, they are bound to reach

that quota and very likely go over it. Don Harris says that there is no need to worry about what the SYL will do and he has practically guaranteed that the SYL will make its sum. No challenges have as yet been issued by him, but he says we are not to trifle with the youth, since they are quite prepared to meet the challenge of any branch. Besides, they have a little competition of their own going on. We're waiting to see the results.

This is not a bad beginning—this 10 per cent for the first week. We know, however, how fund campaigns go. They tend to start much bigger than they end up. That means that a great effort is required in these early weeks to maintain a decent average over the whole campaign.

The big kick has to come from Chicago, Los Angeles and Buffalo. The branches with the largest quotas are the bases for a successful fund drive. It is to these branches that we look for going over the top.

**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 1953 Fund Drive.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

**THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM**

by

**MAX SHACHTMAN**

A Basic Primer!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

Contact has been established be-

# WORLD POLITICS

# YOU and SCIENCE

## Bolivia: The Nationalist Regime's Balancing Act

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Feb. 9.—We have already reported that, after the recent attempted Nationalist coup against the Nationalist government of Bolivia (organized by right-wing elements of the Nationalist MNR against the cabinet which includes representatives of the left-moving workers and peasants), the political position of the working class and of the peasantry was strengthened; and under their pressure the position of the "workers' wing" in the official government party rose too.

The "workers' bloc" of the MNR, represented by Lechin, Butrón and Chávez, is backed by the unions and has a majority in the Central Obrera Boliviana, the trade-union center; it is the real political and social power of the MNR and of the government.

After the collapse of the right-wing Nationalist coup, Lechin began to speak about the need to "deepen the revolution" and to make comparisons with the struggle between the Jacobins and Girondins of the French Revolution of 1789. Lechin speaks very strongly before the masses, if they are in the streets, but he is very "calm" at cabinet meetings. His role, and the role of his comrades Chávez and Butrón, is to support and defend the government before the masses and to appease the workers and peasants when they are in action.

Proof that this is not a "theory" but corresponds to the political reality can be seen in Lechin's procedure in the face of the Indian peasant revolt in the district of Cochabamba. Some thousands of Indian peasants gathered in the city of Cochabamba to protest against the arrest of the leaders by the government. The peasants occupied some haciendas, in this way moving in the direction of making the agrarian revolution by their own methods.

The peasant leaders who were arrested belonged (according to the government's communiqué) to the POR, the Trotskyist party. But some of them were also members of the MNR. The peasant demonstration possessed rifles made by the peasants themselves, but it was in fact quite peaceful. The peasants demanded the liberation of their leaders and the agrarian reforms.

The frightened La Paz government sent "workers' ministers" Lechin and Chávez "to calm the Indians." After Lechin made a speech in which he promised agrarian reform and land to the peasants, ordered the liberation of one of the peasant leaders who was arrested and also promised to set the others free promptly, the peasants went back to their homes. Thus Lechin again saved the Nationalist government.

But the Indian movement is very strong in the country, especially in the rural district of Cochabamba. The agrarian revolution is the cru-

cial problem of the "national revolution" which has been proclaimed by the MNR government.

In Bolivia all of the soil belongs to the landowners, and the Indians have to work for the latter two to four days a week without compensation. Then they have to transport the products of the hacienda to the city, look after the house of the *patrón*, care for his cattle, and every week one of the peasants must go to the *patrón's* house in the city to work for his landowner gratis. These unpaid slave services anger the peasants.

The Indians make up the enormous majority of the Bolivian population—75 per cent of the three to four millions of people in the country; the rest are the "mestizos" cities and villages.

### REVOLUTIONARY CLIMATE

Bolivia and Peru are the only Indian republics in the hemisphere, in the sense that the Indians form the main bulk of the population. The Indians of Bolivia and Peru live under conditions of medieval feudal backwardness, in cottages without windows, in a system of natural economy. Therefore the main task of the revolution and its real starting point is their liberation, the destruction of the medieval system of landholding, and distribution of the land.

So far there has been no revolution for them, only social commotion ending with the nationalization of the mines. The door to real social revolution in Bolivia will be opened only by the peasants' struggle in the whole country against the "Spaniards" and "mestizos" against the landowners, backed by the mine workers and industrial workers. Such a revolution, led by a workers' and peasants' government, would have before it combined bourgeois-democratic and socialist tasks, in accordance with the historical period in which it is taking place and in line with the aspirations of the leading revolutionary class, the working class.

The official government party, the MNR, is conscious of this situation, and so it is trying to hold back and fight the leadership of the working class and peasantry—the left parties in the first place, particularly the POR. At the MNR party congress meeting in La Paz, the president declared that "our policy must be revolutionary and increasingly courageous and brave." He said that the MNR must fight against the leftist parties for the leadership of the masses.

To "revolutionary infantilism" he opposed the theory of class collaboration—that is, collaboration of the middle class, proletariat and peasantry—with the theory of "national unity" as the guarantee of the national revolution. He promised agrarian reform and even the "destruction of feudal medievalism" but he did not concretize the Nationalist program

for the distribution of the land. The peasants want all the land, without compensation to the landowners, but the Nationalist party is protecting feudal property against the Indians and arresting the Indians when they struggle for the agrarian revolution with their own methods and forces.

This is the basis for our view that all the radical speeches of the Nationalist leaders, of President Paz Estenssoro as well as Lechin, are merely maneuvers to gain time and to cheat the workers and peasants of their due. The climate of the country obliges them to speak in "revolutionary" terms and to elect the "left majority" to the MNR executive committee.

Juan Lechin is the executive president of the MNR, the No. 2 man after Paz Estenssoro. But we are informed that the others would like to undercut his position as soon as that is possible. It is impossible now because Lechin is a necessary prop for the regime.

The struggle right now is one that centers about the agrarian revolution, and objectively it takes place between the MNR and the workers and peasants, though the latter act without clear consciousness of what and whom they are fighting, believing as they do that the government will carry through the agrarian revolution. The Trotskyist POR is leading this fight.

### BALANCE OF FORCES

The struggle between the MNR and the POR on the question of going beyond the present political stage of the revolution indicates, best of all, how wrong was the former theory of "bourgeois-democratic revolution" previously held by the POR under the leadership of Lora, the author of the Nationalist-POR alliance. Today, the new leadership of the POR declares that the "petty-bourgeois bonapartist government is incapable of unleashing the revolution" and that it is "necessary to overcome it."

The POR is offering an alliance to the left wing of the MNR—that is, to the Lechin group—in order to save the revolution and form a workers' and peasants' government. I think this tactic is a political mistake, a continuation of the pro-Nationalist policy of Lora; for Lechin is the main prop of the government and the main defender of Paz Estenssoro's policy within the Central Obrera and before the peasants.

The MNR is frightened by the strength of the POR, especially its influence over the peasant movement in the district of Cochabamba. It has threatened the POR with arrests and has indeed arrested some of the POR activists. But it is afraid to go so far as to try to destroy the POR because of the party's influence in the Central Obrera and among the peasants.

On the other hand, Lechin and his "workers' bloc" in the MNR are defending the POR against such repressions because Lechin knows that the destruction of the POR signifies the end of his own career. Likewise, President Paz knows that if the POR is destroyed first, and the "workers' bloc" of Lechin next, this will mean also the end of his own Nationalist regime; for then the center of power will swing over to the right-wing restorationists of the mine owners and the traditional bourgeois parties.

Thus the equilibrium of his regime is maintained by the fight between the POR and the MNR right wing, by the fight between the workers and peasants and the feudal-bourgeois right wing. The latter are waiting for their opportunity for a new coup d'état to arise from the fight within the MNR, from the destruction of the POR and the working-class left.

This balance of forces explains why, after the attempt at the right-wing Nationalist coup, it is possible for agrarian reforms to

## 'AUTOMATION' COMES TO U. S. INDUSTRY

By CARL DARTON

American industry has in very recent years developed some tremendous changes in production techniques—changes which are likely to be far-reaching in their social effects. "Automation" is a new term which has been coined to describe these new techniques.

It is a combination of "automatic control" and "mechanization." Vice-President of Manufacturing Del Harder at the Ford Motor Company is generally credited with originating the term in industry. He says "automation is the automatic handling of materials in process." Another authority, David A. Wallace of Chrysler Motors, notes that there is a tendency to broaden its meaning to include also instrumentation and controls which govern handling, processing, and machining devices.

Automation is far from being just an exercise in semantics. According to the January 1953 issue of *Production* magazine it "is the conspicuous development of the decade in automobile manufacturing." The Ford Company has built and is using a new engine plant in Cleveland which closely approaches an automatic pushbutton factory. Ford has had automation departments since 1947 and is now working on the basis that "every job that comes through is analyzed to see whether or not automation can be applied." Chrysler, General Motors and smaller companies are also turning to automatic handling, machining, fabricating, and assembly lines to increase production and to cut costs.

Studebaker uses one 225 foot-28 station transfer equipment to automatically machine V-8 engine cylinder heads completely. Ford hobs gears 350 per cent faster. Dodge credits automation with the fact that it has been able to reverse the price trend on several of its models. Chrysler says that automation has boosted its V-8 engine capacity by 500 per cent. A Studebaker spokesman claims that the new automatic production line uses only 25 per cent of the direct labor of the old one.

One operator at Dodge watches a 225-ton machine, 159 feet long, through which auto engine cylinder blocks travel at a speed of 200 feet per minute. Another worker at Chrysler handles a 21 by 90 foot giant 32-station installation including 11 machining stations, all wired into one electric control panel.

At Ford's, "During its operation, the cylinder block machine picks up a cylinder block casting from the unloading station of the previous operation and the part is automatically positioned and clamped. The machine cycle is started by the automation, and the carriage with the block moves under the broaching tools for the metal removal operation. The finished block is deposited on the conveyor at the opposite end of the tunnel. . . . In this manner 154 cylinder blocks are broached each hour at 80 per cent efficiency by one operator." Even the metal chips of 900 pounds per hour are removed by automatic oscillating conveyors.

### THE CHAIN OF CONSEQUENCES

Intricate operations are taken away from skilled workers. Depth of drilled holes are checked automatically, and if it is incorrect the pieces are rejected by the machine. The unbalance of crankshafts is recorded automatically by the machine and such recording then directs the next station to drill out sufficient material to obtain the correct balance.

Workers will need to learn new skills—very specialized tasks. More college-trained men are needed to design the complicated machines, the mechanisms that feed and connect them, and the automatic controls that permit the entire huge integrated unit to run itself. Machinists become machine repair men keeping a watchful eye on the production line, making periodic replacement of tools so as to keep "down time" to a minimum. A Chrysler man says: "Without automation unscheduled down time is serious. With automation it's almost a calamity."

Automation is in some respects only a continuation of the use of conveyors in the auto industry in the 1920s. The next logical place to save was to reduce the time required to load and unload machines, to unload automatically from one machine into the other; to build twenty or thirty machines into one and have the completion of one operation be the signal that starts the next.

There are difficulties too. Parts must be designed to have guides and locators so as to facilitate handling by machinery. Standardization is demanded and engineering changes in the product cannot be very numerous or frequent. Automation is very, very expensive to plan and install but it cuts costs—particularly labor. To afford it one needs to have a great volume of production.

This has the smaller producers worried. A Nash official laments that a company needs automation to stay in the running cost-wise but that a company like his doesn't have the sales volume to justify automation to the extent now used by Ford. Will the "little fellows" be crowded to the wall? Perhaps they will have to resort to production of special types of cars.

In future columns we shall give an account of automation progress in industries, especially those dealing with services, and attempt to evaluate the social changes which will result. It will be interesting as well as necessary to discover what changes automation brings about in the socialist concepts of planned production and workers' control.

be realized in Bolivia under the pressure of the worker and peasant masses. But what is still to be seen is whether this problem will be solved (a) by Nationalist petty-bourgeois reforms, without revolutionary methods, to be followed by a Nationalist turn to the right, or (b) by the road of revolution, the road of peasant struggle, to destroy completely the feudal setup, leading to a workers' and peasants' government headed by the workers' unions and the POR—that is, by a revolutionary turn to the left, toward a real social revolution in Bolivia and consequently in other countries

such as Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, Venezuela, etc.

Great political responsibility falls on the Bolivian working class and on the POR, the only Trotskyist party of any political importance in the world. They still have their own political and ideological backwardness to overcome.

Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL America's leading Marxist review



## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 17, No. 8

February 23, 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, 1879.

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.

# Youth and Student Corner

## 'School Probe Upheld' by Norman Thomas in Epistle to the N.Y. Times

By MAX MARTIN

Norman Thomas seems bent on convincing those who still regard him as a civil-libertarian that they are mistaken. The latest is his letter to the New York Times, printed on February 8.

This rather rambling missive contains as its kernel a dangerously anti-civil liberties point of view. The headline which the Times supplied for the letter, "School Probe Upheld," expressed forthrightly the measure of Thomas's degeneration.

The letter begins with pious shudders at "the prospect of an investigation of schools and colleges by men of the character of Senators McCarthy and Jenner, using the methods they habitually employ." Thomas cites the damage done to the teaching profession by the witchhunt and declares that the opposition of "friends of civil liberties is admirable in spirit." He gladly associates himself with it—the spirit, that is.

One would gather that he opposes the forthcoming congressional investigations. But having made his formal bow in the direction of academic freedom, he proceeds to take it all back.

He exhorts those misguided "good people" who defend the civil liberties of all to stop tying up the rights of honest dissenters and non-conformists with the rights of "Fascist or Communist conspirators" to teach the children of democracy. He explains patiently to these "good people" that academic freedom is not "lost" in these anxious days—a teacher "is asked by legitimate authority" about his Stalinist affiliations or fired when he acknowledges such allegiance or merely refuses to answer.

### WHO'S LEGITIMATE?

Thomas' use of the word "lost" is, of course, an evasion. Naturally, academic freedom is not "lost"—in the sense of totally destroyed or completely abolished—merely by witchhunting investigations. It is, however, infringed upon, chipped away and diminished.

He surely is not trying to make the point that defenders of civil liberties should become concerned only when it's all over and that they can afford to ignore the steady narrowing of liberty while it is going on.

It is also interesting that he nowhere indicates those authorities whose inquiry he regards as "legitimate." The letter deals with the investigations of the Jenner and McCarthy committees and

these presumably are such "legitimate" authorities. Thus Thomas renounces, indirectly to be sure, the note on which his letter begins.

The letter presents two reasons for his attitude, both of which deserve closer examination than Thomas gives them. The first is to be found in the difference between Stalinism and other unpopular political ideologies.

That the ideology of Stalinism is totalitarian, as Thomas says, is indisputable. Thomas also stresses that its adherents give monolithic obedience to all of its doctrines including those on music, biology, etc. At the same time he speaks of it as if it were merely the "cloak and dagger" conspiracy that it is painted by the know-nothings of Congress.

Stalinism, no doubt, does have its "cloak and dagger" aspect in the form of its spies and GPU agents. To throw this aspect of it into the same bag with the Communist Party as a political movement is for the purposes of this discussion misleading. There is no question here of defending spies and GPU agents. They do not raise questions of civil liberties. The discussion concerns the rights of those who adhere to and advocate Stalinism as a political ideology, though indeed it is an ideology which we fight and detest.

### CONSPIRACY ISSUE

Stalinists should be denied the right to teach, says Thomas, because of this "conspiratorial" side of Stalinism, because the Stalinists have given up their "freedom in the quest for truth" and because they are likely to use their teaching positions to harm or betray our country. Leaving aside the "conspiracy" issue, we are faced with two arguments.

Consistent party-line Stalinists certainly do subordinate their freedom in the quest for truth to the decrees of the Kremlin, but the point is that this is not necessarily true of all individual Stalinists in all fields of intellectual endeavor. And if it is true for some or most Stalinists in some fields, it is also true for some Catholics, some conservatives and some liberals. It is true, as a matter of fact, for all who accept doctrine in a bigoted fashion and refuse to examine other points of view.

It may be argued that in the case of these others the pressure for "blindness" and bigotry is internal and that in the case of the Stalinists there is an external discipline—the Stalinist organization. But the disciplined devout

Catholic has an external discipline in the form of the Church and its penalties and the ordinary conservative teacher has an external discipline to conform to capitalist ideology in the form of all of the normal pressures of bourgeois society plus the present new pressures and penalties.

Are all Stalinists (party members? sympathizers? Stalinoids?) equally guilty of having closed minds? How can this be measured and who will do the measuring? Thomas doesn't tell us.

### INDOCTRINATION

As for the argument that Stalinist teachers will harm or betray the country—it has its ludicrous interpretations. Thomas does not spell this out. A Stalinist teacher may, of course, steal atom-bomb secrets or blow up the Brooklyn Bridge during his leisure time. But then no one would complain when he was thrown in jail. But what can he do to harm or betray the nation in his capacity as teacher? Thomas can only be referring to his "indoctrinating" of students.

This is also a dubious proposition. On the college level Stalinist teachers (say, in the social sciences) undoubtedly do teach their subjects from the slant of the Stalinist ideology. Adherents of other ideologies teach with their particular slants. There are very few, if any, who do not slant their teaching.

Is this a menace to the country? The university is supposed to be a "marketplace of ideas." Should not the students be confronted with Stalinist ideas?

And how does this "indoctrination" take place on lower educational levels? It is hard to believe that Thomas really thinks that a high school or junior high school science teacher or language teacher, or an elementary school teacher, in between lessons on the formation of molecules or the declension of adjectives or the intricacies of long-division, sneaks in "dangerous" slogans of Stalinist propaganda.

(This writer once had, it is true, a high school French teacher who every now and then mentioned "la Union Sovietique" but this had no noticeable effect on AYD recruitment. The fact that she mentioned "la Union Sovietique" more often than "l'Angleterre" was noticed only by the Stalinists and by the sophisticated anti-Stalinists in the class. This was a very subtle clear and present danger to the country.)

A Stalinist teacher here or there may spend his time talking about

Stalinism and indoctrinating for it to the neglect of the subject he is supposed to be teaching or he may discriminate against anti-Stalinist students. But then he can be disciplined for professional misconduct or incompetence. Thomas knows this for he writes that such misconduct can be taken care of by "enforcing accepted rules." He seems to recognize that the misconduct of an individual Stalinist does not make valid the attempt to throw the Stalinists out of the teaching profession en masse.

But when he presents his arguments for the latter, one of them turns out to be just this in disguise. And sure enough, toward the end of his letter, Thomas writes of the Stalinist teacher who will "indoctrinate pupils with whom he is all day long without being caught in a specific act."

### STRATEGY OF RETREAT

Since all Stalinists can't be denied the right to teach because some Stalinists engage in unprofessional "indoctrination" which can be seen, Thomas advances the notion that all Stalinists engage in undetectable "indoctrination." This makes him feel secure. He doesn't have to prove his case since what can't be detected can't

be proved.

Thomas has another argument in his arsenal, one not noticeably relevant to the merits of the case. His idea is that, in order to combat McCarthyism, civil-libertarians must yield to McCarthyite witch-hunts of Stalinists the better to resist other McCarthy attacks. We can fight the witchhunt best, implies Thomas, if we yield the Stalinists up to it; furthermore, in defending the rights of the Stalinists we are giving McCarthy a weapon.

This short-sighted concept ignores certain elementary facts. Stalinism is today the primary target of the witchhunt. Ultimately, however, its aim is to silence all dissent, including that of Thomas. As a matter of fact, the most rabid witchhunters can even now barely distinguish between the Stalinists and socialists or militant liberals.

To refuse to defend the rights of the Stalinists is to deny the principle of civil liberties; it is to admit to the witchhunters that certain political groups are outside of the pale of democratic rights. Who will decide the limits of the pale? Thomas ought to know that it would be the reinforced witchhunters, and not he, who will decide that.

## School Witchhunt —

(Continued from page 1)

whose opinions they dislike. That will be the moment when McCarthy will move into the bullring to do his stuff. As in the past, he will produce his professional ex-Communists such as Budenz to say that Professor X was known to them as a fellow Communist. Before the poor man can recover from shock, his name will flame in every headline, his college branded as harboring Communists and encouraging communism. Financial contributions to the institution will fall off at once. Faculty morale will be shot to pieces.

It would take years before the particular university or college that gets the McCarthy work-over could recover from the damage. But not only are our great seats of learning and our public and private schools endangered by this insidious process. The very fabric of our society will be loosened and the noble ideals that have made this nation great will be shattered unless the American people now rise in their might to preserve the freedom of the mind.

### CHALLENGE TO IKE

Mrs. Meyer stated that "the American people as a whole must now realize that they are the ones who make the climate of public opinion and that they must come to the defense of our public schools and of our institutions of higher learning. For the independence of our whole educational system will be jeopardized if Velde, Jenner, and McCarthy are not stopped in their tracks before they get under full sail."

Mrs. Meyer urged that radio, the press, television and church organizations take a firm stand against the school investigations. She warned that "either the clergy of all denominations must now unite in a protest against these latest congressional inquisitions, or they will be the next to burn at the stake."

"With an increased budget, McCarthy may well get out of hand," said Mrs. Meyer. "Are the Eisenhower Republicans going to allow this man to disgrace them at the very outset of their administration? If they have any political wisdom they will not let McCarthy blacken their records by permit-

ting him to slander so honorable a group as our educators. But the Republican leaders must act quickly if they wish to save their own reputations. They must recognize their enemies before it is too late. Even now McCarthy's following is large.

"It has always been a psychological phenomenon and a perpetual danger to our democracy that psychopathic characters succeed in getting a hearing more quickly than rational, well-balanced human beings, because it is much harder to establish a truth than to sell the public a plausible untruth. This era of confusion is specially favorable to the quacks, the extremists, the demagogues and their nostrums. McCarthy's power over great numbers of Americans, many of whom are honest, well-meaning people, illustrates the hypnotic attraction of the lowest common denominator of human traits."

### DEMAGOG'S REPLY

After Mrs. Meyer's speech, spokesmen for nation-wide school groups such as the National Education Association and the National School Boards Association referred to it as an "historical event" and a "rallying point" for teachers to maintain independent schools.

When asked for comment on the speech, Senator McCarthy replied: "I would waste no time reading speeches by the management of the Washington Daily Worker, much less answer them."

The applause with which Mrs. Meyer's speech was greeted indicates that she was expressing the private opinions of a large number of the educators and school administrators of the country. It must be pointed out regretfully, however, that it takes a good deal less courage to applaud a militant speech than to take the lead in any action which would expose people to McCarthy's attacks. Yet, as Mrs. Meyer pointed out, it is only such courageous and united action which can stop the McCarthy's "in their tracks."

The SYL Book Bazaar has been postponed. Announcement next week.

## READING from LEFT to RIGHT

BOOMERANG IN EUROPE, by Sidney Lens.—The Progressive, February.

Lens, author of *Left, Right and Center* and *The Counterfeit Revolution*, writes about European anti-Americanism from Paris. The quantity of "anti-Americans" is no greater now, he says, "but the quality of their hostility is deeper."

Lens quotes "a world-famed neutralist" as follows to explain why:

"The Right hates you because you try to tell them what to do in the colonies, because you are ever talking about concessions to the colonials and to our workers. The Left hates you because your talk is never followed by effective action and your policy only strengthens reaction in France.

"Just before the Marshall Plan the government was on the verge of coming to terms with the Communist-led Viet Minh in Indo-China. But the knowledge that American dollars were forthcoming gave our capitalists the courage to fight on to hold the empire. That war alone takes the equivalent of all the Marshall Plan aid we have received. But it also forced a rupture between the Socialists and Communists, thus shifting the center of gravity of the government to the right. The tragedy of the break was that it destroyed the Socialist Party.

"The Socialists discredited themselves by agreeing to all kinds of bad measures just to keep an unstable non-Communist government in office. If France could have maintained a Leftist government, the Socialists would still be strong, and decent legislation to reform the tax structure of France and to break the back of cartels would now be on the books.

"Without the Marshall Plan 'dole' the pressure in France would have been from the Left rather than the Right, and the country would have been forced to make some basic changes to get out of its rut. As it is, the dollars have flowed into capitalist pockets, the rupture on the Left has presented France with an unstable government constantly fighting for a majority, and no dynamic program for housing, fiscal reform, or social legislation, has been forthcoming. The only way out of the permanent French crisis is to get off the American dole. That would weaken our capitalists, revive the Socialist Left, and force through the needed social changes."

Lens also discusses the collapse of the American-sponsored "productivity" program in France, the "new panacea" sold to Europe by American propaganda with "elaborate hoopla," which died for a simple reason: it bumped into the facts of life of capitalism, and one of them fell by the wayside. The loser wasn't capitalism.

# Marx, Engels, and 'The Russian Menace'

## III—On Principles of National Independence, and the Coming First World War

This is the third and concluding part of an article dealing with the material contained in the recently published book *The Russian Menace to Europe*, a collection of writings by Marx and Engels, edited by Paul W. Blackstock and Bert F. Hoselitz (Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 288 pages, \$3.75). Another article will comment on a general question of current interest raised by the editors' introduction to this work.

By HAL DRAPER

A very large part of the material in the Marx-Engels collection on "The Russian Menace" has already been sufficiently noted in the preceding issues. And it is, of course, impossible to speak of all of it. But there are a couple of other highlights that should be mentioned.

For example, we have already written about Marx and Engels' specific views on the national-independence problem of the Slav peoples, but there is another discussion on the national question that deserves singling out. This is their distinction between the question of independence for nations and nationalities.

First of all, Marx and Engels were no less vigorous and categorical than later socialists in their complete support of national-independence movements generally.

"There could, indeed, be no two opinions as to the right of every one of the great national subdivisions of Europe to dispose of itself, independently of its neighbors, in all internal matters, so long as it did not encroach upon the liberties of others. . . . This right . . . acknowledged as it was by the European democracy, could not but find the same acknowledgment with the working classes especially." (Engels, page 98.)

"It is historically impossible for a great people even to discuss internal problems of any kind seriously, as long as it lacks national independence. . . . An international movement of the proletariat is possible only among independent nations." (Engels, page 116-117.) In fact, this even exaggerates the importance of the question; at least it is no longer so true today in the same extreme terms.

"A people which oppresses another cannot emancipate itself. The power which it uses to suppress the other finally always turns against itself." (Engels, page 115.) Labor supporters of the "American Century" still have to find this out.

### THE "PRINCIPLE OF NATIONALITIES"

But from this, in an article of 1866, Engels turned his fire against the fake cries of "national liberation" used for imperialist purposes. He was dealing in particular with the "principle of nationalities" cried up and utilized by Louis Napoleon of France after the coup d'état of 1851.

The French emperor looked for "a democratized and popular-sounding name for his foreign policy." He found it in the "principle of nationalities": "Every nationality to be the arbiter of its own fate—every detached fraction of any nationality to be allowed to annex itself to its great mother-country—what could be more liberal? Only, mark, there was not, now, any more question of nations, but of nationalities."

Engels shows how this was illusorily used as a dodge for an imperialistic policy of intervention in other countries under this pretext, and in every country there was sufficient ground for the pretext. "There is no country in Europe where there are not different nationalities under the same government"—in Great Britain, the Highland Gaels and the Welsh, on the Continent even more complicated possibilities especially as one goes east.

The socialist principle is, therefore, no blanket slogan of this sort, which cannot even make sense practically and politically. "Here, then, we perceive the difference between the 'principle of nationalities' and the old democratic and working-class tenet as to the right of the great European nations to separate and independent existence."

By "great" nations Engels does not mean the "great powers." He is concerned, rather, with nations struggling against the great powers which oppress them. As usual, his prime example is Poland, and he cleverly shows how the "principle of nationalities" was used to counter the real meaning of national independence for Poland, since "the restoration of Poland means the re-establishment of a state composed of at least four different nationalities." The tsar used the old Russian game of playing national minorities in Poland against the re-establishment of the state. It was one of Hitler's games later, particularly in Czechoslovakia.

### ANTICIPATING THE FIRST WORLD WAR

A good deal of *The Russian Menace in Europe* presents aspects of Marx and Engels unfamiliar to many who think of Marx as a bookworm in the British museum library. All scholars acquainted with their work from sources other than popular magazine articles have recognized that, quite apart from their theoretical contributions, they were among the most acute political commentators and analysts of their day on current international developments. Their concrete analyses of contemporary affairs are often amazing even in hindsight at this late date.

Blackstock and Hoselitz, the editors, point out that Marx, in the course of one of his discussions of Russian policy, was the first to draw the Stettin-Trieste line as the natural frontier aim of Russian power. In more than one place Marx and Engels pointed to the coming imperialist clashes among the great powers and mapped out their objectives, alliances and even the course of their struggle. This was particularly true of Engels, who specialized in military questions. Some of these passages are in articles not included in this book. But on page 52, we read:

"The European situation today [1890] is governed by three facts: (1) the annexation by Germany of Alsace-Lorraine, (2) the drive of Russian czarism toward Constantinople, (3) in all countries, the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. . . .

"The first two factors determine the current grouping of Europe into two great armed camps. The German annexation of Alsace-Lorraine makes France an ally of Russia; the czarist threat to Constantinople makes Austria and even Italy allies of Germany. Both camps are arming for a showdown fight, for a war such as the world has never seen, in which ten to fifteen million armed men will be pitted against each other. Up to now only two circumstances have prevented the outbreak of this terrible war.

First, the unbelievably rapid progress of military technology which makes the model of each newly invented rifle obsolete, due to new discoveries, before it can be supplied even to one army only, and second, the absolute unpredictability of the odds, the total uncertainty as to who would finally emerge as the victor from this gigantic conflict. . . .

"As if on an inclined plane, Europe is sliding with increasing speed into the abyss of a world war, a war of as yet unheard-of extent and violence. Only one thing can now halt it: a change of the regime in Russia. This must come within a few years, of that there can be no doubt. Let us hope that it may yet come in time, before the otherwise unavoidable happens."

It did in fact come in 1905 but the Russian proletarian forces were not yet mature. In the summer of 1914 the Russian Revolution almost anticipated the outbreak of war. In 1917-18 it brought the war to its end more effectively than did the military events.

### THE SIXTH POWER IN EUROPE

Contrary to the slanders of anti-socialists, Engels did not look to such a war as necessary to benefit the revolution: ". . . if war breaks out one thing is certain: the splendidly progressing development in a revolutionary direction in Germany, Austria, and even Russia, will become totally deranged and will be pushed onto another, at first unpredictable, path." (1882.)

That is one side of it. But he did not neglect to point out also, for the warmongers and imperialists, that, in case of war between the two camps that were shaping up, there would also be a Third Camp on the scene.

In one of the dispatches to the *New York Tribune*, signed by Marx but probably also drafted or worked on by Engels, there is a detailed discussion of the prospects for military strategy of five of the great European powers in case of general outbreak of war. It concludes:

"But we must not forget that there is a sixth power in Europe, which at given moments asserts its supremacy over the whole of the five so-called 'great' Powers, and makes them tremble, every one of them. That power is the Revolution. Long silent and retired, it is now again called to action by the commercial crisis and by the scarcity of food. From Manchester to Rome, from Paris to Warsaw and Pesth, it is omnipresent, lifting up its head and awakening from its slumbers. Manifest are the symptoms of its returning life, everywhere visible in the agitation and disquietude which have seized the proletarian class. A signal only is wanted, and the sixth and greatest European power will come forward, in shining armor and sword in hand, like Minerva from the head of the Olympian. This signal the impending European war will give, and then all calculations as to the balance of power will be upset by the addition of a new element which, ever buoyant and youthful, will as much baffle the plans of the old European Powers, and their generals, as it did from 1792 to 1800."

This fact is more important for the calculations of the Great Power statesmen than for the socialists, who do not greet war as an opportunity for revolution. Never more than today, socialists present their program in a fight to win the support of a majority of the people, not only before that Third World War breaks out which will put Engels "war of as yet unheard-of extent and violence" in the shade, but in order to prevent such a world catastrophe.

# Let the People Know, Mr. Eisenhower — —

(Continued from page 1)

United States and Russia, the political actions of both participants are far more important than their propaganda barrages.

The actions of the Stalinists in the Prague trials have done more to convince millions of the reactionary nature of Stalinism than a million Voice of America broadcasts.

The action of the Americans in blocking the Tunisian and Moroccan appeals to the United Nations have been equally eloquent and convincing as compared to all the assurances of American statesmen and propagandists that this country is determined to see to it that all men can live in freedom.

### THE WORLD CAN SEE

Actually, the "unleashing" of Chiang Kai-shek against Stalinist China was more an action in terms of political warfare than in psychological warfare, as Lerner uses the terms. The actual military consequences can have but slight psychological effect. But politically, the Eisenhower government committed itself even more firmly than had the Truman administration before it to the support of the most reactionary anti-Stalinist forces in Asia. That the whole world can see, even if the Chinese Stalinists never see one of Chiang's regiments on their soil.

It appears, however, that the Eisenhower "team" is totally un-

aware of or indifferent to this aspect of the question, and views its actions primarily in "psychological" terms.

One of the features of "psychological" warfare is its secrecy. This means secrecy from the people of America as well as from the Stalinists. And this brings us to another commentator on Stevenson's speech, James Reston of the *New York Times*.

### OMINOUS NOTE

In a column written from Washington on February 15, Reston gently chides Stevenson for criticizing the Eisenhower policies without really knowing what lies behind them. To be sure, he lays the chief blame for this on the administration, as he points out that it is up to them to inform the Democrats of what is going on, so as to avoid unwarranted or dangerous criticism.

For instance, Reston implies that Stevenson did not know that Chancellor Adenauer of Western Germany had requested Dulles to insist on rapid action on the formation of the European army, and to use threats if necessary to keep it from dying in its tracks. Possibly such knowledge would have restrained the former Democratic candidate from commenting on the matter.

Yet if this is true it simply indicates that in Europe too the Eisenhower "team" finds its most staunch supporters among the

most conservative sections of society. Even Stevenson probably realizes that although these may be the sections which most strongly support American foreign policy, they are hardly adequate to man the armies of the new crusade.

But there are other sections of Reston's article which have an ominous ring to them: "This is a solemn moment in the development of American foreign policy. Events of the most serious consequences are in the making. Decisions of great importance have already been taken, involving military risks, and it is essential that the leader of the Democratic party be informed what these decisions are."

### DILEMMA

Further on Reston writes: "Already, some Democratic senators are asking questions about the strategic plans of the administration, which confront responsible officials with the dilemma of lying or giving valuable military information to the enemy. This happens not because the Democrats want to put the administration in an embarrassing position, but because they don't have enough information to know what questions to avoid."

Actually Reston is not saying that the Democratic leaders should keep quiet because they don't know what is up. He is urging the Republicans to let the most "responsible" Democrats in-

to their confidence with the implication that if they really knew what is being prepared they would keep quiet, or at least not ask the wrong questions.

As far as the rest of the American people are concerned, it is obvious that they cannot be given the slightest inkling of the "decisions . . . taken, involving military risks," even though the military risks will have to be born by them.

### THE RIGHT TO KNOW

We have been told, in the past, that one of the differences between political democracies and totalitarian states is that the latter have the potential initiative as their leaders do not need to consult the people or their representatives on any move which they propose to make. The people are simply told to trust their leaders, while they make decisions. It appears that this disadvantage of democracy is to be overcome by the Eisenhower administration in the same way that it was overcome by Roosevelt in World War II when he ordered American destroyers to fire on German submarines on sight long before America was in the war or before the American people were informed of the action.

It is indeed quite possible that if the leaders of the Democratic Party were fully informed of whatever spicy stew the Eisenhower team is preparing for us in Asia, they would keep silent.

There is no difference in principle between the foreign policy which was followed by their own government and the one which is now in process of development. It is at most a difference in degree and tempo, even though these can be extremely important.

But socialist proponents of a truly democratic foreign policy are naturally not guided by the same considerations. They are opposed to a foreign policy built on the support of reactionary regimes, and they are doubly opposed to such a foreign policy being conducted by force of arms. They will raise the demand that the people be informed of any new moves which involve a "military risk," and their demand should find an echo in the labor movement and among the common people in general.

The BEST recent book on the labor movement—

"The UAW and Walter Reuther"

by

Irving Howe and B. J. Widick  
\$3.00 Random House

Order from:

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

## An Exchange on Our 'Open Letter to the American Committee for Cultural Freedom'

The following correspondence deals with the "Open Letter to the American Committee for Cultural Freedom," by the Editors, in LABOR ACTION for February 2. The article discussed the statement on the McCarran Act's visa provisions adopted by the ACCF Executive Committee.

Officers and Executive Committee members of the ACCF were invited to comment on the Open Letter in order to present their point of view in our columns. The two replies below have been received at this time, the first from Daniel Bell, a member of the Executive Committee, and the second from Professor Arthur Schlesinger Jr., a vice-chairman of the ACCF. In addition a note from Clement Greenberg, also an Executive Committee member, informed us that "I'm afraid I'm not in the position to discuss the rights and the wrongs of the ACCF statements."—Ed.

### Bell

To the Editor:

It seems to me that LABOR ACTION is excessively dense. The American Committee for Cultural Freedom is not an organization concerned with the totality of the problems of civilization; nor must it rush into every area and at every time where liberal values are threatened. It is an organization with specific concerns and these are focused primarily on the intellectual community and the problems that beset it; hence it is not primarily concerned with civil liberties in all dimensions,

because it is not the American Civil Liberties Union, but it is concerned with those aspects of civil liberties that touch on the question of academic freedom, on employment in intellectual pursuits, etc. In the case of the McCarran law, the primary concern of the Committee quite rightly was with the sections which deal with the entry of professors and intellectuals into the country and the actions of the consular and immigration officials in this regard. It does not mean, if a memorandum is prepared on the visa sections of the McCarran act that we have to make genuflections in all directions so that all the ritualistic pieties are observed. Of course the Committee is against the McCarran Act as a whole; but unlike a political sect it does not have to reach full circle on every issue.

Daniel BELL

### Schlesinger

To the Editor:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your article on the Committee for Cultural Freedom's statement on "the visa problem." But I do think you are reaching a bit for an issue here. The Committee's statement, as its title suggests, was confined to the visa question; it did not purport to deal with the entire McCarran Act. I must add that it seemed to me an excellent statement; and it certainly does not preclude a demand for a thoroughgoing revision of the act as a whole. I find myself in substantial agreement

with the recent recommendations to this end of the Perlman committee, and I suspect that most members of the Committee would also heartily support these recommendations.

Arthur SCHLESINGER, Jr.

### The Editors

We might be quite willing to agree with what Messrs. Bell and Schlesinger write, even that we're excessively dense, but we're afraid that their comments don't bear upon the question we raised.

Prof. Schlesinger, for example, replies with the fact that the ACCF's statement "was confined to the visa question" and "did not purport to deal with the entire McCarran Act." Of course.

But that was exactly why we raised and discussed the question why the ACCF chose to take no position on the McCarran Act as a whole. It happens that this was what the bulk of our Open Letter was concerned with.

We regret that Prof. Schlesinger apparently missed this issue.

Prof. Schlesinger suspects that "most members of the Committee" for Cultural Freedom heartily support the denunciation of the McCarran Act rendered by the President's Committee headed by Philip Perlman. We were somewhat less suspicious, in point of fact.

In discussing why the ACCF chose to take no position on "the general principles of the law" we said we wrote on the "assumption" that the Executive Committee was "really" opposed to the act. We referred to "reports that some influential members" of the ACCF were not, to introduce the point that the ACCF's statement "is written just as if these reports have a basis in truth."

But the interesting question was: why, when "most members of the Committee" are opposed to the act, does the Committee refuse to take a position on it? We suggested an answer to that, and while the suggestion was not complimentary to the orientation of the ACCF, it did at any rate raise a basic question about the nature of the organization, and not about whether most of the members of the organization have their hearts in the right place.

The uncomplimentary suggestion which we were compelled to make was simply this: while the ACCF quite rightly recognizes no limitations to its scope of interest when it comes to denouncing the crimes against culture and freedom committed behind the Iron Curtain, it is reluctant "to speak out on THIS legislative crime, on THIS side of the Iron Curtain" lest doing so "provide aid and comfort to the Stalinist propagandists who have their own axe to grind."

And in so doing, we further suggested, it is the bisymmetric counterpart of those Stalinoids who, while sincerely opposed to the Kremlin's offenses against freedom (or many of them), refuse to speak out about them, lest doing so provide aid and comfort to reactionaries and warmongers in this country. It happens that in the very next issue after our Open Letter we discussed this latter type in the course of an article on the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which in this respect represents the obverse side of the coin.

"I suspect that most members of the [Emergency Civil Liberties] Committee" heartily detest the totalitarian practices of the Russian regime. But most of them remain silent about them, or gloss over them, or minimize them, for well-known reasons. Men like Schlesinger and Bell have justifiably attacked these types on grounds of honesty, truth and cultural integrity, not to speak of political wisdom. We suggest that there is a mote in the eye of some

when they find it difficult to get the point as it applies to their own organization.

But it is not only a matter of simple honesty, important as that is in politics too. We argued that "for this very reason, it [the ACCF] cannot even be an effective instrument in exposing the crimes of the Russian barbarians"—just as the Stalinoids cannot effectively mobilize liberal civil-liberties sentiment as long as they are known as whitewashers for the Russian despots.

It is also characteristic of the Stalinoid type that they choose to "confine" their defense of democratic ideas to the scene on this side of the Iron Curtain. But surely Schlesinger and Bell do not take their decision to do this confining as sufficient justification for the evasion. They would properly ask why, and no doubt answer the question too. We doubt that they would feel much shaken in their criticism if they received in reply a paraphrase of the two letters published above.

Daniel Bell's letter does little more than repeat the explanation for the ACCF position which we quoted in our Open Letter as coming from the executive director of the organization. It is a pity he did not bother to take up our dissection of this very explanation, for it was this which constituted the bulk of the Open Letter. Naturally, our columns are still open to him if he wishes to do this.

In paraphrasing the argument of the executive director, which we had fortunately already quoted, about the limited scope of the ACCF, his method is one of giving platitudinous refutations to exaggerated objections. No one has asked the ACCF to take up "the totality of the problems of civilization." It is not really expected to "rush into every area and at every time," etc. It is not even urged to be "primarily concerned with civil liberties in all dimensions," and so on.

We likewise formally absolve it of any charge that it has failed to make genuflections in all directions or observe all the ritualistic pieties. We wish also to officially denounce and condemn all political sects that have to reach full circle on every issue.

These important questions having been disposed of satisfactorily, perhaps we can return to the present issue.

Of the many problems of civilization and civil liberties which should concern an organization with the stated aims of the ACCF, the ACCF itself chose to take up the McCarran Act; and the ACCF itself, taking up the McCarran Act's visa provisions, chose to take no position on "the general principles of the law," that is, on McCarranism.

Now Mr. Bell is quite aware that the issue of the Act was right before his Executive Committee, which had to push it out of the way with a specific statement. He should not try to convince himself that we pulled some obscure issue out of the totality of the problems of civilization. For in his postive statement he asserts that "the primary concern of the Committee quite rightly" was with the visa provisions for professionals. (Our emphasis.)

Mr. Bell is a skilled journalist, not unused to the nuances of argumentation, nor unacquainted with the saving qualifications which journalists have a right to employ in the interest of accuracy. The excellent word "primary" is one of the latter.

It happens that the ACCF specifically declared that, in the case of the McCarran Act, its only concern was with the visa provisions for professionals and intellectuals. Only concern, Mr. Bell.

This is a movement which, we pointed out, has shown no reluctance to take positions on broad issues of international policy (condemnation of neutralism), on the case of Willie McGee (no in-

tellectual), on Stalinist anti-Semitism, on Francoism, etc., etc. But when we raise the question why it refuses to take a position on McCarranism at home, we are answered with references to genuflections, ritualistic pieties, political sects and full circles.

We do not find this enlightening.

The EDITORS

### HOUSING LOYALTY OATH IN BAY AREA

To the Editor:

The first local test, in the Bay Area here, of the "anti-subversive" loyalty oath in public housing will soon take place, with the Northern California American Civil Liberties Union defending a tenant from the Richmond Housing Authority's pressure to sign or get out.

Until this time, the "Gwinn rider" prohibiting occupancy of low-rent housing "by a person who is a member of an organization designated as subversive by the attorney general" has just been on the books.

However, according to the local American Civil Liberties Union News of February 1953, "a tenant phoned the Union and stated he had received a letter from the General Housing Manager instructing him, on pain of eviction, to report to the Housing Authority offices in order to sign a loyalty oath and to bring other adult members of his family with him. The tenant has a lease that does not expire until October 1953. When he asked for further information about the matter he was referred to a Mr. Sharp, the assistant housing director, who treated him very rudely.

"Mr. Sharp told him that if he were a good American he would be willing to sign the statement. When the tenant expressed a desire to see the statement, and to study it, he was informed he could see the statement when he signed it. The ACLU office is prepared to intercede on behalf of this tenant. The national office of the ACLU is preparing two test suits in Newark, New Jersey, besides one in Washington, D. C."

When the ACLU asked for further information "The Richmond Housing Authority refused to tell the Union precisely what it is doing to enforce the 'Gwinn Rider.'"

In San Francisco, the local Housing Authority on January 27 voted to require loyalty oaths only of tenants moving into low-rent housing projects that are completed in the future. The first tenants to be affected by the new regulation will be those moving into the Hunters Point project when the first 44 apartments are opened on March 15. At the same time, the Authority voted not to amend its existing contracts with the federal government to require loyalty oaths of tenants residing in housing projects already constructed.

When the case comes to court it must undoubtedly touch upon the authority of the extra-legal attorney general's "subversive list" as applied to the other than "sensitive" government offices it was supposedly designated for. If there was any doubt about the future of such a list when LABOR ACTION pointed out the dangers it would bring about to the civil liberties of the United States, such doubt should be completely dispelled by this late date.

Thus any fight for civil liberties nowadays must inevitably gravitate to an attack upon Fair Deal President Truman's original "subversive list."

Jack WALKER

Berkeley, Feb. 3

## 'The Emperor's Clothes': Parable for Heroes and Rats

By BEN HALL

"We are living at a time when a man must be either a hero or a rat, and I don't find that very comfortable," remarks the brother of the protagonist in *The Emperor's Clothes*, a dramatic play by George Tabori which opened at New York's Ethel Barrymore Theatre on February 9.

The setting is Budapest in 1930 but the scene is closer to home.

Elek Odry, portrayed by Lee J. Cobb (who played the main role in *Death of a Salesman*), begins as a great hero in the imaginative eyes of his ten-year-old son Ferike; he seems fated to utter degeneration but is at last saved by the faith of his little boy.

Odry had been a highly respected university professor, honored and loved by his students as a man who taught devotion to the truth and courage in its defense. In the stormy post-war days, he made revolutionary speeches, ran for parliament, appealed to the masses. In the reaction, he is discharged and blacklisted from the schools despite retraction of his most extreme utterances.

But this is all in the past. As the play opens, he is unemployed, his family destitute. He ekes out a living by translating ludicrous American cowboy stories. He is disillusioned and somewhat cynical but strives to maintain some basic integrity and intellectual self-respect.

Odry's wife has appealed for help to a former admirer, a wealthy landowner with high connections in the government. The latter manipulates Odry's appointment to a humble secondary school post if only the latter will sign a formal declaration of loyalty. In a mood of utter despair, seeking only a personal refuge in a private world of teaching Latin and history, Odry decides to accept if it can be arranged without divesting himself of the last shred of dignity.

In Odry's home, the phone

rings. He lifts the receiver but no one answers on the other end. It is a call from the political police. (Odry doesn't realize it and unfortunately neither does the American audience.)

His son has unwittingly opened a box of troubles. Ferike is a boy with a vivid imagination who dresses his father in the "Emperor's Clothes" of great hero, slayer of lions, scourge of cattle barons, explorer of deserts. He has initiated a playmate into an imaginary "Illegal Party of Boys" and of course his father is the magnificent underground leader of the people. The police in actual fact learn of the awesome "plot" and interrogations and torture begin.

It is to be regretted that Tabori handles his material in a confusing and often slow-moving manner. Odry's personality undergoes an abrupt and bewildering disintegration in the face of crisis and an equally sudden and unexplained rehabilitation. The relations of the characters to one another are confused and confusing. But the dramatic portrayal of a man haunted by a secret police for deeds long past and gnawed by vague and terrible fears is enough to make the play worth while.

The police interrogation is presented with great skill and deadly accuracy; the little tricks of the agents; their initial polite and unctuous manner as they enter Odry's home; their not-too-unfunny jokes; then their unanticipated change in deportment; the implied threats; the sudden darted questions, like "What do you think of the Jews?" It is all there.

Perhaps it wasn't quite like that in Hungary in 1930. But we understand it in the United States in 1953.

Unfavorable notices in the New York Times and Herald Tribune seem to have doomed the play to an early death. If you still have the opportunity to see it, don't miss out.

Get it EVERY week!

An LA sub is \$2 a year

# Moscow Finds Pretext — —

## The ISL Program In Brief

(Continued from page 1)  
 Arab-Jewish unity, and look for Arab-Jewish unity to come about only with a change in social relations in the Arab countries. They phrase their ideas in outmoded and racist terminology, for example one writer says: "The land of Persia [meaning the whole Near East!] can be liberated only by the fire of social revolution in the Arab countries. Progressive social systems which are advancing beneath feudal regimes will extend their hand to us for peace and progress in the region of the Semites. It is the destiny of the Semitic body of peoples to rule the Near East."

### SPECULATION

It will be seen by our readers that in this mishmash of ideas there is an unholy confused mixture of ideas which are progressive in themselves (such as unity with the Arab peoples) with extreme-nationalist and reactionary views. Its rise is both ominous and symptomatic of conditions in the area. The question why the Russians

wanted a break with Israel has been answered by some in its most simple terms: in order to win support among the Arab extremists. There is no doubt that while the Stalinist drive against Jews has other motivations the Stalinists are not averse to gathering up by-product profits of increased support among the anti-Israeli Arabs. The breaking off of diplomatic relations with Israel is the first concrete move in the direction of the Arabs that the Stalinists have made since the beginning of the anti-Semitic campaign.

### CAMOUFLAGE?

In our opinion, the more important reason for the break to be kept in mind is that it fits in with Moscow's plan of camouflaging its anti-Semitism under the mask of anti-Zionism. The masking of one thing by another, even by its opposite, is a typical mode of operation of the Stalinist rulers. Thus, dictatorship and totalitarianism are practised in the name of "democracy," bureaucracy is "fought" by increasing

the power of the top bureaucrats, "socialism" is practised by increasing inequality, etc. Anti-Semitism too has been and will continue to be introduced into Russia and the satellite countries under the banner of anti-Zionism and even of "ethnic democracy."

### WITH BLINDERS ON

Unfortunately this line like the others will deceive those who want to be deceived. For example, B. Z. Goldberg, noted Stalinist fellow traveler of the Yiddish press in this country, allowed himself the luxury of disbelief in the guilt of the Moscow doctors, the Jewish playwright Mikhols and the "Joint" as charged by the Kremlin frameup, but he is now able to fool himself and to try and fool others by declaring that the trials are not aimed at Jews as such but at destroying all Zionist and national feeling among the Jews.

He also cites the new Soviet Encyclopedia which explains that the Jews are not a nation and that this is the reason why Zionism and other forms of Jewish nationalism like the Bund had to be-

come agents of imperialism, etc., etc. This is not anti-Semitism, says the fellow traveler, but is a desire to force the Jews to assimilate and to isolate them from the Jews of the rest of the world.

### CAN'T EXPLAIN

He does not and cannot explain why the drive is directed most viciously at precisely the most assimilated sections of the Jews and those who accept Stalin's position that the Jews are not a nation. The truth of the matter is that while the drive against the Jews started first in the destruction of Jewish culture it is now directed toward eliminating Jews from all important positions in the economy and the political life of the country and even expelling them from border regions.

All Jews in the eyes of the masters of the Kremlin have become unreliable. The real reason for Stalinist anti-Semitism lies deeper and is more insidious than the question of whether the Jews are a nation or not; it has deeper reasons than the power politics of the Near East.

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!

# Wildcats in Detroit — —

(Continued from page 1)  
 In most cases the corporations win because the UAW contracts have the notorious "company security" clauses first instituted in the 1946 negotiations at the Ford Motor Company, and since incorporated into many contracts.

These clauses give the corporations power to penalize and fire all persons involved in wildcat strikes. Last year the chairman of the shop committee of Dodge Local was fired under that clause, called Section 6 in the Chrysler contract, and he was never rehired. Many other shop leaders in the Detroit area have been penalized under this clause. Its chief effect is to substitute company discipline for union discipline of its ranks.

In the past year, a new concept has been introduced into relations between the corporations and the UAW on the plant level. It arose from a decision in a General Motors dispute. A shop committeeman was fired for exercising "negative" leadership during a wildcat strike. He failed to stop it.

### BITTERNESS

Last week at the DeSoto plant a chief steward was fired on similar grounds, following an unauthorized strike. Previously a shop committeeman at another Chrysler plant had been penalized heavily on similar charges.

The frustration and bitterness of the secondary leadership over this kind of whittling-down process on the part of the corporations was illustrated this past week by a hectic session that the shop committee,

officers and chief stewards of the DeSoto local had at Solidarity House with top UAW officials. The entire leadership of the DeSoto local stormed down there to protest the inability of the UAW leadership to solve the dilemmas faced in the shops today.

As this writer has pointed out many times, any strict living up to the letter of the contracts simply disarms the shop leaders in fighting speedup. Calling for time-study or writing grievances dooms the men in advance, as most UAW leaders recognize. Slowdowns or walkouts nowadays only bring penalties and further aggravate the problems, since then the local union is faced with two issues: speedup, and discharges because of the walkouts.

The inability of the UAW to resolve this has caused the rank and file in the shops to lose more and more faith in the union, taking out their bitterness on the secondary leaders, and also walking out in desperation. So each successive crisis worsens the situation.

### NO SOLUTION

The attitude of the top leadership of the UAW—which is "Live Up to the Contracts"—just doesn't solve the problem. A roll-call of chief stewards, shop committeemen and active unionists fired in the past two years would astonish observers. They are basically victims of the fact that on-sided living up to the contract doesn't solve shop problems.

The approach of the top leaders

of the UAW has another undesirable effect. The secondary leaders feel that the international union isn't backing them up, that it is "with the companies," as the saying goes in the shop. In desperation they make moves which leave them open to the legal sharpshooters of the corporations and bring them penalties.

Perhaps the major criticism that can be made of this situation is the failure of the UAW leadership to hold authoritative conferences, to discuss this issue frankly and to work out more satisfactory solutions. At least this would restore some of the confidence of the shop leaders and ranks in the higher levels of the union.

### REUTHER DOESN'T HELP

The unrest in the shops, as the companies drive persistently to speed up the workers and whittle down the plant bargaining leadership, has also been aggravated by the perplexity of the UAW ranks over the strategy and policies of the UAW top leadership on the so-called March 1 crisis.

As each statement of President Walter P. Reuther is read in the newspapers, the secondary leaders find themselves unable to answer pertinent questions of the men in the shops, because "higher strategy" is kept strictly at the top level and the local union leaders appear completely in the dark. This does not make for confidence in the shops.

It is amazing to find how many workers think that there will be an industry-wide shutdown in March, the last thing in the world that Reuther would permit. However, his ambiguous statements on the BLS Index, and the failure to keep the secondary leaders informed of developments, further widen the gap between the men in the shops and the union as an institution.

Reuther does not help the situ-

ation any by pleading that the 5-year contracts must be considered "living documents," subject to the realities, on the one hand, while international union representatives tell the ranks that they must live up to the contracts, on the other hand.

### DANGER

The sum-total result is the resurgence of unofficial strikes, which are far more significant as gestures of depression, than as effective weapons at the present time. This kind of unplanned and often provoked warfare tends to dissipate the energies of the ranks.

Meanwhile, it seems undeniable that the very basis of the UAW, its strong shop leadership, has become weaker and less effective as a result of the corporations' successful strategy of taming the union through insistence on a strict living up to the contracts as they interpret them. And working conditions in many Detroit plants are deteriorating through this process.

## 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)

## Labor Action FORUM • New York

### Problems of Socialist Anti-War Policy

by  
**Hal Draper**  
 Editor, Labor Action

Second in a series — NEXT THURSDAY

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

## Leon Trotsky's "STALIN"

The definitive biography of the Kremlin's master

This book is out of print, but we have a number of copies available for \$6.00

Labor Action Book Service  
 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.