

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 27, 1953

FIVE CENTS

## SPOTLIGHT

### His Own Petard

A "famous victory" has been scored over Joe McCarthy and we're glad to see that we're not the only ones in the crowd who aren't cheering our heads off. (Cheer, but never cheer your head off.)

It seems they got J. B. Matthews, and that after the man was down with one shoulder pinned to the mat, that lionlike warrior for civil liberty, D. D. Eisenhower, jumped into the ring and knocked him on the head. McCarthy and Matthews had done the Unthinkable. They were guilty of blasphemy against the clergy, white American Protestant to boot.

Murray Kempton of the N. Y. Post points out they should have known that this would bring the wrath of the Southern Baptists on their heads:

"Old Doc Matthews can say anything he pleases about professors; the Southern Baptist was harrasing school teachers when Matthews was merchandising Christian charity to the Malays. But when you attack any part of his church, you are attacking him.

"It is presumably one of those things people describe as the glory of America that this country is so big that one sort of bigotry cannot get very far without running into a counter-bigotry. Joe McCarthy, an epidemic plague, has been temporarily stalled by the Bible Belt, an endemic disease. That is not necessarily a subject for delight."

That sounds ungrateful for small favors, but it reminds us of what we wrote last week about hallelujahs over "victories" against McCarthy. The theoretical principle we have in mind is this: If a man has been tortured by shooting pains all over his body, arteriosclerosis, paresis, leprosy, Bright's disease, scirrhus of the liver and two broken legs, he will get a warm glow of positive well-being if he is merely left with galloping consumption. . . .

### Lesser Evils

But to get away from such heavy theory, the practical side of it is that sometimes, perversely, we get more concerned with what is happening under cover of some people's "fight" against McCarthy. For example, in comparison with McCarthy's outrageous principles, the attorney general's "subversive list" gets to seem as beneficent and

pleasurable as . . . galloping consumption.

So too, there are the types who compare "even" Senator McCarran with the Kremlin gang, and conclude that our witchhunters are practically old-time liberals in contrast, which no doubt heartens them in their ability to swallow the bitter medicine of the witchhunt out of a laudable desire to "save democracy" in the world.

We once suggested that somebody write a sequel for George Orwell depicting the "Oceania" of 1984 at war with that relatively mild, good-humored, easy-going, wide-open society known as Stalinist Russia. Preferably it should be done by some ex-radical who has gotten real proficient at arguing that, bad as capitalism is, Stalinism is worse, and this is no time

(Continued on page 5)

## Why U.S. Can't Capitalize On German Workers' Fight

Why can't the United States government follow up the smashing blow against Russian totalitarianism which was delivered by the East German workers' revolt?

Why instead does Washington react to the German workers' demands against Moscow "in fear and trembling"?

Why does it feel that these demands against Moscow are also directed against itself?

Those are our own questions, but the answers are by the Washington columnist Stewart Alsop, in the *Herald Tribune* of July 19. Regrettably, sorrowfully, he brings out the facts which damningly indict all of Western foreign policy when subjected to the test of the June events.

"Here in Berlin," he writes in his dispatch, "the infinitely dangerous unresolved dilemma of American foreign policy is startlingly visible." But he is going to show that it is not "unresolved" at all: Washington has made its own decision.

The U. S., he says, should now be engaged "in an all-out political and diplomatic offensive for German unity. But it is difficult to engage in an all-out offensive for something you do not really want."

He explains why the U. S. does not want what the German fighters against totalitarianism want, and what the consequences will be.

"The courageous resistance of the East Germans to their puppet overlords could be a tremendous asset to the West. It will not be an asset for long if the only American response consists of transparent gestures dreamed up by the psychological warriors, coupled with a trem-

(Turn to last page)

## How the 'June Days' Broke Out In East Berlin

. . . page 6

## The Ukraine After Stalin's Death

. . . page 5

## The ACTU Hears a 'Program'

. . . page 2

### The "Neutralist" Demand—

## NEGOTIATIONS WITH RUSSIA?

By HAL DRAPER

It has long been true that the slogan of "negotiations with Russia" has been the rallying cry of "neutralist" opinion in Europe; and recent events, particularly the East German uprising, has given more impetus to this line. Some of the Bevanites in the British Labor Party's left wing, for example, have drawn this as their main conclusion from the great struggle of the German workers, and are complaining that their leaders should insist on British initiative in this respect.

The West German Social-Democrats have also tied the workers' revolt to this question. As Michael Foot wrote last week in the *Bevanite Tribune*: "The workers in Germany have risked their lives to end rule by foreign armies and to secure the unity of their country. That end can only be gained by genuine negotiation with the Soviet government. That is the demand of the German Social-Democrats. It is a demand which should be supported by every socialist all over the world."

We venture to say that few things so clearly illustrate the difference between this widespread form of "neutralism" and a really independent socialist policy in foreign affairs and on the war question. Perhaps the key sentence is: "That end can only be gained by genuine negotiation with the Soviet government."

Obviously the German workers' struggle is looked on, not as the beginning of a movement which can solve the problem itself, but as providing a bargaining point for the West. Here are two different approaches. One view we can summarize as follows, admittedly more crudely than its own proponents would be willing to do—or rather, perhaps, more clearly than its own proponents have thought the question out:

It is a good thing when people under the Russian heel revolt and "cause trouble" because this will persuade the Russians to make a peace deal with the West, on terms more advantageous to "us."

(Turn to last page)

## 85-Cent Tip from Washington

The American government's fond belief that a handout is the answer to all problems of foreign policy is not doing so well in its German application. With no political program to follow up the June days in East Germany, Washington came up with the idea of "feeding the animals." But, says a N. Y. *Times* dispatch—

"Enthusiasm for the project appears to be greater in Bonn and Washington than in Berlin."

The idea held by "top strategists of United States psychological warfare" seems to be that the East German workers were rioting over food, says correspondent Walter Sullivan (July 19). The demonstrators' cries for freedom and unity are translated into callores by these Big Brains.

Observers in Berlin "sense a certain annoyance with the move on the part of the East German populace. The East German reaction may be summed up in the words, 'We stand up and throw bricks at Soviet tanks, and the Americans offer us a reward of 85 cents worth of food apiece.'"

That's how the pro-Americans put the annoyance. The Stalinist press hammered away at the theme—"two frankfurters and a glass of beer."

Also, "Photographs of Western press reports linking the offer with Adenauer's election prospects and noting that the food was surplus in America were displayed on the front pages of the Communist organs."

Accustomed though Americans are to yell "Communist lies," this propaganda happens to be the truth. It does not make the East Germans fonder of the puppet regime, but it underlines the bankruptcy of Washington's approach to the German people's aspirations.

Naturally the people have a right to be incensed at the Stalinist government's rejection of American food—all the more so since they know it will not buy any love for the U. S. war bloc.

# ACTU Convention Hears a 'Program'

By BEN HALL

The Association of Catholic Trade Unionists held its annual national convention in New York City on July 4 and 5. I attended one session as a reporter and present this account not as a complete story of the gathering or as a full picture of the ACTU but as a summary of some of the highlights for the interest of LABOR ACTION readers.

ACTU's strength can be gauged from the representation. Perhaps 30 delegates and observers, mostly young, represented official chapters and friendly bodies. Six chapters were officially represented by reporters: Gary, New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Camden, and Cleveland. Three cooperating groups came from Boston, Buffalo, and Chicago.

The *Labor Leader*, official ACTU publication, it was announced, circulated 120,000 copies last year. But 22 issues are published annually. Simple arithmetic shows that this equals 5,000 per issue and one wonders how many of these are actually distributed.

**One conclusion would appear justified on the face of these facts: whatever influence it wields in the labor movement comes not from any mass following in the ranks of the workers but from its ties with labor leaders through the church. *Business Week* (July 18) reports an ACTU national membership of 3,000; but this is surely a gross overestimation.**

ACTU was formed out of a split with the *Catholic Worker* group in 1938. The CW followed a radical policy of opposition to the war, of support to Loyalist Spain against Franco and has joined recently in joint actions with socialist groups in the committee to protest against the victimization of worker opponents of the Franco regime. In opposition to the policy of the *Catholic Worker*, the ACTUists follow a conservative line and favor the organization of Catholic trade-union members into separate caucuses or caucus-like groups.

ACTU groups, particularly in New York, try to direct or guide the activities of their supporters in unions and at the same time bring them closer to the church. Some of their followers have displayed true courage in fighting gangsterism and anti-democracy in unions. John Acropolis, once president of Local 456 of the Teamsters Union, murdered by gangsters, was a member of ACTU, according to Robert Mozer, head of New York ACTU. And in the International Longshoremen's Association, members and sympathizers of ACTU have fought the rule of thugs and racketeers.

## MAIN AIM

Its main aim, however, is to fight the ideas of socialism and "secularism" in the unions. "The Gary ACTU," reported its representative, "emerged in the struggle against subversive forces." Purely religious activities are simple enough: it holds special services with emphasis on attendance from unionists.

But its problem in the unions is not so simple. So long as the issue of "anti-communism" is sizzling, ACTU can find an easy place in the struggle. But as soon as this breaks down and the day-to-day inner problems of unions come to the fore, ACTU seems to face a crisis.

The Detroit chapter, for example, which was intensely active during the struggle against the Stalinists in the UAW, now reports that it has decided

to become "primarily an educational and spiritual organization" and to "leave other areas of action to members in their industrial organizations."

This would seem to reflect an inability to direct Catholic unionists in general and their own members in particular inside the UAW in this period. This doubtless explains the desperate search of the *Wage Earner*, Detroit ACTU publication, for a "socialist menace" that might help perk up the interest and enthusiasm of its own membership.

An attempt to give the convention some guiding orientation in presenting an ACTU "line" in the unions was made by George Donahue, member of the editorial board of the *Labor Leader*. ACTU members, he urged, had to begin speaking up in unions for the "Christian reorganization of our economy" by putting forward the "industry council plan," an ACTU proposal for representation of workers, owners, and government on industry control boards. Labor leaders and their friends in Congress, he said, are at "the end of their rope" and have no program to meet the needs of our time. And so we need radicals, and radicals must come from Christ. Society can be reorganized so that private ownership is possible and labor is justly treated at the same time.

## PAINLESS PROGRAM

The delegates applauded, under the impression that some road had been pointed out allowing them to seek "class peace" even as "radicals" and reorganizers of society. An editorial in the December 12, 1952 issue of the *Labor Leader*, on co-determination in Germany, offers a hint on how rousing effective the ACTU line might be in stimulating militant workers toward a wide yawn. (The editorial favors co-determination.) The editorial said:

"There is no natural right of workers to share in decisions of management. But—and this is important—there is an obligation of employers to conduct their industries for the common good. Therefore if the economic and social conditions of a nation are such that co-determination in some form is feasible, practical, and conducive to the common good it ought to be adopted *without in any way diminishing the rights of employers.*" (Our emphasis.)

Yes sir, ACTU will show these labor leaders who are at the end of their rope; it will radicalize; it will reorganize. Only without in any way diminishing the rights of employers.

Joint SYL-YPSL Forum  
New York City

MAX SHACHTMAN

on

The Historical Significance of  
The Left Opposition

Friday evening, July 31 at 8:30 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Jointly sponsored by the Socialist Youth League  
and The Young Socialists (YPSL)

# LABOR SCOPE

## WHAT HAPPENED TO REUTHER'S "DYNAMISM"?

When Walter Reuther was elected president of the CIO his followers anticipated a period of quick revival and expansion in organization, under the slogan: Revive the crusading spirit of the thirties. Time-servers would be sloughed off the organizing staff and replaced with alert, dynamic activists; consolidation; organization; and the CIO would march forward.

Instead of the expected upsurge, the CIO now appears to be faced with the possibility of a serious crisis, if not the crisis itself.

No-raiding agreements between the AFL and the CIO, and between the United Auto Workers and the International Association of Machinists, seemed to set the stage for a period of harmonious union-building. But the ink was hardly dry on the pacts when Reuther was compelled to complain of their violation.

Several AFL unions are making stubborn drives to hack away sections of the CIO. The Teamsters Union (AFL) failed to swallow up the Brewery Workers (CIO) but ten locals of the CIO union have already seceded to the Teamsters and 15 others are reported to be considering a similar move. The CIO Packinghouse Union, which has already signed a pact of joint action with the AFL Meat Cutters Union, is reported to be considering merging with it inside the AFL. The CIO Utility Workers Union is reported to be considering a merger with the powerful AFL Electricians Union.

## RESTLESS

David J. MacDonald, president of the steel workers union, who vowed eternal loyalty and swore continued cooperation

with the UAW when Haywood, his candidate, was defeated by Reuther at the last CIO convention, has chosen this time to rock the boat a little harder. MacDonald accidentally arranged a surprise private tête-à-tête with John L. Lewis. He acts mysterious about the purposes of the conversations and informs the public that he just dropped in to see John and talk over old times.

Whatever else he may have in mind, MacDonald obviously wants Reuther to know that the conservative opinions of the steel leadership must be respected.

In every case, it is anti-Reutherites who seem restless. The Utility Workers Union has always been in the extreme right wing, opposing the "socialism" that it detected in government ownership of public utilities. Even while Murray was still CIO president, the representatives of this union fought a battle on the floor of a CIO convention against the finally adopted resolution on this point.

The Packinghouse Workers Union was one of the few large unions which voted against Reuther at the last convention. Although the Brewery Union finally voted for Reuther, its leaders held out to the last minute reflecting a strong anti-Reuther tendency among sections of its ranks.

The problem seems to be this: in the general conservative atmosphere of the country, at a time when the labor movement shows no signs of making any big strides forward, the more conservative sections of the CIO hold out their hands to the conservative AFL. The mood of the day drives them together.

And this can hardly be overcome by efficient and "dynamic" union organizing. The mood of the country is dominated and determined by politics and it is to politics that the CIO must look in its quest for "the crusading spirit" of its founding days.

## Cabinet Member Tells the Truth About Class Nature of Gov't

The *Summit County Labor News* (Akron, Ohio) has caught a high official of the Eisenhower administration in what it designates as a "boner."

Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, addressing the United States Chamber of Commerce, told them that "We are in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry."

Far from condemning Secretary McKay for his statement, we believe that he should be given the recognition due any man who places honesty above considerations of diplomacy. Our gratification is not lessened by the fact that the particular statement made by McKay illustrates one of the Marxist truisms which the American labor movement has rejected and denounced much to its own disadvantage and even peril.

The treatment given this statement in the *Summit County Labor News* is typical of this attitude of the labor movement. Instead of hailing Secretary McKay's statement as one which clarifies the relationship of the government to the capitalists who own American industry, and hence to the workers for whom the labor paper is supposed to speak, it denounces him as a "blabbermouth," and suggests that Eisenhower should muzzle him and other administration spokesmen, or at least censor their speeches in order to prevent similar "boners" from being committed in the future. It states that the government represents all the American people, and not just business and industry, and that no one should say anything different.

## ONLY FOR ELECTIONS

Of course, we believe that the American government should represent all the people, and that is why we devote all our efforts to the task of convincing the labor movement to form a political party of its own which could represent all the people, or at least all of those who do something useful and thus contribute to the welfare of American society.

But there is a difference between what should be and what is, and the *Labor News* performs no service in mixing up the two and denouncing people on the other side who, surprisingly enough, admit that the existing government represents only the capitalist class in this country.

Of course, the paper is not even con-

sistent in its attitude. In this it also resembles most of the labor movement. During the last election campaign, when the problem, as the labor leaders saw it, was to keep the Democrats in office at all cost, they were the first to proclaim, just as loudly and vigorously as they could, that Eisenhower and the Republican Party represent "business and industry" and only business and industry. In fact, they went so far overboard on this line as to draw a fundamental distinction between the Democrats and Republicans which does not exist.

## MYTH

Why then does the *Labor News* now condemn Secretary McKay for saying just what the labor movement said before the elections? The answer lies in one of those myths and traditions which prevent people from thinking clearly and consistently on the problems of our society.

It is the myth that the truth may be said only during election campaigns, but that once they are over, all should rally behind the government even though they know that the government does not represent them, but only their economic, social and political enemies. It is the illusion which permits a Durkin to take a post in Eisenhower's cabinet with the approval of the whole labor movement. It is the myth which permits the labor leaders to openly denounce the government and describes its true class nature only at those moments when the government engages in some dramatic and open anti-labor action such as strike-breaking.

For our part, we prefer the old maxim that honesty is the best policy, especially when it comes to telling the people the truth about who rules over whom in whose interests. The labor movement could do worse than to follow the example of LABOR ACTION and of Secretary McKay in this report.

## WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

# Political Kaleidoscope in New York—III

## From the Corruption Scandal To the Election of Halley

This series of articles on "The Political Kaleidoscope in New York City" began with two articles by Walter Barron in the issues of June 8 and 15. Comrade Barron regrets the interruption since then, and resumes the story of New York politics with the incoming of the present Impellitteri administration.—Ed.

By WALTER BARRON

Vincent Impellitteri was voted into City Hall on the one-election "Experience Party" slate, which had no candidate for any office but mayor. In this 1950 election, there were also races for governor, U. S. senator, congressmen, etc., and so, whatever else Impellitteri's victory showed, it clearly revealed that any idea of an automatic machine vote was grossly overrated.

Whatever Impy's personal qualifications were, he was bound to have a rough time. Everything broke in his administration.

The Brooklyn investigation into tie-ups between bookmakers and police reached its apex while he was in office. The Kefauver Committee's televised New York hearings began just a few months after his inauguration. Within his own party, he and his patronage chief, Frank Sampson, neither actively fought the Manhattan Tammany leadership of Carmine De Sapio nor made peace with it, producing an inner-party stalemate. Ultimately, the mayor ran head-on into the long-growing danger of a financial crisis and its associated background of state government dominance over the city's affairs.

### SCANDAL EXPLODES

The Kefauver hearings were most dramatic for the public. It was not so much what they revealed. This special Senate committee was investigating crime, not municipal politics *per se*. Its revelations about New York City politics were not a continuation of the famous "exposures" by state legislative committees that New York has so often witnessed throughout its history and of which the Seabury investigation of the early '30s was the last.

Nor were the crime revelations a response to any widely felt indignation. Unlike the rum-running, gang-warring, extorting mobs of the prohibition era, the contemporary racketeers (even if so many may have been the same people) did not impress most people as highly dangerous "public enemies" responsible for their personal inquiry.

As Costello, Adonis and others were queried before the national audience and the extent of their wealth, power and influence was dramatized, the consciousness that "somebody was getting away with something" was in everybody's parlor. Everything was now public and on the record, and nobody liked it. It did not seem serious enough to mobilize any action, but it did arouse antagonism to anyone who might be considered responsible, and a latent source of support to anyone who might actively oppose it.

For New Yorkers particularly, all this feeling jelled when O'Dwyer came voluntarily from Mexico to take the stand. The former mayor spent the major part of a full day describing his personal history, what his administrations had done for the city, and how racketeers had become "respectable" since the days when he was a cop. But the committee had detailed questions to ask, and Senator Tobey was set to accept O'Dwyer's challenge to change positions and become a witness, with the famous refrain that he did not like a "fourflusher."

### O'DWYER'S TROUBLES

But as the hearing got down to cases, charges, admissions and denials came one after another. Why hadn't O'Dwyer, as Brooklyn district attorney, prosecuted Albert Anastasia, the reputed payoff man of Murder, Inc.? O'D insisted that the case was lost when star witness Abe Reles jumped from a hotel room. The committee did not entirely agree with

that estimate, but nevertheless, concentrated on the more important subject of what had happened to Reles. How did such an important witness get to a window ledge in the presence of a polite guard under the leadership of O'Dwyer's ever-present sidekick, Frank Bals? Why did Bals remove the "wanted cards" on Anastasia shortly afterwards?

From Reles and Anastasia the story worked its way up, as it so often did throughout the hearings, to Frank Costello. O'D admitted his frequent meetings with the racketeer chief. In one case the purpose of the meeting was supposed to be to get Costello's aid in keeping Wright Field "clean" from some racket; in another case the purpose was to discuss party politics in the home of the then Tammany leader, Representative Mike Kennedy. The purposes for other meetings were not so clear, but usually there were the two steady intermediaries present.

One was Irving Sherman, a close friend of both O'Dwyer and Costello, a racketeer who had worked his way into the non-union section of the garment industry. The other was James Moran who, like Bals, was always at O'Dwyer's side through most of his career, and always at important jobs.

### END OF AN ERA

Then came the incident which involved no criminal tie-up but which was the one item that might have produced legal action. John Crane, president of the firemen's union local, testified that he had secretly given union funds to both Moran and O'Dwyer as campaign contributions in 1949, with the hope of "favors" in return for the firemen's organization. (Such were the legal restraints on the activity possible for the firemen's organization that the latter resorted to such clandestine methods in order to try to do something for this group of the city's workers.)

Both Moran and O'Dwyer denied receiving the money. (Crane also mentioned that he had given money to John Crews, Brooklyn Republican leader, for a Dewey primary campaign in 1948, and Crews admitted accepting it.) In the case of Moran and O'Dwyer, since it was merely Crane's word against theirs, nobody has yet been charged with perjury. But New Yorkers, with their antagonism already strong against the former mayor, made their judgment.

There were more details, but the public indictment of O'Dwyer and his aids needed little more.

Moran did get himself into one more tangle when he denied several meetings with an important policy racketeer. The result was his indictment for perjury, removal from a lifetime position with the city Water Department, and his subsequent conviction and imprisonment.

In addition, municipal exposures of a "license" racket in the Fire Department focused on James J. Moran, then a deputy fire commissioner. The result was another indictment, conviction and imprisonment.

The O'Dwyer era was over. There has been no information on what happened to that other "grey eminence," Frank Bals. O'Dwyer himself recently resigned as ambassador to Mexico and is very reluctant to come home.

### THE HALLEY ELECTION

The O'Dwyer era was definitely ended with the corruption scandal that blew up during Impellitteri's administration, but there was no cessation in public revelations.

The Gross trials were something of a fiasco, what with his sudden trip to Atlantic City and his refusal during the trial to point out any more cops; but the trials did ultimately bring up names very high in the Police Department. It was charged that the Fire Department license racket continued even after Moran had left the job, and it was rumored furthermore that its new chief was for a while Impellitteri's righthand man, Frank Sampson.

The men in important city jobs who were known as "Costello men" were not removed. The Manhattan Tammany organ-

ization, even though it was now under the comparatively vigorous leadership of Carmine De Sapio, was at its low point. The administration of Mayor Impellitteri did not have even that show of vigor.

A new municipal election came up in 1951. When Impellitteri became mayor, he had left open his former job of president of the City Council. This necessitated a special election.

The Liberal Party saw its big opening. The sentiment in party ranks and among the leadership agreed that this was the opportunity to get a figure who could crystallize the public resentment and give the organization its first city-wide solo victory, increase its prestige and bargaining power, and even acquire some patronage. They found the person for the task, Rudolph Halley, chief counsel of the Kefauver Committee.

A surprisingly united Democratic Party nominated the man they were probably building up for the mayoralty in the future, their floor leader in the City Council and the author of most municipal legislation, Joseph Sharkey. Sharkey had recently been publicized as the author of a bill to maintain city rent control even if the state removed all such controls.

The Republicans nominated a very conservative congressman from Queens, Henry Latham.

One Democratic district leader broke away and supported Halley—Robert Blaikie, the most forceful of the "new look" bosses. Blaikie had been behind Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. in his successful campaign for congressman against the wishes of the other party leaders. He had, in 1950, campaigned for Impellitteri, then became upset when the mayor and Sampson did little to oust the party leadership. Blaikie has openly admitted his desire to be Manhattan party leader.

But his ambitions go further. With FDR Jr. at his side, his big hope is state leadership with a new Albany administration. Unlike so many party politicians, who either combat or ignore the newer political forces and appeals in the community, Blaikie strives to utilize them. His support of Halley in 1951 was part of that method.

### DEM MACHINE FLOPS

To close observers of the 1951 campaign, something strange showed up. The Democrats, while supposedly out to build up their new municipal figure, just about lay down on the job completely. Their campaign was almost non-existent, except for Sharkey's activity itself. Perhaps they were too unsure of their constituents to want any sizable turnout on election day, and planned to sneak in by keeping the whole thing very quiet.

But both the Liberals and Republicans would not play that way. The Liberal Party's campaign for Halley merely attacked municipal corruption but that proved sufficient this time. Not only did Halley win, but Latham did almost as well as Sharkey.

It must be pointed out that Halley's vote did not come from precisely the same sources as had Impellitteri's the year before. When we examine the districts where these two showed their respective strengths and weaknesses, we see that the picture is often exactly opposite. Undoubtedly there were more basic political attitudes behind the two votes. Yet the margin in each case probably came from those who were basically just angry. Above all, the local Democratic machine was crushed again.

The disfavor into which the Democrats have fallen continues to this day. It is something more organic than previous transient waves of reform.

(Continued next week)

### LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City  
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.

### LONDON LETTER

## Tory Government Smiles at Franco

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, July 15—Last week, for the first time in 16 years, a British ship (the Mermaid), made a "courtesy" visit to Seville in Franco Spain.

Another incident in the unpleasant story of Anglo-Spanish relations was written. The left wing remembers well the Spanish civil war of 1936-39, with nearly two million killed or rendered homeless. Well do we remember the bombing of Guernica, the defense of Catalonia, and the epic glories of the fight against Franco.

Even better do we recall the support that important Conservatives like Lord Salisbury and Lennox-Boyd gave to the fascists.

In those days the Labor Party had strong words to say against Franco. It officially sponsored some aid to the International Brigade, despite the "non-intervention" policy of Hoare and Laval. One of the brigades was called the Major Attlee Division. Little as they could do about it, Labor members were conscious of their historic task. Despite the efforts of many militants and heroes from all parts of the world, despite the efforts of the Stalinists, the fascists and clerics won the day and prepared the way for repression and concentration camps.

### LABOR DIDN'T ACT

During the last war Franco viewed Gibraltar with avid interest, but he did not think it worth while fighting for. He was waiting—as the Russians did in the Japanese war—for the impending fall of his enemy before attacking. Gentle reminders from Hitler and Mussolini of their mutual involvement produced only procrastinating promises.

Spain, he rightly told the other two dictators, was too weak to be involved in another war, but of course any aid he might be able to give to Axis submarines and saboteurs he would only too readily give. British ships were sunk, bombs were found in oranges, mysterious explosions occurred in Gibraltar—and an air of hostility circulated between London and Madrid.

In 1945, however, Labor remembered Spain—at least with the election. It was one of the main planks of their platform. Franco was a Nazi puppet—the Labor Party would help him off the stage. I well remember various functionaries of the International Brigades Association speaking vehemently on Labor's behalf.

When Labor won the election then, the Spanish government in exile breathed a sigh of relief. It waited patiently for some sign of good will. In reply to a question in Parliament in 1946, the late Ernest Bevin, on behalf of the Labor government, said he thought Franco was a despicable man, but proposed no action. Labor had no official representation in Spain and maintained a calm indifference to its regime.

### TRADE AND AID

Later on, in discussions in 1949, 1950 and later, the Labor government maintained its opposition to the enrollment of Spain in NATO. This is the only time the British government has done anything more than express its distaste.

Shortly afterward, it opened trade negotiations with Spain and allowed tourists to travel there. The next step was to exchange ambassadors. This crime was perpetrated by the Labor government shortly before it left office. What is more unfortunate is that even for a capitalist government, the point of official recognition is to facilitate trade. This object had already been obtained by private companies. Ironically enough, Anglo-Spanish trade-renewal talks recently broke down because the Spanish government was using the sterling it earned from Britain to buy goods from Germany, while buying little from the United Kingdom.

The Tories, being hard-headed businessmen, hastened to send Franco a note soon after their arrival in office, assuring him of their best wishes and hoping for greater cooperation between the two countries. The Labor Party sat in opposition guiltily swallowing any objections.

The British government smiles at Franco; the Americans pay him hundreds of millions of dollars for bases; three quarters of a million people have died in Spain since the end of the civil war at the hands of the "most Christian gentleman of Europe"—but what is that to them?

# Senate Outflanks The 5th Amendment

By GORDON HASKELL

The United States Senate has passed another McCarran bill. The purpose of this bill is to deprive witnesses before congressional investigating committees of the right to invoke the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution as a basis for refusing to answer questions of such committees, provided that such witnesses have been granted immunity from criminal prosecution on any matter on which they are compelled to testify.

If this bill is also passed by the House, all witnesses coming before McCarthy or his colleagues who head other committees can be compelled to give the names of all others with whom they have been associated in Stalinist or socialist political activity. Refusal to do so will lay them open to contempt proceedings.

Thus the only alternatives before witnesses who have been given congressional immunity will be either to inform on their present or former associates or to go to jail.

The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, although not repealed, will thus have been undermined to a considerable extent not by the prescribed method of constitutional amendment, but by a simple act of Congress.

There has been a considerable debate in liberal circles over the use of the Fifth Amendment in congressional investigations. It is a well-known fact that in addition to active members of the Communist Party, the privilege against self-incrimination has been invoked by many witnesses who are anti-Stalinists. These people have felt that this is the only method by which they can register a protest against the methods of McCarthy, Jenner and Velde without running the risk of going to jail for contempt, and at the same time protect others who have long since left the CP.

## LIBERAL ARGUMENT

Actually, the consequences of invoking the Fifth Amendment have turned out to be almost as damaging to the individual who has invoked it as would have been an outright refusal to testify and thus an acceptance of the risk of a jail term for contempt. With a few rare exceptions, people in the teaching profession have been suspended and eventually fired from their jobs for using this method of refusing to testify. The effects have been similar for people in the field of art and entertainment. But at least these men and women have refused to subject others to the same inquisition and penalties. Under the new bill it will take a great deal more courage to refuse to testify than it has taken in the past.

As this is written, a survey by the *Christian Science Monitor* has shown that "most of the teachers who refused to answer questions at hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security subcommittee have lost their jobs or are in danger of dismissal." (N. Y. *Times*, July 22.)

Those liberals who have argued against the practice of invoking the Fifth Amendment have done so on one of three grounds. The first is the property of the brand of "liberal" who feels that although some of the things McCarthy has done may be deplorable, the urgency of exposing the Stalinists in this country is such that every "right-thinking" person should be willing to testify, regardless of the consequences for other former Stalinists and because of the consequences for present ones.

The second argument has been on purely legal grounds: that the amendment should be invoked only when there is an actual possible or probable criminal prosecution in the offing, and not as a legal device for refusal to turn informer. All that can be said about this position is that its advocates greatly underestimate the scope which the witch-hunt has already achieved, and are sadly deficient in their understanding of the scope it may achieve when they attack the witnesses for improper invocation of the protection against self-incrimination on the basis of narrowly conceived technical legal grounds.

## NO PROTEST

The third argument is on the grounds of effectiveness. Its advocates claim that invoking the Fifth Amendment is not an effective way of combating the committees and their procedures, as the witness who does so is prevented from using the forum of the committee to attack it. Included in this argument is the view that in the present political atmosphere in the country anyone invoking the Fifth Amendment is immediately assumed by the public at large to be a Stalinist, and when this procedure is used by non-Stalinists it tends to make the number of Stalinists appear to be far greater than it actually is, and thus to lend substance to the charge that there is a major domestic Stalinist menace which has to be combated by McCarthyite techniques.

It is necessary to point out that all these views advocated by liberals, regardless of the intentions of their advocates, have made the problem appear so complex, difficult and technical that to date no strong liberal protest has been organized against the abrogation of the RIGHT of invoking the Fifth Amendment contained in the bill passed by the Senate.

Whatever opinion we may hold—from the point of view not of the Stalinists but of their labor, liberal and socialist enemies—of the wisdom of invoking the amendment as a blanket means of non-cooperation with the committees, it is absolutely certain that if this bill becomes law it will be used in time against those very liberal, labor and socialist groups which today are failing to wage a major campaign against its passage.

## NEEDS DEFENSE

It is a matter of simple human decency and integrity for a man or woman to refuse to subject others to congressional inquisition, loss of job and livelihood, and general persecution in the community because of the political views which they hold or have held. It should be noted that in the vast majority of cases the congressional investigations have not dealt with any criminal activity such as espionage. They are part of an attempt to transform into legal crimes activities which are considered perfectly legal in every other political democracy in the world, and which were equally legal here prior to the passage of the infamous Smith Act. And even under this act it has been held that only individuals, and not organizations or their general memberships, are liable. Yet it is quite clear that people who are innocent before the law (as is every citizen before he is found guilty) are condemned and convicted by employers and the public once their names have been mentioned before these committees.

We might prefer that every witness be a hero and take the risk of going to jail for contempt, if need be, rather than invoke the Fifth Amendment. As far as the amendment itself is concerned, it must be defended and upheld, like every other aspect of the democratic tradition in this country. For that tradition, and the possibility of social change contained in it, is neither self-perpetuating nor self-expanding. It can only be preserved and expanded by people who are willing to struggle against the social forces which are seeking to undermine and pervert it into an instrument of repression.

## From the STALINIST JUNGLE

### The Russification Drive on Folk-Dancing

In the Stalinization of culture in the satellite countries, the folk dance has been a refractory element. By nature, it is "nationalistic," and therefore dangerous. On the one hand the Stalinists wish to exploit its roots in native tradition to carry a propaganda message, but it is a little difficult for a folk dance to carry the weight of a social message which is merely imposed on it.

Instead of revising the forms, then, the attempt has been made to revise the occasion and substance of the dance. The Stalinists have tried (1) to take the dance out of its national and ethnic context and put it into a party setting; (2) to Russify the native dances as they have tried to Russify all other aspects of culture; and (3) to isolate the dance from Western influences.

The second effort takes the usual forms. For example, the Bulgarian daily *Otechestven Front* (Sofia) for January 18 related that the formation of its own State Folk Ensemble was inspired by the example of two Russian teams, *Pyatnitsky* and *Igor Moiseev*, in fact "formed in imitation of these two teams," it says frankly. "Bulgarian dance and song groups, after the Soviet pattern, are striving toward a multiple, politically acute, progressive repertoire which educates the working people to high patriotism and devotion to the Fatherland, love for the Soviet Union and for the great Stalin. . . ."

The Rumanian cultural monthly *Femeia* (Bucharest) wrote in its April 1950 issue of a dance competition in the Ouasu region: the Rumanian folk dances were performed; then Hungarians presented the czardas—hearty applause. "All of a sudden, a few dancers came forward in Soviet folk dress. The wave of enthusiasm was endless. . . . The dancers were full of grace and we could not stop admiring them. . . ."

In the Baltic countries, more and more Russian elements have been introduced into the native folk dances. Estonian girl dancers are made to look Russian with high black boots, full short sleeves, high necks and Russian-type head-dresses.

The Estonian cultural magazine *Sickle and Hammer* (Tallinn) for January 20, 1951 announced a plan for popularizing Russian dances "to counteract the tendency to adhere to Western dances." Of course, the Estonians have beautiful folk dances of their own, but the masters seem to figure that if they want foreign dances, they'll take the Russian and like it. The magazine, however, complained: In other Soviet countries the problem of ballroom dance repertoire is solved by wide use of Soviet Russian dances, but in the People's Houses of Culture of our republic adherence to Western dances still prevails."

*Vecherni Novini* (Sofia) reported on April 16, 1952 that the Bulgarian Committee for Science, Art and Culture was seeking to replace "the degenerate Western European dances with popular Soviet folk dances and ancient ballroom dances." "In the meantime," it continued, "new national ballroom dances are being created."

But while the people love their own dances, and no doubt would be interested even in Russian dances in small doses, not everyone can take it. Thus the following appeared in the Polish Catholic weekly *Tygodnik Powszechny* (Cracow) for January 11, 1953:

" . . . The new Year's night dance is nice, very nice, but there is one thing wrong: the whirling dances. Just think of it—one has to whirl the whole night

long. . . Am I, ladies and gentlemen, a bumble bee? And besides, how can I, at my age, perform this hard work of whirling? Sometimes the dance program included 20 waltzes, 15 polkas, 3 obereks—only two slower dances—for a well deserved rest. You should, have seen the dangers! They were perspiring like steamboats; ladies would refresh themselves with fans and gallons of lemonade until finally they fainted altogether. Waltzes, polkas, obereks, kujawiaks—and, only one per hour, a tango. Even a horse would give up. . . . And therefore I appeal for more 'walking and sliding' dances. Let us have again a few fox-trots, a bit of slowfox, a soupçon of the rumba. Let a dull old man like myself have a little bit of fun too. . . ."

## Sex Is Cosmopolitan

The Hungarian paper *Szabad Ifjusag* for last December 14 discovers sexual cosmopolitanism:

"The reactionaries try to push the youth into an immoral life. Very often one finds among the youth a certain cynicism on sexual problems. They have a tendency to take things lightly and to take no account of the consequences of their actions. That is why there are so many illegitimate children among us. . . . It is clear that we have to struggle against these manifestations of hostile cosmopolitanism. . . ."

## Counter-Revolutionary

In the light of the recent East German uprising, it is interesting to recall that on January 5 the Stalinist organ *Neues Deutschland* published a news item about an enemy of the people who had been given eight years in prison for chalking the word freedom on a wall.

The curious aspect of the official announcement was that it presented an argument specifically denouncing the slogan Freedom as counter-revolutionary: "The word 'freedom' by itself," it reasoned, "is not tendentious; but in this case, this word is used by the imperialist warmongers and serves the ends of war against the German people and therefore menaces the peace."

## The New Look

*Challenge* prints one of those anti-Moscow jokes which, in this case, serves as a commentary on the talk about Stalinist "liberalization" under Beria.

It seems that right after the death of Stalin, Beria ordered all MVD men to observe a maximum degree of politeness in relations with people. One day someone sneezed loudly in a Moscow railroad station waiting room. An MVD official stalked up and asked menacingly: "Who sneezed?"

Everyone fell into a frightened silence. "Who sneezed?" roared the MVD man. You could hear teeth clattering in fright. "WHO SNEEZED?" he bellowed.

The people around began whispers to persuade an old man sitting in the corner to say it was he: "Come on, grandpa, why you're an old man and because of the amnesty they couldn't get you." Finally the old man gave in: "It. . . it. . . was me, dear comrade."

"Bless you," said the MVD man with the required politeness and walked away.

## GET ACQUAINTED with Independent Socialism

For further information and literature, write to the Independent Socialist League, 114 West 14 St., N. Y. 11, N. Y.

Subscribe to  
**LABOR ACTION**  
Only \$2 a year.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books; publication date July 29:

*Growing Up in New Guinea*, by Margaret Mead, Mentor, 35¢. *Sartoris*, by William Faulkner, Signet Giant, 35¢. *Invisible Man*, by Ralph Ellison, Signet Double, 50¢. *I Take This Woman*, by Georges Simenon, 25¢. *Wives and Husbands*, by David Duncan, 25¢. *Bugle's Wake*, by Curt Brandon, 25¢. *To End the Night*, by Alex Gaby, 25¢. *Death in the Fifth Position*, by Edgar Box, 25¢. *Trigger Vengeance*, by B. M. Bower, 25¢. *Submarine!* by Comdr. E. L. Beach, Signet Giant, 35¢.



## LABOR ACTION

July 27, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 30

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Asst. Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

"VPERED" DISCUSSES THE SITUATION—

# In the Ukraine After the Death of Stalin

*Vpered*, the organ of the Marxist wing of the Ukrainian emigration (Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party), has increased its frequency to regular monthly issuance because of the great importance of recent events in the Russian empire. In order to do this, it has cut down its number of pages to 8 and has eliminated the page of English summary. Two issues of the new monthly *Vpered* are now out—May and June—and they contain much interesting material.

First, some news about the UPA, the anti-Stalinist underground partisans in the Ukraine.

**A letter has been received from the UPA, signed collectively by its high command, definitely repudiating the claims of Bandera to "leadership of the Ukrainian underground." Bandera is an émigré nationalist whose pretensions on this score have been given some credence in the American press. His pretensions are false, says the UPA, and adds that Bandera has nothing in common with them programmatically and ideologically.**

The *Banderovtzy* are fascists, they say, and differ fundamentally with the social ideas of the UPA, which stands for socialization of the means of production in a democratic classless society. The *Banderovtzy* stand openly for the restoration of capitalism and for capitalist intervention.

The other piece of news is not welcome. It was announced that P. Poltava had died in battle with the Russian forces at the beginning of 1952. Poltava, whose name is known to readers of LABOR ACTION from previous articles on the Ukrainian underground, was a leading political writer for the right wing (non-Marxist, nationalist wing) of the UPA; but we must recall that this non-Marxist wing of the UPA stands foursquare on its anti-capitalist program, even if not as advanced in its ideas as the Marxists.

## Ukrainians and Jews

One of the most interesting articles in the new issues of *Vpered* is by Vs. Felix, on the political situation in the Ukraine following the death of Stalin. Following is a summary:

In January (before Stalin's death), at the 15th Komsomol (Young Communist) Congress of the Ukraine, a campaign was launched against "Ukrainian and Jewish nationalists." At this congress, it was officially recognized that a part of the Ukrainian Komsomol youth is under the influence of the Ukrainian nationalists. Several factual reports appeared in the official press stating that, especially in the Western Ukraine, certain leading Komsomol members have been members of the nationalist underground. Among the workers of Kryvy Rog, a big industrial city of Central Ukraine, the nationalists spread their agitation and committed "certain anti-state acts." The press reported the same from Bukovina on the southern border.

During the month of February, the press waged a vigorous campaign against "Jewish and Ukrainian nationalists." Felix quotes scores of papers to this effect, and he draws the very interesting conclusion that the regime intertwined the campaign against Ukrainian nationalism with the campaign against the Jews (as related to the case of the Kremlin Jewish doctors). It never separated the two. The drive was constantly waged in terms of an attack on "Jewish and Ukrainian nationalism," inextricably associated.

Several leading members of the Ukrainian Communist Party were expelled because they had Jewish relatives. For example, the secretary of the Keiv *oblast* committee, Hryza, was expelled because of his brother-in-law, Rakin, who was a Jew and also himself a member of the *oblast* party committee.

The press also attacked many Ukrainian doctors in the Ministry of Health and in several *oblast* medical groups, on the ground that they had protected Jewish doctors and concealed the latter's "crimes."

Other facts were quoted: Public opposition to the persecution of the Jewish doctors came from Ukrainian doctors of higher standing in the party hierarchy. Ukrainian lawyers were criticized for defending Jews in the courts.

When Stalin died on March 6, the Ukrainian CP press, during the first half of March, began to emphasize the person of Malenkov; party committees in the Ukraine sent messages addressed per-

sonally to Malenkov with the same kind of eulogistic fustian as used to be sent to Stalin. It is indicated that the local bureaucrats thought that nothing had changed. However, for about three weeks of the month of March the propaganda "against Jewish and Ukrainian nationalism" ceased; then in the last week of March the line was restored, and the papers gradually again began to criticize and thunder against these "sins."

No doubt the Ukrainian people were especially confused by the issues of both leading Ukrainian papers on April 5: here, on the third page was a big article attacking Jewish doctors and connecting them with the Ukrainian nationalists; but on the second page was the official announcement of the release of the Jewish Kremlin doctors!

After the release of the Jewish doctors, the propaganda against "Jewish nationalism" ceased. Early in April the papers began to stress the necessity of struggle "against all nationalisms," but without specifically mentioning Ukrainian nationalism.

On April 17, an especially interesting development showed up. The Ukrainian press carried an article commemorating the 30th anniversary of the 12th Congress of the Russian Communist Party. Now this congress was noteworthy for the fact that, with regard to its decisions on the question of nationalities, the line was significantly influenced by Skrypnik, a Ukrainian Old Bolshevik later purged for "nationalism." The commemorative article that now appeared in the press made the statement (for the first time in many, many years) that at the time of the 12th Congress the main danger was Great-Russian chauvinism. It ended very suggestively: "Until this very day, the resolutions of the 12th Congress teach us to struggle against all kinds of bourgeois ideology."

It is interesting to note that no commemorative article on the 12th Congress appeared in the Russian press, especially *Pravda*. Thus Stalin's "orphans" tried to conceal or underplay any question of change in their nationalities policy. In actuality, the change was evidenced only by the fact that attacks against Ukrainian nationalism disappeared. But propaganda for Great-Russian chauvinism did not stop, and the Ukrainian controlled press continue to emphasize the leader-

ship of the "great brother," Russia's influence on Ukrainian culture, etc.

## Melnikov's Fall

An editorial in the June issue comments on the post-Stalin course in the Ukraine, also. Taking up the fall of Melnikov, the Russian boss of the Ukraine, it argues that this move did not represent any basic change in Moscow's nationality policy but was simply a concession to the Ukrainians which had been forced by pressure and the new weakness of the regime.

For the first time, the Ukrainian CP got Ukrainians to head it; but, as *Vpered's* editorial says, "Kirichenko, the new head of the Ukrainian party, is not Skrypnik, who could fight against the whole Politburo in Moscow, and Kornichuk, a well-known contemporary Ukrainian writer, is not Khvylovy, who had the courage to raise the slogan 'Away from Moscow!'"

## URDP Program

An article in the May issue by Eugene Burshtinsky, secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party, lays its stress on the continuing class structure of the USSR and emphasizes that the change toward a "collective dictatorship" takes place within the framework of the ruling class. He scouts the possibility of revolution-from-above; a real transformation of the class structure can come only from a real revolution of the workers. But with the death of Stalin, he writes, the bureaucratic class has gotten more freedom from the terror of the party apparatus; therefore, new frictions within the class are possible.

He restates the basic ideas of the URDP:

"We are not going to revise the principles of our political line, namely, that (1) the USSR is a class, exploitive, imperialist state; (2) that revolution in the USSR is the only and inevitable road to a classless democracy; and (3) that this revolution can be achieved from the position of the Third Force."

## Economists' Demands

Another article by Vs. Felix, "The Economists' Opposition," discusses some questions raised by the tendencies revealed in Stalin's last "theoretical" work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*.

According to Felix's view, there have been two groups of economists who demanded reforms in the economy. The "left-wing" group, headed by Yaroshenko (who had been subjected to criti-

cism in Stalin's work) spoke up in favor of the liquidation of commodity relations in industry and of the strengthening of the whole planning system. The "right-wing" group, headed by Venzher, stood for extending commodity relations from industry to agriculture, by selling the Machine Tractor Stations (MTS) to the collective farms. It appears from Stalin's discussion that the former group consists of young communists who grew up under the Stalinist system.

Felix states that this group was connected with the ex-head of the State Planning Commission (Gosplan), Voznesensky. In this debate, Stalin took a kind of middle-of-the-road position, in fact accepting Yaroshenko's views but, at the same time, criticizing him as a "Bukharinist," "anti-Leninist," etc. He agreed that in the future it will be necessary to transform commodity relations into a direct product-exchange between industry and agriculture.

But Stalin's authority disappeared with his death. The followers of Yaroshenko and Voznesensky immediately started a new discussion on economics in the press. By the end of March he demanded the immediate destruction of commodity relations, the liquidation of the compulsory deliveries from the collective farms to the state, payment in kind by collective farms to the MTS, etc.

Ostryanyn based these demands indirectly on the fact that Stalin had not specified what he meant by commodity relations in agriculture. It had seemed to everyone that Stalin was actually speaking only of abolishing the so-called kolkhoz market, which represents only a very small segment of the agricultural economy, but that he did not reject the idea that the compulsory deliveries to state and MTS are not commodities. Ostryanyn then asserts that these are commodities and they must be abolished.

After the publication of this article, several reports appeared in the press to the effect that collective-farm peasants favored Ostryanyn's demands. Similar articles and ideas on such economic reforms appeared in other papers all over the USSR.

Felix also points out that the followers of Yaroshenko and Voznesensky captured the State Planning Commission in the course of the post-Stalin shakeup of the government. The present head of the Gosplan, G. Kosyachenko, who came into this post in March, is an old friend of Voznesensky's and former editor of the Gosplan's central organ, *Planned Economy*. In 1951 Kosyachenko was relieved of his editorial post and was sharply criticized in February 1953 for following Voznesensky's views. Felix draws the conclusion that a strong group of this tendency is now making its way in post-Stalin politics.

## SPOTLIGHT on the Week

Continued from page 1

to boggle at imperfections when larger differences are at stake. What we would like to see him do is figure out a good case for taking a Third Camp position in this hypothetical conflict between Big Brother and the Kremlin.

## Oysterette System

All this pertains to the question of how McCarthy has already won a permanent victory in head-fixing ideologists like Sidney Hook, who is an indignant opponent of the senator. Appalled by McCarthyism, Hook has settled for "merely" witchhunting CP teachers out of the school system. But he doesn't stop there because he can't. In actual practice, most teachers in a city like New York, for example, have been fired because they refused to answer questions about their political beliefs. The Hook principle of "Fire CP teachers" then becomes "Fire teachers who refuse to answer such questions." Then he is faced with the problem

of how to find out whether a teacher is a CPer, and he is forced to lean on the stoolpigeon-and-informer system. Thus the principle becomes one of police surveillance over the profession.

Next step in the "fight against McCarthyism"?

There was the case in May of Dr. Thomas Little, assistant professor of biology at the University of Nevada and vice-president of the school chapter of the American Association of University Professors. The attorney for the Regents charged that the AAUP held the viewpoint that membership in the Communist Party should not be automatic ground for dismissal. Dr. Little, a Republican, was vice-president of this group's local chapter.

The attorney therefore concluded that "serving as an officer of an organization with the stupid policy it shows toward communism, a policy it has reaffirmed, militates against his [Little's] fitness as a teacher."

Why not? Shall we permit men to teach our children who believe that Communists should be permitted to teach our children? Furthermore: shall we permit men to teach our children who believe that men should be permitted to teach our children who believe that Communists should be permitted to teach our children?

To put it in terms of heavy theory again, we recall the picture on the well-known box of Oysterettes, which shows a man eating from a box of Oysterettes, on which box is a picture. . . .

Sidney Hook, we hasten to add in all fairness, is only on his first box of Oysterettes.

Get acquainted with the  
**SOCIALIST YOUTH  
LEAGUE**

Write to the SYL at  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

# How the Historic 'June Days' Were

By GUSTAVE STERN

The unthinkable took place in East Berlin and East Germany: the working class of a totalitarian country, where 30 Russian divisions are stationed, where the Communist Party disposes of all the levers of control, revolted against an implacable dictatorship, left the plants and building-yards, invaded the streets and public places, to cry out their anger and demand—what? Higher wages? No: to demand freedom.

Has the meaning of this event been completely realized? This exploit was accomplished by a working class which suffered through 12 years of the Hitler regime, war, and eight years of the "People's" regime and the Soviet occupation.

[The article then summarizes the period of the Stalinization of East Germany as an introduction to describing the June days—Ed.]

The June events were, of course (as we are going to explain) an elementary, spontaneous explosion. Yet small, almost imperceptible signs heralded the revolt.

During the first days of June, *Neues Deutschland*, the central organ of the Communist Party, and *Tägliche Rundschau*, the paper put out by the Soviet occupation authorities, were filled with reports on discussions inside the factories, always on the question of the "work norms." The working class's discontent over the inhuman exploitation, over the Soviet-model Stakhanovism, over the overtime work, had become so strong that the Communist party was obliged to take note of it at meetings and in the press.

## First, Grumbles

Thus one could read in every paper of the Eastern Zone that the workers were "grumbling" in Leipzig and Halle, in Magdeburg and Jena, working-class centers where the old Social-Democracy had formerly been entrenched in impregnable bastions, where Rosa Luxemburg had exercised a dominating influence. One could read that the workers of a plant in Leipzig had declared: "It is a shame that 70 years after the death of Karl Marx we are forced to demand decent living conditions!" These words, which were taken up everywhere to some degree, were uttered at a time when the most elementary food necessities were lacking, because of the collectivization policy, because of the frantic pace of industrialization, and also because everything was being subordinated to rearmament.

The Communists did not understand this "hobbyhorse" of the workers—the "norms." The Leipzig workers were told by responsible Communists—"Don't you understand that these factories are your own, that for the first time in your lives, you are working for your own interests and for the wellbeing of your children?"

At the beginning of June, when the Communist authorities, following out Soviet orders, decreed the end of "bolshevization" in the Eastern Zone (from all the evidence, in order to launch a new policy on the question of German unity, a question we cannot deal with here), the workers seized the pretext of the apparent relaxation of the pressure to protest more boldly against the "infernal speedup."

## "We Are All Going"

Thus the "June days" began. On June 14 the paper of the Communist party, *Neues Deutschland*, attacked the "irresponsibles" who were trying "to force the building-trades men in Stalinalee to increase the work norms," in spite of the measures that had been decreed. The paper declared that this was a typical example "of a false policy which has to be brought to an end!" At the same time, *Neues Deutschland* pointed to "some partial strikes" among the workers of Stalinalee, an immense artery where gigantic buildings were being constructed in the purest Soviet neo-classic style.

On the morning of June 16, the norms having been once again raised, the workers of a small building-yard, consisting of 100 men, met

LABOR ACTION has already carried a great deal of material on the East German workers' uprising against Stalinism, but we think that the account by Gustave Stern is of special interest in its vivid account of the June Days. Reservation can be held on some of his interpretations—for example, the connection with the Social-Democrats which he sees, and the completely spontaneous and unorganized character of the actions—but the picture he presents adds much to our knowledge. The article is translated from the current issue of *Révolution Proletarienne*.—Ed.

to protect against "this new intolerable measure." The responsible officials of the building "union," frightened by the turn that events were taking, ran up to preach "calm." One of the secretaries of the "union" suggested a "friendly approach" to the authorities in order to "get satisfaction."

But the reaction of the workers was unexpected: "We are all going there!" was the unanimous cry of the workers at this building, and immediately they set out to march to the central office of the Ministry of Reconstruction. En route they were joined by all the workers of Stalinalee. It was the beginning of the revolt.

## Socialists Take the Lead

Here we must stress this point: the demonstration in Stalinalee took shape on the morrow of governmental measures decreeing the end of forced "bolshevization"; it was directed, at bottom, against measures (increase in the work norms) which no longer corresponded to the "line" and which were due to the initiative of some "backward" elements who, dazzled by bolshevization, had not yet mentally grasped that the "turn" was to be made with dizzying rapidity. The demonstration was directed against a government which was already in retreat but which yet engaged in provocations through a part of the apparatus.

The curious thing about this June 16 was this: The Stalinalee workers down tools, imitated here and there by some steel plants which set up strike committees, following the example of the construction workers. Significant fact: the responsible leaders of the strike committees are for the most part workers known as social-democrats, as partisans of the "traitor" Ollenhauer [leader of the West German Social-Democratic Party], enemy No. 1 of Chancellor Adenauer's regime. June 16 confirms that the influence of the Social-Democracy is dominant in the eastern sector of Berlin.

It likewise confirms that the demonstration, which has begun as a demonstration against the "infernal speedup," soon takes on a political character. The Stalinalee workers dare to shout: "Down with the Ulbricht-Grotewohl government!" On the other hand, not a word against the Russians. The "people's" police are bewildered and let things go: no one opposes the workers' march, now numbering 4000, which arrives before the central construction office. A delegation is received by the "director" who promises everything: "Go back to work; you will get satisfaction!"

## "It Is Time to Make an End . . ."

A "curious day," we said. The workers, in fact, go back to work. But back in the building-yards they start to discuss; the discussion rapidly takes a political turn and ends with the conclusion: "Tomorrow we will see!"

And on June 17—memorable date—the Stalinalee workers assemble before their building-yards. Everywhere, in front of groups of 100 and 200 workers, mostly youth well-known to their fellow workers get up on ladders and boxes and make speeches:

"Comrades!" says a young socialist, respected by his comrades, well known for his courage, "it is time to make an end of it. The government of the Grotewohls and Ulbrichts has betrayed the working class. We demand the unification of Germany, the end of slavery, and free elections!"

Thunder of applause! All over Stalinalee, innumerable speakers—not "provocateurs" but

workers well known to their comrades—pick up these words of the young socialist. Suddenly thousands of workers, dressed in their working clothes, sally out in a march toward Leipzigerstrasse, where the "People's" government buildings are located. All along, wherever they pass construction workers, they are joined by other workmen who quit work.

The women and youth begin to make placards and flags—black, red, gold: the emblem of the old Weimar Republic and of the federal republic at Bonn. Need one be surprised? The workers do not want to be confused with those who "under the reign of the red flag" have imposed the regime of slavery. But here and there are seen on the flags the "three arrows," under whose sign the Social-Democracy of the Weimar Republic conducted its fight against the Nazi hordes.

## Red Henningsdorf

By the time the workers get to the government buildings, they number tens of thousands. The "people's" police fall back; some of the policemen openly take flight and quickly get rid of their uniforms: it is a stampede. But some detachments remain loyal; they prevent the workers from getting into the government buildings to get hold of the Ulbrichts and the Grotewohls.

Meantime, the workers of the steel plants, especially those of Henningsdorf in the Soviet zone, have heard the news and downed tools. Henningsdorf, in the suburbs of Berlin, is traditionally "red." There it is that in 1931-32 the Communist Party had its most solid fortress. These were the workers who had chased the Nazis out of the factories and daily fought against the brown hordes. The sons of these workers, rich in the experience of eight years, went out on strike, but now against the Communists:

And there it is: a fantastic march by 8000 workers, in their working clothes, across the French sector of Berlin, chanting slogans: "Freedom! Free elections! We don't want to be slaves!"

A fact to be noted: the responsible officials of the Communist "cells" in the plants have disappeared, and the majority of the members of the "party" are marching at the side of their comrades, carried along by the revolutionary élan of the crowd.

On Leipzigerstrasse, in Potsdamerplatz, on the Wilhelmstrasse, there are now 40,000 chanting the old chants of the working-class movement: "Brüder, zur Sonne, zur Freiheit!" —Brothers! toward the sun, toward freedom!

It is revolution; it is the revolt of a whole people known for their sense of discipline; it is the most amazing manifestation of human dignity; it is open struggle against the Communist power.

## "You Are Not Our Comrade"

The People's Police are incapable of standing in the way of their will; they are powerless against this human sea which swirls about them, against these demonstrators who carry their placards high ("Down with the Grotewohl government! We want freedom!"), enthusiastic and determined. The police call for reinforcement; they have lost the battle. They begin to fire on the crowd, who draw back at first, only to advance again.

All the streets of East Berlin are black with people, workers who are on strike, merchants who feed the demonstrators. Isn't this the way that Lenin defined a "revolutionary situation"? The Communist government no longer exists. The CP headquarters are sacked and burned. The party officials have vanished. Only one of them, Minister Selbmann, dares to leave a government building. He gets up on a platform to speak to the workers: "Comrades—" But before he can go on, he is interrupted by the cry, repeated from a thousand throats: "You are not our comrade! You have betrayed us! We want freedom!" Selbmann quickly returns to

# Launched by East Berlin Workers

his office, and a construction worker takes the floor to make a speech to the workers.

There was only one thing to do to meet this situation: the call to arms. The Soviets did not hesitate. Suddenly tanks roll up, menacing, and the crowd falls back step by step. Young workers, courageous and determined, begin to bombard them with stones and pieces of metal. The Soviet soldiers fire, cries ring out, men fall.

Up to now (we are writing this article on June 23), the number of dead and wounded in East Berlin is not known exactly; but in West Berlin alone, where the demonstrators dragged them, 16 workers lie dead of their wounds; and hundreds of people were wounded. The Soviet leaders immediately understood the scope of the events: if they had not intervened, it would have been the end of the regime, the fall of the Communist government, whose leaders were isolated from the masses and whose determined people could have liberated themselves from their chains by their own strength, given no outside intervention.

On June 17 and 18, in spite of the tanks, in spite of the dead and wounded, the battle continues: everywhere photos of the "well-beloved leaders" are torn down, everywhere the files of the "party" are burned; the SED [Stalinist party] offices are burned; it is the end of the "Sedistan Republic," an end made symbolic by the courageous action of two young workers who climb up the Brandenburg Gate, on the border of the Western and Eastern sectors, to tear down the Soviet flag, symbol of slavery.

**And the whole city is on strike. In all the factories, strike committees have been named and formed, for the most part, of socialist workers and comrades known to be determined enemies of the Stalinists.**

## "To the Jails!"

While the Berlin events were played, so to speak, on a public stage, before the eyes of all the Berliners of the Western sectors, the revolt over the whole Eastern zone can be reconstructed only from information that came to Berlin. We will note only that part of the reports which could be checked and whose authenticity cannot be contested.

In Magdeburg, a working-class city, an old fortress of trade-unionism and the Social-Democracy, all the workers downed tools about 2 o'clock in the afternoon, when, alerted no one knows how, they learned of the events in Berlin. Here again: election of strike committees in the factories, hurried manufacture of placards ("Down with the government! We want freedom!"), and—a march by ten thousand workers on the party headquarters, which is taken by storm. The leaders of the Communist Party are given a thrashing and abused, the station is occupied, and then suddenly comes the cry: "To the jails!" Then, a memorable liberation of the political prisoners who, carried on the crowd's shoulders, join the demonstration!

The Soviet troops, having received no instructions, do not budge, at least at this time.

In Halle, the city where the "Leuna" plants are located, where in 1920-21 revolutionary movements were touched off: street demonstrations, general downing of tools, liberation of political prisoners. At this time we cannot get confirmation of the rumor that the "Leuna" factories were burnt down. The *Leipziger Volksstimme*, the Communist party's paper, admitted, "The building workers and workers of other branches of industry have gone on strike!" And the Communist paper wrote that on June 20!

## "Pretty Much Everywhere"

"In Halle," writes the *Neues Deutschland*, central organ of the CP, "fascist hooligans attacked the headquarters of the Communist Party!" The minister of railroads of the Soviet zone, Roman Chwalek, admits: "There were

acts of sabotage pretty much everywhere in Thuringia!" We learn from him, besides, that "the management of the railroads in Magdeburg was taken by storm and sacked!" What this minister does not say, but what can now be affirmed with complete certainty, is that on June 17, 18 and 19 there was a general strike on the railroads throughout the Soviet zone.

At Stralsund the leaders of the Communist Party were jailed; at Gera (Thuringia) the police offices were taken by storm; at Görlitz the railroad station was seized by the strikers; at Leipzig 15,000 workers demonstrated in the streets and sacked the party headquarters; over "the whole Democratic Republic," we read in a proclamation of the Communist party on the 21st, "workers' clubs, apprenticeship houses and workers' canteens have been burned down!" It is a likely story, isn't it, that the demonstrators took to the "workers' canteens"? At Chemnitz and Erfurt, the demonstrators occupied the Communist Party headquarters (Chemnitz was baptized "Karl Marx City" recently . . .).

Let us not continue the enumeration of details: future historians, possessing all the details of this popular explosion, will doubtless give us precious information which will permit us to get a better picture than we have at present of the ups and downs of this *proletarian revolution*.

## Revolutionary Situation

From today on we must draw conclusions from the June days.

This first of all: it is not necessary to take into serious consideration the Stalinist "argument" that "a gang of conspirators" succeeded in inciting hundreds of thousands of workers to revolt. If that were true, it would in any case be a confession that the Stalinist regime is rotted through to an unheard-of extent!

Then too, the "explanation" that the workers were encouraged "from the top," that is, by the Soviet leaders, to demonstrate and even to get rid of the Communist leaders is also not deserving of consideration: the events themselves constitute a very clear refutation.

**And we know that "over the whole Democratic Republic," the people hunted down the Communist leaders, liberated the political prisoners, organized a general strike.**

**What is amazing about this workers' revolt is that the picture is extremely simple—one is tempted to say, simplistic: it is the kind of situation described by Lenin where "the governments confess themselves incapable of going on in the same way and the people no longer stand for being ruled in the same way." When the "people's" regime announced on June 12 that "bolshevization" was ending, that forced collectivization had ceased, that the work norms would be lowered, the working class immediately and instinctively understood that these steps, although they were dictated by Soviet foreign-policy considerations, were a confession of the bankruptcy of a regime which rested solely on Russian tanks. It was after the publication of these measures that the first open demands were heard, that the first localized strikes broke out.**

## The Movement Is Alive

The question has been raised, legitimately: "Why didn't these workers revolt against the Hitler regime, since they have just proved that they were capable of it?" The answer seems to us very simple: the Hitler regime had solid bases in the population, even in a part of the working class; its mass organizations were something real; on the contrary, the Stalinist regime in East Germany always was, and is, a bluff, and only that. Politically the workers of the Eastern zone lived their own lives during these eight years of the "people's" regime; the

slogans touched them only very superficially; the "mass organizations" of course had adherents (forced adherents), but only some thousands of Stalinist functionaries sought to put a breath of life into them.

As we said, the Stalinist rulers in Germany could not establish that *monopoly on information and news* that the Communists possess in the other satellite countries of Soviet Russia; West Berlin is there, a Berlin that courageously resisted the Soviet blockade, which nourishes a strong socialist and free trade-union movement, and which has shown itself capable, in spite of the Iron Curtain, of sending a message of hope and fraternity to the workers of the Eastern zone.

But this explanation, however important, is still insufficient. The course of events in East Berlin and in the Eastern zone proved that no illegal organization was at the head of the demonstrations and strikes. Those who took the initiative, in the outbreak of the strikes as well as the demonstrations, were trade-unionists and socialists, without any material support other than the will of the workers to free themselves of the slavedrivers.

**The revolt in Berlin and East Germany is the spontaneous uprising of hundreds of thousands of workers. Take the example of the steel workers of Henningsdorf: when two workers arrived from Stalinalee to bring the news to their steelworker comrades, it was sufficient for a single worker, a young socialist, to cry: "We are going there!" for 8000 workers to set out on the march!**

Everywhere, in all the cities of the Eastern zone, things happened in the same way: in Leipzig, in Halle, in Jena, among the "Leuna" workers. Monatte and Rosmer [the editors of the *Révolution Proletarienne*] know that it was practically in these cities that the German workers movement was forged. And the June days supplied proof that in Berlin, in Saxony and Thuringia the workers' movement remains alive, beyond all expectations.

## They Wait to Hear from Us

And that is the hope that remains, in spite of the summary executions, in spite of the draconic sentences imposed on those who feared neither the "people's" police nor the Soviet tanks. Another hope inspires us: isn't it certain that the bases of the "popular democracies" in all the satellite countries is hardly more solid than in Germany? The events in Czechoslovakia prove this, from all the evidence. And doesn't this fact open up perspectives which could hardly have been believed before the June days? Has it not been proved that the "liberation" of the satellite countries is possible otherwise than by war? Has it not been proved that a firm policy by the Western powers, joined with moral and material solidarity with the oppressed people, can hasten the process of dissolution in the Soviet camp?

This is one side, an important side of the problem. But what is more important, meanwhile, for the free workers' movement as a whole is the fact that Stalinism, modern totalitarianism, has not succeeded in destroying the workers' movement and its traditions. The cry of "Freedom" was accompanied during the memorable days of June 17-18 by the cry of "Solidarity!" The workers were in solidarity: that was what was fundamental, while the totalitarian regime had striven for eight years to destroy their class-consciousness, to erase every feeling of solidarity, to atomize the will of the working class.

**All of us hang over the radio, anxiously awaiting news. We are likewise anxious to know the reaction of the workers' movement of France [AND OF AMERICA!—Ed.]. Don't say "nothing can be done for them," that the repression will in any case follow its own course. While we write these lines, on June 23, there are still strikers in various cities of the Eastern**

(Turn to last page)

# Negotiations with Russia — —

(Continued from page 1)

The other view is:

The historic and courageous fight of the German and Czech workers show the road by which the Russian power can be overthrown without war, without supporting either camp of imperialist diplomacy and arms. It is not a pawn in the game of strengthening one governmental camp against the other; it itself IS the third camp, however it regards itself, which bears its own solution to the war crisis.

If the British Laborites, including the Bevanites, looked at it from this socialist point of view, it would be impossible to explain why they insist that only American diplomacy can free the German workers—American diplomacy, for in the Western camp the best that they hope for from the British partner is to prod Washington to do its duty. It would be impossible to explain why the powerful British Labor movement did not respond to the German events with a mighty movement of solidarity rallies, relief for the victims of Stalinism, spectacular steps to convince the German people that free labor knows what they are doing and is behind them with its millions.

That was not really done even by the West German Social-Democrats. And the reason was not that the Social Democrats did not want to mobilize the people to the aid of their brothers in the east, but because they subordinated their laudable impulses to what the occupation powers demand. And the latter never want the boat rocked by action from below.

The German workers showed courage and militancy which must put us to shame, and they have gotten—approving editorials. Here in the United States the labor movement has not risen to the occasion any more; but that is scarcely surprising about this backward, under-developed country of ours (politically speaking). The demonstration in New York City at the Russian offices got an approving nod

from the CIO, but it remained small-scale because it did not get real support in the form that could count.

Here the socialist movement is weak, and we cannot wag the dog. But in Europe, all up and down the continent from Britain to Italy, it is strong; and the shameful fact is that the great June days of Berlin and East Germany evoked less of solidarity than did the Sacco-Vanzetti case in its day.

Instead the German workers are told to look to "negotiations" to free them and unite them; that "only" this can do it.

By all means let us have "talks" and "negotiations," and conference around a table with the Russians. But what is to be negotiated? What is on the counter? What is offered? What is it that makes "negotiations" the central solution of the "neutralists"?

## HORSE TRADE

When we get right down to it, it is the idea of a deal with Moscow. But a deal requires tit-for-tat, or as the literati would say, quid pro quo. Just how are "negotiations" supposed to be able to convince the Kremlin to give up its hold on its half of Germany? Not by wheedling talk, surely; not by brilliant logic; nor by appeals to their morals, sentimentality or honor. The enthusiastic proponents of "negotiations" know that. Something will have to be shoved across the counter.

We once saw a high-minded and well-intentioned film produced by the Quakers (American Friends Service Committee) bearing a plea for peace, and when it came to the point of making a proposal it did so in frank terms. We need "negotiations" with the Russians.

If proceeded to explain in ABC language what that means. It means a "horse trade." We Americans understand horse trades, it went on, illustrating the thought with cartoons showing the nags being actually swapped.

The popular slogan of "negotiations" could not have been more adequately defined. Only—

What horse are "we" going to swap? Indo-China? Burma? Assurance to the Russians that if only they take their talons out of Germany, "we" will guarantee their control of the rest of the satellite empire?

It does not do any good to accompany demands for "negotiations" with soul-saving warnings against another Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. What else can it mean, if it is to mean a real deal?

## AROUND THE TABLE

The heart of "neutralism" and its multifarious forms, though it wishes to be independent of the two war blocs, is that it conceives its role of "independence" as that of an independent referee between two dogs scrambling for all the bones. Don't be greedy and unreasonable ("imperialistic"), it says—share the bones! From the days of Henry Wallace's fellow-traveler period, when this naive bubblehead openly talked in terms of a new division of the spoils to satisfy "everybody" (everybody except the spoils), the idea has had no other real content.

So—by all means, let us have four-power talks, let us sit around a table with the Russians. But a government which truly represented the interests of the world's people, a government which had a right to talk in terms of progress and freedom and the rejection of imperialism, above all a socialist government—such a government could approach such negotiations with the Russians only from a quite different objective. But to pursue this objective, its own hands would have to be clean first.

IF Washington withdrew its own occupation troops and leading strings from its own part of Germany, it could come to a "negotiation" table with the Russians and demand: "Take your troops out of East Germany!"—before the eyes of the people of the world, before the eyes of the people of Germany, using the meeting as a tremendous sounding board for all the peoples' yearning for freedom. "Negotiations" would then be subordinated to a political offensive against the Kremlin's power, and that is what it would be good for.

## THE PRACTICAL THING

We may be told: Come, let us be practical! You know it's utopian to expect Washington to do that!.....We do not have to be convinced. We insist that it is utopian to dream of it from this capitalist government. But it is not utopian to expect that from the British socialists. It is not utopian to expect that the demand be raised by the German socialists. It is not utopian to hope for such a glimmering of reason from those who wish to be left-wingers in these movements, like the Bevanites. And these movements are contenders for power in their countries.

Let them demand "negotiations," by all means. But this slogan, which merely echoes the "neutralists" of every stripe, is a hollow thing at the best, and a deception at the worst, unless it is coupled with a program for the much desired round table. And it is the anti-imperialist program which is of the essence, not the tactic of negotiations.

Not the least thing which the German uprising has proved is that a truly independent socialist policy is the most practical course in the world. For eight years the cold war has revolved around the maneuvers of the contending governments, with peace-laying liberals, pacifists, neutralists and reformists of all sort urging their expedients on the diplomats. Then in one stroke, a people rise up, buttressed by the socialist traditions and experience of the German proletariat, and in that stroke all foreign policy has been transformed. Not only the Russians but the Western maneuvers are on the spot.

The task of "every socialist all over the world" is to bring the power of the socialist movement to bear on the breach which the oppressed workers behind the Iron-Curtain have opened up. It can do so only by standing up politically to its own capitalistic government, instead of being the tail to their kite, and that does not require half the courage that it took to stand up to Russian tanks.

# U.S. Can't Capitalize—

(Continued from page 1)

blingly cautious approach to the central issue of German unity."

This is what is known as "measured language." We will see how uncautious (though trembling) the American approach is.

## EYES ON BASES

"Dulles' reluctance [to agree to a four-power talk] is easily explained. Not long before he met with the British and French foreign ministers, according to reliable reports here, the National Security Council [the top strategy board in Washington] had firmly ruled that American bases in Western Germany must under no circumstances be given up. This decision merely serves to underline what has been obvious for a long time—that American policy in Europe is squarely based on the permanent division of Germany into two parts. It is fatuous nonsense to imagine that the Russians, short of a war, are going to agree to withdraw their forces from Germany while American forces remain on German soil."

It is a dilemma, to be sure, but Washington cannot be accused of having failed to "resolve" it. They have a choice: Shall we ally ourselves with the revolutionary forces which are shaking the Russian power from below; or shall we trust in the might of our armed force, which stands over these people as a foreign occupation? Shall we look to the victory of the revolution behind the Iron Curtain, or shall we look to victory in a third world slaughter?

Their decision means that they have chosen to rely on war.

Alsop writes: "the June uprising has transformed the situation for the West as well as for the East. It has dramatized the issue of German unity for all Germans. Since June 17 the Germans have therefore been visibly losing what-ever enthusiasm they once had for the policy of 'integration before unification.'"

This is so because June 17 showed them that there is a third alternative to both Russian domination and "integration" into the West's war plans, and that this alternative is more powerful than anything the West has been able to do up to now. In this sense, it was a victory for the Third Camp.

## FALLING APART

Alsop reports: "Only ten people in Europe still really believe in the European Army," they say in Berlin, "and they are all Americans." Thus a side effect of the East German revolt has been to weaken further the moribund European Army project, and to compromise the position of pro-American West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, chief German sponsor of the European Army."

Suppose the Russians—not because of Western militarization, not because of NATO or the non-existent European Army, not because of Western diplomacy or deals, but because the German workers themselves are making it too hot for them, what with other troubles at home in the Kremlin—decide that they would do better to retreat from Germany before all the satellites explode? For the first time, it can be argued that a sliver of a possibility exists that the Russians might be willing to withdraw, raising the demand that the U. S. withdraw its troops likewise. The U. S. would be isolated in the world, Alsop points out; the French, Germans and "influential quarters even in Britain" would be for it.

The American troops in Germany are holding back the real struggle against the Kremlin, the struggle that is going on now, while they are presumably preparing for the atomic war of the future, which no people of the world wants.

"In these circumstances there are wise Americans here who would gladly exchange a paper German neutrality for the evacuation of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe. Whether they are right or wrong, surely it is time to cease to approach the overriding issue of German unity in fear and trembling. . . . This rigidity [of American policy] is one reason why American policy in Europe shows every sign of falling apart at the seams."

## Marxology

Marxism is older than you think, according to Rep. Gwinn (R., N. Y.) in an article for an anti-public-housing outfit. In it he writes, in different paragraphs:

(1) "... public housing is a communistic arrangement that was taught us by the Marxians in the first place. . . ."

(2) And: "500 years before Christ, in ancient Greece, Pericles in his give-away programs promised public housing. In return, the people re-elected him 15 times."

Gwinn found out all about this in the ancient Greek manuscript called the *Communist Manifesto*, which quotes a Pharaonic papyrus to the effect that Pericles got the idea straight from Marx's famous work *Das Odyssey*.

# Berlin's June Days — —

(Continued from page 7)

zone. The workers are also listening to the broadcasts from the West. They want to hear that the West, the workers' movement, has not forgotten them. They have had to learn that up to now the weighty apparatus of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has scarcely gotten into motion, that up to now there has not even been any results in taking care of the families of those who are dead, of the hundreds and thousands who were wounded, of the others who were executed without a trial, of those who were given heavy jail sentences.

Right now, all the cities of the Soviet zone are surrounded by Soviet troops. Soon "peace" will reign in all these cities. For how long? That will depend to a great extent on the West and its workers' movement. The "June days" are a message sent to us not only by the workers of Berlin and Magdeburg, but likewise by the workers of Prague, Warsaw, Budapest and Bucharest. The Stalinalee workers, trade-unionists, socialists and free men, have perhaps changed the destiny of the world.



Don't miss a single week of  
**LABOR ACTION**  
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!