

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 26, 1950

FIVE CENTS

GM CONTRACT & UNEMPLOYMENT:
The Company President Gives an Angle
... page 3

CP Fronts: They're on the Shoals
... page 2

N. Y. Daily Shut Down by Strikers
... page 2

Is Yugoslavia a 'Workers State'?
... page 5

The British Labor Party and European Unity

'Socialism in One Country': Heart of the BLP Stand

By HAL DRAPER

What is the *thinking* behind the British Labor Party's declaration on "European Unity"?

Is it "doctrinaire socialism," as the U. S. press commentators are calling it in somewhat heated abuse?

Is it simply old-line British nationalism, isolationism or provincialism?

We think it is neither: the first is demonstrably not true, and the second is superficial. And what it *is* does not have as familiar a label as those two epithets. It might help understanding to leave the label for the end rather than the beginning, and to consider first the two interpretations being put forward.

Is it "Doctrinaire Socialism"?

As LABOR ACTION mentioned last week, the New York Times and other sources have been presenting the British statement as if it were a product of the "left wing" of the Labor Party, said "left wingers" having put their document over behind the backs of the sober, undoctinaire Laborites like Attlee and Ernest Bevin. Or at least such was the frame in which it was put in the first dispatches.

As this is written, the Times at least is carrying the report that this is not believed in England, certainly not in the Labor Party. "In reality," writes its correspondent Raymond Daniell, "there never was much difference between the government and the party except over the choice of words and the time for speaking bluntly." And he quotes the (British) Press Association's diplomatic correspondent that "[Paul] Hoffman [ECA administrator], the principal American critic in the early stages, has now come around to the view that the National Executive's pamphlet and the cabinet's statement on the plan amount to very much the same thing instead of being, as he at first thought, sharply divided."

In any case, the view that the party declaration was a product of left-wing thinking could make sense only by ignoring a couple of facts about its sponsorship and authorship.

(Continued on page 6)

You're Invited
To Take the Floor
On This

The declaration of policy by the British Labor Party on European unity (the text of which is now available in this country) has raised important problems for socialists, not only with regard to European unity itself, but also with regard to an analysis of the British Labor Party and its government.

In this issue we present three articles taking up different aspects of the questions; the discussion begins with the article to the right on the Schuman Plan and the U. S. reaction to the Labor Party statement; continues with the article to the left on the thinking behind the LP leaders' views, and leads to the article on page 7 on socialist alternatives to both the Schuman Plan and the BLP's stand.

These articles, insofar as they discuss the nature of the Labor Party and Labor government's politics, should be considered as contributions to the discussion on the very important developments in England of the past years. Readers are invited to participate in the discussion and express their own views.—Ed.

U.S. Attack on BLP Tags Meaning Of Pool Plan as Anti-Socialist

By MARY BELL

The current conferences on the most significant of the "integration" plans to date, the Schuman Plan, which calls for a European steel-coal pool under a supra-national authority, finds the British Labor Party government on the sidelines, and its reasons for refusal to participate the subject of widespread attack.

The specific details of the pool—its organization, extent, method of representation, powers—are not known since they are under discussion among the six powers at the conference. It has not been ratified by any government, including those most intimately concerned, the French and German.

Yet many things are known about the proposed plan and why it presents a special problem for the British Labor Party. The vigorous backing of the United States was a foregone conclusion: European "integration" on a vaster scale had already been proposed by ECA spokesman Paul Hoffman as a part of the general U. S. purpose of welding a Western bloc as a counterweight to Russia and its sphere of influence; and, corollary to this, as a means of European "self-help" to close the dollar gap by lowering the tariff barriers to intra-European trade and attempting to create a single market.

The motivations of the European enthusiasts for the plan are known. For France it represents an attempt to get rid of German competition in iron and steel, a historically well-grounded phobia of the French ruling class. For the Germans it represents a good-will gesture for the amity of the United States, which can be expressed in greater American aid to the German economy.

It is also known—and this knowledge forms part of the core of Labor Party objections—that any such plan adopted by the present governments of Western Europe will create a new giant capitalist combine. The Christian Socialist chancellor of Germany, Adenauer, is already trying to oust from power in the Ruhr the socialists who favor nationalization of industry. Any authority set up by the capitalist governments of Western Europe will answer to the industrialists and its policies will be determined precisely by the profit needs of the industries involved.

The continental socialists, who for the most part favor the plan,

(Turn to last page)

Israel Makes Arabs 'Second-Class Citizens'

Campaign Against 'Infiltrators' Covers Squeeze-Out of Arab Peasants from Land

By AL FINDLEY

The policy of the Israeli government in relation to the Arab refugees from its territory is a sorry one, as has been pointed out in LABOR ACTION before. Recent events have added horrid details to an already bad course.

The armistice line between Israel and the various Arab armies cuts across natural boundaries, villages, etc., and has separated many Arab peasants from the land they till. This was the case in the Hebron area; it involved 12,000 Arabs and about 55,000 acres of land.

Last year the Israeli army permitted the Arab peasants to cross the armistice line to sow the land and to repossess. At harvest time the peasants came back, reaped the fruits of their toil and then returned to the other side of the line. This year something new was added.

This year the Arabs were permitted to plow and sow their land but when harvest time arrived the army found "security" reasons to prevent the Arabs from crossing the line and harvesting their crops.

The Israeli government claims that it is acting legally within its rights under the armistice agreement. This

seems to be borne out by the fact that Jordan made no formal protest. However, as far as the average Arab peasant or Jewish worker is concerned, such "legality" cannot and does not remove the stigma that rests upon such an unreasonable, cruel and inhuman action.

Accusations have also been made by UN sources about the mistreatment of Arabs entering Israel without permission. These Arabs are reported to have been tortured in the prison camp near Rehovoth, then were put over the border at points in the desert that gave them little chance of survival. Many died but a few reached Amman.

The charges against the prison camp were made once before and the Israeli government had reported that the camp was abolished. The recently reported atrocities at this prison camp show that the camp has been functioning all the time. The reaction of the Israeli government to the charge, and its promise to investigate, is an implied admission—this is clear to anyone familiar with the way the government and the Zionist movement usually react propagandistically when completely unfounded charges are made. Whether the current investigation will produce anything remains to be seen.

Many of the Israeli actions against Arab refugees

have in the past been passed off on the vague justification of "war needs." Neither of the above incidents can by any stretch of the imagination be justified under this claim. Such actions are wrong not only from the standpoint of socialism, labor and humanitarianism, but are wrong from even the narrowest selfish viewpoint of Israeli interests.

They can only add fuel to the propaganda of the warmongers, the Multi and the Stalinists, in line with the latter's accusations against the Jews as the despoilers and robbers of the Arabs. Such actions delay peace by preventing the growth of a popular desire for peace among the Arab masses, a peace so urgently needed by both Jews and Arabs.

The recent news has revived discussions about the position of Arab citizens in Israel. What is their status today?

The well-known statistician Leschinsky, in an article in the Jewish Forward of June 16, paints a rosy picture—a picture that is false and so easily disproved that one wonders how a reputable man like Leschinsky dares make such ridiculous statements.

According to Leschinsky, there is no unemployment

(Continued on page 4)

World-Telly Strike Shuts Down N. Y. Daily Newspaper

NEW YORK, June 19—Two firms have been chalked up by the New York Newspaper Guild (CIO), now in the second week of a spectacular strike against the World-Telegram & Sun, the largest Scripps-Howard outlet in the country.

This is the first time the publishing of a major daily has been totally squelched through strike action. (In 1923 all New York papers were combined into a single format during an eight-day typographers' walkout.) Management was unable to turn out a single copy of a paper normally selling 600,000 copies a day.

And this is also the first instance on record that a mechan-

ical union has wholeheartedly respected the picket lines of an office union. It was essentially this show of 100 per cent solidarity that brought about the "Telly's" shutdown. In fact, had the AFL typographers, pressmen, stereotypers, mail clerks and others returned to their jobs, a sheet of sorts would have been gotten out if merely to save advertising revenue, since there would presumably be enough non-union editorial personnel to prepare syndicated copy.

The present stoppage is the climax of three months of mock negotiations which management insistently conducted through a flunky from the chain's legal staff in

Cleveland. Not until about two weeks ago, after an enthusiastic strike vote of over 400 to 0, did the paper's New York office stir from its arrogant indifference to present so much as a token offer.

Outside of a few minimal grievance and security proposals, the Guild requested a flat 18 per cent wage increase which it later dropped to 10 per cent. This would put minimum salaries in line with most other city dailies, though they would be below those of the N. Y. Post, one of the "Telly's" two afternoon rivals. Management countered with a last-minute offer to increase wages \$2.00 a week for those earning below \$60, to \$5.00 a week for those earning \$175 and over (these latter being only columnists and top-ranking editors).

During the opening days of the strike the tiny Washington Street temporary Guild headquarters was mobbed with strike-duty volunteers from every unit in the local. At times close to 800 pickets could be counted; the round-the-clock lines sported many placards indicating support from units of the Times, Mirror, Jewish Daily Forward, Herald Tribune and many other city papers. Readers of LABOR ACTION can send contributions to Strike Headquarters, 224 Washington Street, New York City.

Up to now, management has been completely adamant, despite two attempts at conciliation by the U. S. Mediation Service. It is daily losing jobs of advertising and circulation to rivals, indicating a breakthrough in the previously arranged publishers bloc. Most of the other dailies also ran the strike story all over their front pages, proving that King Profit reigns supreme over "loyalty" when it comes to a good news item.

The striking editorial and business staffers are preparing for a long siege. They are enjoying the greatest strength of numbers and are aglow with the most widespread spirit of militancy since the Guild's shoestring founding in 1933 by Heywood Brown. Already there is talk of turning a possible victory into a fight against the other publishing moguls, the Hearsts, Sulzbergers, Reids and McCormicks, who, along with Roy Howard, have set and maintained the pattern for the lowest-paying of any skilled profession.

CP FRONTS

Stalinist Party Losing Out In Non-Party Sympathizers

By DANIEL WELSH

In a previous article, we reviewed some figures on membership in the Communist Party, made public through its press. Another yardstick of organizational strength is the amount of money which the Stalinists were able to collect under direct party auspices.

While no figures are given as to total dues collected, the CP claims to have raised, in the course of three fund drives during 1949, the sum of \$2,500,000, and in addition to have collected \$1,000,000 in the course of ten days as a special bail fund for the twelve Stalinist leaders. It will be recognized that this is no mean achievement, even for a party of the CP's reputed size, and it certainly compares favorably with Stalinist fund-raising efforts of previous years. It would appear from these figures that the CP still retains the loyalty and financial support of a large part of its previous supporters.

Yet even if these figures can be trusted, the picture is not really as favorable for the CP as would appear at first glance. A great deal of the money raised through direct party sources had to be devoted to purposes which previously would have been taken care of through contributions from non-party members.

This is a consequence of the Stalinists' growing isolation and estrangement from hoodwinked liberals who were formerly willing to contribute to the vast and elaborate network of Stalinist front organizations. The decline of such organizations as the "Friends of the Soviet Union" (in its various forms) and the "Independent Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions," and the consequent decline in their financial status is not reflected by figures of the party itself.

Fronts Are Floundering

Yet these organizations operated as direct auxiliaries to the party apparatus and supplied immense amounts of money for maintenance of functionaries who were almost always Stalinist hacks. Today liberals are much more wary of contributing to organizations which are clearly Stalinist-dominated.

An example of how this tendency operates, aided by the typical bureaucratic intransigence that Stalinists always display toward opponents, is the fate of the New York Civil Rights Conference. Originally designed to found a broad defense movement behind the "Case of the Twelve," this "united front coalition" floundered when many of the liberals refused to go along with the Stalinists in opposing civil rights for "Trotskyite fascists." The Stalinists found it necessary to abandon this enterprise and set up a much more narrowly constituted "Non-Partisan Committee in Defense of the Twelve Communist Leaders." Thereafter they were much more restricted in defense efforts.

Another interesting sidelight shows how the Stalinists are forced by bureaucratic-ideological considerations to disregard general political interests. When Anna Louise Strong sent the Non-Partisan Committee a check for \$1,000, the money was returned with a curt rejection to the effect that "an anti-Soviet agent" could not buy her way into "progressive ranks." The effects of the Tito split, given in financial terms, are seen in the failure of the Stalinist fund-drive among its Yugoslav periphery. While during the war it was capable of raising over \$50,000 from this group alone, it is currently engaged in a similar effort and has been unable to raise even one fifth of that sum.

Thus while we are given a picture of general financial stability in the Communist Party itself, its growing isolation has resulted in a considerable diminution of total Stalinist financial strength.

Another criterion of organizational influence is the CP press circulation. Here again we see that insofar as it measures party strength directly, the Stalinists claim not to have been affected too greatly by the government witchhunt. Circulation of the weekly *Worker* stood at an average of 79,000 throughout 1949. Fluctuation was considerable, due to the importance of sub drives. These drives are a direct party function and give some measure of actual party strength in terms of active sub-getters, who would appear to be no fewer than in previous years.

Growing Isolation from Sympathizers

On the other hand, in circulation of the daily press, which gives a better picture of general popularity, a decline has certainly taken place. *Daily Worker* circulation is down to 18,000, a new low point in its history. Another interesting fact is that of its total circulation only 3000 copies are distributed outside of New York City, so that if every copy were sold to a member, that would still mean that only one out of every eight claimed members read the party press.

Of course it is a well-known fact that on certain campuses people are discouraged from reading the *Daily Workers* because Stalinist student leaders themselves consider it so atrocious. Even greater declines have taken place in the circulation of some of the foreign-language papers, particularly the Yugoslav organ.

OHIO LABOR NOTES

CIO Wins Majority from UE; Court Upholds Loyalty Oath

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND, June 18—The CIO electrical union (IUE-CIO) made a clean sweep in the runoff elections at the General Electric plants here this week. In the elections to determine union representation several weeks ago, IUE had the edge over the Stalinist-controlled UE in most of the Cleveland units, but in five plants neither union had an absolute majority, necessitating these runoffs.

The total vote in all five was IUE 466, UE 336. The bargaining strength of the two unions in GE here now stands as follows: IUE has 17 units with 2455 workers, and UE has four units with 982 workers. The new IUE is quite proud of its accomplishment, as Cleveland GE Local 707 was only recently completely under the control of the Stalinists.

The control of these five units was very important to the unions involved, as the total number of workers involved could have swung the majority influence in this area to UE, if the latter union had won all five. As things stand now, the forces are not even closely matched. As a highlight of this election drive, James Carey, national IUE leader, made an appearance at a couple of rallies and gave pretty good talks, sticking to the trade-union issues involved.

LOYALTY OATHS AGAIN

Cleveland teachers were singled out for loyalty-oath requirements in a court decision this week. The school board had previously voted to demand this test of its teachers, and this action was challenged in a taxpayer's suit filed by a local lawyer. The case was heard in Common Pleas Court by Judge James C. Connell, who had previously gained fame of a dubious sort as the judge who issued contempt edicts against the Fawick strikers last year. His anti-labor bias at that time aroused the indignation not only of the workers but of many of his colleagues.

Judge Connell, in his usual manner, gave an utterly reactionary ruling in this loyalty-test case and then went further in his remarks to criticize the high courts of this country for failure to be "sufficiently alert to the Communist menace." He further criticized the Executive and State Departments for their failure (in his opinion) to combat this danger adequately. The judge wound up by suggesting that those failing to sign loyalty oaths should be "removed, disfranchised, disbarred and deported."

Questioned about the hearing later, the lawyer bringing the action admitted that he would have preferred having another judge hear his case. It is not difficult to see why.

Farm Bureau Wags the Government

The House Agricultural Committee has been hearing startling testimony on the powerful and reactionary Farm Bureau, which hasn't been getting into the papers much. Included are details on the tie-ups between this outfit and the Farm Extension Service of the Agriculture Department, through which the big farmers virtually use the government agency as their front.

J. Lewis Henderson, a former Extension Service agent who recently made a study of small farmers' problems under a Rosenwald Foundation fellowship, was one of the witnesses: "Throughout the South the Bureau has been taken over by the large farmers. It represents the 'corporation' type of farmers, and the point of view of the power companies, banks and the Chamber of Commerce."

In one Mississippi county, for example, where the Farm Bureau has 4,000 members even though there are only 395 farm owners, most of the members are Negro tenant farmers who pay their dues under a forced check-off system arranged by the landowners. The county Farm Bureau never meets and its secretary is a banker.

One Farm Bureau stalwart was quoted as saying: "I require all my 75 tenants to join the Farm Bureau." A Tennessee witness testified concerning the case of a girl who got a job as a home-demonstration agent under the extension program. This girl had to write out five checks for \$10 each, paying her dues to the Farm Bureau five years in advance, before she could get a job.

Midway into 1950 —

LABOR POLITICS IN READING

READING, June 10—The politics of the organized labor movement in the city of Reading and in Berks County is still exclusively directed toward the Democratic Party. The New Era, a weekly labor paper established several years ago by George Rhoads, erstwhile Socialist and now Democratic congressman from Berks County, strongly champions the Democratic Party and proclaims it to be the "People's Party." The morally and programmatically bankrupt Democratic Party, for its part, needed the additional resources of the labor movement to sustain its life.

That some elements within the Democratic Party find the weight of organized labor somewhat heavy to bear and, therefore, unwelcome is certain; still these elements have little choice in the matter because by themselves they would have no future at all. By pursuing their present policy, the labor officialdom in Reading is helping to perpetuate a city administration that has achieved

the "honor" of being known as the worst administration the city has ever had.

An interesting sidelight on the Democratic primaries was the defeat of one of the two incumbent representatives to the Pennsylvania State Assembly from the Reading district. This situation developed from a factional situation within the union movement here. The representative defeated (by a nonentity) was Andrew Kondrath, who some time ago grew too big for his breeches and attempted to challenge the CIO Steel Workers (of which he had been sub-district director) for leadership in the Har-risburg-Reading District. His failure within the Steel Workers led him to organize an independent union, the Steel Workers Federation, which captured two locals in the Reading area, a development which induced Kondrath to organize an international union which is currently challenging Philip Murray in the United States and Canada for control of all steel workers in those two countries.

At any rate the CIO refused to support Kondrath in the primaries and threw its support to a nonentity who won the candidacy.

That the labor movement in Reading reduces itself to this kind of politics is almost criminal. In this area, with its long socialist tradition, the formation of an independent labor party would result in its becoming the dominant political instrument of the workers almost overnight. Such a party would relieve the grip of the corrupt and stupid politicians over the city and would arouse the enthusiasm of the workers in a campaign of creative energy. The formation of a labor party in Berks County would be a stimulation to the latent desire for such a party in other sections of the country. It would result in the workers voting for their hopes, for a positive program, rather than the negative fears that induce them to vote for the Democratic Party—because the Republicans are worse.

GM Contract and Unemployment

The Company's President Explains His Angle: A Danger of the 5-Year Feature

By PHILIP COBEN

Several articles have appeared in LABOR ACTION pointing out the dangers of the five-year term agreed on by the United Auto Workers (CIO) in its new contract with General Motors. It would be especially useful for trade-unionists to think hard about one of these, which emerges with especial force from some recent developments.

The president of GM, Charles E. Wilson, made a speech on June 8—after the signing of the contract—before the National Press Club which should give one to think furiously.

He seemed to be making a perfectly innocuous point, to begin with. As the New York Times reported:

Mr. Wilson said the central fact that made possible this "entirely different kind" of agreement was the union's complete acceptance of technological progress as the key to higher living standards and a rejection of "the erroneous idea that machines take the bread out of the workmen's mouths."

Nothing wrong with that, is there? Except . . . one may wonder at this point, even before Wilson inserts the knife, why the GM tycoon is claiming, by implication, that other unions do not accept this principle.

There was more of the same, all strictly limited by Wilson as applying to the new contract and, by the same implication, not to previous contracts or other unions:

The union, he said, has agreed not only to accept technological advances but has agreed to encourage them. With that kind of cooperation, said Mr. Wilson, General Motors expects to exceed the average gains in the productivity rate achieved by American industry in the last fifty years.

A last example:

Both parties [to the new contract] completely accept the principle of progress including the use of machines, mechanical power and better organization, better working conditions and better arrangement of the work in order not to waste human effort.

If the people of our country really understand this principle and stick to it and are willing to work for the things they would like to have . . . I have no worries about our country being able to stand the costs of pensions, insurance and high wages.

What's He Talking About?

All of this would make sense if GM had just made a contract with a union which had previously been denouncing or opposing the use of machinery, assembly lines, "mechanical power," (1) and other new-fangled inventions. But it need not be pointed out that the UAW has no "Luddite" faction in it. One has to be a student of the rise of capitalism even to recognize the term.

In those earliest days of the new industrial revolution, there were workers who saw the machines as taking the bread out of their mouths and sought direct relief in "machine breaking." It was, of course, no more useful than modern trust-busting in stopping the development of the inherent potentialities of the new economic system. There are remnants of the attitude today cropping up in isolated instances and in different forms—but never in the mass-production automotive industry and certainly not from Walter Reuther. Reuther, in fact, gained quite a bit of notoriety because of his flair for proposing schemes for greater efficiency in the use of plant capacity.

All that is breaking in an open door. The question is: What is President Wilson talking about?

We propose the following section of the same speech as the starting point:

. . . a continuing improvement in the standard of living of employees depends upon technological progress . . . and a cooperative attitude on the part of all parties in such progress. It further recognizes the principle that to produce more with the same amount of human effort is a sound economic and social objective. That is neither the speedup nor feather bedding; it is just what it says. The benefits of technology in raising the standard of living of a country can be dissipated through strikes, work restrictions, featherbedding, absenteeism and an artificially short work-week. Without a clear understanding regarding this matter we would not have had the courage to promise in advance a yearly increase in real wages.

So far, GM President Wilson explaining

what he likes about the new contract. So far the edge of the knife is not too visible. Wilson didn't intend it to be.

But without commenting any further ourselves, at this point, we present two other discussions of technological progress—this time from the labor press and not written with reference to the GM contract. The first is from an editorial in the Summit County Labor News of May 5:

AUTOMATION

The New York Times refers to it as "the newest production science in industry."

Here's what it means: By installing more automatic machines and taking full advantage of technological developments industry can reduce the number of its employees and still increase production.

Yep, that's "automation," and the Times says its sweeping industry.

That, of course, isn't news to CIO unions whose members have become victims of "automation."

They tell us that some of the newest gadgets are simply marvelous, from a technical standpoint, and some of them closely resemble "mechanical brains."

That isn't any comfort, however, to the man who's been tossed out of a job by a machine. Try to tell him he's making a great contribution to the advancement of industry and he'll probably say, "Yeah! But what am I supposed to use for money?"

The CIO has never been known as an organization that sought to halt technical developments—but it has been known, too, as an organization greatly concerned over the welfare of those who lose jobs through no fault of their own.

"Automation" is creating a problem—a problem that can reach serious national proportions unless something is done about it.

We're not suggesting that there's a simple answer or that we even have the answer. What we're saying, however, is that those close to the problem had better start studying it immediately and come up with some solution.

This labor newspaper is proposing it as a problem for labor—which it certainly is. But note that the reference to the New York Times also brings out that it is equally a problem posed before the capitalist owners of industry—especially with regard to their labor relations.

Productivity and Jobs

Our second exhibit gets down to the point. It is from the weekly newspaper of the railroad unions, *Labor*, for May 27:

Why, in the midst of record production and general prosperity, is America faced by the problem of increasing unemployment?

As Labor has reported previously, that mystery has claimed the attention of business writers and government officials, including President Truman. Now comes the Federal Reserve Board, to point up the issue and present new evidence.

The board's Monthly Bulletin observes that increasing "productivity" has been one cause of rising unemployment, and cites the huge profits which corporations piled up during the war as an important factor.

These large profits "have encouraged business to spend record amounts for new machinery and equipment of highly efficient design," the Bulletin says. This has meant increased total production without a corresponding rise in the number of workers employed.

This was born out by a Commerce Department announcement a few days earlier that total national production has climbed back to the record level of late 1948 after last year's decline.

But the number of unemployed has not dropped correspondingly.

The jobless problem is made worse by the fact that increasing population has brought a rise of about 1 million a year in the total of job seekers.

We're at the question of unemployment, then—the peculiar kind of unemployment which exists at the present time and which bids fair to become worse, not better. It is not the kind of unemployment which existed in the Great Depression of the '30s, and which was accompanied by the breakdown of industrial production—idle plants, idle machinery, closed banks and spider-webbed wheels. Just as during the '30s we used to speak of starvation in the midst of plenty, so today we see mounting unemployment in the midst of maintained productivity.

If the '30s are not back with us now, if the U. S. has avoided the crash into a recurrent depression, that is due—as we have analyzed many

times before, and as even capitalist economists have pointed out in their own way, notably Professor Sumner Slichter—to the shoring up of the system by the cold-war economy. But this is not our theme now.

The fact is that due to the cold-war economy on the one side, and technological progress on the other, we see the rise of unemployment without the accompaniment of industrial crisis in the sense of the '30s. It can lead to a crisis, depending on how far the government is willing to go in fostering the contemporary tendencies toward the dominance of production of the means of destruction in the economy. *But whether it does or does not, in the next period or before the greater crisis of war overtakes, unemployment does not become any the less a horrid specter before labor.*

Throwing Away an Answer

The Summit County Labor News called on labor to "come up with some solution." What solutions are there?

There is the basic solution, of course—as basic as is the tendency of capitalism to throw workers on the scrapheap as their place is taken by "automation." Technological progress should lead to ever-increasing productivity and ever-rising standards of living. Produce more with less labor, says Wilson; but that can have two results not one. It can mean: (1) produce more; and it can mean: (2) produce with fewer workers. The fact is that, under this private-profit system, it has been doing both: raising productivity and throwing workers out of jobs. Both can mean greater profits for the machine owners, and both are done.

The basic solution is not machine-breaking. It is utilizing the greater productivity of the machine for realizing the potentialities of plenty for all. But this requires the elimination of the private-profit owners of industry and a socialist economy. The solution, in fact, is too basic for the backward labor movement of the U. S. today.

But there is also a solution on the trade-union level. It is the solution which the trade-union movement is going to have to "come up with" as the problem intensifies, as it has done before. It is: *Spread the work! Shorten the work-week or work-day! Maintain production while keeping everyone employed at decent union wages!*

It is this demand of labor, looming right on the horizon, which is the problem which GM President Wilson was talking about. Closely bound up with it is the problem of the speedup, especially in the auto industry.

And Wilson, as we saw in his speech, specifically swung the edge of his knife against such demands by labor which, from his own point of view and only for his point of view of profits, would "dissipate" the gains of technological progress—that is, "dissipate" some of the gains into the hands of the workers. The knife was swung against "an artificially short work-week," and against strikes to counter speedup.

But there is nothing in the GM contract which stops the UAW workers' fight against speedup, up to and including strikes and job action, assuming that the UAW leaders do not stand in their way. What the GM contract does stop—for five years, a half-decade—is any effort by the union to spread employment at the expense of profit. What the UAW cannot get from GM, since the contract cannot be reopened on these points, are any new provisions if and when the problem of technological unemployment becomes overwhelming.

As the labor editorialist said, labor has to "come up with a plan." A black feature of the GM contract, side by side with the gains it registered and as the price of those gains, is that the UAW threw away—for five years—the main answer that labor has today.

This, to be sure, is only one aspect of the GM contract. It is for that matter, only one aspect of the dangers of the five-year term. But it points up the reasons why the five-year feature of the GM contract is a trap for labor, and not the trivial concession which the UAW leaders tend to make it out to be.

The BLP's 'Socialism in One Country' --

(Continued from page 1)

One is Hugh Dalton's role as godfather of the declaration. It would probably not be accurate to say that Dalton is to the right of Ernie Bevin, but to find him a millimeter to the left would be a sea-change indeed! The foreign correspondents also rang Aneurin Bevan's name in beside that of Dalton, but so far this seems to have rested on a pure deduction that if the declaration was a left-wing plot, Bevan must have had something to do with it.

In any case, while nothing so far has appeared with regard to Aneurin Bevan's role in the matter, it is reported (by A. M. Schlesinger Jr. in the N. Y. Post) that the Tribune group of the Labor Party has not at all taken the Dalton line. The Tribune is the paper around which is grouped a number of the figures in the Labor Party who are associated with Bevan's type of semi-leftism.

The Tribune's line is the obverse of that of the Executive's declaration. Where the latter reject the perspective of Western European union, the Tribune looks with hope and expectation to the Schuman plan for a capitalist integration of European economy. Rejecting the reasoning of the executive (and not because of its "doctrinaire socialism") they see only the alternative of the Schuman Plan; as advocates of European unity, they embrace it, with qualifications to be sure but also with hope.

It may be added, as a straw in the wind, that the Independent Labor Party's weekly, the Socialist Leader, like the Tribune group, also editorially supports Britain's entrance into the Schuman Plan, because the plan "provides the basis for a searching inquiry into the possibilities of union," and because Britain can better keep the proposed setup from being dangerous to socialist objectives by being in than by being out. Unfortunately, the Schuman Plan is a plan for more than a "searching inquiry," and the argument does not really meet the cogent objections raised in the Executive's declaration.

If the LP executive's declaration is the product of "doctrinaire socialism," there has surely been an unexplainable and amazing reversal of roles!

THE "PRINCIPLED" PASSAGES

But this has to do only with the sponsorship of the declaration. Isn't it true that the declaration itself bears down heavily on "socialist principle"? This is certainly so—in particular sections—the sudden spurge of "principledness" in some of the language is, to put it mildly, not characteristic of its authors. It might even be considered grounds for suspicion. . . . If these "principled" passages were really the heart of the document, it would be reasonable to consider it as an expression of "doctrinaire socialism"—but then there would be no reasonable explanation for the abrupt accession of galloping orthodoxy to its authors.

The fact is that the declaration presents, side by side and coordinately, two reasons for rejecting European union. The "principled" passages appear only in the first. Like this:

"The Labor Party could never accept any commitments which limited its own or others' freedom to pursue democratic socialism, and to apply the economic controls necessary to achieve it. . . . The Labor Party's socialist principles demand that the movement toward European unity should be such as to permit the continuation of full employment and social justice in Britain and the extension of those benefits over the rest of Western Europe. . . . No Socialist government in Europe could submit to the authority of a body whose policies were decided by an anti-socialist majority. . . ."

The principledness and doctrinaireness end with these proclamations, which are useful for the purpose of rejecting any orientation toward European union and play no role in the declaration's consideration of what is to be done.

If the LP Executive really saw European union as a desirable aim (as it says) and if they really saw European capitalism as its main obstacle, then it would be impossible to explain three outstanding characteristics of the main body of the document:

NO SOCIALIST PERSPECTIVE

(1) The declaration consistently picks up and plays down the very perspective of a socialist Europe.

In one curious passage, it sees no possibility of practicable union even if the other countries did have socialist majorities, because of something it calls "civic and administrative traditions." It speaks of a "permanent anti-socialist majority" on any supra-national authority.

In a summary paragraph it flatly labels European union as "excluded"—without any qualification such as "at present"—because of the "unattainable degree of uniformity" it would require. It considers the subject exhausted, in another passage, when it makes the point that such uniformity "does not now exist and is unlikely to exist in the immediate future."

It "fundamentally" rejects the abolition of intra-European trade barriers on the interesting ground that this would cause "economic disturbances and political tensions which would throw Europe open to Communism." Surely a revealing "fundamental" objection!

For one thing, the present system, which the LP leaders obviously fully expect to continue indefinitely, produces no lack of political tension and economic disturbance—their own "principled" passages even make a special point of insisting on this, but since it appears on a different page it does not get in the way. For another thing, the socialist transformation of Europe, which the "principled" passages claim to look forward to, can hardly be expected to come without those two dread accompaniments (not to speak of the even more horrid term Revolution), just as they accompanied the Labor victory in Britain.

Any reference to a socialist Europe is purely ceremonial; the thinking of the pamphlet is entirely based on the indefinite continuance of capitalism in the rest of the Western world.

(2) The "principled" socialist objections of the LP Executive, however correct in themselves, are further seen to play no decisive part in the thinking of the document when its authors counterpose to European union the kind of unity they themselves aim at. This alternative, so counterposed, is unity of the entire non-Stalinist West, not only including but especially including the U. S.

It would be superfluous to ask how they can speak of this either more hopefully or more favorably than European union if they take their principled passages seriously!

(3) If it is the capitalist character of Europe which stands in the way, what do they propose to do about it? As another article in this issue points out: nothing.

Conclusion: the passages in the declaration which understandably impressed correspondents as representing insistence on socialist principles are undeniably present but play no integral role in the thinking of the LP leaders. To put it bluntly, they are strictly window-dressing.

Is It Traditional British Nationalism?

Window-dressing for what?

The document is not coy on that matter. It is given as a second and coordinate reason for the LP policy, alongside the socialist principles, but it is given without too much doubletalk. The frankly imperialist Lord Beaverbrook had no difficulty in getting the point; the document shouts it at him and the reader, stridently. Here is the most concentrated passage:

"Britain is not just a small crowded island off the Western coast of continental Europe. She is the nerve center of a world-wide Commonwealth which extends into every continent. In every respect except distance we are Britain are closer to our kinsmen in Australia and New Zealand on the far side of the world than we are to Europe. We are closer in language and in origins, in social habits and institutions, in political outlook and in economic interest. The economics of the Commonwealth countries are complementary to that of Britain to a degree which those of Western Europe could never equal. Furthermore Britain is also banker of the sterling area. This is the largest multi-lateral trading system in the world—within which exchange controls are not applied and all transactions are conducted in a single currency. We believe it is in the interest of the world at large that this system should be protected and maintained. In any case it is a vital British interest."

Further quotation would re-emphasize the point but not change it. The economics of Western Europe, the document argues, are parallel and competitive. "The cause" of slow progress toward unity, it says, in another place, "does not lie in any inadequacy of the institutions which exist. It lies in real conflicts of interest which cannot simply be ignored or suppressed. . . ." But these and others are only footnotes on the above-quoted clear statement.

That this is the heart of the document is not a view peculiar to our analysis. It is clear that it is the interpretation of the document in British opinion right across the board, from right to left. The U. S. press has played up criticisms of the declaration in the British right-wing press; but it is now clear that this criticism is mainly on secondary points—timing, etc.—not on the main line.

The LP declaration itself more than once goes out of its way to insist that a Conservative government in power would have to take the same attitude if British interests are to be conserved. (The that up with the "doctrinaire socialist" reasons for the policy!) In fact, they charge by clear implication that Churchill's role in the Western European Union movement is insincere demagoguery.

This point was already made in last week's LABOR ACTION and the question we raise now is a further interpretation of it. It looks indistinguishable from the motivation of the capitalist elements who are applauding it; it looks like a mere continuation of the long-standing British imperialist aim of hanging on to whatever remnants of the empire are not yet in America's bag economically or independent politically. That it is narrow nationalism and imperialism cannot be gainsaid. In this respect it is of a piece with the foreign policy outlook evidenced by the Labor government since it took power: continuation of the old imperialist aims and methods throughout the world, from Palestine to Africa. Whatever may be said about the Labor government's domestic policies, it is certain that its foreign policy has been consistently on the reactionary side. And the question we are dealing with is in the province of foreign policy.

THE BLP'S KIND OF NATIONALISM

But it would be a mistaken simplification to consider it as being merely a continuation under Labor Party auspices of traditional British imperialism, though it meshes and dovetails completely with British imperialist needs and ideology. From the point of view of the political thinking of the Labor Party general staff, it is rather a resultant of two factors: national and imperialist interests AND the reformist socialist perspective characteristic of the Labor Party itself.

To call the combination "national socialism" may be undesirable only because of the tie-up of that term with the name of the Nazi party, which would be quite irrelevant. The "national-Bolshevism" of the Stalinist counter-revolution in Russia in its earlier stages, as Trotsky called it, would be more to the point. A New York Times editorial of the LP declaration was titled "Socialism in One Country." Though the editorial itself had virtually nothing to do with the title, the title at least showed a glimmer.

For the nationalism of the Labor Party leadership (and of its declaration on European unity) IS the nationalism of the theory and practice of socialism-in-one-country.

The Labor Party leadership sincerely believes that the national interests of Britain and the maintenance of its special hold over the Commonwealth is the "overriding" consideration for the sake of building "socialism" in

Britain. They believe this as sincerely as the Stalin of 1924 believed that it was necessary for Russia to turn its back on the world and European revolution and concentrate on its own national development, for the sake of building socialism at home. (To believe that Stalin started out with the sinister aim of creating a totalitarian despotism is as superficial as to believe that Atlee and Bevin are simply acting as the agents of Lord Beaverbrook's empire-rebuilders.)

This reference to the degeneration of the Russian Revolution can be both a help and a hindrance to understanding. It would be a hindrance if, taken outside of historical context, it is mechanically used to imply the automatic necessity of an identical line of development. It is relevant if it is used to understand why the Labor Party line cannot, on its basis, lead to democratic socialism in England, whatever else it might lead to; and if used to understand why it does, in fact, lead to the continuance of all the forms and methods of imperialism by the Labor government.

What stands out in the Labor Party Executive's declaration (and what bridges the two motivations they give) is the conviction that the narrow nationalist interests of Britain, its Commonwealth and the remnants of its empire, are identical with the interests of socialism.

Even of world socialism! In a remarkable sentence, the LP declaration states baldly that "The Commonwealth now represents the nucleus of a potential world society based on free cooperation." The parallel is striking with the early Stalin's (sincere) belief that he was not abandoning world revolution by turning inward to build socialism in Russia; he was finding another road to the same goal, which would be achieved around a socialist Russia as the nucleus. His departure from Marxism was merely a new means to an end—but the end did not long survive the impact of the means.

WITH U. S. AID?

But there is quite another element in the BLP's socialism-in-one-country. For Stalin, it meant striving toward self-sufficiency and an approach to autarky on the one hand, and maneuvering with the capitalist states on the other. Britain has not the natural resources of a Russia to waken the will of the wisp of self-sufficiency. The Executive's declaration even insists on the degree to which British economy depends on that of the world, on the "predicament" of British economy, on the decisive role of the dollar gap, etc.

The specific contradiction of this British version of socialism-in-one-country is the fact that this socialism, it would seem, can be built only with the aid of the United States—the only going-concern capitalism left in the world and the last-ditch rooster for "free enterprise."

The Executive's declaration in fact insists on the impossibility of getting anywhere economically without American dollars. Not only with respect to its remarks on the dollar gap (which, indeed, it makes into a virtually insuperable obstacle to European economic unity). "In the building of unity throughout the free world," it says, the U. S. A. must play a major part. For unless America's strategic, economic and political activities are closely integrated with those of Europe, Africa and Asia, the non-Communist world will be dangerously weakened. Moreover, America alone at present commands the resources needed to support the development of world unity in its early stages."

There would be a doubtful usefulness to asking how the Labor Party leaders expect to get the main bastion of capitalism in the world to help build their socialism for them. For one thing, whether with conviction or not, they argue in one place that next to Britain itself and the Scandinavian countries, the U. S. government is the most progressive in the world, and it should surprise no one if Atlee and his colleagues expect the Fair Deal to wake up one fine morning to find that it has made the U. S. socialist unbeknown to itself.

UNDER THE SHADOW OF WAR

For another thing, they too believe that they can maneuver their anti-socialist allies across the sea into tolerating their socialism. For is not the U. S.'s main problem its struggle with its Russian imperialist rival? Can U. S. imperialism, for all its distaste for British socialism, afford to turn it from its door as long as it is at death-grips with the bear? Can't they buy tolerance and aid for their socialism-in-one-country—especially if it is confined to socialism in one country—by swearing allegiance with double vehemence to the cause of the cold war?

So at least they count. It would be otherwise hard to account for the presence, precisely in the LP declaration under discussion, of what is probably the most extreme statement yet made by any European working-class movement rejecting the very idea of (even lip-service to) the idea of independence from the struggle between U. S. and Russian imperialism, certainly the most point-blank statement by the Labor Party rejecting any kind of neutrality.

Economically we fight for our own interests within the Western bloc; politically we line up with you—they offer the deal to America.

Socialism in one country of one bloc in the cold war—with world war hanging over its head; such is the basis of the Labor Party's perspective and ideology. Considering what war would mean for this pretty prospect, Stalin's socialism-in-one-country was a somewhat more reasonable proposition in comparison.

It is not only foreign policy and world orientation which is conditioned by this perspective, but it is these that we are discussing here. The Labor Party declaration on "European Unity" is founded on it, and not on any internationalist socialist principles.

Positive Approach to West European Unity Is Needed as Against BLP's Nationalism

The issue of European union and the Schuman Plan could have been an opportunity for a genuinely socialist Labor Party at the head of England to take the initiative in rallying the workers of Europe to the banner of unity. But the Labor Party executive, which is now being abused in the U. S. press for its "doctrinaire socialist" attitude, chose instead to present itself before the workers of Europe as the guardian of its own commonwealth and national interests.

The party declaration (in passing) even pointed to the conditions under which Europe could be united economically and politically. But this was done only in order to find reasons to reject any such orientation. It stated: "Socialists would of course welcome a European economic union which was based on international planning for full employment, social justice and stability. But international planning can only operate on the basis of national planning. And many European governments have not yet shown either the will or the ability to plan their own economies."

Such a policy would be a powerful lever in breaking the workers of France and other European countries from their allegiance to Stalinism.

The BLP statement proclaims that "some of the existing barriers to economic co-operation would become less important if the workers felt they had a real stake in supporting European unity."

But the workers of Europe cannot feel they have any stake in a European unity brought about by these governments. They can only feel they have a stake in such unity if it is brought about through their own efforts. Stated differently, they can only have confidence in unity if their own organizations, their parties and trade unions, are the vehicles by which such unity is achieved.

A STARTING POINT

Rather, the LP confines its proposals to the governments of Western Europe, to the very same governments which (it says) have failed to control their economies in the interest of their people, and which now intend, in its opinion, to set up an steel-coal pool which will be nothing more than a big cartel for dividing markets and restricting production.

Also in passing, the declaration says: "It is the duty of all who have European unity at heart to see that the Schuman proposals are shaped in the interests of the peoples as a whole. The decisive part in coordinating Europe's basic industries must be played by the governments, as trustees for their peoples."

Along the same lines: "It is also vital that the trade unions should be intimately concerned in the planning of Europe's basic industries. Only they can guarantee that wage levels will not be set by the least progressive industries in the plan. With their help the planning of basic industry can be an instrument for raising labor standards throughout Europe."

These undoubtedly correct remarks, thrown in to color the water, are left completely unrelated to the main line taken by the declaration—which is that of counterposing commonwealth unity (and vaguely, Western unity with the U. S.) as against Western European integration.

But they can be a starting point for a line by left wingers in the Labor Party.

'SUPRA-NATIONAL' UNION?

The most elementary step is: They can urge that the British unions take the immediate initiative in calling a European conference of all the non-Stalinist unions, for the purpose of setting up a committee empowered to negotiate with the body established by the Schuman Plan to control the coal and steel industries of Europe.

The trade unions need not endorse the Schuman Plan or its proposed supra-national authority. They need only state that in dealing with the workers of Europe this body set up by the capitalist governments will have to deal with a united labor movement, rather than with one divided along national lines.

What role could the British unions play in such a body in view of the fact that their steel industry will not be under the control

by all odds the lesser evil. For the BLP's whole domestic policy rests on the economic stability of the rest of the world, of which Western Europe is no insignificant part. Yet the BLP recognizes fully that the continuation of a wobbling capitalism in Europe puts a question mark over world economic stability.

But the clearest expression of a positive alternative to both the Schuman Plan for a capitalist (partial) integration of European economy, on the one hand, and to a completely negative approach on the other, is indicated by the idea of an Independent Western Union, put forward by the Independent Socialist League. This is based precisely on the political idea which the BLP specifically rejects: independence from the two war blocs in the world.

"Not a single one of the European countries can exist independently because it cannot exist as an independent economic unit. Such a union, therefore, would make possible the independence of these countries from Marshallization by American imperialism and at the same time would constitute a powerful assurance against assault and domination by Russian imperialism."

The ISL statement continued, in part: "An Independent Western Union demands a voluntary deci-

sion on the part of all the countries entering into it. It excludes any infringement upon the democratic right of national self-determination of any participating nation by any other. To begin with, its functioning requires no greater self-limitation upon the sovereignty of each nation than this: that placed at the disposal of the union are all the economic resources of all the participating nations, to be organized, exploited and shared in common. The primary prerequisite for this is the complete abolition of all customs barriers now dividing the Western European countries, and the establishment of a single stable currency common to all of them, which alone can make possible a harmonious economic reconstruction of these countries on the basis of economic independence from American imperialism."

And further: "An Independent Western Union is possible, and can be counterposed to all imperialist schemes parading under that name, only on the basis of the boldest and most thoroughgoing application of democratic principles. This means first of all, the renunciation by all participants of any imperialist 'rights' to dominate colonies and possessions now under their rule. It means, at the same time, the most extreme democratic reforms of the political structure of every one of the countries in question. It means, in the second place, the full assurance of all democratic rights and unqualified equality, especially to such participants as Germany, Italy and Austria, namely, the withdrawal of all occupation troops. . . ."

"It means, in the third place, that the proper functioning of the economic machinery of the union shall be assured by unhesitatingly removing all obstacles to it constituted by private ownership of industrial or financial monopolies, and by unhesitatingly imposing the most drastic capital levies wherever and whenever they are required."

Such a view of the road to Western European unity points squarely to the necessity of socialist governments to carry it out in practice, in our opinion, but it does not preclude the mobilization of workers behind the idea who may not yet be of this opinion. Popular support for the idea of unity is considerable on the Continent; it would be just as wrong merely to flatter counterposed socialism-in-general to this aspiration as it would be to accept the kind of integration offered by the capitalist class. The idea of a democratic and independent Western Union points the socialist road to the much-needed goal.

Readers Take the Floor . . .

On the British Labor Party's Motivations

To the Editor:

There is something about your article on the British Labor Party stand toward the Schuman Plan that is not clear. You describe the specific motivations of the Labor Party statement and conclude by saying that it "has in effect announced that it is banking on tying British imperialist interests to those of Washington."

Now this may be true in general, but it hardly seems a sufficient characterization of the Labor Party's stand toward the Schuman Plan. For you do not say in the article that the U. S. government was taken aback by the LP statement; that the U. S. government wants Britain to enter the Schuman Plan; that, in part, and in a rather devious way, the British LP statement is also anti-U. S.

The Labor Party statement is partly motivated by an attempt to keep together the remnants of the empire and prevent its gradual dissolution by the U. S. dollar; it is partly traditional British insularity, with which the LP leaders are richly blessed; and it is partly an attempt by the so-called "left wing" to get the government to play a somewhat more independent role in world politics.

This does not mean that the statement should be applauded. But it does mean that it requires a more subtle analysis than merely saying that it shows British subservience to the U. S.

R. FAHAN

Comrade R. Fahan must have read last week's article by Sam Feliks very hurriedly. By no means can it be characterized as "merely" saying that it [the LP statement] shows British subservience to the U. S."

Important emphasis in the article was in fact given to the British leaders' orientation toward the remnants of their own empire.

We think the British LP declaration warrants continued analysis and discussion in addition to this first article written immediately on the announcement of the news. Pending such, however, the arti-

cle presented an analysis which, in our opinion, is substantially more "subtle"—and more correct—than the three motives given by Comrade Fahan as prompting the declaration.

The heart of this analysis, brief as it was, is: "It [the LP statement] argued that Britain, for its own advantage, preferred close ties with its own economic bloc, what is left of its empire, to European unity; with this, it argued specifically against the very notion of organizing Western Europe as a 'third force' independent of both U. S. and Russia. It counterposed to a Western European bloc two others: its 'sterling bloc' on the economic side and the U. S. war bloc on the political side."

"The seeming contradiction with its 'socialist' argument is made possible by the narrow nationalistic outlook that pervades all sections of the current leadership of the Labor Party. On the one hand the base of the Labor Party is in the British working class and a policy of full employment, while at the same time it is tied to the cold-war policies of Washington and has planned its economic policy toward the Commonwealth and colonialism."

Comrade Fahan's view is superficial, we think, in that it does not put these crisscrossing considerations in any relation to each other, whether in the way indicated in Sam Feliks' article or in any other. The boldface sentence above does this.

"The British LP statement is also anti-U. S.," writes Fahan, "in a rather devious way." In the light of our article this thought should be put more subtly:

Inside the Western war bloc led by the U. S.—with all of its crisscrossing current of inter-imperialist rivalry which we have analyzed in other connections also (German dismantling, for example)—the British bank on maintaining their influence vis-a-vis the U. S. by maintaining their special influence and ties with their sterling bloc. As against an Independent Western Europe, or any approach to it or wish for it, the British counterpose tying up

with Washington. This latter point is made explicitly in the LP statement and is not an interpretation of ours.

The LP statement therefore does not indicate any attempt to "get the government to play a somewhat more independent role in world politics," although there is plenty of pressure and talk from the Bevan-Crossman left wing in this direction as there is from even non-socialist figures on the Continent. Its emphasis is on Britain's independent economic role within the Western bloc, and to this it couples the most explicit rejection so far made in a LP document of an independent political role.

Fahan's second suggested motivation is "traditional British insularity." This is not quite the same thought as that put forward by Sam Feliks' article, which speaks of the "narrow nationalistic outlook" of the LP leaders and "the specific type of 'national socialism' of the BLP" as a motivation of the LP statement (indicating the LP statement incidentally, that Fahan's last sentence does less than justice to Comrade Feliks).

The reference to "traditional British insularity" in this connection would seem to indicate—if we are not reading too much into it—that the narrow "nationalistic outlook" of the LP leaders is merely or mainly a hangover of provincialism and isolationism in the most backward and traditional sense. We don't think this is the most important aspect of the LP's nationalism. The "specific type of 'national socialism'" of the BLP deserves more subtle discussion, and we are planning to give it more analysis in LABOR ACTION. To reduce it to "insularity," however, is not only shallow but points away from an extremely basic starting point in understanding events in Britain today.

Finally, we refer Comrade Fahan to the article by Sam Feliks in LA of two weeks ago, June 12, on the Schuman Plan and the British attitude toward it. Written before the LP statement, this article already contained a cogent analysis of factors affecting the British policy. We recommend it for reading now.—Ed.

BLP Blast at Schuman Plan --

(Continued from page 1)

recognized the essentially capitalist nature of its aims by themselves demanding in the recent London conference with the British socialists that it be implemented by a series of indispensable "socialist" or "working-class" conditions. Among other things, they asked: (1) that labor standards in basic industries be raised to the levels of the more progressive countries; (2) that trade unions participate at national and international levels; (3) that democratic control be safeguarded by participation of trade unions and representatives of consumers. The demands are raised because the plan does not have as its point of departure the raising of the standard of living of the masses.

SOCIALIST SIDE OF ARGUMENT

The socialist supporters say further that if the Schuman Plan is not based on expanding demand and full employment, it could "quickly develop all the characteristics of a restrictive cartel" and would "produce mass unemployment and derelict areas." (N. Y. Times, June 17) They admit again that the pool is not based upon the interests and needs of the working peoples of the respective countries. As it is put forward, it is undeserving in any manner of the support of organizations which purport to speak for the betterment of the working class.

In the Labor Party document, "European Unity," which revealed the main emphasis of Labor Party thought in advance of an official government stand, there are many excellent and unassailable arguments, from a socialist viewpoint, for its opposition to European integration schemes on the present basis of capitalist Western Europe — alongside, of course, purely nationalistic arguments.

"Socialists," they say, "would of course welcome a European economic union which was based on international planning for full employment, social justice and stability. But international planning can only operate on the basis of national planning. And many European governments have not yet shown either the will or the ability to plan their own economies." This is incontestable! It is such arguments as these that have produced the epithets hurled by the big American dailies of "left-wing doctrinaires" and the like.

"No Socialist Party," reads the Labor Party statement, "with the prospect of forming a government could accept a system by which important fields of national policy were surrendered to a supra-national European representative authority, since such an au-

thority would have a permanent anti-Socialist majority and would arouse the hostility of European workers." Again we ignore here, for the purposes of pointing out the motivations of American criticism, the other horses the British Labor Party is trying to ride, its empire and collaboration with the capitalist U. S. From the point of view of socialist responsibility to its electorate, it is correct for the BLP to object to submission to a capitalist majority when its economy is based on planning and full employment.

WOULD THE U. S. DO IT?

A sample of American criticism of this aspect of British policy is contained in the New York Times editorial of June 18, "Socialism in One Country." "The present Labor leaders make a fetish of economic planning as a prime factor in their philosophy and it is that very feature of planning which is at the bottom of the present conflict over European unity," admonishes the editorial. "The Laborites are well pleased with themselves these days. There is something of the nature of a boom in Britain this year, etc."

The United States rails at the objections of the British to giving up part of their national sovereignty, when it would never consider doing so itself. Many of the United Nations proposals are in conflict with American traditions and constitutional provisions and had to go by the board. The Hoffman proposal for European integration was made without an offer on the part of the United States to lower its tariff barriers. "Do as I say, not as I do," says Uncle Sam. This is apart from class considerations, which also weigh in British thinking, since England represents a mixed economy.

"Only they [the trade unions] can guarantee that wage levels will not be set by the least progressive industries in the plan," reads the BLP statement. "Full employment," "social justice," "over-all" planning—all these factors weigh heavily in the British arguments.

The American press has many reasons for its violent opinion on the British point of view. We have already indicated its basic motives for European unity. It also has an ax to grind with relation to the British Labor government itself. As the Times editorial puts it, "The Laborites tried to cling to Socialist doctrine while carrying out policies that differed little from Liberalism or even Toryism. A development like today's puts an almost impossible strain on the leadership because the doctrinaire horse suddenly bolts. The question brought out so acutely now is whether the Laborites really intend to be Socialists in fact

as well as in name."

It is the aspect of socialism-in-fact that bothers the American press and government representatives. They sigh only mildly over Tory agreement with the Labor Party policy, the Tories only being able in the present circumstances to rail about the "blunder" of timing and errors of diplomacy. The London Times echoed these conservative sentiments, "There is nothing particularly partisan or peculiar to the Labor Party about the assertion that this country cannot hand over essential details of national policy to be decided by the external authority... There is much good sense in the statement."

MARSHALL PLAN BIG STICK

The reaction of Senator Knowland, California Republican, is typical of the righteous indignation abandoned themselves to. "I'm damned mad," he said. "I think of all we've done to make ends meet—and then we wake up to find the British will not cooperate in Western Europe."

There was implied in his remarks, as was more openly stated elsewhere, the usual eagerness of the United States to resort to waving the Marshall Plan stick. It was quickly pointed out that Brit-

ain received and spent the largest of American loans, as well as getting the lion's share of Marshall millions. The senators threaten to keep this in mind when the Marshall funds come up for renewal.

The weakness of the British Labor Party's position lies in its negative opposition to the Shuman Plan and its failure thus far to utilize the occasion for a positive proposal for European unity. Its argumentation is largely limited to why a bourgeois unification scheme would place in jeopardy the elements of socialist planning in British economy. It is this which gives its statement its nationalist tone, one of being based solely on British interests. Unfortunately, the British Labor Party does have its own type of nationalist perspective. Its "socialism" is largely internal and geared to the empire and Commonwealth. Its foreign policy is entirely geared to this limited program. Its stated foreign policy is to work equally closely with the empire, the United States and Western Europe. It has no socialist perspective in foreign policy. It has no internationalist perspective.

Thus the foreign aims of the British Labor Party are limited to a loose collaboration with the Western bloc. Its statement makes

clear that it sees no room for a "Third Force" as an independent pro-socialist entity, directed against the two major exploitive forms of society, Stalinist and capitalist. "Neutrality is not a possible choice," its statement affirms.

BLP DILEMMA

This is the dilemma of British socialism: It is pledged to socialist reorganization of society at home, while it attempts to maintain its non-socialist empire and remain a part of the capitalist bloc of the West. Yet the interests of genuine British socialism demand that it propose, instead of the Schuman Plan, a progressive form for the unification of European economy.

It must be, if the world is not to degenerate into two frozen imperialist blocs, an independent Western European unification, which will have the interests of the working classes as its base; a planned economy based upon nationalization of basic wealth. Such a union would be neither a competitor to British planning nor a cartelization scheme. Such a union is indispensable if the European masses are to better their standard of living and if a third force against the war-makers on both sides is to rise.

Defense of the Purge Misfires In Radio Program on 'Loyalty'

By WILLIAM BARTON

About two weeks ago the American Broadcasting System delved into a subject which most might regard as controversial for a documentary radio program—the federal government's loyalty purge.

It was intended as an elaborately prepared justification for current official policy, but to this listener it boomeranged. By trying dramatically to present the ostensible reasons for the loyalty probes, the script succeeded in revealing how shallow were those reasons.

It was cast as a series of episodes around the life of a fictitious character named Harry Bradley, assistant chief of a non-existent Washington bureau. Trying to make their message most effective, the story made Bradley a very sympathetic person. There was, in fact, something close to the American ideal about him—active, alert, intelligent, witty, nonchalantly courageous.

Bradley had been a CP fellow traveler during the Popular Front days. He had been so militantly anti-fascist that he was willing to sell Stalinist literature that took a minimum line. In his testimony before his agency's loyalty board he announces, without qualification, that in a similar situation he would probably do the same. The board is apparently impressed by his honesty and courage in so testifying, and the listener is likely to agree with his agency's security officer's statement that Bradley only appears to be a "loyal American" but also a "swell guy."

By the time of the narrative, he had broken with Stalinist fellow traveling for some time—since the Stalin-Hitler Pact. He describes Stalinist Russia as a huge "company town," and believes the loyalty program is necessary to weed out the "Com-mies." But he gets himself into trouble by an innocent meaningless remark shouted to a boorish hostess at a boring Washington cocktail party. If stretched into a possible code signal, the remark could be a reference to the date of some secret operation in which Bradley's bureau is concerned. An anonymous phone call informs the FBI of this.

The G-men have a plant in the Russian espionage system who knows that there is a source of secret information in the bureau. Bradley's cryptic remark plus his earlier record is combined to make him the "logical" suspect. One morning he is suddenly informed that he is to appear before the loyalty board for investigation.

Whether planned by the writers or not, the torment of this easily liked man becomes a personal experience for the listeners. The terror of not knowing what they "have on him," who has been reporting him, etc., provides a set of anguishing experiences that would make anyone wonder if its worth while to work for the federal government.

His hearing before the loyalty board sounds like a third degree, even though the inquisitors are frequently very polite and thank him for his testimony and his cooperation. As has been pointed out, his brave defense has impressed them with his integrity and his probable innocence of "subversion." But that innocent remark at the cocktail party remains to be cleared up.

NET RESULT

While the board is deliberating, in good old melodramatic style the real culprit is exposed. The FBI plant in the Russian espionage system, by the very ordinary technique of getting fingerprints, finds the actual spy in the Bureau. He is Harry's chief and presumed good friend, who also turns out to be the anonymous telephone informant. An epilogue gives a dialogue between Bradley and his bureau's friendly security chief, who tries to assure him that, despite the ordeal he has undergone, he must understand the "other side." That other side is summarized in the title of the broadcast—a cynical paraphrase of Justice Holmes—that there is now a "Clear and Present Danger" in the cold war and the Russian use of espionage agents as part of that war.

There are many sidelights to the story, but we have presented its essence. Does it impress the previously unconvinced? We doubt it. The loyalty program is supposedly designed to ferret out spies. Yet all it does is hound an innocent man and a "swell guy" while the

usual police methods of counter-espionage expose the real culprit. The result of the loyalty investigation thus appears all bad and none good—that is, if exposing foreign agents is assumed to be the genuine motivation.

It is not our job or our interest to teach the American government how to capture spies. But we do concern ourselves when the announced hunt for spies is used to intimidate opposition of any sort. That is the favorite gimmick of the Stalinist countries. The accused in their "treason trials" are never accused of mere opposition—the main indictment is always spying. The federal loyalty program is not too different in kind. Few of the actually tried or indicted spies have been active politicians of any sort. That is understandable the way espionage activities are organized; you generally don't recruit those who are likely to be suspicious on past record.

The loyalty program works subtly to terrorize political opposition, to make such divergence and dissent more and more unpopular. It is primarily directed against Stalinists, but need not and has not stopped there. When a legless veteran who is a member of the Socialist Workers Party gets fired from a clerks' job in the Veterans Administration one must ask: What possible secret information is thus being protected? The Kutcher case is not an accidental aberration of the loyalty program. If strictly enforced, such situations are inherent results. A rule by secret administrative processes is produced, which has already shown itself in such events as the refusal of Central Intelligence to hire a long time "trusted" government employee for reasons never stated, the refusal to admit a German war bride to this country on unspecified grounds, the firing of AMG official Samuel Wahrhaftig by the U. S. Army in Germany, which took a vigorous ruckus in Congress to change into complete "exoneration."

The federal loyalty program is not planned to and will not capture spies; it will mainly harass the Harry Bradleys. The ABC broadcast unwittingly makes this point and no other, certainly not that of a "clear and present danger."

What Is INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM?

For information and literature about the Independent Socialist League, write:

ISL, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE



LABOR ACTION

The Independent Socialist Weekly
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

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

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS APT.

CITY ZONE STATE

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