le .						
					×	
20						
						€
		o So				
			120	36	ř	
	e e					
	•	*				
		TV.				

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

GM CONTRACT & UNEMPLOYMENT: The Company President Gives an Angle

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

N. Y. Daily Shut Down by Strikers

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

FIVE CENTS

The British Labor Party and European Unity

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

By HAL DRAPER

JUNE 26, 1950

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, undoctrinaire 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

These articles, insofar as they liscuss the nature of the Labor Party's 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.

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

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

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 recross. 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

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 Ammam.

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 Mufti and the Stalinists, in line with the latters' 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

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

have been chalked up by the New spected the picket lines of an of-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

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-

CP FRONTS

By DANIEL WELSH

fice 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

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

Stalinist Party Losing Out

In Non-Party Sympathizers

In a previous article, we reviewed some figures on membership in

While no figures are given as to total dues collected, the CP claims

the Communist Party, made public through its press. Another yard-

stick of organizational strength is the amount of money which the

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 lead-

ers. 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

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 con-

trangement from hoodwinked liberals who were formerly willing to

contribute to the vast and elaborate network of Stalinist front organ-

izations. The decline of such organizations as the "Friends of the So-

viet Union" (in its various forms) and the "Independent Committee

of the Arts, Sciences and Professions," and the consequent decline in

Yet these organizations operated as direct auxiliaries to the party

An example of how this tendency operates, aided by the typical

apparatus and supplied immense amounts of money for maintenance

of functionaries who were almost always Stalinist hacks. Today liber-

als are much more wary of contributing to organizations which are

bureaucratic intransigence that Stalinists always display toward op-

ponents, is the fate of the New York Civil Rights Conference. Origi-

nally 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 Lead-

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 "progres-

sive ranks." The effects of the Tito split, given in financial terms, are

considerable diminution of total Stalinist financial strength.

Growing Isolation from Sympathizers

one out of every eight claimed members read the party press.

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

are discouraged from reading the Daily Workers because Stalinist stu-

dent leaders themselves consider it so atrocious. Even greater declines

have taken place in the circulation of some of the foreign-language pa-

Of course it is a well-known fact that on certain campuses people

Another interesting sidelight shows how the Stalinists are forced by

ers." Thereafter they were much more restricted in defense efforts.

their financial status is not reflected by figures of the party itself.

Yet even if these figures can be trusted, the picture is not really as

This is a consequence of the Stalinists' growing isolation and es-

alinists were able to collect under direct party auspices.

support of a large part of its previous supporters.

tributions from non-party members.

Fronts Are Floundering

unable to raise even one fifth of that sum.

pers, particularly the Yugoslav organ.

clearly Stalinist-dominated.

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.

ance 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

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-theclock 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

Up to now, management has been completely adamant, despite two attempts at conciliation by the U.S. Mediation Service. It is daily losing gobs 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

The striking editorial and business staffers are preparing for a long seige. 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 Broun. 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.

OHIO LABOR NOTES

CIO Wins Majority from UE; Court Upholds Loyalty Oath

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND, June 18-The CIO electrical union (IIIE-CIO) made a clean sweep in the runoff elections at the General Electric plants to determine union representation Outside of a few minimal grievseveral 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 460, UE 386. 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

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 here this week. In the elections of its teachers, and this action was challenged in a taxpaver'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 col-

> 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

later, the lawyer bringing the acpreferred having another judge hear his case. It is not difficult

Farm Bureau Wags the Government

The House Agricultural Committee has been hearing startling estimony on the powerful and reactionary Farm Bureau, which hasn't been getting into the papers much. Included are details on the tieups 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

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 checkoff system arranged by the landowners. The county

five checks for \$10 each, paying her dues to the Farm Bureau five years in advance, before she could get a job.

the power companies, banks and the Chamber of Commerce."

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

Midway into 1950 —

I ADAD DAI ITICC IN DEADING LADUR PULITICO IN READING

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 of the organized labor movement this group alone, it is currently engaged in a similar effort and has been n the city of Reading and in Berks County is still exclusively Thus while we are given a picture of general financial stability in directed toward the Democratic the Communist Party itself, its growing isofation has resulted in a Party. The New Era, a weekly labor paper established several Another criterion of organizational influence is the CP press ciryears ago by George Rhoads, erstculation. Here again we see that insofar as it measures party strength while Socialist and now Demodirectly, the Stalinists claim not to have been affected too greatly by cratic congressman from Berks the government witchhunt. Circulation of the weekly Worker stood at County, strongly champions the an average of 79,000 throughout 1949. Fluctuation was considerable, Democratic Party and proclaims 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 morally and programmatically active sub-getters, who would appear to be no fewer than in previous bankrunt 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

READING June 10-The politics the "honor" of being known as At any rate the CIO refused to the worst administration the city support Kondrath in the primaries has ever had.

An interesting sidelight on the tity who won the candidacy. Democratic primaries was the defeat of one of the two incumbent Reading reduces itself to this kind representatives to the Pennsylva- of politics is almost criminal. In nia State Assembly from the Read- this area, with its long socialist oped from a factional situation dependent labor party would rewithin the union movement here. sult in its becoming the dominant The representative defeated (by a political instrument of the workit to be the "People's Party." The nonentity) was Andrew Kondrath, ers almost overnight. Such a party who some time ago grew too big would relieve the grip of the corfor his breeches and attempted to rupt and stupid politicians over challenge the CIO Steel Workers the city and would arouse the en-(of which he had been sub-district director) for leadership in the Har- paign of creative energy. The forrisburg-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. the Republicans are worse.

and threw its support to a nonen-

That the labor movement in ing district. This situation devel- tradition, the formation of an inthusiasm of the workers in a cammation 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

GM Contract and Unemployment

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

Several articles have appeared in LABOR ACTION pointing out the dangers of the fiveyear 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 develop-

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

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

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," (!) 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

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

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

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

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

AUTOMATION

The New York Times refers to it as "the newest proluction 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 employes 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

"Automation" is creating a problem-a problem that can reach serious national proportions unless something

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

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

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 cor-

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

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 privateprofit 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 artifically 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 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 world-wide 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 everpresent 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 dejoin the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED?

15.3 Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League-4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York ☐ I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL. ☐ I want to join the ISL. Name Address



A British Scientist on Science and Socialism

By CARL DARTON

Science today is almost as successful and honored as success itself. And yet science is most obviouly being perverted by political forces to accelerate the degradation and destruction of civilization. It is to be expected, therefore, that some scientists who are driven to politics by the subversion of science will find the theoretical aspects of social-

An English biologist, C. H. Waddington, in The Scientific Attitude (Pelican Books) points out the similarities of science and socialism. His observations, in part, follow:

(1) "It [socialism] too [as well as science] knows that it has never discover the whole truth, and that each individual can only hope by his efforts to came a little nearer than his predecessors to a full comprehension of the processes he is studying; it, too, is a method of approach, and not a final body of hard and fast doctrine."

(2) "In its second most important point Marxism is also in perfect agreement with science. It is a materialist philosophy.... It means merely that there is a world of stubborn reality which we can investigate and which can be changed by our actions, but not only by our thoughts alone.'

(3) "The next point in Marxist thought is not merely in agreement with orthodox scientific views, but is, I think, in advance of them and states clearly and definitely an idea which science is just beginning to recognize. Everything in this world, this part of Marxism states, is essenally and necessarily changing and developing."

Over a century ago Marx and Engels perceived that science had built a firm foundation to support the warm-hearted desires for equality, peace, freedom and plenty. During the past 100 years scientific investigation has widened and deepened these foundations. Theoretical and applied physical science has increased the productive level so that an economy of abundance, such as socialism, couldtexist in much of the world tomorrow if the political control of the privileged few were vious Arabs who want to enjoy

Science Has Laid the Basis

Moreover, biological and social sciences have increased the understanding of human behavior of the individual as well as his statistical aggregate. Critics of socialism like to point out that production has continued to increase despite Marx's prophecies of the collapse of capitalism and the revolt of the proletariat. One wonders if the same critics would admit also that the destruction of wars, the waste of unemployment, fratricide, suffering and frustration of the human race over the century has greatly exceeded the worst fears of the

Science has also substantiated the international brotherhood of man by showing the physiological, psychological and sociological similarities of all people. In most significant aspects the individual or intragroup differences are of much greater importance than inter-group variances. Any supposed "natural" basis for racism and discrimination has been disproved by scientific inquiry.

In yet another way science has laid the basis for socialism by making available sufficient time not only for leisure but also for participation in politics. Efforts toward collectivism have clearly shown that one of the most important tasks of socialist planning is the involvement of each individual into the political life of the community. This will mean setting aside sufficient time in the shops and offices for democratic industrial government by the workers themselves. And similar arrangements outside the shops must be provided for adequate consumer and community representation.

It is difficult in a few hundred words to describe fully the interrelations of science and socialism. It is true that science is concerned with more than establishing a rational basis for politics, and socialism is a political movement as well as a philosophy and an economic system. But it is necessary to answer again and again the capitalist propagandists who say that socialists proceed not by scientific means and conversely that scientists are by nature unsocial, or anti-socialist.

They Need Your Help!

Local New York of the Independent Socialist League mocracy. To enroll under this banner, has been regularly mailing packages of food and clothing to needy workers in Europe. The relief committee has especially urgent need for clean, wearable clothing for children of school age, particularly in the 12-14 age group. Please bring or send your contributions to the city center of the ISL, at 114 West 14 Street, 3rd floor, New York City.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 26

June 26, 1950

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117.

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

> Editor: HAL DRAPER Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

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

Reading from Left to Right

THE MEANING OF THE LABOR ZIONIST CON-VENTION, by William Zukerman. (Jewish Newsletter, June 91

The liberal and afti-Jewish-nationalism editor of the Newsletter puts the spotlight on the "new program and ideology for American Zionism" being pushed by the Labor Zionists as a reflection of the policy of the Israeli government

"The gist of [the new program] is that Jews are one, indivisible and eternal people and that their home is Israel wherever they may live. The establishment of the state of Israel has not completed the task of Zionism, as some Zionists and non-Zionists aver. It has accomplished only its first aim, the establishment of the states. Now comes the second aim—the in-gathering of the exiled Jews from all over the world to the new state in order to make of it the home of all

Zukerman points out that this line has been adopted by Israeli Prime Minister Ben Gurion, and was put forward by the Mapai and government leader in a speech in May:

"The state of Israel is the state not only of its citizens: it is the heir of the entire diaspora. It is the messenger of Jewish history for the future of the Jewish people and its mission among the nations." And later: "The state (Israel), as established two years ago, was not the end of Zionism, but an important means of attaining the aim of Zionism"

"In short," he summarizes, "Ben Gurion and his government have yielded to the extreme nationalists-not for the first time-and accepted in full their ideology not only for Israel but also for all the Jews of the diaspora.'

Israel and Arabs--

"There also continues to exist a

severe economic crisis amongst the

Arabs. Workers are unemployed,

former government officials have

little hope of finding employment,

farmers find it difficult to market

their product, businessmen suffer

from lack of customers. The ex-

ceptions to this rule are farmers

who did not abandon their villages

but even some of these have mis-

takenly been listed as absent and

their land registered with the

office for abandoned property and

now have to pay high levies for

property that is in fact their own."

ernment departments that are

constructive . . . are unfortunately

all restrictions on free movement

of "some" when this is used in

connection with freedom of move-

ment is-very little, while the def-

inition of "some" in relation to

wrong registry of land is consid-

An article entitled "Crescent in

the Shield of David" in a recent

issue of UN World confirms

the picture of economic crisis

among Israeli Arabs and has this

to say about freedom of move-

ment: "Arab citizens still need

special permits to travel from one

There is no discrimination

against Arabs in cafeterias, etc.,

such as exists against Negroes in

the U.S. However, the Yiddish

press reports that even the Arab

deputies in the Knesset (Israeli

parliament) are almost completely

solated and that NO ONE talks to

Alvin Rosenfeld, writing in the

"For 12 long months an Israeli

citizen — although not charged

with, tried for or convicted of any

state authorities figured that, free,

he might possibly prove to be a

"The man, an Israeli Arab

named Naif Salim el Khoury, had

been arrested as a suspect in the

murder of two settlers at the fa-

mous war-battered collective farm

of Negba. Despite the fact that

the charge was dropped for lack

of sufficient evidence, the army

decided to hold El Khoury any-

way, since he was known to be

anti-Jewish. The Arab was locked

away on the order of the army

córpus was forgotten.

democratic principles....

danger to the community.

March 5 N. Y. Post, reports from

"In some parts of the country

We suspect that the definition

few and scattered. . . .

have been lifted."

town to another."

Israel:

EL KHOURY CASE

"Examples of activities of gov-

(Continued from page 1)

among Israeli Arabs; there is no discrimination; Arabs have full freedom; Arab farmers are prospering; wages are equal; Israeli Arabs are better off than Arabs in other countries; in fact, the Arabs who are infiltrating Israel are not enemies or spies but enthe privileges and benefits of Arab citizenship in Israel. We agree with some of what

Leschinsky says: the Arabs attempting to enter Israel illegally are not enemies of Israel. This undoubtedly true statement only completes the case against the Israeli government policy toward these unfortunates, a policy which Leschinsky supports. These refugees do not seek privileges or benefits; they seek only to return to their lands, from which they fled in fear. In return they will act as peacefully as peasants anywhere in the world. In time, by proper action, the Israeli government can win their lovalty.

It also may be true that Arabs in Israel are better off than in other countries: but this is an indictment of the social conditions in the Arab states, and not praise of Israel.

The rest of the article is untrue. and to disprove it one need go no further than publications of Leschinsky's own party, the Poale

On November 8, 1948, there were 69,000 Arabs in Israel; today there are 165,000. The increase is due to the acquisition of new territory by Israel, to the Israeli policy of permitting the return of wives and children of Arab residents, and partly to the illegal re-entry of Arab refugees.

Writing in the February 1950 issue of the Jewish Frontier (a Labor-Zionist Poale-Zion publication) Emanuel Kaplevitz has the following to say about the condi-

tion of the Arabs in Israel: "Individual Arabs have improved their status but the Arab community as a whole has not made the desired progress and the relations between the government of Israel and its Arab citizens have not advanced to the optimum degree.'

ARAB PLIGHT

On the positive side he lists the government's special attention to the religious and communal needs of the Arabs; the growth of the Brith Poali Eretz Israel (Palestine Labor League), the Arab tradeunion organization run by the Histadrut, which has grown a great deal through its control of jobs amid widespread unemployment. The league now claims more influence than the Communist Party in Nazareth and other important Arab sections. "The past year," he writes, "has witnessed the beginnings of Arab initiative in the economic field." He also lists: marketing associations formed in some villages; the organization of one Arab "kibbutz" (collective); and Druze Arab bus drivers have joined a cooperative. On the other hand he reports:

now, after the El Khoury case.

Normally and as a matter of routine, in the search for Arab "infiltrators" the army surrounds entire Arab villages in the wee hours of the morning and searches every house without warrants. These searches are not the brutal searches of the Gestapo or GPU. The army has invited the Arab deputies and the CP to go along. However, these searches are illegal and place the Arabs in a position of second-class citizenship.

TWO DANGERS

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency reported June 19: "Prime Minister Ben-Gurion has announced the creation of a 'security zone' from Jerusalem to the beginnings of the Negev. This was taken as a measure against 'infiltrators.' Well-informed sources predict that if the infiltrations' do not stop all the residents of the Arab villages will be deported further inland."

This can only be compared to the shameful treatment of the Japanese-American population of the West Coast by the U. S. government during the war.

It is undeniably true that the current bad position of the Arabs in Palestine was born of war. But whatever the Israeli government could claim about "military necessity" during the war, there is not even this shadow of justification now. The present no-war-no-peace situation cannot justify this kind of treatment of the Arab refugees and of Arab citizens of Israel.

The fact that legal redress in the form of Supreme Court decisions is sometimes obtained after long delay is slight consolation and ignores two basic dangers.

The first is, of course, the obvious one that the "emergency" pattern of relations with the Arabs will become permanent. This is espeno-war-no-peace in the Near East tends to perpetuate these evils. These actions also tend to prevent crime-rotted in a local iail. Hethe achievement of peace since it sat there, day in and day out, for gives the opponents of peace solid some 365 days, simply because the arguments. They prevent the emergence of popular Arab demands for peace, as a real and effective force.

The other danger, and by far the greatest, is the apathy of the public, press and even the labor movement to these violations of democratic rights. In most cases the government does not even feel the need to apologize for its actions. And this is a government whose ruling party, the Mapai, claims to be socialist.

Such an attitude and such chief of staff himself, and habeas apathy help perpetuate the bad practices which are supposed to be temporary. Worst of all they show "The incident, disclosed when a lack of understanding of the El Khoury at last was able to road to peace and to Arab-Jewish appeal to the Supreme Court for his freedom (successfully), was

but one of a series of small but Arab-Jewish unity will not be achieved through holiday prodisturbing happenings wherein Israel has sidestepped or ignored -nouncements about friendship. At best there is a long hard road Unofficial government spokesahead. The labor movement must men admit that a few Arabs are mobilize itself to combat every being held without charges even action and policy that tends to divide Arab from Jew.

Is Yugoslavia a 'Workers State'? Evidence, Please! states," since nationalization is complete or virtually complete, and these countries are also experiencing characteristic bursts of reconstructions, industry prodution and so on? Hasn't the city of Warsaw, according to all reports, also been rebuilt? Of course, for that matter, France has now practically completed the rebuilding of its ruined cities in Normandy, and the German cities are also ex-

So far as the nationalization is concerned, this was recognized by us a long time ago, particularly We say that theirs is the prime responsibility to prove that the Tito regime is a genuine demoin opposition to the Trotskyists who only discovcratic workers' state, building socialism, not simered it recently and until last year tried to deny it ply because these same people maintained anyor belittle it. The point is: what is the character and nature of this nationalization; under whose thing but that until recently, but for additional reasons. Anyone, including the so-called Trotskycontrol and management does it operate; for whose benefit is it conducted? This is what the analysts ists, can be in error-although the chiefs of the Fourth International, who only a short time ago of "Tito socialism" must tell us. This brings us, of labeled the same Yugoslavia a "state capitalist, recourse, to the basic test question in understanding the Tito regime-who is the master in the house, actionary regime," never acknowledge errors: and how does he exercise his mastery? The burden of proof that a revolutionary change

periencing reconstruction booms.

WORLD, POLITICS

Upon those who maintain that Yugoslavia is a

socialist or workers' state, under the rule of the

Yugoslavian working class and people, necessarily

falls the main burden of proof. This holds particu-

larly true for those among the socialist left-Trot-

skyists, revolutionary and independent socialists.

etc .- who have arrived at this amazing conclusion

only recently, i.e., within the brief period of time

has taken place rests upon those who understood and

who automatically accepted, until recently, the fact

that this regime in Yugoslavia had risen out of the

same historic and social processes which brought

Stalinism to power in half a dozen countries (Poland,

These people knew well that the head of the

lugoslavian Stalinist movement, Tito, was a bred-

in-the-bone Stalinist of Moscow and GPU origin

(ask the Spanish POUMists, who had dealings with

him during the Spanish civil war); that his entire

thought process, psychology and approach to poli-

tics and the socialist movement was Stalinist to the

core; that the Yugoslav Socialist Party he created

was in the typical and characteristic image of the

Stalinist movement (that is, absence of democracy,

leader cult, purge psychology, etc.); that the be-

havior and politics of the Yugoslav resistance

Tito even maintained the semblance of a Popu-

lar Front (he still does, in fact), and he even fol-

lowed his fellow marshals in Eastern Europe in

quickly destroying the Trotskyists in Yugoslavia,

physically. We dislike embarrassing the leaders of

the Fourth International, but let them please tell

us what happened to the Trotskyist organization in

Yugoslavia. When did they last hear from it, or

It will be maintained that the Stalinist-like

birth of the Tito regime does not prove its Stalin-

ist character today. Good; this is not our conten-

tion. We merely wish to point out that its birth

and recent origins have surely had some influence

upon its subsequent development. Those who now

maintain it has developed in a different direction

must offer us proofs, in detail, example and illus-

tration. We must charge the discoverers of "Social-

ist Yugoslavia" with a failure to do so; with

slavian state, you must show us that it is organ-

ized in a socialist manner, that it functions in such

a way as to democratically express the will of the

working people and the poor peasantry, that the

various state institutions are democratically elected

and operative, that the toilers participate actively

to offer proof. For example, doesn't Tito, in his

speeches and his various publications which are

widely circulated, guarantee us his socialist intent

and Leninist bona fides? Of course, we know that

Stalin has personally assured us of the "classless

and communist" character of his regime, and social-

ists in general (with the exception of those who sim-

ply must deceive themselves) have long since passed

the stage of accepting the word of ruling groups

at their face value. So we must be forgiven if we

are somewhat skeptical of what Tito says about him-

self, even if he did receive 96.7 per cent (or was it

97.6 per cent?) of the votes in his plebiscitary elec-

tionary left, must be taken more seriously. The

general argument advanced in such circles tells us

of the "nationalization of Yugoslav industry (now

complete in industry, commerce and banking), to-

gether with the alleged great success of Yugosla-

via's "Five Year Plan" for production. Belgrade

But others, particularly those of the revolu-

It may be said that some efforts have been made

in the operation and planification of industry, etc.

To prove the socialist character of the Yugo-

hardly even bothering to make the effort.

from those of Poland, Czechoslovakia, etc.

TAKING TITO AT FACE VALUE

Baltic lands, Rumania, etc.) at the end of the war.

since Tito's split with Stalin.

Some Tito workshippers belabor us with the existence of the "Popular Committees" which were created during the resistance days. Good; let them inform us how these "Popular Committees" operate and, above all, how they were and are elected. A Trotskyist named Kamalesh Banerji, writing in Janata (April 23), publication of the Indian Socialist Party, compares these committees to the democratic soviets of the Russian Revolution. The man is ignorant.

The Yugoslav "Popular Committees" grew up during the Popular Frontist days of the war, when various political elements were represented in them. As Tito centralized the power in his hands from 1945 onward, these committees were steadily and constantly, purged, until they ended representing nothing but the Yugoslavian Communist Party, with all other elements (including Banerji's own Trotskyist friends) thoroughly expurgated. Another and characteristic fairy tale offered us

movement during the war was Stalinist and Mosby this individual is that concerning the free "trade In a word, the birth and coming to power of this unions" which are not a state institution. On paregime, which took place when the Russian armies per, or in practice? Let us have some information reached its borders and the Germans collapsed, was regarding their right to strike or, more pertinent, entirely of the Stalinist variety. We do not recall details of the most recent working-class strike aca single current supporter of the marshal who contivity in the country. In fact, let us have some intended otherwise in 1945; we do not recall a single formation about different political tendencies witheffort to differentiate the origins of Tito's regime in the trade unions, the "popular committees" and other organs of the so-called "democracy."

Or should we believe that "socialism" has been constructed with such astounding speed in backward Yugoslavia that a completely harmonious society now exists, in which there are no political or social differences? Let us kindly have some details about the rights of criticism (from workingclass organizations, such as the Trotskyists, not bourgeois or Stalinists!); let us know about the elections that do take place, about rival candidates on differing platforms, about the right of Comrade Banerji or co-thinkers to demand the recall and removal of Comrade Tito, for example.

THEY FALL FOR THE ACT

The point should be clear enough. Those who have permitted themselves to accept at face value the statements of the Tito propagandists must be called to order. Let them substantiate their claims by laying bare and proving, in detail and with proper reference, just how their non-existent "socialist" state operates. They must not be permitted to pass off their shoddy goods as the true cloth of

An objective examination of this state, which bases its theoretic approach on the idea that socialism can only be measured by the degree of control, administration, participation and regulation by the working class itself, through its democratic institutions and bodies, will convince anyone that we have another reactionary, bureaucratic and authoritarian state, stamped in the Stalinist image

We give but another example of this. Another Trotskyist "thinker," Ernest Germain, favorably reports the following incident: Milovan Djilas, secretary of the Yugoslav CP, called together all the intellectuals of Belgrade and told them: "I have called you together to give you one final directive. There will be no more government directives in the future." Poor Germain! He doesn't grasp the irony of

his story; he doesn't realize that this one detail gives away the whole fakery of the newly found "freedom." The intellectuals are called together to be "directed" to be free! Tito has commanded; henceforth you are "free." Will someone kindly explain to Germain that such "freedom" is a fraud and can be rescinded by another meeting of Diilas on the morrow? Doesn't he understand that the whole thing was done to take in independent radicals? Evidently not, since he fell for the act completely. May the socialist movement be spared from the glories of a regime which finds it possible to call people together and instruct them that they are henceforth "free"!

is being reconstructed; a new highway from Belgrade to Zagreb; homes for 200,000 people in 1948, Lack of space makes it impossible to do more than suggest the line of our thought in rejecting the widespread tendency to capitulate to the myth of Titoist socialism. In detail and with greater frequency, we intend to return to this subject. In the meantime we reiterate our original statement that the burden of proof rests upon those making the

Union-in-Law

The Chicago police are forbidden to organize - so their wives are doing it for them.

Six years ago the city crushed plans by policemen to form a union. Now the newly chartered. Police Wives Association has 500 members and expects 1000 by the middle of June, out of a goal of

Says the Michigan CIO News: "They know what they're up against. They know top police officials have used suspensions, demotions, transfers to the sticks, threats and other weapons to fight policemen's organizations."

Says one of the wives: "We figure they can't blame our husbands for anything we do. And if they do transfer somebody out to the sticks because of us, they'll have at least a few hundred angry wives on their necks. And who can put up with that?"

The organization plans to begin discussions with "the proper authorities" when it gets bigger.

Partisans at Work

On April 28 a West German agency reported that since the beginning of that month, the transport section of the Russian Control Commission had to discontinue 80 per cent of the transit traffic through Poland to Russia. Instead of 25 trains per day, only six would run from Frankfurt-ander-Oder via Poznan to Brest-Litovsk. These trains would have military protection against attack by Polish partisans, frequent in the Lodz and Kolo area. During the last six months, 116 trains had been fired on and eight locomotives temporarily put out of action. The bulk of the transports. mainly reparations goods, had to be routed via Wismar and Rostock by sea to the Russian Baltic ports.

Jail Strike

In Mexico City, 800 striking taxi drivers were thrown into jail en masse. Sixteen jail attendants thereupon walked off the job on the ground that they were being given too much work.

New York

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE SUMMER SCHOOL

Six sessions. Every Tuesday night for six weeks

STARTING TUESDAY

JUNE 27

THE THEORETICAL ROOTS OF MARXISM

Instructor: Paul Bern 7:30-9:00 p.m.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND THE EUROPEAN REVOLUTION

1917-1923 Instructors: Max Shacht-

man and Hal Draper 9:00-10:30 p.m.

50 cents for each class or 10 cents for each session

LABOR ACTION HALL 114 West 14th Street, 3rd floor **New York City**

YUGOSLAV FAIRY TALES

The first thought that occurs to one in reading this type of argument is: by what rhyme or reason are Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, etc., also excluded from the category of "socialist

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

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 milimeter 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 leftwing 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-

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 "doctringire 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 splurge 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

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 poohpoohs 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-Europe 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

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 seri-

(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-

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 in 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 multilateral 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 economies 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

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. (Tie 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 demagogy.

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: 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 counterrevolution 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

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 Attlee 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

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.

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 o' the wisp of self-sufficiency. The Executive's declaration even insists on the degree 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 rooter 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 strateaic, 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

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 Attlee 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 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

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 imprialism, certainly the most point-blank statement by the Labor Party rejecting any kind of

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 warwith 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 rea-

sons 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 econo-

Instead of using this idea to take the initiative away from the capitalist "unifiers" of Europe, it is used to dismiss any thought of working in this direction. The LP executive clearly was not even interested in presenting any policy by which the workers of Europe could be moved to establishing the conditions they lay down.

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 a 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

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 Eu-

ropean 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

stability. of the Schuman Plan board? They

could join with the Continental unions for the purpose of giving assurance that they would not permit the British coal and steel industries to derive undue competitive advantages which might accrue to them through a substantial increase in the wages of European steel and coal workers. Such a policy would be a power-

ful lever in breaking the workers of France and other European ountries from their allegiance to

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 uni-

But the workers of Europe cannot feel they have any stage 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.

RISKING U. S. WRATH

The left wing of the BLP could point this out insistently to the workers in Britain. Side by side with a trade union body united to confront the Schuman Plan board it could urge that the BLP propose to all socialist parties in Europe that a united political movement be formed to win the workers in all countries to the idea that European unity can be achieved if THEY and their organizations break with Stalinism and with collaboration with capitalist parties in their own countries which cannot and will not plan their economies in the interest of the mass of the people.

The objection may be raised that policy on the part of the British Labor Party designed to encourage the socialist parties of Europe to rally the workers against their governments would incur the hostility of the American government and the ruling parties in Europe. And as the BLP is in power in is partly traditional British insu-Britain, this hostility would be di- larity, with which the LP leaders rected at the British government

That objection can only be met

head-on. The hard reality is that the American government favors only that kind of European unity which is achieved under its own control and on a capitalist basis. But the BLP asserts that it cannot be achieved on a progressive basis unless democratic socialism prevails in Western Europe. The militant socialists in the BLE could insist that the party follow the logic of its own assertions. If democratic socialism is a precondition for a union of Western Europe, and if the American government is determined to oppose the only social force in Western Europe which is capable of instituting democratic socialism, the BLP will have to risk the danger of incurring the opposition of the American government. It certainly cannot dream of achieving the socialist Europe of which it talks with the benevolent approval of U. S. capitalism.

Even from the nationalist point

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 But the clearest expression of

a positive alternative to both the Schuman Plan for a capitalist (partial) integration of European conomy, on the one hand, and to a completely negative approach on the other, is indicated by the ideaof 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 Euronean 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- most extreme democratic reforms the much-needed goal.

BLP's whole domestic policy rests tries entering into it. It excludes on the economic stability of the 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

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

on the basis of economic indepen-

dence from American imperial-

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 flatly counterpose 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

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 Brit-

ish 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 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 saving 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 decla-

ration warrants continued analysis special influence and ties with and discussion in addition to this first article written immediately on the announcement of the news. of view of the BLP, this risk is Pending such, however, the arti-

cle presented an analysis which. in our opinion, is substantially more "subtle"-and more correctthan 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 '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 their sterling bloc. As against an Independent Western Europe, or sis of factors affecting the British any approach to it or wish for it, the British counterpose tying up reading now.-Ed.

with Washington. This latter point is made explicitly in the LP statement and is not an interpre-

tation 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 LF document of an independent po-

litical 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 motival tion of the LP statement (indicating once again, incidentally, that Fahan's last sentence does less than justice to Comrade Feliks).

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.

The reference to "traditional

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 analypolicy. We recommend it for re-

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

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

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 na-tional 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 bia American dailies of "left-wing

doctringires" 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 up 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 n 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, out policies that differed little 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

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
		☐ Siz months (26 is		
		☐ One year (52 iss	ues) at \$2.0	DQ .
AI	иЕ	(PLEAS	E PRINT)	

STATE .. ZONE

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

as well as in name.'

It is the aspect of socialism-infact 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 indigna-American conservatives 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 was quickly pointed out that Brit- Western bloc. Its statement makes makers on both sides is to rise.

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 social- Such a union would be neither a ist perspective in foreign policy. competitor to British planning It has no internationalist perspect-

Thus the foreign aims of the

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 af-

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. nor a cartelization scheme. Such a union is indispensable if the European masses are to better the United States to resort to British Labor Party are limited their standard of living and if a waving the Marshall Plan stick. It to a loose collaboration with the third force against the war-

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

By WILLIAM BARTON

About two weeks ago the American Boardcasting 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

It was cast as a series of episodes around the life of a ficti-"The Laborites tried to cling to tious character named Harry Socialist doctrine while carrying Bradley, assistant chief of a nonexistent Washington bureau. Tryfrom Liberalism or even Toryism. . ing to make their message most A development like today's puts effective, the story made Bradley an almost impossible strain on 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 traveller during the Popular Front 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 testfying, 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."

THE HOOKS SINK IN

By the time of the narrative, he had broken with Stalinist fellow traveling for some timesince the Stalin-Hitler Pact. He describes Stalinist Russia as a huge "company town," and believes the loyalty program is necessary to weed out the "Commies." 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 gov-

ernment. 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 Holmesthat 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 man and a "swell guy" while the ger.'

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 politicos of any sort. That is understandably the way espionage activities are organized: you generally don't recruit those who are likely to be suspicious on past

The loyalty program works subtly to terrorize political opposition, to make such divergence popular. 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 lovalty 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 story, but we have presented its not planned to and will not capessence. Does it impress the previ- ture spies; it will mainly harass ously unconvinced? We doubt it. the Harry Bradleys. The ABC The loyalty program is supposedly broadcast unwittingly makes this designed to ferret out spies. Yet point and no other, certainly not all it does is hound an innocent that of a "clear and present dan-