

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 30, 1951

FIVE CENTS

BEHIND THE UKRAINE PURGES:
Dissension in the Bureaucracy?

... page 6

The Polish Regime Beats a Retreat

... page 3

Detroit Speedup Puts UAW on Spot

... page 2

WHILE FRANCO FASCISM WOBBLER, U. S. SEEKS HITLER'S PAL AS ALLY

By MARY BELL

After the visit of the late U. S. Admiral Forrest P. Sherman with Generalissimo Francisco Franco to explore a bilateral military pact between their two countries, President Harry S. Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson explained publicly that the United States line on Spain had changed in the course of the last year.

From the standpoint of the Spanish working people, the U. S. line has basically never changed. During the years of the civil war, when the forces of democracy were bloodily arrayed against the fascists led by the present dictator of Spain, the U. S. embargo on aid to the then republican government helped to defeat the Spanish working class. It was a war which was in part a proving ground for Hitler and Mussolini.

Washington has followed through now, as Franco reaps his reward and bolsters his shaky regime through a treaty which will give him money and materiel in exchange for American use of Spanish naval and air bases.

The rickety structure of the Falangist regime was bared to all in March of this year by the general strike which broke out in Barcelona and spread to many neighboring cities and which had echoes in Madrid.

The impoverished people, burdened by the huge bureaucracy and supporting one of the largest standing armies in Europe risked imprisonment and death in their refusal to pay the higher tramway fares. Thousands were jailed in the mass demonstrations which are without parallel in the history of modern totalitarianism. These victims, let it be remembered, were persecuted by police who were trained by Himmler. The people, who had been through unique political experiences in the Spanish civil war, were brave beyond imagining. But the strikes were also a symptom that the regime was weak. There is no question, that barring outside intervention, the days of Franco and the Falange were numbered.

WHAT WILL HE GET?

Now, the Iberian fuhrer will get a shot in the arm. How much he will exact is not known, but he is accustomed to charging high prices. Hitler reported after dicker for Franco's support of the Nazis, "Rather than go through that again, I would prefer to have three or four of my teeth out." Franco's government has already liberally dipped in to the \$62½ million loan extended earlier this year by the U. S. He expects a goodly portion of the \$8½ billion foreign arms budget now under discussion.

Franco also wants, and will inevitably get, friendship with the U. S., the prestige attaching thereto and economic and military assistance to the ragged economy. He has his spokesmen here, American and Spanish. The former, men like Senators Capehart and McCarran, call with the logic of Senator Taft for paring down the military-aid bill by several million and assurance that Franco will be added to the list of beneficiaries.

LEQUERICA'S ROLE

The Caudillo's fellow-countryman who speak for him here is José Félix de Lequerica, who arrived in February in exchange for U. S. Ambassador to Spain Stanton Griffis. This was one of the early moves in the wheeling around of American policy. De Lequerica, dubbed "von" by Spanish monarchist critics because of his pro-Germanism, was an intimate of French Nazi collaborator Pierre Laval and Hitler Ambassador Abetz. His mission in Paris during World War II was to foster Franco-Hitler collaboration against the British. The ambassador has been active fostering Spanish-U. S. relations.

The U. S. deal with Spain is unilateral: after a year of bickering with the two major Atlantic Pact nations, France and England, it failed to get compliance for inclusion of Spain in the pact. (There goes Spain's UN seat, for the time being, at least.) France, even though a Catholic country, has little sympathy for the Franco regime. Both England and Franco had direct experience with European fascism and both are concerned about the high-handed methods of the U. S. in subordinating all considerations to the military.

500,000 CUTHROATS

The official U. S. attitude deprecates the regime in Spain, but waives consideration of it in favor of what it considers the overwhelming weight of military considerations, an attitude that operates in other areas of the world as well. The U. S. is concerned with Spain's harbors and naval bases, its protected air-base sites, its military manpower—and the devil take ideology and politics.

In the sphere of manpower, almost every Spanish male from 18 to over 60 capable of bearing arms is an experienced veteran of the civil war. What does it matter if most of them fought against Franco? Spain's standing army, nearly two-thirds of which is composed of professional soldiers, numbers 325,000. What does it matter if it is so large in order to guard against revolt?

U. S. strategic opinion was summed up by one commentator



U. S. Ambassador Moves to Break Greek Strike

The State Department's Bureau of arm-twisting is at work again—in Greece.

The U. S. ambassador has intervened to break a strike of Greek workers. It is put virtually as bluntly as that in a N. Y. Times dispatch, July 24.

The strike was by 55,000 government employees for a living wage; they were out for 15 days before returning to work July 23 "not too happily." And—

"Many admitted that United States Ambassador John E. Peurifoy's letter to Premier Sophocles Venizelos, in which the envoy clearly threatened a stoppage of United States aid funds to Greece if the 'chaotic' conditions continued, had influenced their decisions to resume work for the present." (Times.)

A foreign correspondent for the Times, naturally must hedge with stock phrases like "many admitted," but the fact is clear: Washington's ambassador swung the big stick of American blackmail (withdrawal of aid) in order to force the Greek civil-service workers back to their desks.

The strikers threaten to go out again in two weeks unless their wage demand is met.

BEVAN'S MANIFESTO

The new programmatic pamphlet by Aneurin Bevan and his associates in the British Labor Party, "One way Only," has been shamelessly distorted in the American press, including the N. Y. Times. Its text is now available here. To find out what Bevan says—

Get LA Next Week
(and every week)

SPs Dump All Principles In Forming International

By GORDON HASKELL

"Outside America, Socialism is the only serious rival to Communism for the allegiance of the working class. . . . Moreover the very word Socialism has unchallenged prestige as a symbol of utopia. . . ."

The Economist, July 14

The Socialist International has been re-established, in a manner of speaking. Representatives of some 34 socialist and labor parties from all over the world, claiming a combined membership of 9,783,000 and the electoral support of 43,543,000 in the most recent elections, met in Frankfurt, Germany from June 30 to July 3. They labored to bring forth a program and a declaration of principles which could better society.

By and large, for the masses who have not been misled by Stalinism, the organizations whose leaders gathered in Frankfurt represent a hope of the future. The quotation at the top of this article from the conservative London Economist is a sober statement of fact. And as long as the masses of workers throughout Europe and Asia retain their confidence in these organizations, as long as they belong to them and support them, they represent the chief organized force for the struggle for socialism—the hope of humanity.

Nevertheless, it can be said with certainty that the program adopted by this conference does not represent a means of rallying the workers for a determined struggle against both the decaying capitalist system and the new totalitarianism of Stalinism. It represents, rather the codification of the confusion, the social conservatism, the political cowardice, the historical myopia of the leaders, old and new, of the social-democratic movements of the world.

The statement of principles worked out and adopted without dissenting vote at the conference, "The Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism," represents a compromise. But it is not a com-

The declaration is a mass of generalities which, with a few exceptions and trimmed of the constant use of the word "socialism," could be accepted by most enlightened followers of the Fair Deal. This tendency to make the document "respectable" and acceptable to all but rigid conservatives is as glaringly illustrated in its omissions as in what it says.

MUM ON CAPITALISTS

For instance, the declaration at no point attacks the capitalist class as such. At no point does it describe the capitalist class as being, by its very nature, a body of exploiters the social existence of which is incompatible with a democratic socialist society. It does state that "Socialism aims to liberate the peoples from dependence on a minority which owns or controls the means of production," and that "such planning [economic] is incompatible with the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few."

It may be asked: is that not the same as saying that the socialists regard the capitalist class as the main obstacle to socialism, and that it is therefore their aim to eliminate this class from power in society?

It is and it is not the same. The evasion involved here is not just a

(Turn to last page)

(Turn to last page)

What Does UAW Propose to Do About Chrysler, Hudson Speedup?

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, July 22—The continuation of sporadic walkouts in the Chrysler plants has posed to anxious workers this question: Will the Chrysler workers' struggle against the speedup degenerate into another tragic Hudson situation?

The uncoordinated, confusing and exhausting departmental walkouts wherever management puts on the heat for production, with the subsequent shutdown of entire plants, has put that fearful possibility into the workers' minds.

For no one wants a repetition of the terrible mess at Hudson where the workers have not worked a full day since June 11! And the near-by Chrysler workers keep asking, "If the UAW can't whip a small company like Hudson, how can they defeat Chrysler on speedup?"

The full-page advertisement which the UAW had in Saturday's daily press does place the blame properly on the Hudson management for the ghoulish situation, but it fails to give any clue to a successful strategy for winning at Hudson.

IT'S SPEEDUP

The UAW story about Hudson may be summarized as follows: Last winter the Hudson management produced at a fantastic rate, stockpiling cars to an extent where it now has over 82,000 in backlog. (The UAW doesn't say that Hudson did this in anticipation of war contracts, which Hudson subsequently failed to receive because it insisted on fabulous profits.)

Hudson was forced to reduce its production schedule drastically this spring. It even had two weeks' complete shutdown. But the huge backlog remains.

"On June 11, 1951 when the workers returned to their jobs, they found that the company had arbitrarily reduced the negotiated manpower on over 40 jobs by some 111 men. The company made this reduction in manpower without prior consultation with the union and in direct violation of agreements reached on manpower in negotiations between the union and the company," The UAW statement points out.

When the workers were unable to meet the company's production schedule—and this certainly is speedup—the company sent the men home and then the entire plant was also to leave. This has been a daily procedure since June 11—more than a month!

The UAW statement adds: "We charge the Hudson Motor Car Company with willfully and deliberately violating the contract between the union and the company, and violating agreements reached on production standards in order to tie up their production and thus have a convenient excuse not to operate their plants because they are unable to sell their products."

"We believe that the company has been reluctant to shut down its plants because they are afraid of the adverse effect it might have on present and future sales of their cars."

"We further charge the Hudson Motor Car Company with provoking production bottlenecks which they use as an excuse to send workers home in order to avoid payment of unemployment compensation to their employees."

WHY DON'T THEY?

What does the UAW propose to do? The full-page advertisement is a reprint of a letter it sent to Senator Blair Moody. It calls on him and his committee to make a thorough and complete investigation of the activities of Hudson in order to correct injustices that the company is imposing on thousands of workers.

Now Senator Moody may very well think that this is passing the buck to him—after all, his committee has no power to force a different policy on Hudson.

Outside of publicity value—and this is valuable—the letter to Senator Moody shows the UAW leaders do not have a union answer to the problem. Why wasn't a lockout charged against Hudson, and an attempt to get unemployment compensation made? Or why wasn't a strike called—it was voted by the ranks—and the men given strike relief which would have been more per week than the 6 or 7 hours a week they worked? These are just some of the questions which the UAW hasn't answered satisfactorily to the ranks, and they are the questions which are asked every day of harassed stewards and committeemen in other plants.

Chrysler has been using the Hudson pattern against the workers in its plants. New production schedules are made, manpower has been cut down, and men sent home for not producing more; then the others walkout in sympathy. Or the tense situation in the plants makes any small irritation the cause of a walkout in some department which forces the rest of the plant home. The national press has been carrying story after story of these walkouts.

HIT CONCESSIONS
In this critical situation the routine answer of top union officials—take the speedup issue through grievance procedure—through grievance procedure—though it certainly seems like the answer to those conservative unionists who think only that the contract is sacred, and the umpire system of solving disputes between the union and management is the final word in all negotiations.

As everyone in the UAW knows, many times the umpire's decisions are against the workers. In the cases of chief stewards fired for departmental walkouts, the umpire is always dooming the union official. Speedup is viewed legally by the umpire, not in terms of the human effort involved.

But the basic reason why the ordinary union grievance procedure doesn't work successfully is that any strict enforcement of the provisions of the contract, be it in Chrysler or any other major plant, gives the corporation far more leeway on speedup than the practices and customs in the shops themselves.

Over a period of years, the militant stewards and shop committeemen have been able to squeeze out of plant management many concessions not clearly written in the contract. Often the men have worked out little techniques which are time-savers and this gives the men brief respite from the relentless demands of the moving assembly lines. It is precisely these concessions which are the first target of the companies now.

Chrysler workers are often told that these kinds of concessions have been lost in both Ford and General Motors plants. Chrysler management openly says that it considers the annual-improvement factor increase of 4 cents a reason for getting more work from the men.

The pattern of Chrysler's attack on working standards has varied from plant to plant in the past week. After they penalized a total of 22 men in the Jefferson and Kercheval plants, the company returned manpower to previous standards in the face of a belligerent local union and shop leadership. At Dodge they press forward. At DeSoto they keep up the tactics which have kept that shop in a state of turmoil for months.

STELLATO GAINS
The over-all situation was considered so acute that the shop committeemen from all Chrysler plants met in an emergency meeting last week and decided on a common policy. They advocated a full Chrysler conference to threaten a nation-wide strike if necessary. They met with the Chrysler department, directed by Norman Mathews, and the union leaders had a special session with Chrysler management warning them against further speedup.

Nevertheless, the harsh fact remains that Chrysler, like Hudson, is determined to make the most of the current layoffs and the resultant fears and confusion among the workers; and the steady policy of attrition against the workers' standards continues. For the shop leaders the dilemma is this: What to do when they know that grievance procedure will not answer satisfactorily the production problem from the workers' point of view. It is also a question for the entire UAW leadership.

In this stormy period, such questions are a source of irritations to the top UAW leaders. The vacuum of doubt about the Reuther leadership increases, as shown by the almost overt support that Carl Stellato and Ford Local 600 get from previously hardened Reuther strongholds in the local unions.

How much the internal relations of the UAW are being affected by this crisis may be judged soon by the results of the forthcoming Wayne County CIO convention which is now Reuther-controlled. At Ford Local 600, the Stellato regime won 68 out of 76 of the delegates.

What effect this will have on the mayoralty campaign—along with the previous political action policies of the UAW leadership—will also soon be known, for the deadline for filing candidates for mayor is July 28 and the UAW will have to take a public stand by then.

DISILLUSIONED?
Old-timers in the UAW recall how this kind of mess in 1941 largely discredited the Thomas-Addes leadership. Not the last reason why Stellato and Company are demanding a national emergency conference of the UAW is because they hope to put Walter Reuther on the spot as he did other people in other times. Since the Reuther leadership has developed the cult of Reuther as responsible for all good, it is only logical that the opposition of all varieties plays on the theme that

exaggerated, it is certainly an auspicious beginning.

NEXT STEP
The demand raised by most of the speakers was that the convention strip Rieve of his power to appoint most of the union's salaried officials, on the ground that he was using this appointive power to set up a "totalitarian organization" in the union.

It is important that the Baldanzi backers have taken the offensive and are organizing their forces this early. They have thereby made their victory at least possible, just as a mere last-minute defensive role would have doomed them to defeat. Whether their programmatic discussion included any references to or consideration of a militant policy for the union, both on the economic and political fronts, or whether the fight is to be strictly limited to the issue of internal democracy, does not appear from any reports. It is to be hoped that the former course will be pushed.

As we said in the above-mentioned article: "Baldanzi, if he wants to defend himself and his ideas, must take the offensive. He must rouse the membership not only by appealing to them to defend democracy in their union, but by carrying to them an all-around progressive militant union program that embodies their own hopes and aspirations. If he is capable of carrying on such a campaign and is successful, it will mark the first reversal to the present reactionary trend in the CIO, and will give heart especially to the militants in the auto, electrical and rubber workers' unions who await only such a lead."

At the Baldanzi faction meeting over the weekend, the press now reports, 400 union members in attendance (with Rieve supporters and reporters for Textile Labor locked out) pledged a fighting fund of \$100,000 to finance their revolt against the union president's machine. They set up a 70-man Pre-Convention Committee for a Democratic TWU, plus a 5-man steering committee headed by Baldanzi. The banner unfurled was that of democratization of the union "from top to bottom."

The conferees stated that they already represented one third of the membership. If that is not

less demands of the moving assembly lines. It is precisely these concessions which are the first target of the companies now.

Chrysler workers are often told that these kinds of concessions have been lost in both Ford and General Motors plants. Chrysler management openly says that it considers the annual-improvement factor increase of 4 cents a reason for getting more work from the men.

The pattern of Chrysler's attack on working standards has varied from plant to plant in the past week. After they penalized a total of 22 men in the Jefferson and Kercheval plants, the company returned manpower to previous standards in the face of a belligerent local union and shop leadership. At Dodge they press forward. At DeSoto they keep up the tactics which have kept that shop in a state of turmoil for months.

STELLATO GAINS
The over-all situation was considered so acute that the shop committeemen from all Chrysler plants met in an emergency meeting last week and decided on a common policy. They advocated a full Chrysler conference to threaten a nation-wide strike if necessary. They met with the Chrysler department, directed by Norman Mathews, and the union leaders had a special session with Chrysler management warning them against further speedup.

Nevertheless, the harsh fact remains that Chrysler, like Hudson, is determined to make the most of the current layoffs and the resultant fears and confusion among the workers; and the steady policy of attrition against the workers' standards continues. For the shop leaders the dilemma is this: What to do when they know that grievance procedure will not answer satisfactorily the production problem from the workers' point of view. It is also a question for the entire UAW leadership.

In this stormy period, such questions are a source of irritations to the top UAW leaders. The vacuum of doubt about the Reuther leadership increases, as shown by the almost overt support that Carl Stellato and Ford Local 600 get from previously hardened Reuther strongholds in the local unions.

How much the internal relations of the UAW are being affected by this crisis may be judged soon by the results of the forthcoming Wayne County CIO convention which is now Reuther-controlled. At Ford Local 600, the Stellato regime won 68 out of 76 of the delegates.

What effect this will have on the mayoralty campaign—along with the previous political action policies of the UAW leadership—will also soon be known, for the deadline for filing candidates for mayor is July 28 and the UAW will have to take a public stand by then.

DISILLUSIONED?
Old-timers in the UAW recall how this kind of mess in 1941 largely discredited the Thomas-Addes leadership. Not the last reason why Stellato and Company are demanding a national emergency conference of the UAW is because they hope to put Walter Reuther on the spot as he did other people in other times. Since the Reuther leadership has developed the cult of Reuther as responsible for all good, it is only logical that the opposition of all varieties plays on the theme that

exaggerated, it is certainly an auspicious beginning.

NEXT STEP
The demand raised by most of the speakers was that the convention strip Rieve of his power to appoint most of the union's salaried officials, on the ground that he was using this appointive power to set up a "totalitarian organization" in the union.

Jim Crow Justice

Last month in a North Carolina witness box, Miss Willie Jean Boswell, 18, testified that 44-year-old Mack Ingram had not touched her, spoken to her, but had "looked at her" from a distance of about 75 feet. A judge found Ingram guilty of "attempted assault on a female" and sentenced him to two years at hard labor.

This week in a Mississippi witness box, Miss Cornelia Slater, 31, testified that Lonnie Bevell, 27-year-old farmer, had raped her and then beaten her into unconsciousness. A 12-man jury acquitted defendant Bevell.

As the Moscow radio will be at least second to point out, Miss Boswell, Mr. Bevell, the judge and the jury were all white. Mr. Ingram and Miss Slater were Negroes.

Editorial in the New York Post, July 15.

There is little possibility that in this situation a major opposition will arise which can seriously challenge the Reuther leadership. It is too strongly entrenched. But the gap between the international union machine and the ranks is getting bigger. Nor is it made any smaller by the fact that any criticism, no matter how mild, of the Reuther leadership is treated as virtual heresy. Such an atmosphere only exaggerates the differences, and antagonizes more ranks.

The limitations of the union as an organization to solve basic economic problems, the limitations of the Reuther leadership itself, and the general uncertainty and doubts in the auto workers' minds have combined to make for quite a different outlook and attitude within the UAW than the Reuther leadership anticipated at the recent convention. Disillusionment is the word for it.

The Liberal Party then nominated Rudolph Halley, who achieved fame as the chief counsel for the Senate Crime (Kefauver) Committee in its television hearings, and is an independent Democrat with virtually no political past or record. The Liberals insisted that they were running him as a public service for the good citizens of New York City who wanted to be rid of Tammany bossism and gangster domination. They pleaded with the Republicans to accept him as a coalition candidate, above parties and above "narrow interests."

But the Republicans weren't

swallowing this line, and in their next move they cleverly nominated Javits. After all, they pointed out to the Liberals: you yourselves have pointed out how liberal, how pro-labor, and what a top-notch candidate Javits is. They pointed out, to the discomfort of the Liberals, that their votes have again and again elected Javits to Congress. If he's good enough for the Liberals for Congress, why not for City Council president, the second highest elective office in New York City? Wouldn't that be as good a public service as running Halley?

In the face of the deals of yesteryear, with the still-green memories of Republican-Liberal coalitions the Liberals could only matter that Javits was too important a man for Congress to lose in this time of international tension. This line was echoed by Javits himself, who found himself uncomfortably placed between the crossfire of the Republicans and the Liberals.

"OUR FRIENDS"
Javits insisted that he would not run without Liberal endorsement, while the Republicans darkly threatened that as a Republican he owed his fundamental obligation to them and should click his heels when the party says it's necessary . . . or else they hinted that his ambitions for higher political posts may come to an early death.

Javits wriggled on the spot and came out with a letter urging the Liberals to withdraw Halley and make a deal with the Republicans on some jointly agreeable candidate other than himself. Thus do the "friends" of the Liberal Party use their influence and prestige, built up by the Liberal Party, against the party itself. In any crisis, they demonstrate that they are Republicans (or Democrats) first and will further the aims of that party against the Liberals.

But the Liberal Party, for a series of reasons—not all of them worthy of close inspection, decided they would not dump Halley and began building up the campaign for him. In part at least, it is a recognition of the growing sentiment within the party ranks to run candidates of their own, as well as an attempt to capture the anti-bossism and anti-gangster-

Dems, GOP Talk of Break With Liberal Party in N. Y.

By PETER WHITNEY

The furious boiling of the political pot in New York City has now sufficiently simmered down so that New Yorkers can see what has been cooked up for them in the way of candidates for the presidency of the City Council. Last Friday, July 20, the various party nominating petitions were filed, and the door was closed to any further jockeying on the candidates.

The candidates running are: Joseph Sharkey, Democrat; Henry Latham, Republican; Rudolph Halley, Liberal; and Clifford McAvoy, American Labor (Stalinist). The Republicans filed petitions with the name of Jacob Javits, Republican-Liberal congressman, but substituted Latham at the last moment because the Liberal Party leaders insisted on their selection of Halley.

For weeks preceding the filing of the nominating petitions, the Republican and Liberal Party leadership engaged in a series of maneuvers, each with the hope that it would come out on top with its candidate. In previous city-wide elections the Liberals have usually endorsed the Republican "good government" candidate and worked harmoniously against the Tammany-dominated Democratic candidates.

This year, however, a snag developed and the Liberal Party, unable to make a deal, came out with a candidate of its own selection. At the start they would have been willing to make a deal on Javits, but at that point the Republicans became incensed at what they termed dictation and insisted they would pick their own candidate—and not be "bossed" by the Liberals.

CROSSFIRE

The Liberal Party then nominated Rudolph Halley, who achieved fame as the chief counsel for the Senate Crime (Kefauver) Committee in its television hearings, and is an independent Democrat with virtually no political past or record. The Liberals insisted that they were running him as a public service for the good citizens of New York City who wanted to be rid of Tammany bossism and gangster domination. They pleaded with the Republicans to accept him as a coalition candidate, above parties and above "narrow interests."

But the Republicans weren't

swallowing this line, and in their next move they cleverly nominated Javits. After all, they pointed out to the Liberals: you yourselves have pointed out how liberal, how pro-labor, and what a top-notch candidate Javits is. They pointed out, to the discomfort of the Liberals, that their votes have again and again elected Javits to Congress. If he's good enough for the Liberals for Congress, why not for City Council president, the second highest elective office in New York City? Wouldn't that be as good a public service as running Halley?

In the face of the deals of yesteryear, with the still-green memories of Republican-Liberal coalitions the Liberals could only matter that Javits was too important a man for Congress to lose in this time of international tension. This line was echoed by Javits himself, who found himself uncomfortably placed between the crossfire of the Republicans and the Liberals.

"OUR FRIENDS"
Javits insisted that he would not run without Liberal endorsement, while the Republicans darkly threatened that as a Republican he owed his fundamental obligation to them and should click his heels when the party says it's necessary . . . or else they hinted that his ambitions for higher political posts may come to an early death.

Javits wriggled on the spot and came out with a letter urging the Liberals to withdraw Halley and make a deal with the Republicans on some jointly agreeable candidate other than himself. Thus do the "friends" of the Liberal Party use their influence and prestige, built up by the Liberal Party, against the party itself. In any crisis, they demonstrate that they are Republicans (or Democrats) first and will further the aims of that party against the Liberals.

swallowing this line, and in their next move they cleverly nominated Javits. After all, they pointed out to the Liberals: you yourselves have pointed out how liberal, how pro-labor, and what a top-notch candidate Javits is. They pointed out, to the discomfort of the Liberals, that their votes have again and again elected Javits to Congress. If he's good enough for the Liberals for Congress, why not for City Council president, the second highest elective office in New York City? Wouldn't that be as good a public service as running Halley?

In the face of the deals of yesteryear, with the still-green memories of Republican-Liberal coalitions the Liberals could only matter that Javits was too important a man for Congress to lose in this time of international tension. This line was echoed by Javits himself, who found himself uncomfortably placed between the crossfire of the Republicans and the Liberals.

"OUR FRIENDS"
Javits insisted that he would not run without Liberal endorsement, while the Republicans darkly threatened that as a Republican he owed his fundamental obligation to them and should click his heels when the party says it's necessary . . . or else they hinted that his ambitions for higher political posts may come to an early death.

Javits wriggled on the spot and came out with a letter urging the Liberals to withdraw Halley and make a deal with the Republicans on some jointly agreeable candidate other than himself. Thus do the "friends" of the Liberal Party use their influence and prestige, built up by the Liberal Party, against the party itself. In any crisis, they demonstrate that they are Republicans (or Democrats) first and will further the aims of that party against the Liberals.

But the Liberal Party, for a series of reasons—not all of them worthy of close inspection, decided they would not dump Halley and began building up the campaign for him. In part at least, it is a recognition of the growing sentiment within the party ranks to run candidates of their own, as well as an attempt to capture the anti-bossism and anti-gangster-

swallowing this line, and in their next move they cleverly nominated Javits. After all, they pointed out to the Liberals: you yourselves have pointed out how liberal, how pro-labor, and what a top-notch candidate Javits is. They pointed out, to the discomfort of the Liberals, that their votes have again and again elected Javits to Congress. If he's good enough for the Liberals for Congress, why not for City Council president, the second highest elective office in New York City? Wouldn't that be as good a public service as running Halley?

In the face of the deals of yesteryear, with the still-green memories of Republican-Liberal coalitions the Liberals could only matter that Javits was too important a man for Congress to lose in this time of international tension. This line was echoed by Javits himself, who found himself uncomfortably placed between the crossfire of the Republicans and the Liberals.

"OUR FRIENDS"
Javits insisted that he would not run without Liberal endorsement, while the Republicans darkly threatened that as a Republican he owed his fundamental obligation to them and should click his heels when the party says it's necessary . . . or else they hinted that his ambitions for higher political posts may come to an early death.

Javits wriggled on the spot and came out with a letter urging the Liberals to withdraw Halley and make a deal with the Republicans on some jointly agreeable candidate other than himself. Thus do the "friends" of the Liberal Party use their influence and prestige, built up by the Liberal Party, against the party itself. In any crisis, they demonstrate that they are Republicans (or Democrats) first and will further the aims of that party against the Liberals.

But the Liberal Party, for a series of reasons—not all of them worthy of close inspection, decided they would not dump Halley and began building up the campaign for him. In part at least, it is a recognition of the growing sentiment within the party ranks to run candidates of their own, as well as an attempt to capture the anti-bossism and anti-gangster-

ism feelings of the New York electorate. The Halley nomination has tended to hearten those without in the party who believe the party should end its policy of deals with Republicans and Democrats and should make a clean break with the two old parties.

While there is little doubt that the Liberal Party leadership would have preferred to make a deal in this campaign, the fact remains that it is now pitting Halley against the candidates of the Democratic and Republican machines. It has been pushed into this position, but instead of exploiting and developing this possibility the Liberal Party leadership intends to run a respectable appeal-to-all-parties campaign, it seems.

LESSON FOR LIBERALS
The Republican and Democratic leaderships at least talk with a show of more principles than do the Liberals themselves.

The Republican candidate, Latham, when substituted for Javits, proclaimed that fusion with the Liberal Party was always a horrid idea! "From the standpoint of political philosophy we could more readily swallow a coalition with the Democrats," elucidates Latham, and he is 100 per cent right. Would that the Liberal leadership could assimilate this fundamental fact of political life!

And if the Republicans can't teach them, maybe the action of Paul Fitzpatrick, Democratic state chairman, should stir them to some thinking of their own. Fitzpatrick wired the Democratic county chairmen to reject endorsement of their candidates, except for judicial posts, by any other party. This injunction, while too late for practical application, was directly aimed against any further alliances with the Liberal Party. For the November election, the Liberals have already endorsed more than 100 Democratic candidates in line with their usual policy of playing handmaiden to the Democratic Party.

But unfortunately the Liberal Party leadership is expert at turning the other cheek, and it may take many more blows before it embarks on the road to consistent independent political action across the board.

held at the beginning of June in Paris and its decisions, which were reached at the end of six long sessions of what was described as "lively debate," were published in this issue. They consist of a recapitulation of their analysis of the spring uprisings (published in LABOR ACTION some weeks ago) and also a program of preparation for future struggles. They are evidently chiefly interested, in this respect, in building some unified command among émigré groups for leadership in coming battles.

FOR UNITY
The new situation created by the movements in Catalonia and Euzkadi demand that an end be immediately put to the separation of the emigration forces. This separation has been the fruit of long months of sterile policies: that of the republican groups and of the Socialist Party. The first expected the restoration of the republic by the decisions of the UN and the great powers. The latter hoped the fall of Franco would come from the political and diplomatic agreements with monarchist elements."

The resolution goes on to suggest that the parties in exile follow the example of the people of Spain who, in their uprising,

formed no alliance with the monarchists, called for no UN resolution to help them out in the struggle, and split up into no self-sufficient groupings. The resolution goes on to offer a minimum program which can unite the anti-Franco forces of the resistance and the emigration," the basis of which would be something along the following lines:

"(1) Destruction of the Franco regime. (2) Dissolution of the Falange. (3) Liberation of all the political prisoners and return of the exiles. (4) Freedom of association, meetings, press and propaganda, and the right to strike. (5) Dissolution of the Falangist unions and a reconstitution of the workers' organizations. (6) General rise in wages proportionate with the cost of living. Escalator principle. (7) Review of the fortunes made since 1936. Confiscation of the great fortunes which are a fruit of exploitation. (8) Restitution of the goods confiscated from the working class and republican organizations."

"Today, as yesterday," notes the resolution, "it is necessary to bring to a head the offensive against Franco on three fronts: in Spain itself, among the émigrés, and in the international

arena. The Spanish front, evidently, is the main one, the decisive one."

The Spanish people have been let down in the "international arena" more than once. A people once conquered by a dictator whose chief supports were Hitler and Mussolini are probably not surprised to find that same dictator maintained in rule by the arms and finances of one of the "democracies." They grow embittered; but the fight carries on.

Polish Regime Retreats Before Mass Resistance

By A. RUDZIENSKI

In a recent article we reported on the Polish mine workers' strike in Upper Silesia and Dombrowa, on the peasant riots in the South of Poland and on the street fight in Szczecin between the people and the Polish military. Now we receive the news that the peasant riots took place not only in the South but also in the center of the country near Warsaw and in the North, on the Baltic coast, in the district of Szczecin.

The Stalinist party, the "youth brigade" and the *Bezpieka* (secret police) all participated in the attack on Grifice village in connection with the "grain buy-up." The police and the "youth brigade," under the personal leadership of party commissar Dekert, destroyed the peasants' houses, beat them up and stole quantities of their goods.

BACKWATERING
This terror was intended to give a boost to the organization of collective farmers and forestall peasant resistance to government policy in the buy-up. But the peasants fought back all over the country, in the North as in the South and central region, and the Stalinist terror was isolated in the face of the mass resistance of the people.

Now the Warsaw politburo has given the signal for a retreat: it has officially condemned the "adventuristic and gangster action against the peasants." To give this some color of verisimilitude, judicial action was instituted against some Stalinist activists (that is, strong-arm men) in Grifice (Szczecin district); they were sentenced to from 1-5 years for their "abuses" against the peasants.

The Szczecin district court handed out 5 years to the district chief of the grain buy-up, St. Grösinger; the first secretary of the regional party committee, Grodzinski, got 4 years; the chief of the party's economic section, Dekert, got 4; likewise the district security police chief, Muszynski, and the head of the Youth Association, W. Majcherek. All the defendants confessed their guilt, including "abuse of authority" and "adventuristic and gangster policy against the working peasants," and pleaded for mercy from the jury. Indeed, the sentence was very mild; the jury motivated its clemency by citing the former "merits" of the de-

fendants for their previous activity.

In Fryzansysz (Warsaw county) also, a military jury condemned four officials of the security police for "abuse of authority." The police had beaten people up in the streets. Sentenced were Jan Dalkowski to 10 years, Z. Adamiak to 8 years, St. Matyjasiak to 7, M. Bartkowski to 3; and all were demoted.

JUST A LULL
The Warsaw politburo has introduced and published a bill directed against abuse of authority, willfulness, etc. and has declared that the grain buy-up must be voluntary and spontaneous.

In reality, all over the country the month of March saw the unleashing of a mass terror against the peasants. Grain was confiscated by force; peasants were arrested en masse; the police and "youth brigade" assaulted the villages; and the government press was charmed into silence by the well-known methods of the "popular democracy."

But now, after the Stalinist terror met peasant mass resistance and after the miners' strike and street riots, the Stalinist party understood that it had to crawl out of responsibility for the terrorist drive and had to retreat.

Very likely, Moscow does not now wish to inflame the Polish situation in view of the international war tension; it does not want to weaken the spirit of the Rokossovsky army. Even more probably, the "retreat" is designed to disorient and lull the peasants and working masses with regard to the good intentions of the party, in order better to prepare a general offensive against the peasants, as in the Ukraine, and destroy their economic independence completely.

In any case this Stalinist strategy is proof of the difficulties which the Polish puppets face, and proof that the Stalinist regime and terror can be beaten by mass popular resistance not only in Poland and Yugoslavia but also in the Ukraine and in Russia itself, if there existed in the country political forces capable of leading them. Certainly, in the case of collapse in war, the resistance of the workers and peasants could break out of the bonds of the Stalinists' disorganized apparatus and open up the stage of the socialist revolution.

Spanish POUM Stresses Unity Against Franco

The July 10 issue of the publication of the Spanish POUM, *La Batalla*, has just reached our hands. Very few new reports from Spain are in this issue, indicating continued quiet in that land; the people are still taking stock of their great triumphs of April and March, triumphs which, *La Batalla* emphasizes, have completely changed the revolutionary perspective (from defense to offense) in Spain.

They are not unmindful of the fact that American aid might bolster the Franco regime for a period of time, but they are convinced that the March and April events demonstrated that, in the long run, even with outside help, the structure of the ruling regime is so diseased and weak, the people so determined, that its destruction remains probable. The initiative remains in the hands of the people.

However, Solano, editor of *La Batalla* points out that "if Franco succeeds in getting the credits and military help that he begs for with such anguish, the responsibility for the situation that will be created in Spain will fall to the anti-Franco forces and above all to the international working class."

The POUM plenum of its departmental policy chairmen was

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

The Handy Way To Subscribe!

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

Please enter my subscription:
 NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME (please print)
 ADDRESS
 ZONE APT.
 CITY
 STATE

Bill me.
 Payment enclosed.

Next — A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party

25 cents Order from:
 Labor Action Book Service
 114 West 14 Street
 New York 11, N. Y.

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____
State _____ Tel. _____

Youth Student Corner

FIGHTING STALINISM ON THE CAMPUS

By DON HARRIS

It was only a few years ago that Stalinists on campus represented a major factor in student life. Throughout the war and during the honeymoon period immediately after, they could at one and the same time trade on the prestige of "the Russian experiment" and of their radicalism on domestic reforms and civil rights.

Through a succession of organizations which they either controlled or influenced, the Stalinists exerted ideological influence over wide sections of the student body on precisely those college campuses which were the most politically sophisticated and advanced. In some schools in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, the American Youth for Democracy used to dominate school politics and frequently held practically a monopoly on the school paper, student government, and other officially recognized bodies. Even when the bulk of the student body was passive, the active political elements were more likely than not to be found in and around the Stalinist student organizations.

With the organization of the Young Progressives of America and more especially the 1948 Wallace candidacy, the process of the isolation of the Stalinists on campus began. This was, of course, only part of the process accompanying the sharpening of relations between East and West. Yet even at this stage, the Stalinists could claim to have corralled in their camp, broadly speaking, hundreds and thousands of radically-minded, active, politically-oriented student leaders. And tens of thousands of enthusiastic non-Stalinist students were active in YPA and its frequent campaigns.

Today the isolation of the Stalinists on campus is almost complete. Where they have not been destroyed by administrative action, their political defeat has been effectuated by campus coalitions of liberals and socialists, or by conservative groups in the more backward places.

Yet while the broad influence and control of the Stalinists have been destroyed, they still represent a significant political tendency on campus, particularly insofar as the radically oriented student is concerned. Their continual campaigns for civil rights, however demagogic and factionally motivated, tend to impress the naive liberal. Their persecution by the government attracts to their cause the politically inexperienced radical. And each year brings to the campus a new "generation" of students which has not gone through the numerous experiences which have served to sour and repel previous groups from the Stalinist cause.

These are the reasons why we of the SYL must always be prepared to devote time and effort to combatting the ideological and political influence of Stalinism. For while its mass base is gone, the CP and its Labor Youth League still have a core of members which enables them to carry on political activity on a reduced scale. And in certain circumstances, they still retain posts on student newspapers and magazines, from which their ideas are spread and their influence exerted.

Some may argue that it is not necessarily the task of the SYL to engage in debate and discussion with the Stalinists, since the latter are under attack from so many directions already. The facts are, however, that nine times out of ten these attacks are directed from reactionary quarters or accompanied by conservative argumentation. Even the liberals can not be entrusted with the task, for their attack is usually based on the necessity to defend American "democracy" as the lesser evil in the cold war. As a result their attacks apologize for the social and political facts adduced by the Stalinists in criticism of American domestic and foreign policy.

By leaving to liberals and conservatives the task of combating Stalinism, we allow them to tarnish with the Stalinist label ideas which are far more rightfully the possession of others. Socialism itself, not to speak of the principles of national independence, human equality, and social justice, are frequently attacked in the guise of "fighting communism."

Equally important, however, is the necessity that all socialists face of distinguishing themselves from what Stalinism represents. However much we may deny the truth of the charge, in the popular mind socialism is repeatedly charged with being a "stage" or development toward Stalinist totalitarianism. Professors pronounce in sophisticated terms what the newspapers later repeat in the form of "socialism equals slavery."

In the face of this widespread belief student socialists face the task of making clear that what Russia represents has nothing in common with our concept of socialist freedom. One of the most effective ways in which we can do this is to engage in political debate with the open defenders of the Stalinist regime.

Thus, while we have always had the task of fighting the ideas represented by the Stalinists, today this is even more important, even though we may not do so with the primary idea of "winning over" or convincing Stalinist adherents directly. While this is not excluded, our main aim in this area is to differentiate ourselves from Stalinism with the greatest clarity so that there can be no possible confusion in the minds of the vast majority of students, who are anti-Stalinist, about what we represent.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 31 July 30, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign). Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

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

TOWARDS THE WORLD ZIONIST CONGRESS, by Emanuel Neumann.—Zionist Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 1, Summer 1951.

Anyone who wants to get an appreciation of the dilemma faced by Zionism today, now that Zion has been politically established in the state of Israel, can do worse than read this article by a leader of the American Zionist movement. (The magazine, incidentally, is the first number of a new quarterly speaking for General Zionism in this country.)

Dr. Neumann's article is illuminating as to the dilemma because it is devoted to sketching a "way out"—and clearly fails. The problem is: Has the Zionist movement in the diaspora an independent function and role today in any permanent sense, or does Israel take over where it leaves off?

Since this problem, which strikes at the heart of Zionist ideology, will be treated in LA shortly with the greater detail it deserves, it is enough to note here how Neumann poses the problem and the line of his solution.

He stresses that "the problem of the future of the [Zionist] Movement is essentially the problem of diaspora Zionism." An Israeli citizen, he points out, is a "Zionist," and a functioning Zionist doing his duty, by virtue of his citizenship alone and what it entails. Not so, of course, for Jews outside Israel. "It was inevit-

able" for them that "Suddenly and at one stroke, the Zionist Organization was shorn of its political prerogatives and much of its authority." Therefore the paradox: the Zionist prognosis, doctrine and ideal had been vindicated and verified (his modest passing claim) and yet "In point of fact its position has tended to deteriorate. . . . This was especially true of General Zionist organizations, more particularly the Zionist Organization of America. . . . [Its] proud position was now threatened with collapse."

And much more to the same point. The heart of that point is that Zionists are no longer sure of what their movement is for.

Neumann's solution: (1) The Zionist movement in the diaspora "is indispensable to the state of Israel, for an indeterminate period," because of Israel's "precarious position" in the midst of the Arab world. (2) It "is equally essential from the point of view of Jewish life in the diaspora, its health and vitality, its spiritual bond with Israel and the bracing sense of world-wide Jewish unity."

It is perhaps enough to remember that far wider sections of the Jewish community than the Zionist are anxious to be "friends of Israel" to see why the Zionists are wondering whether their movement as such has a reason for existence.

WORLD POLITICS

CAVIAR FOR THE COMMISSAR: IRAN HITS RUSSIAN GRABS

By RICHARD TROY

Throughout the entire duration of the recent anti-British, anti-western-imperialist rumblings in Iran, the Stalinist press has had, with its usually vulgar unanimity and repetition, a great field day. Naturally the Stalinists have denounced the British and lauded the efforts of the Iranian government to oust the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company.

For those with any familiarity whatever with the imperialist character of the relations now existing between Russia and its East European satellites this line has had, like most Stalinist propaganda, a hollow sound. But as if this contrast between word and deed was not enough the Iranian government made a move last week which demolished, in a particularly vivid manner, the Stalinist claim to represent the forces of anti-imperialism. The matter in question was, globally speaking, one of minor importance, but since it involved the very country—Iran—which has become the storm-center of the anti-imperialist movement for the past few months, it has significance.

BROKE TREATY

The Iranian government, it seems, is considering ending the fishing concession which it granted to Russia 25 years ago for operations in the Caspian Sea. The similarity—on a smaller scale, of course—to the Anglo-Iranian case is remarkable and the timing of the announcement, from the point of view of destroying all current ideas that the anti-imperialist movements are a Stalinist plot, are remarkable. The Iranians are complaining that the Russians have been getting far more than their share of the profits of the fishing enterprises, chiefly the caviar industry, and abusing the fishing concession in many other ways.

Although Iranian currency has depreciated to one tenth of its 1927 value, the Russians are still paying on the basis of the 1927 agreement. In addition, the Russians refuse to live up to the section in the treaty stating that there are to be alternating managers; they refuse to permit the Iranians to examine the Russian-kept books; and have insisted that all the fish caught in the area be sold to Gievriskipit, the Russian fish trust. Moreover, the Russian trust buys the fish at a very low price, sells it on the world market at an extremely high one. The Iranians not only want a bigger share of the profit, but they want to assuage national sentiment which has been hurt by this over the years.

The Iranian government has attempted to negotiate a better treaty but has met with no success, and hence it today considers the possibility of (so to speak) "nationalizing" the Caspian fishing industry, refusing to renew the treaty and putting the area in Iranian hands solely. This may well mean, of course—as the Russian may point out in protest!—that efficient exploitation of the huge caviar resources may cease, but, as we know, an intense anti-imperialist nationalism often takes steps which mean such short-term sacrifices of industries formerly directed by the trained technicians of the "advanced" countries.

WILL THEY ECHO BRITAIN?

How the Russians will reply to this contemplated move is not yet known, but it seems doubtful that they will let the lucrative caviar concession go without a few stern protests. Perhaps Molotov, following Herbert Morrison's lead, will denounce Mossadegh's government as "reactionary," and

demand more appreciation be shown long-standing international treaties.

And thus we see a case of Russian imperialism in a most classic frame—Persia, the meeting place of imperialists for centuries—being rebuffed by the awakening national consciousness of the exploited backward country. We see that, given an opportunity, the Russian rulers are capable of imitating the most time-worn patterns of Western imperialism. And apparently they cannot even be classed as "enlightened" imperialists who offer a small concession every few years to snuff out possible native stirrings. In this case the Russians appear to have copied the British too!

In this connection it is interesting to recall that several years ago the Iranian Stalinist front, the Tudeh Party, took a stand against the nationalization of the oil fields of the country. It was during a period when the Russian government expected to obtain a concession from Teheran to permit them to exploit the oil resources in the northern part of the country.

However, Teheran, after much consideration, refused to grant the concession, and thus left the Tudeh Party in extreme embarrassment. They recovered, however, and soon afterwards the Stalinists wheeled around and began to demand, with the rising Mossadegh group, the ousting of the British. What their position on the new issue of the day—the caviar question—will be, of course, depends upon whether or not the Moscow imperialists have learned anything from Morrison's blunders or not. Who knows? The Russians might even take the case to the Hague Tribunal!

READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

Send for the following special issues of LABOR ACTION:

May Day issue, 1950—THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

May Day issue, 1951—

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR 10 cents each

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of L.A., "Readers Take the Floor." It's YOUR forum. Our policy is to publish all letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

A Reader Asks Some Questions On Civil Liberties and Stalinism

To the Editor:

The title of this letter ["Draper vs. Draper"—Ed.] is by way of congratulations by a group of us in this city on your article, "Schlesinger vs. Schlesinger." If he has retrogressed since his earlier writing on civil liberties, you on the other hand have progressed. About 5 or 6 years ago you wrote on the same subject in the New Internationalist; it was an attempt to answer one Barrett, if I remember correctly, who had written what many of us here considered at the time to be the most thorough analysis of civil liberties in any periodical literature. We felt then that your reply was rather evasive, depending as it did upon too much sarcasm and wisecracking. This time, however, you have succeeded in soberly discussing basic issues. Will you please help clear up one point for us (we use LA and NI material for group discussions) in connection with the problem of "bills of attainder" and "guilt by association" which you refer to.

In order to circumvent the vexatious problems of "personal guilt," "due process of law," "evidence," etc., with regard to convicting Communists, Schlesinger, you point out, proposes instead to cope with them by "naming" the CP as a criminal conspiracy. But suppose he retorts, as did Barrett then and later elsewhere, that "guilt by

association" is an irrelevant issue, since the CP is allied with a foreign power and an international group, committed to defend and perpetrate specific practices as over two decades have shown us. What more evidence do we need of continuing political frame-up, intimidation, blackmail, abduction, mayhem, individual and mass murder, slander, subversion, forgery, torture, putschism, falsification, slave labor, sabotage, perjury, conspiracy, etc., etc? Shouldn't the CP be just as liable to prosecution on the legal ground of probable consequences as any person (let alone one who had already served sentences for assault and manslaughter) would be if he brandished a gun and said he was going to kill someone?

Equal irrelevant, or at least secondary, is the "clear and present danger" problem at this point. We are confronted with an obvious present intent and a demonstrable history of crimes against humanity, especially the destruction of democracy. The main point is not to arrest or legalize the CP now or later; it is whether such a group can be rendered legally, as well as morally, liable at any time without impairing democratic principles (we are not concerned at the moment with practical consequences). How would you answer Schlesinger and others on this point?
Washington, D. C.

Fred CUTLER

Stalinists' Rights Cannot Be Hit Without Striking at Democracy Too

Thanks to our gracious correspondent for the kind words about the Schlesinger article. And in view of them it may seem almost ungrateful, if not downright cantankerous, to add that I wish he had re-read the NI article he refers to [Dec. 1945] before getting on a limb with a title like "Draper vs. Draper," which moreover smacks of sarcasm and wisecracking.

I make this modest suggestion, not only because the viewpoint of that article is identical with that of the article he now likes, but because it would also answer some of the questions he raises. In fact, the Schlesinger article is relatively superficial; myself, I think the more fundamental question was discussed in the NI article.

He also seems not to remember that the writer I was discussing in the NI ("one Barrett") had put forward—as his central thesis, in my consideration—the proposal for the suppression of heinous opinions. In doing this Barrett had at least the virtue of raising the question in undisguised form.

I think Schlesinger and his like are seeking means of doing the same, while trying to convince themselves (since they are trying sincerely to be liberals) that they are doing nothing of the sort. Hence their piteous soul-searching.

Since it's been brought up, let's take another look at Barrett's line of thought as I (not he) summarized it:

"The theory that Barrett advances is simply this: An anti-Semitic opinion 'logically' leads to anti-Semitic acts, the latter 'logically' lead to totalitarianism—therefore suppress the whole chain at its root, suppress initial opinion, and you have a 'fundamental' solution."

INDIVIDUALS' JUDGMENTS AND DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

I trust that correspondent Cutler does not want a discussion of this, when it is overtly a matter of suppressing an opinion. I hark back to it because the challenging question is similar: Are you going to wait until . . . ?

Now, Cutler's friendly questions are presumably based on acts, not opinions. But if he examines them more carefully, this becomes doubtful.

Take his list of Stalinist crimes: "What more evidence do we need," he writes, "of continuing political frameup, intimidation . . . slander, subversion, putschism, falsification, slave labor . . . etc.?" The Stalinists are guilty of all these things; very well. That is part of the reason why neither Cutler nor I are Stalinists. We have a "right" to decide for ourselves that they are guilty of these crimes and direct our actions accordingly.

I also have a right to be "morally certain" that (say) Governor Byrnes is responsible for continuing crimes against the Negro people; and I am; and I act on that certainty within the limits possible. I do not accord him a trial by jury before coming to that verdict. I do not follow Blackstone's (or whoever's) rules of evidence.

I do not, in other words, accord him "due process of law," the demand which Schlesinger-1949 raised as fundamental to democracy. In fact, my verdict is not arrived at "democratically" at all in any except an extended sense. That is because democracy is relevant to the organization of SOCIETY, more accurately, to the organization of the STATE. I try to arrive at a personal opinion fairly, objectively, scientifically—what you will—but to add "democratically" would be simply irrelevant or meaningless.

Has Cutler distinguished between the "moral certainty" of his opinions and democratic rights in a state structure? A dictator may also arrive at his opinion as fairly, objectively, etc. as he or I; he may be a "good" dictator; he is nonetheless a dictator, because his opinion replaces democratic rights in regulating relations of people within the state.

LET'S EXAMINE THE LIST OF CRIMES

Look again at what Cutler includes in his list of crimes: slave labor, for example. He no doubt means slave labor in Stalinland, since the American CP is fortunately not in a position to be guilty of these acts.

Why then does it crop up in his list? He is thinking of the Stalinists' opinions, that is, their approval or toleration of slave labor in Russia. Is he willing to follow through with regard to the approval or toleration by many eminent Americans of the concentration-camp regimes of Hitler and Mussolini? Or the approval and toleration of many another crime in the world by many an other individual or group? And is he willing to follow through with this approach consistently?

Is the CP guilty of murder, etc.? I think so. I have not only the right but the duty to draw many conclusions for action from this belief, but one of them is not to call for the electric chair for the CP National Committee on this ground.

No proof—it's as simple as that. "Legal proof"? Yes, "legal" proof; that is, proof in a form which safeguards the democratic rights of everyone else who may be accused of murder, or any other heinous crime on the list, by someone else who makes a charge as sincerely as I may do. Otherwise . . . ? Notice also that every crime on Cutler's list is a crime right now.

No new law, regulation or decree is necessary to stamp them as crimes. There is only one little thing missing: evidence—yes, "legal" evidence, that is, the kind of evidence that would hold up in any court based on democratic procedures, indeed most especially in a court based on the kind of democratic procedures that Cutler believes in. I would repudiate any kind of "socialist" who believes that democracy is something you fight for only when the other fellow controls the state.

None of this makes democratic rights some fixed absolute, independent of time, place, and circumstances. That is matter for a different discussion. What I am concerned with is an approach which absolutely does away with democratic rights at all, at any rate destroys any possible guidance as to the norm.

Naturally, the biggest question involving time, place and circumstances is the one which has given rise to the "clear and present danger" concept. One has to see how and why the "clear and present danger" rule-of-thumb fits into the total problem. That problem is, the distinction between acts and opinions, dangerous deeds and dangerous thoughts.

THE STATE'S DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD

It is easy to get lost in the brilliant discovery, which some people have made late in their lives, that the expression of an opinion is also an act, and that the communication of a dangerous thought is also a dangerous deed.

If that were not so, there would have been no place for the "clear and present danger" concept in the first place.

After discovering that it is so, types like Chief Justice Vinson, in the full flush of belated illumination, naturally conclude that there is no place for it now—I say naturally because there is no concern for democracy in his thinking at all, at bottom, but only concern for the preservation of the status quo as the highest good.

Instead of "clear and present danger," Cutler's question poses before us "obvious present intent" and brings up the one about the man who brandishes a gun. Now, in the case of that notorious man who brandished the gun, the "clear and present danger" concept did NOT become "irrelevant!" That is precisely what the gun-flourishing proves to Cutler, that there IS a clear and present danger as well as an "obvious present intent!" It is therefore that the gun-flourishing is a clearcut case for him. Yet he (that is, his question) cites this gun-flourisher as reason for abandoning the "clear and present danger" rule!

I am not here taking up the consequences of the "obvious present intent" rule. I am assuming that, in the context, they are presently obvious. In any case, they would add up to the point which he shows he is well aware of, in his last few words: that it is impossible to regulate democratic rights in a state on this basis "without impairing democratic principles." Without destroying them, I would amend. Behind all this, is the main point I tried to make in the 1945 NI: We will fight Stalinism, racism, etc. with all the political weapons at our disposal. We do not call on the state to suppress these opinions, monstrous as they are in our eyes; that cure is worse . . .

For that cure is a DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD. Above all (but not only) in the capitalist state of today, it is a double-edged sword with the sharper edge turned against us and all the goals and ideals we hold dear.

I do not intend these discursive comments as an inclusive review of the problems. But I think the comments are, at least, on the heart of the question. The floor is open.

Hal DRAPER

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

WHERE WE STAND

To get acquainted with the ideas of Independent Socialism, send for the special issues of LABOR ACTION listed below:

May Day Issue 1950

THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

May Day Issue 1951

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

Ten Cents Each

LABOR ACTION, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

What's Behind the Purges in the Ukraine? Reports Grow of Split in the Bureaucracy

By Vs. FELIX

RELEASED BY "VPERED", Western Germany, July—The Russian Stalinist press has again announced a new attack on Ukrainian "nationalists" in the Ukraine. The Central Committee of the CP of Ukraine, several district committees, editorial boards of the central papers, cultural and scientific institutions, and prominent personalities have been sharply criticized for "deviations." The Kremlin's attack on such a big scale is the first in the last five post-war years. It is therefore of serious significance, and needs some explanation.

May 24, 1945 was the date which should be reckoned as the beginning of the era of unceasing Stalinist Great Russian nationalism. On that day Stalin himself, speaking before the assembly of generals and officers of the army, announced for the first time that the Russians "are the most eminent nation of all the nations which constitute the Soviet Union," that the "Russian people . . . is the leading force of the Soviet Union among all the other peoples of our country." (Cf. I. V. Stalin: *On the Great Fatherland War of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1949, page 197.)

Open Russian Chauvinism

From that time on, the Stalinist press and all the publications were overflowing with propaganda for Russian nationalism. For instance, we quote a couple of examples from quite recent publications:

"The Great Russian people have been generally recognized by all the peoples of the Soviet Union as the leading force in the country." (*Pravda* editorial, "Under the Banner of an Unshaken Friendship of Peoples," April 13, 1951.)

"The arrival of a new era in the history of mankind is connected with Russia and the Russian people." (*Komsomolskaya Pravda* editorial, January 24, 1951.) Note that the words "Russia" and the "Russian people" are never used in Stalin's empire to mean the USSR and the people of the USSR, as they are commonly used in the U. S. There they refer only to the "Russian Federated Republic," one of the 15 republics constituting the USSR, and to the 90 million Russians of this republic, out of the 200 million inhabitants of the USSR. Besides the Great Russians, there are 181 other peoples within the USSR.

"The greatest significance in the development of the national cultures of the peoples of the USSR is possessed by the Russian language. It has a great unifying and educational role. It should be clear to everybody that without a knowledge of the Russian language it is impossible to become a highly educated and cultured man." (*Narodnoye Obrazovaniye*, No. 8, August 1950—the organ of the Ministry of Education.)

Genocide

This nationalist course has been pushed in all aspects of life in Stalinland. Zhdanov's attack on the "cosmopolitans" in cultural life was in reality an attack against the Russian internationalists. Later came anti-Semitism and "pogroms" against the Jewish intelligentsia. Then came the attacks on the historians of the Central Asiatic republics and the purge of Russian historians who wrote the history of the Ukraine and the Caucasus. The rebirth of the Great Russian Orthodox church and the glorification of tsarist generals, an announcement that all the scientific discoveries in the world were made by Russians, the new All-Union hymn with the words "all the peoples of the Union are once and forever united by Great Russia," etc., etc.—all these followed in the post-war years.

At the same time there was a real occurrence of genocide. The following non-Russian regions of the Union were totally liquidated:

Read

The NEW INTERNATIONAL

The recent news about new purges by Moscow among its leaders in the Ukraine led us to ask the editors of VPERED, the organ of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party in emigration in Germany, for an article explaining the meaning of the new developments. The accompanying article is the result. Its great interest is apparent.

The VPERED comrades also add that they like very much the recent articles in LABOR ACTION on the "foment revolution in Russia" school of thought in the U. S. and on the letter by Kerensky & Co. to the N. Y. Times. They send along an interesting article on the same subject from a German publication, which we expect to publish in our next issue.—Ed.

Checheno-Ingush Autonomous Republic; (2) Crimean Autonomous Republic, Tatar population only; (3) Kalmuck Autonomous Republic; (4) Volga-German Autonomous Republic; (5) Balkarian Autonomous Republic; (6) Karachayev Autonomous District; (7) Kyzyl National Region; (8) Population of Adygey Autonomous District; the district exists still but now with a Russian population; (9) National minorities of Taman Region.

The native population of these nine areas have been entirely resettled in Siberia and their territories inhabited by Russians. At the same time there took place several mass deportations from the Baltic republics and the Ukraine, to Siberia.

This Stalinist policy did not fail to arouse resistance from the non-Russian peoples of the Union. Underground organizations were formed in the Baltic states, in the Caucasus and in Byelorussia. In the Ukraine the existence of the UPA has been the most powerful source of resistance.

But only now has it become possible to disclose some further information on the resistance in Stalinland. The schism of discontent with Stalin's policies has penetrated the Stalinist bureaucracy.

Russians Disaffected

This time the discontent in the party and apparatus does not go along the lines of the former party oppositions of the '20s and early '30s. This time it is a question of discontent inside the bureaucracy itself. It goes along the lines of the question of nationalities and from there it goes on to all the other questions. The regional and provincial bureaucracies in the governments and party committees of the national republics are not satisfied with the growing centralism of Moscow, which infringes on their power and position in society.

The important issue is that though this new opposition starts from the question of nationalities, it is very often not native-national in essence. The Russian-majority Central Committee of the CP of the Ukraine has now been accused of lack of vigilance toward the growing Ukrainian nationalism. The *Pravda Ukrainy*, the Russian central paper in the Ukraine, has been accused of the same deviation. Several secretaries of party district committees recently attacked are also Russians. The same course of events is now taking place in other republics. Several months ago members of the government of the Baltic republics who were dismissed were accused of Titoism, among them several Russians. The purge of the Azerbaidjan CP swept from the central posts not only the native bureaucrats but the Russian ones too.

One-Way Love

But the national schism does not limit itself to the party bureaucracy only. Among the technicians and directors of several big industrial enterprises in the Ukraine and Central Asiatic republics there took place recently new dismissals, without any clear explanations and de-

spite the fact that the enterprises did fulfill the plan and all the obligations.

The Moscow authorities have officially found the source of growing nationalism in the cultural field. There was recently held in Moscow a performance about Ukrainian culture called "The Ukrainian Decade." The Moscow officials were present and found it "nationalistic." Right after that, the attack upon the Ukrainian cultural workers began.

The strongest complaints in the Russian press arose over a poem by the Ukrainian poet Volodymyr Sosyura, a long-time member of the party, several times decorated with orders, an old man. In his poem "Love the Ukraine," which has been "reprinted many times in the whole press," he addresses himself to the Ukrainian youth and says: "Young men! It is impossible to love the other peoples without loving your own." Moscow got furious and hopping mad at that phrase. It is now permissible only to love the Russian people.

But neither of these oppositions inside the bureaucracy and among the cultural workers is an organized one. It is only the result of discontent caused by the post-war Stalinist policies.

However, there are some indications now available that the Moscow organs of the party consider these oppositionists as an organized group inside the party. The Moscow rulers call them "cordonzatory," that is, those who want to establish the frontiers and relations between the Russian and Ukrainian republics. This name, however, is not an official one, it is used only inside the party. The cordonzatory exist especially in the highest strata of the party, among those who dare to talk more or less freely. Their strength is not yet known, however.

Opposition in Leningrad?

Some kind of opposition has come into existence in Russia too. In Leningrad there are strong anti-Stalin feelings in the regional party committee now. There is now some testimony available from people who claim they have read certain oppositionist publications of the Leningrad party group. The Ukrainian cordonzatory are being supported by the Leningrad group. Stalin's surprising agreement to stand as candidate in the election for the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federated Republic in February 1951 in Leningrad (previously he had always been elected from Moscow) could be explained by his wish to calm the oppositionist feelings of the capital of the revolution.

However, in spite of these inner contradictions in the party, the Stalinists up till now did not intend to carry out any kind of general purge of the party. There were some individual dismissals from the leading party posts even in Leningrad (A. Kuznetsov and P. Popkov) and in several other centers, but there has been no general purge. All of Stalin's dissatisfaction with his lower bureaucrats has been limited only to inner-party criticism.

The recent announcement in the *Bolshevik* requesting a "security check" has as its aim the strengthening of the power of the district committees over the rank-and-file members only. The absence of any purge on a big scale, as well as the twelve years' delay of the party congress (the last was held in 1939) indicates that there really exists some kind of uneasy situation inside of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

"VPERED"

is the organ of the Ukrainian socialist resistance movement, published by its section in emigration in West Germany, recording the thinking and activities of the new anti-Stalinist underground fighting behind the Iron Curtain. It is written in Ukrainian, of course, but an English summary of the contents appears in each issue.

For Ukrainian friends, *Vpered* is a must. Others will find the English page of extreme interest—and can help the movement by subscribing.

One dollar for 5 issues.

Order through: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

From *Vpered: Stalinism as a New Social Order* —

A Ukrainian View on the 'Russian Question'

By Vs. FELIX

One can consider the end of the '20s and the beginning of the '30s as the period at which the society which had issued from the October revolution entered for the first time into the phase of new social contradictions. The contradictions were new, because new social forces arose which were to become within a short time the decisive factors in the development of the USSR.

With the liquidation of the NEP and the institution of the first five-year plan, with the collectivization of agriculture and the intensification of industrialization, the Stalinist machine, which had already anchored itself firmly in the party, surged beyond the framework of the party and conquered the whole economic, cultural and political life of the country. In this period the destruction of the remains of the former ruling class and the total liquidation of private property in the means of production were carried out.

All connection with the past was broken, forever. A new society was created.

The Bureaucracy Develops

Although the classless society was to have been the goal of the socialist revolution, this goal could only be achieved in a deformed manner due to the backwardness of the capitalist development of Russia. The revolution had had a bureaucratic character at the very beginning of the creation of the "classless" society. This is most easily recognized by its methods (terror, the use of force). As a result of these methods, as a result of its general backwardness and its numerical weakness, and particularly as a result of the exhaustion of the preceding few years, the Russian working class was already passive during this stage of development. Thus, when the old social relations had been completely liquidated and only two forces remained in the social arena—the bureaucracy and the working class—it came about that the latter was not capable of offering any kind of resistance to the bureaucracy which was intoxicated with success. The bureaucracy occupied the leading positions in the new society and built up its unbreakable shell.

The first and second five year plans, collectivization and industrialization: these were the successful phases of the strengthening of the bureaucracy. In spite of the colossal development of the forces of production (a surplus of workers, development of industry and reorganization of agriculture) the workers remained powerless. All their class and political organizations (especially the trade unions) were conquered and totally destroyed by the bureaucracy. The working class was also weakened socially, as into its ranks came numerous elements from the land, possessed of little class-consciousness and in many cases even with an attitude hostile to the workers.

The New Class

But it was precisely this expansion of the working class which was an unavoidable result of the industrialization of the country and the collectivization and mechanization of agriculture. All of this was carefully utilized by the bureaucracy for the purpose of drawing the rope ever tighter around the neck of the worker.

After the bureaucracy had grasped the whole of the organization of the society in its own hands, it began to legalize its position in society. New laws were worked out by the government departments which progressively restricted freedom for the worker and at the same time bestowed new privileges on the bureaucracy.

We mention here, only as examples, the laws which prohibit the voluntary movement by workers from one job to another, the laws concerning the dictatorial functions of the factory directors, etc.

This process has already assumed stable and final forms. The bureaucracy has become a new social class. Its social-economic functions with respect to the means of production and the process of production are today quite clear: it exercises control over all means of production,

In line with our wish to acquaint our readers with developments of interest in the theoretical work of the socialist movement abroad, we here republish an article on the nature of the Russian state by one of the regular collaborators of *Vpered*, the organ of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party, which is the Marxist wing of the Ukrainian resistance movement. Our readers are already acquainted with Vs. Felix through his reports in LABOR ACTION on the activities and development of the UPA. (Ukrainian Insurrection Army.)

It will be noted that the center of emphasis in this article is the development of the Russian Stalinist regime as a new social order dominated by a new social class, the bureaucracy. This, which we also consider to be the basis of the question, is identical with our own view.

While it is our understanding that Comrade Felix uses the term "state capitalism" to describe this new social order (we prefer the term "bureaucratic collectivism"), in the given context this difference in itself is of little importance. In our view there is an essential difference between those comrades abroad who speak of Stalinism as state capitalism and mean thereby a form of capitalism, and those who speak of it as state capitalism and mean thereby a new social order.

Of course, there are many other problems of analysis and policy which are not automatically resolved by such an analysis, but it is the indispensable starting point.

The present translation is, in point of fact, made from a German translation of the *Vpered* article which appeared in the April issue of *Funk*, a German Social-Democratic magazine.

i.e., it has made them its indirect property via the state. It directs and controls all processes of production, and distributes the products of the labor of society. The bureaucracy is an exploitive class, since it appropriates for itself the larger portion of the surplus value of the labor of society. Only a small example of this are the salaries of the bureaucrats: these are from 15 to 50 times greater than the wages of the ordinary worker.

The characterization of the bureaucracy as a class is not contradicted by the fact that the individual bureaucrat has no guarantee of remaining permanently a member of the privileged class. The eternal "purge actions" have created the impression that the bureaucracy finds itself constantly in motion, that its composition is continually changing and that a uniquely fluid process is taking place. But such mortality is equally characteristic of every other class.

Making Privilege Hereditary

For example, it is true for the bourgeoisie, which also very often changes its personal composition as a result of the bankruptcy of individual firms which are vanquished in competition. But it does not lose its class character as a result of this, for this character is not determined by its constituent individuals, but rather by their social function. When a director is shot in the USSR and another one takes his place, his functions remain the same. This process is similar to the change in ownership as the result of a bankruptcy in capitalist society.

Furthermore, the situation has changed during the past ten years to the extent that the mortality of the bureaucracy has decreased. In the first place, there have been no purge actions in the USSR for quite a long time, and secondly the bureaucracy has worked out a whole series of laws which make their privileged status in society hereditary. The law of 1940 on payment of tuition in the middle and higher schools, for example, is of this nature. One must not forget that a degree of education is essential to the function of the bureaucrat. Today in the USSR only he can get an education who has money, which means that the bureaucrat is first in line. It is for this reason that a strikingly lower percentage of workers' children attend the higher schools.

But the working class has also experienced a great transformation in recent years. The increase in the skills and the technical knowledge of the workers favors a most positive process of crystallization in the working class. The increased exploitation deepens the social gap between the bureaucracy and the worker, and permits the class-consciousness of the workers to ripen.

The bureaucracy too sees the danger of the revival of class-consciousness among the workers. The most important goal of the Stalinist regime is the disorganization and fragmentation of the working class. The government keeps the standard of living of the mass of the workers at the lowest level, but at the same time makes it possible for individuals in the working class to rise above this level. This is accomplished by giving great privileges to all workers who produce more than the norm (Stakhanovites) and raising them out of the working class. In this way the government realizes a further goal. It increases production, as the norms achieved by Stakhanovites are then "proposed" as compulsory norms.

The Class Struggle Goes On

Recently the bureaucracy has noticed that this method does not help it much to fill up the gap between the worker and the bureaucracy. It has therefore found a new method, and distributes enormous numbers of decorations, medals and different honorary titles among the workers. Of course, these bits of tin confer on the worker no actual advantage in the society. They only create the illusion that the government has great esteem for the worker and that these decorated ones are "something better" than the mass, are "privileged" people.

The class struggle in the USSR takes place in deeply concealed forms. It is hardly noticeable from the outside, as the working class has no legal organizations of its own. But the struggle does take place. It is very complicated, as the totalitarian regime of the bureaucracy which has the whole police power at its disposal is today stronger than the workers. But history is not working in favor of the regime. This is demonstrated primarily by the deepening and broadening of the gap between the two classes. Sooner or later the circumstances will arise which will tear the regime apart.

The strength of the new revolution in the USSR will depend on the clarity of the goals for which it takes place. And these goals are quite clear to the broad masses of the workers: To "de-kulakize" the Stalinist state, and to give all the property into the hands of the people. This can be accomplished only by a new revolutionary mass movement against the Stalinist bureaucracy for the realization of higher stages of the revolution, for the creation of a really classless society.

And in closing, one further observation. The victory of the Russian working class over the bureaucracy can only be facilitated if the workers of the West fight consistently for the ideas of socialism. It is a fact that every victory of the West European or American workers is at the same time a defeat for the Stalinist bureaucracy and is aid given by the Western working class to the struggle for freedom of the workers in the USSR.

If You're—

- Against capitalism
- Against Stalinism
- For a Socialist Democracy

You belong with the—
INDEPENDENT
SOCIALIST LEAGUE

You should read—
Max Shachtman's
"THE FIGHT FOR
SOCIALISM"

For information and literature, write to:
Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 St. New York 11, N. Y.

Form Socialist International — —

(Continued from page 1)
 question of avoiding old and worn phrases. It is certainly not forced upon the framers of the document by fear of legal repressions. But it is dictated to them by the fact that so many of the organizations represented sit in the same cabinets with open representatives of the capitalist class, and take responsibility jointly with them for the administration of governments.

This document is supposed to rally the workers, all the oppressed and exploited and disinherited, to struggle. It is supposed to give them a lead in this struggle which is superior to the lead given them by Stalinism. It is supposed to rally them to the struggle against their present exploiters, as well as against the new rulers in the Kremlin. But it starts . . . by politely not naming the main enemy at home.

The same spirit is displayed in the whole document. At no point does it call for the socialization of the decisive industries. Instead . . . it lists the areas of economic life in which private ownership is compatible with "socialist planning."

ON SOCIALIZATION
 There is nothing wrong, of course, in making it clear that socialists do not advocate the immediate or even the eventual nationalization of every last productive enterprise. There is nothing wrong . . . as long as it is made clear to the working people that socialists do advocate the socialization of the basic industries. But the declaration states instead:

"Socialism seeks to replace capitalism by a system in which the public interest takes precedence over the interest of private profit. The immediate economic aims of socialist policy are full employment, higher production, a rising standard of life, social security and a fair distribution of incomes and property. "In order to achieve these ends, production must be placed in the interests of the people as a whole.

"Such planning is incompatible with the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few. It requires effective democratic control of the economy.

"Democratic socialism therefore stands in sharp contradiction both to capitalist planning

and to every form of totalitarian planning . . .

"Socialist planning can be achieved by various means. The structure of the country concerned must decide the extent of public ownership and the form of planning to apply.

"Public ownership can take the form of the nationalization of existing private concerns or the creation of new public concerns . . .

"Socialist planning does not presuppose public ownership of all the means of production. It is compatible with the existence of private ownership in important fields, for instance in agriculture, handicraft, retail trade and small and middle-size industries. The state must prevent private owners from abusing their powers . . ."

FINE PHRASES

What could be more evasive? Production need not even be placed under the "control" of the people as a whole, but in their "interest." It is only the economy as a whole which must be placed under "democratic control," a statement to which Truman could give his hearty support. Public ownership is only one among many means for establishing socialist planning, but as long as its degree is left so completely undefined, it can, as it was meant to, mean all things to all men.

Once again, no socialist party is to be embarrassed by this declaration if its ministers sit in the cabinet of a country in which only the post office is a government concern. The programs of the British Labor Party have been far more specific and revolutionary than this, and their actions as well.

The document, quite correctly, avoids the old error of equating nationalization with socialism. But at the same time it also avoids the demand for workers' control of production as a necessity for the establishment of socialist planning. Instead we find the sentence: "the workers must be associated democratically with the direction of industry."

How can anyone be rallied behind a phrase like that? It is put in, no doubt, to please the German comrades, who are embarking on their schemes of co-determination in privately owned industry, while not offending the British comrades whose party,

even when in sole control of the government, has not established any means by which the workers can participate in running the nationalized industries.

Considerations of space, and of the reader's patience forbid a detailed analysis of the whole declaration. In it are many fine generalities about all manner of things. The Socialist International is for political democracy, for justice, for the right to work, etc., etc. It is against Stalinism and all its works. It aims "to achieve freedom and justice by removing exploitation which divides men under capitalism" and it condemns the Stalinists for seeking "to sharpen those class divisions only in order to establish the dictatorship of a single party." In this phrase, it seems to be saying to the workers that they can remove exploitation without seeking to remove the exploiters . . .

PRO-WAR

But the framers of this declaration could not avoid at least one concrete question: the cold war. And when they faced this question, they revealed the basic emptiness of their declaration.

The question of the attitude of socialists toward the two great imperialist camps tended to divide them more than any other point in the program. Both in the "Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism" and in a special resolution entitled "World Action for Peace," the majority of the parties came out for "collective security," which means for support to the bloc of nations led and dominated by the completely capitalist government of the United States.

On this question, the Economist reports: "The . . . Conference showed that it will face its greatest test outside Europe. The Japanese delegation . . . was clearly unhappy in voting for the Declaration of Aims and Tasks, it abstained on the resolution about world affairs since it favors unarmored neutrality for Japan. The Indian observer, Dr. Lohia, expressed similar doubts on both issues. There is a danger that the Asian parties will form an opposition inside the new International."

The congress came out in support of the U. S.-UN camp in the Korean war, and in support

of rearmament. It did not even temper this with a concrete criticism of those actions of the United States which have been criticized even by the British government. It did not give an inch to the position of the Indian Socialist Party, or to the criticisms of the Bevan wing of the British Labor Party. It went right down the line, covering the policies which (even from a reformist point of view) require criticism with the whitewash of pious wishes.

NO LEAD HERE

"Peace," the resolution declares, "is one of the fundamental aims of International Socialism." And later: "The freedom, independence and equality of status of all nations are an essential condition for the defense of peace." This was, no doubt, a concession to the German party. But how about Africa, and Indo China, and Malaya?

The Socialist International "believes that in defense, as in all aspects of policy, equality of sacrifice must be assured, both within each nation and between nations. But countries which do not enjoy equality of rights cannot be expected to play their full part in common defense." Again, the German comrades had their way in the last sentence. But, we may ask, in which country is there equality of sacrifice? And what possibility is there of equality of sacrifice among the nations dominated by the rich United States?

The fate of this declaration was sealed with its adoption. The workers who belong to the socialist parties want an end to capitalism. They need leadership in program and in action. They need to have their enemies pointed out to them and a series of direct, evident, relatively simple goals for which they can struggle defined. These things are given them by Stalinism, which declares that the capitalist system and the capitalist class are their enemies, that nationalization of industry, the land to the farmers, political power for the people led by the workers are their goal. The Stalinists are losing out and will continue to lose influence among the workers because these aims are seen to be a cover for their own brutal, totalitarian ambitions.

The struggle for democratic socialism could be infinitely more attractive than the shibboleths of Stalinism. But the workers can and are rallied to this struggle only when bold aims are presented to them by leaders who are willing to lead them against the enemies who oppress them. They are in the great European and Asian socialist parties because they seek such aims and such a leadership. The declaration of the Socialist International demonstrates once more that in this world organization both are sadly lacking.

Not in the Headlines

Notes of Cheer

The Standard Oil of New Jersey is earning the biggest profits in its history. In the first six months of this year it will have raked in \$19 million more than it did in the first half of last year, when it made only \$159 million.

Newspaper advertising set an all-time record in May. The poor corporations, that have to scrape the bottom of the barrel to pay those government taxes, seem to have lots of money left over to buy a lot of the nation's press—a lot of space, we mean.

Different Story

There's that 10 per cent ceiling which is supposed to freeze wages and salaries. As everyone knows, the government has no difficulty in policing wage raises, for the most part. The boss just doesn't give the raise, referring the union to the wage freeze. When it comes to freezing salaries for corporation executives, the story is different. The executives give the raise to themselves. How's it going to be policed?

It isn't, one gathers from the U. S. News (June 29), which reports that a Salary Stabilization Board is being set up. It adds:

"Salary Stabilization officials express the hope that salary controls can largely be 'self-enforcing.' They want to avoid a large-scale organization that would be required if every increase of every employer had to be ruled upon.

"There is this other significant factor. In World War II, salary control was enforced by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The employer who violated a rule or who acted without regard to restraints on salary increases, faced what could amount to an automatic disallowance of the entire illegal payroll as a deductible wage cost or tax purposes. This time, salary control is outside the Treasury and is not geared to enforcement by Internal Revenue inspectors.

"Policing of salaries of hundreds of thousands of employers is to be a very difficult task for a small organization with few enforcement agents. The Salary Board staff has the policing job for salaries of all executives, all administrative workers not covered by the Wage-Hour law. The job also applies to professional people not affected by the Wage-Hour regulations.

"As a practical matter, most employers are going ahead with normal procedure in granting raises."

U. S. Seeks Franco as Ally — —

(Continued from page 1)
 who said, "Franco has 500,000 cutthroats and we need them."

Now the public relations job on Spanish fascism begins. The slogans of the late war made such a deep impression—the slogans of the "crusade against fascism"—that the public must forget how Franco came to power. We have already been treated to a photo of him admiring his grandchild. Can his regime be so bad?

Franco himself is willing to collaborate on this build-up. He has reshuffled his cabinet specially for the benefit of the U. S. strategists. The Spanish people did not even know a change was being contemplated. He has ordered some freedom of press!

The Spanish press, however, emphasized for home consumption that "continuity" was the keynote of the cabinet changes. There is apparently a reduced emphasis on the Falange but no sign what-

sover of any change in the fundamental character of government. The monarchists themselves repudiate any sign of any tendency even in the direction of the monarchy.

A MATTER OF TASTE

In the course of one short year, in response to the military exigencies of the Korean war, the U. S. has effected removal of Spanish sanctions in the UN, ambassadorial exchanges, financial assistance and now a military alignment with the only fascist member of the Axis powers still in existence. It is an alliance with a totalitarian—against a totalitarian.

There are those who see a basic difference between a totalitarian system and a democratic one and who base all politics accordingly. We do not believe that an awareness of this obvious difference provides an automatic answer to political questions, particularly to deciding whom to support in a war.

But we never agreed with Molotov, who said after the conclusion of the Stalin-Hitler pact, that "Fascism is a matter of taste." It would be difficult to find a public utterance in worse taste from the standpoint of working class and socialist principles. But it is a characterization which is damningly suitable for U. S. policy toward Spain. For it, fascism has become a question of taste.

NEW YORK CLASS

Sponsored by the Socialist Youth League at Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

WORLD POLITICS: 1930-1950

(Tuesdays, 7:30-9 p.m.)

- July 31—The Popular Front
- Aug. 4—The Spanish Civil War
- Aug. 14—The National Question and Modern WarHal Draper
- Aug. 21—The Role of Stalinism in the Chinese RevolutionJack Brad

NEW YORK

Labor Action Forums

Thursday at 8:30, August 2

Origins of Totalitarianism

ALBERT GATES

Secretary, ISL

Thursday at 8:30, August 9

The Death of a Social System

Capitalism, Stalinism, and The Roman Empire: An Historical Analogy

HAL DRAPER

Editor, Labor Action

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