

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 10, 1953

FIVE CENTS

**"Peace Party" in the Kremlin and
The East German Workers' Revolt**

... page 6

German Unions Enter Politics

... page 2

Are Europe's Socialists "for" U.S.?

... page 7

British View of Korean Truce

... page 3

SPOT-LIGHT

German SP Policy

The Social Democratic Party of German (SPD) has drafted legislation for the nationalization of the basic coal and iron industries in Western Germany to be presented to the federal legislature (Bundestag).

The bills which have been drafted seem to be patterned in their main outlines along the example set by the British Labor Party's nationalization schemes. Thus the basic enterprises in these vital industries are to be organized into two great government-controlled corporations, and the present owners are to be compensated in bonds issued by the Federal Republic.

These industries would then be operated as independent undertakings subject to the general supervision of the Federal Economics Ministry. They would be subject to policy guidance and operational control by a Federal Coal and a Federal Iron Council. Each of these would be composed of four members elected by the Federal Council, four by the Federal Parliament, eight nominated by the Federal Ministry of Economics from a list submitted by the trade unions, and eight on advice from the German Conference of Industry and Commerce.

Labor participation in management would be based on the existing legislation which provides for "co-determination" in parts of these industries. From the information available it appears also that the SPD legislation seeks to provide for a considerable degree of decentralization in the management of the individual units which would be divided pretty much on the basis of the present corporate structure.

The fate of this legislative project will, of course, depend on the results of the elections in Germany this fall. The introduction of this legislation at the present time indicates that the SPD plans to go before the electorate with a demand for the nationalization of these industries as part of their election platform. No wonder the Eisenhower government is backing Adenauer to the hilt!

East German Toll Mounts

A report reaching Radio Free Europe indicates that the June 17th uprisings in East Germany had a much greater effect than the regime cares to admit. This report lists casualties at 2457, including 587 deaths. Official regime figures listed only 25 dead and 278 wounded. The report also listed damages caused by production stoppages and breakage at over 30 million East German marks (\$7,500,000). The report further states that 1756 People's Police and regime officials, considered loyal Communists, were arrested for not having taken energetic measures to quell the riots and in some cases even supporting the demonstrators.

From National Committee
for a Free Europe, Inc.

(Turn to last page)

The 83rd Congress

The 83rd Congress has staggered to a close. There have been "do nothing" Congresses in the past, specially in times when the party which controlled the White House was in a minority on Capitol Hill, or when the executive part of the government was faced by a hostile bi-partisan coalition in the legislature.

But for sheer inactivity, for utter helplessness, for really big-scale, gold-plated, diamond-studded futility, we think that this Congress can claim a record, at least for the modern era of the game.

It is true that some of the Republican promises were carried out. They gave the tidelands oil to the big oil companies under the pretext of giving it back to the states. They slashed away at expenditures with eyes closed and meat-axe in hand. Thus they achieved not "economy in government" but a reduction of whatever strength the United States had in foreign affairs up to now. For the most part, their promises were carried out simply by sitting on their hands while legislation passed by other Congresses lapsed into nothingness. Price controls, rent controls, public housing, support for school children's lunches, in short, anything which could be considered as "social legislation" was either axed or permitted to lapse.

In the last day, as drowsiness was slipping into death, the "vigorous" Eisenhower leadership made a few futile gestures, like a sleep-walker

vaguely trying to brush the cobwebs from his brow. They rushed in, these advocates of "sound money," with a demand that the national debt be raised to some even more astronomical figure. Congress yawned. They "demanded" that America make one of those typical gestures toward one of its old traditions by providing for the admission of 240,000 Iron Curtain refugees in ten years above the vicious McCarran-Walter Immigration Act quotas. Congress lazily passed a law for 214,000 in three and a half years. Other proposals to change the McCarran-Walter Act were "rushed" to Capitol Hill two days before adjournment. Of course, no one bothered to read them. Eisenhower, the man of action, was just trying to make the record.

Investigation, Not Legislation

Although it can be said that this Congress did nothing for the American people legislatively, and even very little against them, it would be an exaggeration to say that it was totally inactive. While there was neither energy nor direction for legislation, there was plenty for investigation. McCarthy, Jenner and Velde, with no legislative duties to distract them, were able to stamp up and down the country, and even the world, spreading confusion, fear and animosity wherever they trod.

Of course, the scope of the investigations was

(Turn to last page)

ROBERT TAFT—COVER FOR REACTION

By DON HARRIS

The veil of popular beatification which shrouds the death of every public figure has served to transmogrify the senior Ohio Senator into a great national hero. While the homage which his followers pay him cannot be begrudged, it would not seem to be a breach of good taste to remind the labor movement of how and why a man like Robert Alfonso Taft could achieve the pre-eminence and power he did. For Taft was one of the first enemies of the American labor movement, and the program for which it stands.

None of the eulogies written have been able to say more than that he was a consummate politician, which is true. His success was that of the Republican machine man, from what used to be the country's second strongest and most corrupt Republican stronghold. Within this environment, his outstanding qualifications for leadership were energy, intelligence and above all, wealth.

These are hardly sufficient to create greatness; and his purported spokesman-ship for American conservatism becomes a measure of that movement's current ideological weakness. A comparison with Disraeli is ludicrous, for Taft was never known to base his political views on any

broadly conceived view of the organic character of society, as did the English politician, or on any other kind of social theory as far as can be told. His literary contributions compare unfavorably with Lord Beakensfield's lesser novels, and his speeches reveal a vision no broader than a barely disguised small-businessman's economic self-interest. Still less with Webster and Calhoun does the comparison favor, for Taft's inherent attachment to the status quo was not advanced in his compatriots' institutional defense of religion, the family or the nation. Rather, his politics dealt only with the immediate and concrete, and toward such problems he applied copy-book maxims from Lord Acton and The Readers Digest.

If Taft was not the Great American Conservative, he was certainly the most successful of all living conservative Republican politicians. In winning his first election to the Senate in 1938, he defeated an ardent New Deal democrat by a 170,000 majority in a state which Roosevelt had carried two years previously by 630,000 votes. Re-elected again in 1944, he earned the bitter enmity of all sectors of the labor movement by sponsoring the anti-labor law which carries his name, as well as by his almost perpetual opposition to all liberal social measures. Yet despite the resulting opposition to him, in 1950 Taft was re-elected by the most thumping majority he had ever enjoyed.

MR. ANTI-NEW DEAL

Taft's success must be measured against the period and his opponents. He was elected to the Senate only in 1938, on the basis of opposing the New Deal. Despite his "advocacy" of old-age pen-

sions, relief and other measures of social amelioration, Taft's main political capital was obtained through attacking the "socialistic" programs of the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations. It was this which attracted to his support the conservative forces of small business which, having survived the depression, were prepared to undertake a return to the Hoover-Coolidge philosophy Taft was so adept at preaching. Opposition to the expansion of government functions, to controls, and to all of the other war measures were of direct and immediate economic importance to business, and particularly to the small business and agricultural interests which became fanatical Taft supporters. Yet such views could have wide currency, indeed, did not constitute an insuperable obstacle to political success, only because Taft advanced them as a substitute for a New Deal which had failed to solve the fundamental problem of depression, and in the context of the war economy prosperity that soon succeeded it.

Taft's domestic "program," if such it may be called, consisted mainly of ways and means to reduce government expenditures, and hence taxes. Never declaring outright for the politically impossible repeal of Roosevelt's social legislation, one of his first acts in the Senate was to call for reduction in the federal relief budget. His support of other business-sponsored legislation was practically automatic, particularly in the fields of public power, price-controls, anti-discrimination measures, "give-away" programs, and above all labor legislation where he authored and co-sponsored the infamous and crippling Taft-Hartley law. His ad-

(Turn to last page)

German Trade Unions Return To Politics

By EUGENE KELLER

According to the N. Y. Times of July 31 the Federation of German Trade Unions (DGB) has come out with a statement advising its membership to vote in the coming Bundestag elections in September only for those who have championed labor's "justified demands"; and concluded its appeal as follows:

"He who wants peace and progress, freedom and unity, he who does not want a return to the rule of force and war, terror and air raids, must help with his vote to exclude from the Bundestag those forces that want to plunge our people into another disaster."

On Aug. 1 the Times reported, in a dispatch from Bonn, that Adenauer charged the DGB with having violated its own constitution which enjoins "political neutrality" upon the trade unions. He also warned of a split within the unions between the Catholic (Christian Democratic) and socialist workers which this "violation" might provoke.

The statement of the DGB did not, to be sure, explicitly advocate the election of a Social Democratic government. In this sense Adenauer's charge that the trade union constitution had been violated was formally incorrect. In effect, however, he is right: The stand of the DGB coincides closely with that of the Social Democratic Party (SPD).

NEW UNION STRUCTURE

The DGB, which today counts about 6.5 million members, was founded in 1948. Its supra-party character meant a break with the traditional trade structure in Germany which, before Hitler, had consisted of three or four major trade union hierarchies, each more or less closely affiliated with a political party. The DGB unified the trade unions under one leadership, meeting the requirements of the occupation authorities as well as a natural desire on the part of trade unionists for labor unity. The DGB was not to take any political position officially.

But once the major tasks of German reconstruction had been accomplished the social and economic problems pressing upon the workers and upon the trade unions as corporate organizations had to be faced, bringing the latter into ever-sharpening conflict with the Adenauer regime. It is significant that the final break with Adenauer—for whose personal willingness to compromise there exists considerable evidence—did not come over economic issues such as lower taxes, legal wage standards, food subsidies, etc., but over the issue of co-determination. It was in July 1952, after a series of wide-spread strikes, that the DGB finally declared that it would fight Adenauer at the polls over what it considered unsatisfactory legislation on co-determination which the Bundestag has passed in preceding weeks against SPD opposition.

This issue of co-determination makes political "neutrality" impossible. German management simply has not been "reasonable" enough to permit serious inroads to be made by the trade unions, into its control over industry and the economy as a whole.

WORKERS TO SHARE CONTROL

In a country with an economy as highly organized and finely articulated as Germany's it would be futility itself for the trade unions to confine their functions to bettering workers' living conditions. In the interest of their very existence they must control or share in the control of such matters as investment, production schedules and similar matters of economic policy; and in order to be effective in the execution of policy they must control or share control over matters of a more detailed but not less important nature, such as personnel, audit, prices etc.

Co-determination is not a particularly bold concept, it is open to much criticism on practical and theoretical levels. But

leaving these criticisms aside, it is the central issue between the Adenauer regime and the DGB. And notwithstanding the good will and spirit of compromise which the very concept of co-determination implies on the part of labor, it has become the symptomatic expression of the struggle of the German workers against the Bonn regime and its powerful backers. It has made a fiction of political neutrality.

The statement of the DGB referred to above did, however, go on to an even broader issue than co-determination: it did not hesitate to associate the struggle for freedom and unity with the struggle of the German workers. Such a statement would normally be expected from the SPD; that the DGB makes it appears to be a new step for it. It is known, of course, that the DGB is predominantly composed of people sympathetic towards the SPD but its Catholic minority is by

no means insignificant and it is unlikely that the DGB would risk the unity of its ranks by issuing a statement of which it is not sure that it will have wide support among the entire membership. We may even go further: This statement is but a mild and inadequate expression of the true sentiments of those whom it addresses.

JUNE 17 AND WEST GERMANY

We have to this day heard nothing, or very little of the reaction to the June 17 events in East Berlin among the West German trade union rank and file. There have been no reports of sympathy demonstrations of any kind. The SPD leadership reacted, half-stupefied by surprise, in a confused, half-fearful manner. (They warned the East Berlin demonstrators against futilely sacrificing themselves and reminded them that the forces

of the West were needed to realize their political demands. Such a statement is doubly meaningless: A people in daily contact with a totalitarian power would seem not to stand in need of being warned against it. The forces of the West are indeed needed but the SPD, being such a force, did not lift a finger by calling out the Western workers for even two hours.)

The SPD and DGB officialdom which thought themselves safely in control of their organizations were not improbably disturbed perhaps even stirred, by this assertion of the power of the workers. In West Germany this assertion cannot have remained without profound effects upon the population as a whole, but particularly upon the workers. The concluding paragraph of the DGB statement is an indication of the surging political will of the masses which must be heeded from now on.

German SP Misses the Boat on East Berlin Workers' Uprising

By GORDON HASKELL

The official reaction of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) to the June 17 political upheaval in Eastern Germany is contained in their *News From Germany* for July, published in English. It consists of statements made at a press conference by Erich Ollenhauer, national chairman of the party, a leaflet distributed in East Berlin by the SPD on June 18 and a resolution passed by the Social Democratic Party Council of Berlin on the same date.

Ollenhauer and the SPD Council of Berlin both lay the heaviest emphasis on the fact that the demonstrations revealed the utter bankruptcy of the Stalinist puppet government in Eastern Germany. In the face of the heroic action of the East German workers, Ollenhauer said: "if, nevertheless a government remains in being, its existence is due solely to the fact that by declaring martial law the occupying power in the Soviet zone has taken the reins of government into its own hands again. This is the measure of the *raison d'être* left to the Party government after these events."

But the conclusions drawn from this by Ollenhauer are dumbfounding in their lack of initiative and daring. Since the Russians have shown that they are the real power in East Germany, he says, it is up to them to now exercise mildness in the treatment of the people imprisoned by them during the demonstrations, and to guarantee to the people of Eastern Germany the elementary democratic rights which have been denied them by their puppet government! As for the SPD in Western Germany, their job is to renew and re-emphasize their demand that the Western occupying powers call on the Eastern occupying power to hold an immediate conference on the unification of Germany.

This, of course, has been the demand of the SPD for at least a couple of years, and Ollenhauer does not even propose a new form in which this demand should be put forth, such as mass demonstrations on his side of the border. He in no way suggests that the heroism of the East Germans in demanding an end to the occupation be complemented by the much lesser heroism which would be required for mass demonstrations in Western Germany demanding an end to the occupation there.

SPD LEAFLET

The official resolution by the SPD Council of Berlin is along the same lines, except that in addition it stresses the need of giving "all possible aid to the victims of the demonstrations in the east sector and in the Soviet Zone, to their dependents and friends." It is in this resolution, most likely, that the present distribution of free food parcels has its origins.

The leaflet distributed in East Berlin reads as follows:

**"Workers of East Berlin!
Your battle and its achievements are beyond compare for a people under a dic-**

tatorship. Since the Soviet occupying power has intervened by declaring martial law, the realization of your political demand for free elections has become a problem whose solution no longer lies within the powers of a civilian population under military occupation. They can be attained only together with the forces of the free world.

"Do not therefore let yourselves be carried away into action which can only lead to senseless sacrifice. Rather save your strength for the coming struggles."

There can be no objection to a warning against "senseless sacrifice." But at the same time, the workers of Eastern Germany may well wonder just what is meant by the reference to the "forces of the free world," or to "the coming struggles." If the SPD in Western Germany had mobilized giant demonstrations demanding an end to the occupation of their country by both the Stalinists and the Western Powers, if they had organized even a one-day general strike in solidarity with their brothers in the East and as a means of pressure on the government of Adenauer and his American supporters, these phrases would have a concrete and stirring meaning to the embattled workers of the East. It is hardly likely, however, that workers who are willing to face tanks with their bare hands are going to be much impressed or inspired by leaflets and stern declarations which show that the SPD in the West is determined to confine its actions to strictly parliamentary and diplomatic speechifying.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION

It is true that the free food distribution is an action which has forced the Stalinists to show their hand even further in Eastern Germany, and has given the workers there an additional pretext for what amounts to political demonstrations. It has been announced in the press that in addition to the mass influx into West Berlin of hungry individuals seeking to get food packages, the workers in factories in Eastern Germany have

planned to down tools and move as a mass toward Berlin to get their food packages. After the events of June 17 no one in the Stalinist government is under any illusion that such concerted movements have a purely spontaneous, non-political character. They have shown this by cancelling all sales of railway tickets for Berlin from the East. They are obviously terrified at what might happen if tens of thousands of workers from the whole Eastern zone should arrive in Berlin simultaneously under the pretext of getting food parcels.

However, this food distribution has only the most limited political significance. For one thing, it is made possible only by the co-operation of the American occupying authority. It is thus part of the American effort to make some kind of capital out of the East German rebellion. But as this is divorced from any political initiative, and particularly from any West German political initiative, it can play only a very minor role in helping the struggle for political freedom by the workers of Eastern Germany. The idea that political victories can be won by food or other economic aid alone is one of those illusions which should have been dispelled by years of Marshall Plan aid and the like. But where other ideas are lacking, illusions hang on for a long time.

Thus it appears from the reports received to date that the SPD leadership in Western Germany is missing the boat in this critical situation. From the timidity they have shown in supplementing the action of the workers of the Eastern zone with some bold and meaningful action in the West, one can only draw the conclusion that it was not they who organized and led the June demonstrations. It is much more likely that these were given leadership by underground organizations directed by men of much greater determination and vision than is possessed by Ollenhauer, regardless of what their formal political affiliations may be. Their example should serve as an inspiration to the left-wing forces in the SPD in Western Germany to demand a bolder policy from their own leaders.

SECOND NEW ENGLAND ANTI-WAR CAMP AND SUMMER SCHOOL

September 6-12
Harvard, Mass.

Faculty will include

George Houser, Gordon Haskell, Lewis Goser, etc.

For reservations and further information, write to
DOT BONE, 230 Prospect Street,
New Haven, Conn.

LONDON LETTER

British Stalinists Sink to All-Time Low as Scots Leader Resigns

THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY IN PARLIAMENT

By **ALLAN VAUGHAN**

LONDON, July 29—The right and left wings of the Labor Party are drawing up their forces for the great clash at the forthcoming Margate Conference. Herbert Morrison has received two severe setbacks in his attempt to return to the National Executive Council via the treasuryship of the Labor Party.

Arthur Greenwood now has a reasonable chance of retaining his position since (1) the Scottish NUM (mineworkers) has demanded a reversal of the decision to back Morrison and, (2) Tom O'Brien's own union, the National Association of Theatrical and Cine Employees has decided by a majority vote of its executive to back Greenwood (Tom O'Brien is chairman of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and more often than not acts as a mouthpiece of the Big Four trade union bosses).

Just in case the Big Four fail in this backstairs intrigue, they are trying to get an amendment to the constitution which will automatically make the deputy leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party, at the moment Herbert Morrison,

a member of the NEC. Even this maneuver may be spiked.

LONDON CONFERENCE

The London Labor Party Conference, specially convened to discuss "Challenge to Britain" last Saturday at the Friends House, drew an abnormally large number of delegates. Some estimated that as many as 900 attended. Morgan Phillips spoke for more than an hour, and was then subjected to a barrage of cross-fire from all sides of the hall. Except for one delegate, every single one who got up to speak from the floor disapproved the document. It was blasted with great gusto by the overwhelming majority of the delegates from the left.

Very good speeches on the fallacy of economic planning in one country were made by Bill Hunter (from Islington), and on the engineering section of the document by Ronald Grange (St. Marylebone). If this is the mood of the rank and file, there is every chance that we in the left will triumph over all the tricks of the union bureaucrats.

The BLP in Parliament

The exciting finish to the Fourth Test Match between England and Australia has almost completely obscured the really important event of the week—the signing of the Korean truce. I was fortunate to be in the House of Commons on the Monday afternoon of this week when Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, the minister of state, announced the welcome news on behalf of the government.

The House was crowded, the opposition benches appearing fuller than the government benches. The government front bench was a sorry looking bunch of individuals, with their two star turns absent (Churchill and Eden). A more uninspiring national leadership it would be difficult to imagine.

The Labor front bench was quite packed. Attlee, looking even more diminutive than usual—his feet up on the dispatch box—sat snugly beside Morrison and Shinwell. Apart from associating the Opposition with the sentiments expressed by Selwyn Lloyd, he had nothing to say about the three years of mutual annihilation that has cast a black shadow on the future of Korea.

Mr. Selwyn Lloyd's statement came at the end of Question Time. There were no less than 115 questions on the order paper, and only a tiny fraction of them were answered by the ministers concerned. Just to give our American readers a feel for this aspect of British parliamentary procedure, here is a representative selection of them:

No. 3: Mr. Bottomley (Labor). To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is the present position concerning the retention in prison of Mr. Edgar Saunders by the Hungarian government.

No. 13: Mr. Noel-Baker (Labor). To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether he will make a statement about the work of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations the mandate of which was continued by the General Assembly at its recent meeting.

No. 27: Driberg (Labor). To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, if he has now received full reports on the various official statements made by President Syngman Rhee and the South Korean foreign minister, on their attitude to a truce; if he will publish in Hansard, or as a White Paper, the full texts of these statements and of the communications on this subject which have been passed between the South Korean and United States governments; and what steps Her Majesty's Government have decided to take in the event of an infringement of a truce by the South Korean government.

No. 38: Dr. Barrett Stross (Labor). To ask the Minister of Food why, during the year 1952-53, liquid milk consumption in Stoke-on-Trent rose by 100,000 gallons, whereas in the country as a whole it fell by 33,000,000 gallons.

No. 58: Mr. Callaghan (Labor). To ask the Minister of Transport if he will set up a committee to review the adequacy of present arrangements for searching out and assisting vessels in distress around the British Isles.

No. 92: Mr. Keenan (Labor). To ask the Minister of National Insurance, how many widows over the age of 60 years, were receiving 10 shillings per week pensions at the end of June 1953.

No. 114: Mr. Brockway (Labor). To ask the Under-Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, on what grounds Mr. L. M. Seretse of Bechuanaland, has been arrested.

A VISITOR'S IMPRESSION

A visitor in the public gallery of the House gets the following impression of the parliamentary representatives of the two parties:

1. The Tory Party has a policy without a leadership, while the Labor Party has a leadership without a policy, that is, a distinctive policy.

2. The Labor M. P.'s get the better of the exchanges in the debates, questionings, etc. This is probably due to the fact that most of them had to fight their way up to become speakers, agitators and propagandists for the movement, while the Tory M. P.'s are just handed their seats by the local Conservative Constituency Associations on the basis of wealth or aristocratic connections.

3. Labor MPs are more conscientious in their duties than their opposite number on the other side of the House. And the left-wing Labor MPs, though a minority, dominate the LP's contribution to the debates and discussions in the House.

Blow to Stalinists

And now, a word about the Communist Party. On Tuesday, what is left of them got a real shock. The Scottish leader of the party resigned, stating that:

"The Communist Party has built up an apparatus patterned on the Russian party when it was illegal and preparing for revolution. This places tremendous power in the hands of the leadership.

"It enables the leadership to remain in power permanently.

"It is said that the members can change things at congresses, but the panel of names submitted by the leadership invariably goes through. . . ."

Harry McShane, the 62 year old leader of the Scots party has not even been "touched" by the London *Daily Worker* as yet. They are still making up their minds what to do about him. It appears that the naive, or not so naive, McShane, took the new Malenkov "line" of opposition to bureaucratic leadership and one-man dictatorship literally and seriously.

ROCK BOTTOM

I have also heard from a friend in Leeds that the CP in the provinces generally is at rock bottom. At the London Labor Party Conference, I even met three delegates—formerly CPers and still Stalinists ("Russia is bad, we know, but we mustn't say so as that would be helping the capitalist press")—who told me that the CP is sectarian and does not know how to put Stalinism over. There is more truth in what they say than they realize, of course.

Stalinism, as an ideology, still holds a strong attraction for the left wing of the Labor Party. Certain large chunks of its present demagogic propaganda — for Churchill, for East-West trade, for recognition of China, etc.—goes down in the L. P. But the CP is not at the receiving end of this potentially useful (for them) propaganda. It was this indisputable fact that was the excuse made by the Socialist Outlook supporters for their "tactical" pro-Stalinism (that is, until their belated change of line about nine months ago). Of course it doesn't work. Opportunism in the long run never does.

Pamphlet on Russia

Finally, I must congratulate the Independent Labor Party for publishing Raymond Fletcher's *Russia Through Socialist Eyes*. This excellent, readable pamphlet is, in my opinion, a must for thinking socialists in the Labor Party. Its only weakness is its failure to give one definition of Russia—instead of at least two. In any event, every active member in the Labor Party should seek to give this pamphlet the widest possible circulation among the left wing.

A Socialist Comments from England on Truce in Korea

By **DAVID ALEXANDER**

All of British opinion received the news of the truce in Korea with a sense of considerable relief. Most people here stress that its main value will be the temporary—and we hope permanent—cessation of the fighting and the reduction of casualties which have been enormous on the Chinese side, and considerable for the South Korean and Western powers.

Labor circles in Britain feel that once the fighting has ceased, President Rhee will not start it up again unless he is given the powerful backing of American arms. And Labor members of Parliament have been trying to obtain assurances from the government that it will do its utmost to influence the American government against allowing this to happen.

In the Korean war, 700 United Kingdom citizens have been killed, and 922 are now prisoners of war. But this is not, of course, the total British interest in that war. The situation in Korea is reflected in Malaya.

ECHO IN MALAYA

As a result of the most ruthless bombing of civilians, the burning of villages, etc., some 130,000 British troops and police have managed to suppress "Stalinist" forces estimated at a strength of 5,000. This is a balance of forces which may be overturned by the serious economic position facing Malaya due to the fall in the price of tin and rubber.

The loss of prestige which must result from the Korean war for the Western imperialist powers cannot be underestimated. After three years of fighting, China, a "backward Asian power," with Russian connivance has managed to drive back the Americans to the position from which the North Koreans started hostilities. In other words, the United Nations have not been able to extract from the aggressors the "penalty due to them from their aggression." In this sense, the United Nations have failed.

Reports reaching me from Indonesia and Malaya indicate that Stalinists in these countries consider a truce on these terms an extremely favorable one. British prestige has for the same reason gone down a great deal in India and Hong Kong, where the stalemate of the Western imperialists is not regarded with much misgiving.

MONEY SAVINGS SLIGHT

All sections of British public opinion seem to agree that no real let-up in the cold war has occurred. Economically speaking, the money savings which re-

sult from an end to the war in Korea are minor compared to the total cost of the cold war. One estimate has it that Britain has spent only \$83 millions per year in Korea, and has used only 20,000 troops. This represents about one thirtieth of total commitments for "defense" both in money and men.

For Britain, the real expenses of this conflict have been in the acute shortages and rising prices which are engendered by the threat of world war. It may be remembered that the financial crisis of 1951 in Britain was due more to the rise in prices resulting from American stock-piling for the war than to the comparatively small cost of the conflict itself.

The United States, with its high productivity, would regard a real slowing down of the cold war with considerable apprehension. Both Wall Street and the City reacted very unfavorably to reports of the prospective truce.

But whereas the truce will not provide any logistic excuse for cutting arms production in Britain and America, a real slowing of the cold war would. Although there may be argument as to whether this would necessarily precipitate a slump in America, it would certainly do a world of good to Britain's economy which cannot stand the strain of funneling much of its resources into armaments in a competitive world. All sides of British capitalism would, therefore welcome an end to the cold war, not only for this reason, but also because of the prospects of better trade in cheaper goods.

BRITISH WANT SAY

Now that the truce has been signed, the British government has announced its intention of pressing for direct British representation at the political conference which will follow. Australia has pledged herself to the same demand. And sensitive as the government here is to the political settlement which will result in Korea, it cannot allow the Americans to ignore its interests as Roosevelt did to the Dutch in Indonesia in 1944.

The obvious question everyone is asking here is this: What will happen if the political conference fails? The Labor Party seems to be fairly well agreed that the United Nations should, if necessary, force a political settlement on President Rhee even if, as is likely, the conference does not manage to unify the whole of Korea. In other words, the British, both Labor and Tory, want to finish the war in Korea, and having stopped it, to prevent its resumption at all costs and by all means.

Both Labor and the Tories are prepared to offer Mao a seat on the United Nations; they are prepared to forget his Korean aggression; they are willing to ignore his doings in Malaya and Indo-China. They are prepared to pay anything to patch up the fabric of that war theatre, so that the curtain can come down on a most unpleasant drama. They are prepared, in short, even to pay the players not to repeat the performance.

NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .

A year's subscription to **LABOR ACTION** brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, socialism, minority groups, national and world politics — for \$2.00 a year.

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

BOOKS and Ideas

"Spark of Life": A Grim Reminder of Life and Death Under the Nazis

SPARK OF LIFE by Erich Maria Remarque.
—A Signet Giant, 318 pages, 35c.

Spark of Life is an exciting, moving and horrifying story of the last days of a Nazi concentration camp. It brings before the reader's eyes a vivid reminder of the particular type of barbarism represented by the Nazis, in these times when Stalinist barbarism makes it easy for many of us to forget to what depths of human degradation even advanced countries can be brought in the era of capitalist decline.

The treatment in this book is typically Remarque. Those who remember his other books, from *All Quiet on the Western Front* through *Arch of Triumph* will know, in a way, what to expect. Human beings, when confronted with extreme situations, are capable of the greatest heroism and nobility, and also of measureless meanness and brutality. Remarque does not concern himself with the social or political causes of Nazism, nor with a social program for the era after the Nazis have been defeated. He remains a-political, and even anti-political. His idea seems to be that humans, on the average, will behave pretty decently toward each other unless they are given too much power over each other. Hence his ideal seems to be a state of affairs in which everyone is permitted to tend to his own business without a government which makes some masters and others slaves.

But aside from this naive attitude, this reader found the book almost impossible to put down. Here are the inmates of a concentration camp many of whom have been reduced to the level of animals by their torturers. Even the men of strongest character have been able to survive by limiting all their thoughts and actions to the narrow problem of

keeping alive from day to day. Amid unspeakable tortures, starvation, and inhuman degradation by their sadistic SS guards, they know that only by hanging together, by mutual support can any of them survive.

SPARK BURNS HIGHER

They hear that the war is coming to a close. Suddenly the world opens up before them. Thoughts of the future, of the meaning of their torture which had been suppressed in the interest of survival, can be suppressed no longer. As they hear the rumble of the American artillery in the distance, as American planes bomb the town near their camp, the spark of life begins to burn higher in them.

On the other hand, the Nazis start on the road to demoralization. The idea that Hitler may lose the war begins to sink in. They react according to their natures. Men who in their day of power had seemed steel-like in their makeup begin to disintegrate. They start changing their records in the hope that they can later prove that they had been "merciful" and "lenient" within the orders handed down to them. They appeal to the prisoners for confirmation of their "kindly" treatment, and when the prisoners give the automatic answers of agreement with their murderers, the latter actually believe that the prisoners mean what they say.

Others are the SS to the last. On the day before the Americans arrive, they try to exterminate the most dangerous witnesses of their brutality, and just kill at random in a frenzied attempt to prove to themselves that they are still the bosses. The novel reaches its climax in these last days of horror, when the prisoners, in whom the spark of life has now been fanned to a raging blaze, use every device of cunning in their effort to survive till the day of liberation. It is in these days that they are also confronted with the terrible dilemma: when some are bound to be killed, who should be saved?

It is only in this last phase that Remarque deals with a political question in his own way. The Stalinists are the best organized and most powerful group among the prisoners. They are quite willing to co-operate with non and anti-Stalinists where mutual aid is necessary. But even under the heel of the Nazi torturers, their leaders are thinking and preparing for the day when they will need concentration camps for their opponents. Of course, they say, these camps will not be extermination camps run by a select group of sadists. But in their scheme of things camps will be necessary for the "re-education" of opposition elements.

Spark of Life is not a political novel. It is an exciting and rewarding study of human dignity and will to live and resist even when to some life appears less desirable than death itself.

Jenner Committee Labors And Brings Forth a Zero

By L. G. SMITH

The Senate Internal Security subcommittee, headed by Senator William E. Jenner of Indiana has submitted a unanimous report on the investigation it has been conducting since last year into Communist infiltration into the American schools and colleges.

Congressional investigations are supposedly conducted under the power Congress has to investigate any problem for the purpose of proposing legislation. The fact is that after hearing more than 100 witnesses in both private and public sessions, this subcommittee has been able to propose only one piece of legislation—and that has already been passed by the Senate. This is the bill which would deprive witnesses before Congressional committees of the right to invoke the immunity granted by the fifth amendment to the Constitution against self incrimination if they have been guaranteed against prosecution by Congress.

MUM ON LEGISLATION

Although the Jenner committee's report had little to say with regard to legislation, it had a lot to say about the danger of Stalinists in the schools. Most of this cannot be said to be a product of the extensive questionings of the committee. It is based solely on the exaggerated testimony of one or two ex-Stalinists who have tried to give themselves importance by painting Stalinist activity in the schools in the lurid terms of an organized and effective conspiracy.

As a matter of fact, the committee has found that it is almost impossible to lay a legal basis for proceeding against most Stalinist teachers. That is, their activities have been so limited and so carefully carried out that they have not accomplished enough to make them "dangerous" in any sense except that of a hysterical feeling that as long as a single Stalinist is teaching anywhere in our schools the republic is rocking on its foundations.

HUMAN FERRETS

If one boils down this report, and its proposals to their essence, one finds the following: It is very difficult for local school authorities to apprehend Stalinists and expose them. For this one needs Congressional and State committees who can call up suspect teachers and put them on the spot. If they refuse to testify, they should be fired. Further, the committee recommends that the procedure which has been established in California be copied by other states. This involves hiring professional human ferrets to enter the classrooms in disguise as students and report on what is being taught. It involves, further, the setting up of a centralized blacklist, so that teachers who have become suspect in one school can be barred from teaching in any other.

The committee recommends, further that "school authorities, colleges and local boards of education institute 'positive'

programs, under qualified experts in the field of combatting communism, to teach both teachers and pupils the nature of the Communist conspiracy."

The committee was also highly pleased by the work done by Dr. William Jansen, superintendent of schools in New York City, who has devised his own unique method of firing teachers regardless of whether or not he can prove that they are Stalinists or incompetent. [For comment on Jansen, see the article on another page of this issue of Labor Action—Ed.]

A DEAD MOUSE

All in all, it can be said that this committee has labored and produced little more than a dead mouse. That is from the point of view of what its proper function might be thought to be—to deal with some phase of "internal security" as it relates to the functions of Congress. But of course, it has made a major contribution in another field: that of scaring and intimidating a large number of teachers. If that be a proper function of Congress, it has done its job, and proposes to do more of it in the future.

Yet in the balance of history, this committee may have done something which it neither sought nor desired. It has drawn the attention of a large number of people prominent in the educational field to the dangerous attack on civil liberties which is abroad in the land. As long as that attack seemed to confine itself to men and institutions far from the academic halls, many of these people were inclined to regard with detached academic interest, and even tolerance. But once they felt the hot breath of the witchhunters on their own necks; once they came to realize that academic freedom is not at all sacred to those who would force American thought into a single narrow mold, many of them have started to take a far more active interest in what is going on in the country.

The resistance to the Jenner committee, to its theories and methods, which has been shown by a considerable number of schools and teachers' organizations has been gratifying. Unfortunately, these people do not carry much political weight in America. Their awareness and resistance can only become a powerful factor if it is combined by a similar awakening in the labor movement. For that, we fear, we will have to wait a little while longer.

Get acquainted with the SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

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



LABOR ACTION

August 10, 1953
Vol. 17, No. 32

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 MASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Socialists Come to Power in Costa Rica

On Sunday, July 26, the little Central American country of Costa Rica had its second election under the constitution of 1948. The President elect is Jose Figueres, leader of the National Liberation Party, and his campaign was based upon a broad socialist program which produced such fear from the rightist backed by American business interests in general and the United Fruit Company in particular that they entered into a coalition with the outlawed Stalinists to oppose him. However, despite this strange opposition Figueres won by almost two-to-one (125,108-65,625) and furthermore, the National Liberation Party came within one seat of having a two-thirds majority in the legislature (they obtained 29 of 45 seats).

To obtain a majority vote is one thing but to carry out even a semi-socialist policy is still another, especially in Latin America. Though it offers to United States capital an "environment of safety and honesty" there is considerable evidence that the biggest American investor in Central America, United Fruit Company, will have a difficult time with this new

administration. During the campaign Figueres demanded that the contract with the UFC and Costa Rica be renegotiated and further demanded that the UFC pay the same custom duties as other Costa Rican firms, employ the same exchange rate and finally that it be subject to a graded income tax (instead of a flat 15 per cent of net as now). Figueres has declared that the benefits of his policy will accrue to the 85 per cent of the people who live in substandard conditions. "We are", he said, "going to prove that democracy can solve the problem of underdeveloped countries". It is indeed strange (though no stranger than the cooperation with the Peron regime in Argentina) that the Stalinists could work in a coalition which proclaimed that Figueres and the National Liberation Party was planning a large program of increased education and "social welfare".

1948 REVOLUTION

Traditionally the most democratic of all of the Central American countries, Costa Rica experienced a revolution following the election of February, 1948. The candidate for the administration, Guardia, was defeated by Othlio Ulate Blanco but the results were nullified by the National Assembly. At that time Figueres was a Colonel in the army and led it into a revolt supporting Ulate Blanco. During this period the leader of the Stalinist Popular Vanguard, Manuel Mora, was

an active supporter of the rightist administration and of the Guardia forces. It was the general antagonism aroused by the Stalinists in the right opposition which led to their being outlawed when the new constitution was drawn up in May 1948. With the end of the revolution, Mora fled to Nicaragua and apparently helped lead a band of a few hundred partisans over the border into Costa Rica and again attempted to overthrow the government of Ulate Blanco.

When a truce was agreed upon, the revolutionaries under Figueres seized for the government all banks, power plants and facilities for the production and distribution of primary necessities. What was of more significance, especially for a Latin American officer, was the reduction of the army to a police force of one thousand and a coast guard of seven hundred.

The situation in this little Central American country should be watched with care. There is no doubt that the United Fruit Company will do all in its power to see that the present government is overthrown, but for socialists the interesting group to watch will be the Stalinists—for how can they function now? Cut off from the large masses of the people through their support of a rightist regime and candidate (as in Argentina) it would seem that they have little prospect of affecting the course of events there until the pro-US groups can get back into power. How this can occur is not too obvious since the total organized armed forces are less than two thousand. There is some indication that aid from Nicaragua will be forthcoming, for Figueres has little popularity in that country.

Youth and Student Corner

N.Y.C. Board of Education Sets Up Phoney Standards for Excluding CP Teachers

By DAVE BERGER

In testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee early this year, Dr. William Jansen, superintendent of New York City's schools, reported on "progress" made thus far in ridding the schools of Stalinist teachers. In his testimony Jansen upheld the congressional probes; urged inquiries by more State legislative groups such as the Rapp-Coudert committee of 1940-41; and advanced arguments for not permitting Stalinists to teach.

While the drive against Communist teachers in New York City's schools had been effective, reported Dr. Jansen, "we are by no means satisfied that we cleaned up the situation." About 180 teachers are now under investigation, he reported, and since 1950, 81 teachers have been removed, suspended, retired or allowed to resign after inquiries had got under way—in short driven out. He discussed the mechanisms by which this has been done. To quote from the New York Times report on his testimony (March 26):

"Refusal to answer questions about communism was taken as an act of insubordination and a ground for dismissal by the Board of Education.

"Another process for ridding the system of Communists, Dr. Jansen pointed out, was Section 903 of the New York City Charter . . .

"Still another way of meeting the problem, he declared, was discovery of false answers to loyalty questions in applications for teaching posts. This had operated in a few cases, he said.

"Dr. Jansen defended Federal and State legislative investigations into subversion in schools on the ground that local and institutional handling of the problem could not be backed by sufficient authority, such as the power of subpoena and testimony under oath. Institutional investigations, he said, also were accompanied by a danger of futility and institutional damage through the finding of one faculty element divided against another in lasting unsettled controversy."

CLIMATE OF FEAR

Thus Dr. Jansen prefers Federal and State inquiries to local or institutional ones both for "hard" and "soft" reasons. The latter do not have teeth in them, and they encourage wrangling within the institution. If the morale and unsuspecting relations within the institution concern him, what of the climate of fear and suspicion created by Congressional investigations?

The New York Board of Education, Dr. Jansen related, "had decided that Communists should not teach American students. It was decided, too, Dr. Jansen testified, that teachers in New York City's schools should measure up to standards that no real Communist could meet. They were:

Loyalty to Country. A Communist would fail this test he said, because he had given his allegiance to an international conspiracy that had the destruction of American democracy as an aim.

Scholarship. A Communist could not have that, he held, because his mental processes were circumscribed by party line and under strict discipline.

Love of Children and Respect for all Individuals. An individual does not count, he remarked, in a Communist state.

High Ethical Standards. Communists "definitely advocate lying" when it is deemed to achieve their objective, he declared."

Let us briefly consider the arguments advanced here.

LOYALTY TO COUNTRY

With regard to the first criterion, one need only point out that Jansen's method of firing alleged Stalinists bears no relationship to it. In no single actual case has the Board of Education attempted to prove that the individual had expressed

"disloyal" sentiments in or out of the classroom. In any event, "loyalty," in and of itself, is a concept capable of the most flagrant abuse.

As to scholarship, it is true that where the Stalinists hold State power, the arts and sciences are whipped into line by the regime. In Russia "deviations" are found even in music, and woe to those who do not confess and beat their chests!

However, does it not follow that a Communist Party member in this country is necessarily subservient to the Stalinist line on everything? Indeed, this writer has encountered Stalinist intellectuals who had reservations about the line, particularly in their own field. One of them was a biologist who, otherwise devoted to the Kremlin's policies, regarded Lysenko's theories as nonsense. He was disturbed by the official embracement of Lysenkoism and the proscription of other views. But he would go through all sorts of rationalizations to show that this was not the actual case.

Now, one can ask, how a person competent in his field, and generally intelligent, can rationalize the way this scientist did. However, this unfortunately happens and is not limited to Stalinists only. *But the point is that in his field this man did not hew to the line, and it was the most sensitive area through which to enter an attack on his Stalinist views.*

Among fellow-travelers, deviations from the line on one question or another are abundant. And even though the CP seeks to establish unswerving obedience to the line, the existence of such "blunders" invalidates the reasoning: "a CP member, therefore a prisoner of the CP line in all fields."

LOVE OF CHILDREN

The same fallacy is present in the application of the criterion of "Love of Children and Respect for All Individuals" to CP members.

Now, it is true that the individual—and the mass—is crushed in the barbarian Stalinist state. And it is true that by membership in the CP a person is working to bring such a state of affairs about here. But does this mean that a teacher, who is a member of the CP, cannot by virtue of his affiliations and views have a Love of Children and Respect for the Individual? In most cases Stalinist teachers, we daresay, do not adhere to a Russia which tramples on children and adults but to a fantastically happy picture of a regime doing the utmost for the people. Time and time again Stalinist adherents, when confronted with evidence for the barbarism of Stalinism, deny the evidence as the lies of enemies and wreckers.

That Stalinists, or those accused of being Stalinists, can be excellent and warm-hearted teachers with a love of children we have seen in enough cases to dismiss Dr. Jansen's moonshine.

Just one example: Several months ago this writer was struck as by lightning on reading about the investigation of a certain instructor, and his subsequent resignation. He was accused by a Congressional committee of having been a CP member and having recruited students to his movement. This man was one of the finest teachers one could find, an excellent instructor and a princely man. His resignation brought on by the investigation (and if he had not resigned one can be pretty sure he would have been fired) is a great loss to his students.

Now, whatever his political views and affiliations, he never expressed them in class in any manner which exceeded the bounds of objective teaching. Even a political conscious student of his had to read about his "exposure" in the Times to find out that he had been subjected to alleged Stalinist "influence."

Finally we come to the last criterion for a teacher's fitness: High Ethical Standards. The Stalinists are debarred, presumably, because their movement "de-

finitely advocates" lying when it is their political interest to do so.

If the same criteria were to be applied to all teachers, we fear that New York's school system would be denuded of its staff. For those of them who are not Stalinist are quite likely to be Democrats and Republicans. And even though we cannot prove that these parties advocate lying when it is to their advantage, we can certainly prove that they practice it.

In the last elections, did not both parties claim that the election of the other one would ruin the country? Would Jansen admit that they were both telling the truth? Did the Republican Party say that they could both cut taxes and balance the budget? Does it follow that Republican teachers be thrown out as a mass because their party has low ethical standards? And should the Democratic teachers be fired because of the lying, bribery, and corruption which has been proved about their party, particularly in New York City.

Actually, all these criteria and arguments are Jansen's attempt to give a high-sounding reason for the procedure he has employed in firing teachers in New York. In most cases no attempt was made to prove that they are members of the CP, let alone that they were personally guilty of violating any of the alleged criteria for teachers set up by the Board of Education. Most were fired on the sole grounds that they refused to answer the \$64 question. And it is reasonable to believe that at least in some of these cases the refusal was based not only on the teacher's membership in the CP, but on a reluctance to give information on other teachers. Since a demand for such information invariably follows admission even of past CP membership which has been followed by opposition to the Stalinists, these teachers were performing an ethical act in risking their own jobs so as to protect others from persecution.

SYL-YPSL Has Program of Joint Summer Activities

By JULES SOREL

The trend towards closer co-operation between the two anti-war socialist youth groups, the Socialist Youth League and the Young Socialists (YPSL) has been gaining new impetus over the summer as a result of the cementing of a firm alliance of the two. Conscious of the increasing need for unity of all third camp socialists in the youth field, the YPSL began the summer with exchanges of discussion between themselves and representatives of both the National SYL and its New York unit destined to promote the closest co-operation between the two organizations.

The discussions, based upon an atmosphere of good faith rather than strictly formal ties, have already begun to bear fruit. Under the conviction that the two groups must meet together as regularly as possible if the planned co-operation is to become a reality, the New York units succeeded in planning a summer program for their respective organizations under joint sponsorship. The most significant aspect of the program was a series of educational forums now taking place.

SUCCESSFUL FORUMS

The joint forums, focussed upon broad sociological topics, have been intended to promote discussion rather than merely to provide interesting lectures. Consequently, the keynote forum on "Alienation in Modern Society" consisted of a short introduction by the speaker, Harrington of the YS. This was followed by a discussion, led by the speaker, in which all members of the audience were invited to participate. In this, it was a complete success since a large part of the packed house contributed to what

all felt to be a fruitful and provocative discussion.

The following forum, led by Egal Roodenko of the War Resisters' League on "Trends in Modern Pacifism" was conducted in a similar manner and evidenced the intentions of the sponsoring organizations to provide speakers chosen on the basis of familiarity with their topic and ability to provoke discussion rather than strict agreement with the views of either or both groups.

At this point in the forum series it was planned to have Terence McCarthy of the Socialist Party speak on "The Economic Basis of Forced Labor in the Americas," but the suspension of the local YS by the New York local of the Socialist Party (discussed in a previous issue) resulted in McCarthy's being forbidden to speak. At the last moment, Al Findley of the ISL volunteered to discuss the role of the collective farm movement in Israel. Another forum presented Abe Stein on "The Struggle Within the Kremlin," a Marxist interpretation of current developments in Russia.

The forum series entered its second month with Max Shachtman speaking on "The Historical Significance of the Left Opposition." A capacity crowd heard comrade Shachtman give a detailed analysis of the origins of Stalinism and the role and tactics of the Left Opposition. The next joint meeting, to be held this week, will be a membership discussion on the question of socialist perspectives in the United States.

Discussion forums, however, are not the only activity planned for the summer. The middle of August will see a Film Social in place of the regular Friday forum. Joint socials and outings have been held and others are planned.

ANTI-WAR SCHOOL

Nor will the summer program end with the final forum. The two groups are also sponsoring, along with Focal

Point of Yale, the War Resisters' League, and other anti-war groups, the second New England Anti-War Summer School. The program, centered upon the topic of "Social Revolution in the Twentieth Century," includes camping as well as classes. It will be held between September 6-12 at Friendly Crossways near Harvard, Massachusetts. Those interested in further information about the Summer Camp should write:

Dorthea Bone
Summer School Committee
230 Prospect Street
New Haven, Connecticut

Further information about the coming forums and socials may be obtained by writing or dropping down to the SYL at Labor Action Hall.

This type of co-operation, based on mutual respect, can only be greeted by all socialists with warmth and approval. It signals the beginning period of a co-operation which can only lead to the most fruitful results.

**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.**

Isaac Deutscher — Apologist for Stalinist Totalitarianism

Workers' Revolt or Kremlin 'Democratization'

By A. STEIN

Isaac Deutscher has acquired a considerable transatlantic reputation and audience in recent years as an authority on Russia. His biographical study, *Stalin*, published in 1949, at first glance seems like a solid piece of work. It attempts to explain the mystery of Stalin's rise to power and to pass judgment on his historic role. Deutscher's undeniable mastery of the facts he has assembled, his gift for historical analogy and the logical manner in which his exposition unfolds are bound to impress the reader. Above all, Deutscher's "objectivity," the cool and dispassionate manner in which he weighs the conflict between Trotsky and Stalin, tracing the diagram of social forces symbolized by each personality in the struggle, gives the book a scholarly tone that seems to raise it above the hurly-burly of partisan and factional politics. And what gives final weight to Deutscher's judgment is that he denies none of Stalin's excessive cruelties, the tremendous falsifications of history and the synthetic nature of the Stalin myth.

Deutscher's basic thesis is seductively simple. Stalin was the blind instrument history chose to complete the basic tasks of the October Revolution begun by Lenin and Trotsky. He combined the qualities of a Robespierre and a Napoleon. Like the first he was compelled to resort to the weapon of revolutionary terror to safeguard the fundamental revolutionary conquests and to complete them; and like the second he was compelled to carry the revolution abroad on the point of bayonets. Regrettable as Stalin's excesses were, inhuman as they were, they were forced upon him by objective necessity. Stalin was great in the sense that Robespierre, Napoleon, or let us say, Bismarck, were great. *Malgré lui*, despite himself, Stalin was forced by history to take the only possible, the only correct road that could have saved the Russian Revolution from shipwreck. He transformed Russia from a backward nation of *muzhiks* into a first-rate industrial nation. Therein lay his revolutionary greatness.

The Paradox of Personality

And thereby Deutscher explains the paradox of personality. Trotsky was incomparably superior in his gifts as a revolutionary, an organizer, a politician, a writer and an orator. Stalin was his acknowledged inferior. And yet Stalin triumphed. This happened because the revolutionary internationalism of Trotsky was a delusion and violated historical necessity. The sacred egoism of narrow nationalism which Stalin raised as his banner in the formula of "Socialism in one country" was justified and redeems Stalin and all his works.

Alas for Deutscher and his historical schema, so scholarly, so neat and so utterly, utterly false. Robespierre wielded the revolutionary terror to defend the basic conquest of the French revolution—bourgeois property. It was necessary to crush those on the right—including the moderate Girondins—who dreamt of, and had actually conspired to restore the monarchy and feudal property; it was equally necessary to crush the extremists of the left, the Hebertists and Enragés, whose program of primitive communism and equalitarianism could not be realized and would have ended in collapse and ultimate restoration. Robespierre and his Jacobin faction represented the exact mathematical center of the French revolution. Napoleon, its consolidation.

To give his historical analogy a semblance of reality, Deutscher had to prove the following: that the Right-Wing Opposition stood for capitalist restoration; that the Left-Wing pursued a program that was utopian and would end in shipwreck for the revolution; and that conspiracies were being hatched on every side. Once these points were established, Stalin could be dressed up in the garb of a Robespierre and the terror given revolutionary justification.

But the historical analogy was not quite so

Writing in the English newspaper *The News Chronicle* for July 13, 1953, the well known analyst of Russian affairs, Isaac Deutscher had this to say:

"The Germans who on June 16-17 descended on the streets, assailed the People's Police and met Russian tanks with a hail of stones, may have had their genuine and long-suppressed grievances which demanded an outlet. Nevertheless, their action had unfortunate consequences in Moscow. It compromised the men who stood for reform and conciliation. It gave fresh vigour to the diehards of Stalinism and other irreconcilables. . . ."

This type of reaction to the great events in Eastern Europe is not confined to Isaac Deutscher. It is common to all points of view which reject the independent struggle of the working class as the answer to both Stalinist and capitalist imperialisms, and seek a solution to the central issue of our times in the action of the governments and ruling classes on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Deutscher is one of the most able and sophisticated spokesmen of this point of view. We believe that the following article, which traces Deutscher's method and approach from their earlier application to the history of Stalinism down to the present, is an important contribution to our understanding of the past as well as of the great events which are now unfolding before our eyes. Ed.

neat. The Russian Left-Wing opposition certainly did not base its program on primitive communism and a crude equalitarianism. Trotsky's program had as its main plank: industrialization, (which Stalin simply appropriated and distorted) revolutionary internationalism, and the restoration of party democracy as a means of struggle against the usurping bureaucracy.

Deutscher's task boils down, therefore to two main points. To prove that democracy was impossible because it encouraged conspiracy, and that Trotsky's belief in the possibility of revolution abroad was a mirage. If there were conspiracies, democracy was impossible and the terror justified. If revolutionary internationalism was utopian, then Stalin's program of industrialization and the barbaric form it took was the only road for the Russian revolution. Russia could only advance under the whiplash of a monstrous dictatorship.

II

FROM THE KIROV MURDER TO THE MOSCOW TRIALS

The starting point of the Stalinist terror was the murder of Kirov in 1934. By now sufficient evidence has accumulated to show that Stalin instigated Kirov's assassination to rid himself of a dangerous rival, to prove that a "liberal" policy of relaxing the dictatorship was impossible, and to justify the wholesale physical annihilation of all sources of opposition, including rebellious members of his own clique.* For while the opposition groups had argued for the restoration of inner party democracy, within Stalin's own politburo, his own praetorian guard, there were people like Kirov who thought it possible to relax the terror now that the opposition had been smashed and the foundations of industrialization laid.

Deutscher's handling of the Kirov murder is dubious, to say the least. He accepts as authoritative the final Stalinist version of the affair, and never treats the non-Stalinist interpretations which directly pointed to Stalin as the chief author of the plot. Nikolayev, the young assassin is pictured as an embittered former Zinoviev supporter who had succumbed to the idea of individual terrorism. In Deutscher's version, Stalin rushed to Leningrad, interviewed Nikolayev and came to the conclusion that "the time for quasi-liberal concessions was over. His victory over the opposition had been far from complete. He had only succeeded in driving discontent from the surface to the depths of political life. He would now strike deeper and harder." This version of the Kirov murder and its outcome is necessary to Deutscher's historical image of Stalin as the victim and servant of historical forces beyond his control. Caught in the conflict between quasi-liberal elements and those who argued for an even more severe terror, Stalin wavered for a time, then adopted the latter group's viewpoint because of the Kirov assassination. A slight relaxation of the dictatorship had led to individual terrorism. Individual terrorism, if unpunished, might lead to larger conspiracies and the ultimate overthrow of Stalin. But if Stalin's program was the only objectively possible course Russia could take, then historically speaking, the bloody terror was justified. History, and Russia's barbaric past which

*Trotsky's pamphlet, *The Kirov Murder*, 1935; *The Letter of an Old Bolshevik*, MacMillan, 1937; most recently, Alexander Orlov, former NKVD official, in *Life* magazine of April 6, 1953.

provided ample precedents for individual terrorism and conspiracies, was to blame.

The Tukhachevsky "Plot"

This line of reasoning and the necessary "documentary evidence" is presented clearly in Deutscher's interpretation of the 1936-38 purges and the annihilation of Tukhachevsky and the entire General Staff of the Red Army in 1937. According to Deutscher, Stalin became alarmed at the possibility of an attack by Hitler. In case of war and military reverses, the opposition might overthrow him. Therefore, it was necessary, to destroy it root and branch.

But if Stalin feared that war was so imminent, then his catastrophic beheading of the Red Army does not make sense. Here Deutscher comes to Stalin's rescue by simply accepting in toto the Stalinist claim of a military conspiracy. Deutscher declares: "But all non-Stalinist versions concur in the following: the generals did indeed plan a coup d'état. This they did from their own motives and on their own initiative, not in compact with any foreign power." One may well ask, what non-Stalinist version? This interpretation, repeated by Deutscher, was the last retort of Stalin when he could not convince the world of a link between the military and Hitler. When and where, and by whom was the claim presented that such a conspiracy existed? Where are the proofs? Deutscher gives none because there are none.

All the non-Stalinist versions declare, on the contrary, that there was no military conspiracy of any kind. There is, on the other hand, proof that an attempt was made to fabricate evidence of such a plot. It was prepared by the GPU, transmitted through a double agent, a White Russian general, Skobilin, operating in Paris, to the Gestapo and then in turn transmitted back through French and Czech government sources to Stalin.**

III

OF "HISTORICAL NECESSITY" AND REVOLUTIONARY UTOPIAS

Having proved, with Stalinist manufactured evidence, that the terror was justified by the conspiracies against the regime, Deutscher then set out to prove that Trotsky's belief in the reality of international revolution was as utopian as the belief of the Enragés in primitive communism.

This argument is presented most plainly in Deutscher's new book, which has just appeared, *Russia What Next*. He asks: "Was Stalin, then the great saboteur and betrayer of the world revolution as Trotsky saw him? Yes and no. He certainly did his best to destroy the potentialities of revolution abroad—in the name of the sacred egoism of the Russian Revolution. But how real and important were those potentialities between the two wars? Trotsky saw that period as one sequence of great but missed revolutionary opportunities. The historian of the period cannot be so sure about its latent possibilities. He can gauge only its actuality, not its potentiality." [My emphasis—A.S.]

The argument is astounding. The historian . . . cannot be so sure about its latent possibilities, says Deutscher, talking about revolutionary situations in the inter-war period. "He can gauge only its actuality, not its potentiality."! The reader pauses a moment to think: China from 1926-27; Germany in 1932-33; France from 1934 to 1936; Spain from 1931 to 1938. What force was it that prevented these revolutionary situations from developing into victories for the working class? None other than Stalinism, which in each and every case played the role of hangman and executioner of the proletarian and colonial revolution.

"Latent Possibilities?"

Stalinism could only thrive and prosper, its very condition of existence was the defeat of revolution abroad. And what at first was an instinctive fear of such revolutionary forces abroad, later became a conscious effort, alas successful, to throttle them. And Deutscher, who knows this history very well, must admit it in a backhand way, in order to give his argument some appearance of rationality.

The key, however, to Deutscher's falsifications lies in the word "latent." The revolution in China was not latent, the revolution in Spain was not latent, and the need to make a revolution in Germany, which Stalinism held back in every possible way, was not latent but a life and death question. If the historian must gauge the "actuality" then he must say, which Deutscher does not, that Stalin destroyed not "latent revolutionary possibilities," but "actual revolutions" that had every chance of success had not Stalinism played its counter-revolutionary role. But for Deutscher to say this would be to shatter completely his fiction: that Stalin was complying with historical necessity while Trotsky pursued revolutionary utopias and daydreams.

(To be concluded next week)

*For the most convincing evidence of this, see the volume U. S. Dept. of State, on *The Soviet Union, 1933-1939*, pages 383-86, and pages 519-520. Not one of the foreign military attaches in the various foreign embassies, including the French and Czech, believed there was any kind of conspiracy.

**The connection between the GPU and the Gestapo through General Skobilin is presented in "Secret Front" by Walter Hagen, published in Austria, 1950-51. Hagen is the pseudonym of a former Gestapo official.

European SPs: 'For Us or Against U.S.'

By LARRY O'CONNOR

Why are the chief supporters of American foreign policy in such political trouble in Europe today? Why have the Marshall Plan and its successors failed to build a solid political and military framework for America in Europe? And why, above all, are Americans and their government so disliked over there, after all the money that has been poured in with the idea that the heart will follow the bankroll?

These questions are forcing themselves more and more on the minds of American supporters of this government's foreign policy. And they take on a particularly anguished form when these supporters also consider themselves, or are considered, spokesmen for the liberal sector of American political opinion. After all, the liberals have been trying to sell support of U. S. foreign policy both here and abroad not, they believe, because they have become adherents of the idea of the "American Century," but because it is in the interest of the whole of humanity to understand and support the policies of this bastion, bulwark and arsenal of world democracy.

But as the political crisis engendered by the change of government in Russia, by the development of the "soft" cold war policy by the Stalinists, and by the workers' actions in East Europe becomes more acute, it also becomes more evident that as far as the masses of Europe are concerned American policy has utterly failed to gain real supporters. It is at this point that the frustration of some of the liberals here turns into a kind of impotent fury. Instead of probing for the reasons for the popular disaffection from American policy in Europe, they turn to a denunciation of the European for blindness, thanklessness or worse.

THE "NEW LEADER"

An example of this was contained in a recent article by Leon Dennen in *The New Leader*. Although readers of *Labor Action* who have been following *The New Leader* in recent years may wonder by what stretch of the term it can be called a "liberal" (let alone "socialist") magazine, they must be reminded that old standards can no longer be applied, and that a

publication so intimately connected with the Social Democratic Federation and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union must at least be thought of as a spokesman of "liberalism" in the McCarthy era.

Even more recently, we have the writings of Victor Riesel from Paris. Now, it is true that Riesel's columns appear chiefly in the Hearst press. But he also is a regular contributor to the aforementioned *New Leader*, and hence, by a simple logical process which can perhaps best be explained by that other prominent *New Leader* contributor, Sidney Hook, he too can or even must be considered a spokesman of a brand of latter-day "liberalism."

For the present purposes, perhaps the most interesting article by Riesel is dated July 23, and deals specifically with the attitude of the various European socialist movements toward the United States and its policies. He presents a picture which is most completely black. That is, it is black in his eyes, and in those of anyone else who judges the European socialist movement as if it were or should be nothing more than a series of loyal divisions of the American army. (When referring to Stalinist movements in a similar role it is customary to refer to them as "fifth columns" of the Russian army).

"Overlooking the Socialists' animosity toward the U. S.," he writes, "is as militarily dangerous, it seems to me, as it would be to send Moscow the hydrogen bomb in a diplomatic pouch."

TOOLS, ALLIES OR ENEMIES?

"We've accepted the Socialists as friends," he continues, "because they are in constant feuds with the Communist parties of their countries. We've hypnotized ourselves into believing that the Socialists, therefore, are our allies. They're not!"

For this type of "liberalism," you see, it is not enough that Socialist parties should fight the Stalinist enemies of the American government in their own way, and for their own objectives. Either they must also unquestionably support every American policy and action, or they are as dangerous to the

U. S. as the most successful atom-bomb spies could possibly be.

Proof of this horrible independence of the Socialist movements from the State Department, or even worse, from the Pentagon, is piled on till it makes one's head swim. In Japan, "the Socialists send protest delegations to Tokyo every time we put up a rifle or radar range." (This apparently refers to the protest of the Left-Wing Socialists of Japan against turning over the traditional common lands of certain poor Japanese communities to the American army for target-ranges, and thus depriving the villagers from their use for grazing their cattle and other purposes.)

But there is worse to come. When General Mark Clark offered \$100,000 to the first Stalinist pilot who would deliver a Russian MIG to the U. S. Army in Korea, a British labor peer, Lord Chorley had the gall to stand up in the House of Lords and denounce this as a "dastardly proposal" which sought to "bribe Chinese airmen to commit treason to their own country."

REPORTING, OR FRENZY?

If these were the sole grounds on which Lord Chorley denounced General Clark's proposal, we might join in wondering whether the good lord's socialist brains have not been addled a bit by his elevation to the peerage. A real socialist might have based his attack on the \$100,000 scheme on the basis that it illustrates a typical capitalist mentality which considers loyalty as a commodity to be bought and sold according to the laws of the market. But whatever we may think of it, to bracket this exercise of Chorley's democratic right to express a criticism of an American general with the delivery of hydrogen bombs to the Russians is to display a certain frenzy in the face of unpalatable political realities.

But there is more to follow. "The French Socialists have little more love for us than the Bevanites. Early in June . . . the Socialist Party here voted to support a prime minister who would reverse the nation's foreign policy—which meant turning on us." That is not all. "A few days later the Socialist British Labor Party issued an 18,000 word party platform based on the principle of breaking with American aid. It actually said that it would 'deliberately' discriminate against American imports while trying to increase British sales to the U. S."

Actually! Just think of it! The BLP proposes to do the same thing to the United States which the American tariff policies have been doing to Britain all along. The ingrates!

STAB IN THE CHECK BOOK

"The Italian Socialists now must be counted an enemy force." And that applies not only to the socialists allied with the Stalinists under Nenni, but equally to the "right-wing Socialists who have been supported by American money." Their crime? They "have been urging De Gasperi to cooperate with Nenni. What price friendship?" Overwhelmed by his disgust for people who follow their own policies after having been "supported by American money," Riesel omits to mention that the recent maneu-

vers of the Italian right-wing Socialists have been based on the first signs of a serious rift between the Nenni socialists and the Stalinists, and that their policies, whether wise or not, have been based on an attempt to exploit and widen that rift.

The German Socialist Party, it goes without saying, are quite outside the pale. They too are "actually" devoted to a policy of unifying their country rather than making its truncated Western portion an appendage of the United States. And even the Scandinavian socialists are not to be trusted at all. The Danes, it seems, are opposed to the building of Allied air bases in their country. Something should be done about them too.

Finally, heading up this group of "enemies" is none other than the Socialist International. Riesel thinks that it should be made to stand up and be counted:

"When the Socialist International Executive Council met here recently in the town hall of suburban Puteaux, Bevan, the loudest and most quietly admired of Europe's left-wing Socialists, actually urged that the International condemn Chiang Kai-shek and support the immediate admission of the Sovietized Chinese government to the United Nations."

WITH US OR AGAINST US?

Actually! Imagine that! He even proposed that the Socialist International, in the year 1953, condemn Chiang Kai-shek! One does not have to agree with Bevan's lack of insight into the nature of Stalinism, and hence his softness or even weakness in a Stalinoid direction to recognize that such a proposal is widely regarded as desirable in such places as the non-socialist governments of India and even Britain itself. But it is on the basis of such proposals and attitudes (this one, it appears, was a little too bold even for the leaders of the Second International, and was hence turned down in favor of a vaguer formula) that Riesel proposes that "it is . . . important to take on the Socialist International in a showdown fight to prove whether they are with us or against us."

Now just who is to "take on" the International is not quite clear. Should the State Department write a diplomatic note to the Executive Council, demanding an oath of allegiance to the United States government? Should the NATO command read the articles of war to the Council, which forbids soldiers to publicly criticize their officers? Or should David Dubinsky, or the editorial board of the *New Leader*, demand that the Socialist International give satisfactory replies to a "for us or against us" interrogatory, or otherwise they will do something to them?

Riesel is understandably vague about this, despite the vigor of his language. For a real showdown would disclose the last thing that these gentlemen want to understand: that in the whole wide world they stand virtually alone as "liberals" or even "socialists" who feel that the test of liberalism, or socialism, or even genuine anti-Stalinism lies in support of the political and military policies of the American capitalist government!

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Blood Money

To the Editor:

In this era of the A and H bomb we have become prettily used to expecting the worst from the new uses of science. I'd like to call attention to two of the latest, more personal, horrors that I'm unable to reconcile myself to.

First, and not uncommon, is the practice of selling blood to meet rent bills, a "familiar" expedient observable around Berkeley by students at U. C. Old analogies about "blood money" deservedly fall by the wayside as we behold this quarter-annual ritual, followed by an orange juice "chaser." However, blood is replaceable, we can always console ourselves, with a "Twenty-Fifth Hour" cheerfulness.

A new note was struck in this evening's Berkeley *Daily Gazette*, which has greater possibilities of grisliness, although limited to two transactions per person, excluding that monster two-headed uncle whom we keep locked up in the attic.

An unidentified farm wife had her offer to sell an eye for \$10,000 taken up by a Colorado retired contractor, who had seen her ad in the Wichita Falls

(Texas) *Record-News*. The 28-year-old woman "said that her family had been struggling for funds all her married life. She said she hoped to get \$10,000 to pay off about \$1500 in debts and move the family to Alaska for a fresh start. She and her welder husband have three children, with a fourth on the way.

"She said her husband, whom she described as a 'wonderful, considerate man' gave her permission to run the ad because he thought her chances of receiving an offer 'very slim.'"

Frank Benbow, the retired contractor, was proceeding under his doctor's advice saying: "I don't know whether an operation to replace my (left) eye would work, but I think it would be worth a try."

While not insensitive for the contractor, who is going blind in his other eye, it is an act of abomination for a newspaper to consider running such a travesty of an "ad." Science has discovered how to operate a "bone bank" through refrigeration. Is the next step likely to be an ad reading: "Bankrupt expectant father offers to sell left femur bone for \$2,000"?

Jack WALKER

Berkeley, June 21.

The 83rd Congress

(Continued from page 1)

limited. The promises to uncover the record of Democratic corruption were brushed aside. After all, even this Congress found it difficult to make a pretense of righteousness, when on opening day they found before them a record of the financial dealings of their chief investigator, McCarthy, which would make an old Tammany ward-heeler blush. They promptly buried it, and with it the promise to investigate the Democratic administrations.

For the rest, this Congress was not lacking in humorous incidents. In its very first days it was confronted with a nominee for secretary of defense who could not get it into his head that there is any difference between the interests of General Motors and the United States. Toward the end of the session, they had the pleasure of interviewing a nominee for the director of the Bureau of Mines who frankly said that he was against all mine-safety legislation, and was and would continue to be financially beholden to one of the large mining corporations. In between they were able to confirm the nomination of a man who opposes all public housing to head the public housing program, and of a person who represents the enemies of the public lands program to administer the public lands.

But the World Goes On

While Congress stood still, or pedaled slowly backward, the world continued on its course. The

Stalinist "peace" offensive got under way, the workers rose in Eastern Europe, the war in Korea was brought to an end. Plunging forward under the impetus given it by the armament program, the American economy continued on its boom phase. Nothing this Congress did do or could do, had much effect on the development of these trends.

But now it has adjourned, and will not revive till the beginning of next year, unless the President finds it necessary to call a special session. In the meantime, the world will not stand still. As a matter of fact, there is every reason to believe that things which have been started will have come to a head by that time, or shortly afterward. The boom will not last forever, and the build-up to a really decisive crisis in foreign affairs is there for all to see.

Will the same men who have slept so soundly in the 83rd Congress suddenly come to life in the 84th? Under the lash of crisis they can be counted on to thrash about more actively, that is true. But they will represent the same interests, and the same political parties which they have represented in the past. Left to themselves nothing better can be expected of them. Only a real political groundswell outside of Congress, and outside of the political parties which both in power and in opposition have demonstrated their futility, can start to change the drab, conservative, deadly character of American political life exhibited by the unlamented 83rd.

Robert A. Taft

(Continued from page 1)

vocacy of federal aid to education was entirely within the theory of his conservative philosophy and the Tory tradition which has always given education a special place and role. Aside from this, and his support of an unimportant piece of public housing legislation, the labor movement owes but a single debt of gratitude to Taft for at least once placing his factional antagonism to the Democratic administration above sound class instincts. This was when he blocked the worker-draft provision of Truman's proposed law to deal with the railroad strike in 1946.

In his defense of business interests, Taft was the foremost figure of the "practical right" within the Republican party during a period of war economy prosperity. His program had meaning only for such a period and was tempered by considerations of political and social necessity. An implacable foe of "big labor," Taft was able to come to expedient agreements with "reasonable" labor leaders, like the reactionary Harry Lundeberg of the West Coast Sailors Union. In this area, as in all others, Taft had an instinctive genius for attracting to himself the forces, the sentiments and feelings of reaction. At a time when the social climate and the strength of organized labor prevented the development of an independent and completely reactionary movement of the lower middle classes against labor, Taft became the leader of a broad coalition of

conservative forces within the party of big business.

COVER FOR REACTION

His family tradition of public service, his vast inherited wealth and his undeniable sense of personal honesty and intellectual integrity separated Taft from other elements in the Party who are forced to rely on straight reactionary demagoguery to create for themselves a following. Taft never let himself be associated with the irresponsible charges of a McCarthy (and charged with responsibility, he could indeed carry on a fight against him) nor implicated in a personal scandal such as Nixon's. By position, associations and training, Taft was the direct representative of the collective interests of Mid-Western industrial circles. This was undoubtedly the source of his independence and integrity. But at the same time, Taft served as a general cover for and leading figure of all reactionary elements; if he would not pay homage to McCarthy, McCarthy was certainly willing to express his gratitude to Taft. And in a period of social crisis, it would not be Taft, but the more reactionary elements he helped to raise which would take over Taft's position of leadership.

Yet perhaps as much as his domestic ideas, which were his primary stock-in-trade with his supporters, it was his position on foreign affairs which earned the bitter enmity of his liberal opponents in

both parties, and at the same time won him wide support among the voters. Prior to World War II he opposed lend-lease and the draft but advocated aid to Britain. Believing in reciprocal trade, he voted against the act with that name in 1945. Supporting the idea of an international organization, he voted against giving money to the UN. Calling for America to declare a Monroe Doctrine for Europe, he voted against the Atlantic Pact. Coining the phrase "Truman's war" for Korea, he called for a "stronger" policy in Asia.

In assuming all of these seemingly contradictory positions, Taft was only partly moved by an extremely narrow conception of American capitalism's interests, or by a short-range desire to reduce the budget. He was also taking steps, even if in opposite directions, to separate himself from responsibility for the administration's foreign policy and its uninspiring consequences. Thus he drew political strength from the frustration and opposition which this policy and its failures created.

In foreign policy as well as domestic, Taft represented the conservative reaction to the Democratic administration's inability to solve its problems on a world scale. And in the same way, his success can be attributed to the failure of any powerful social force to put forward an alternative program or criticism of the Administration.

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

As Pegler Sees It

We know that there is almost no end, and certainly no change, in the ravings of Westbrook Pegler, and hence little point in keeping our readers informed about them. But every now and then we read them, just to keep up with what passes for thought in the right-wing booby-hatch of Republican Hearstism. Here is the last section of his column for August 2, 1953:

"The dominant element of the present Republican Party is no less socialistic than the Democratic Party. This includes Ike, Dewey and the whole eastern element from Maine down through Pennsylvania.

"The Eisenhower Democrats of the South howled for handouts when their cattle famished in the drought. But they didn't think of reducing the price of beef when their stock was fat. They are, in short adjusted to socialism even though they regard themselves as rather sporty Republicans. The creeping socialism feels nice.

"I would say . . . that even though we have a Republican ticket in 1956 it will not represent a Republican Party. It will represent a socialist party.

"In four or eight years more, even the title will have vanished with the fundamentals of the Government established by the Constitution—'republican in form.'"

Read about Independent Socialism

in the special pamphlet-issues published by LABOR ACTION—

10 cents each

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.

Independent Socialism and the Third World War.

The Fair Deal: A Socialist Criticism.

Socialism and Democracy: The Independent Socialist View

Order from:
LABOR ACTION
114 West 14 Street, New York City

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME (please print) _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____
ZONE STATE _____

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2. New
 - 6 months at \$1. Renewal
 - Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print) _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____
ZONE STATE _____