

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 10, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**THE SOCIALIST LEFT AND THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE**

... page 6

**Truman and the Indian Sergeant**

... page 2

**Stalinist United Fronts: A Discussion**

... page 5

**The Monument of Leon Trotsky**

... page 3

THE CIO ELECTRICAL WORKERS' CONVENTION—

## IUE Still Faces Task of Beating CP with Militancy

By JOHN WILLIAMS

The convention of the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE) which opens in Buffalo during the week of September 17 has as its main job the completion of an old task. This is the organization of the rest of the electrical and machine industry, and the complete elimination of the Stalinist United Electrical Workers, Independent, from the field.

The job of reducing the Stalinists to an inconsequential minority has turned out much harder than some casual observers thought it would be. They remain as a threatening force in the two big chains, General Electric and Westinghouse, and show no signs of being easily reduced. There is much evidence to substantiate this statement.

AN EYE OPENER

The recent National Labor Relations Board election at the great GE plant in Lynn, Mass., controlled by Local 201 IUE-CIO was an eye opener. As part of a move to take over the GE chain, the IUE granted the UE an NLRB election at Lynn in order to get new elections at the two big GE plants at Erie and Sche-

nectady, New York, now controlled by UE. The elimination of these two big GE plants from UE domination was absolutely necessary for the IUE in view of the contract negotiations in which it is now involved with the whole General Electric chain.

Both the UE and the IUE threw strong forces into the test, and the IUE won by a vote of 6,927 to 5,867. As one can see by the vote, the UE remains surprisingly strong. What is even more disturbing is a comparison of the 1951 UE vote to the vote it got in 1950 when it also lost to the IUE. In 1950 the UE got 5,341 votes. After a whole year in which the IUE had a chance to prove itself, it could only reduce the UE total by 553 votes!

Small wonder, then, that there is anxiety about the Schenectady and Erie vote on September 14. James Carey, president of the IUE, undoubtedly hopes to beat the Stalinists at Schenectady and Erie, and to bring this in to the Buffalo convention as a major accomplishment. This is to be hoped for, but is by no means assured.

Things are not going too well in the Westinghouse chain either. Here the IUE has a three to one majority and is in a relatively

better position, but in the main East Pittsburgh plant the UE remains as a major opposition. It will be remembered that a runoff election was needed last year to settle this plant in IUE-CIO's favor, and only about two hundred votes separated the two.

STALINISTS ROUTED

The Communist Party and the UE, it seems, cannot be eliminated by flag waving, conservative unionism. In fact, the UE in Pittsburgh feeds on this and grows stronger. Only militant, democratic unionism can erase Stalinism from the electrical field in Pittsburgh.

In contrast to the difficulties experienced at Lynn and Pittsburgh, District 4 of the IUE, which includes New York City and all of northern New Jersey, has had outstanding success against the UE. It must be pointed out that District 4 has been and still is the heart of the concentration of the Communist Party in the electrical field. Each big shop is literally loaded with Stalinists. Yet despite this big concentration, stronghold after stronghold has fallen. What is even more important, the Stalinists have been routed in almost

(Turn to last page)

## UAW Top Brass Reverse Decision Of Conference on Political Action

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Sept. 1.—At every important conference or convention of the United Auto Workers (UAW) in recent years, the question of independent political action as part of the long-range build-up of a labor party has been debated in one form or another.

In every case, the reaction of the leadership has been mainly to argue against the proponents of independent political action, and to use as a major point of debate the claim that "the ranks aren't ready for it; they don't want it."

The impression given by the Reuther leadership has been that they were just waiting for the first sign of real political consciousness, and that they would be only too happy to give it an impetus forward. The Reuther leadership never claimed it would stick its neck out be-

fore any such manifestations of rank-and-file dissatisfaction with the present policy of tail-ending the Democratic Party were clearly in evidence.

On another occasion we will discuss the role of leadership and its major responsibility in advancing new and better ideas for a program for the union movement.

For the moment, let's accept the main argument of the Reuther leadership that they

were waiting for a sign of revolt from the ranks, before the leadership would stick its neck out, and that this was a prudent policy.

How can the Reuther leadership then defend its action last week of forcing a reversal of the decision of 450 active UAW secondary leaders endorsing a majority candidate, since there was no real choice for labor?

No sooner did the daily newspapers in Detroit carry the story that the UAW and Wayne County CIO delegates rejected the proposed endorsement of Ed Branigan than the top brass of the UAW went into action.

Did they hail the sign of independence of the UAW ranks? Did they rejoice in the fact that for once they had a good excuse for not tailing the Democratic Party? Did they admit they had made a major blunder in seeking to foist that candidate on the ranks?

Of course not! Quite the contrary. The UAW leadership swung into action, all right, and it was AGAINST the first sign of indepen-

dence shown in recent times by the ranks on the political front.

Telephone calls to key local union presidents, a few strategy meetings, and the passing along of THE WORD, and everything was arranged to go according to schedule—the schedule being to reverse the previous decision.

Ed Branigan, county clerk, was endorsed 207 to 34 for mayor against the incumbent Albert Cobo at a regular meeting of the Wayne County CIO council last Wednesday night.

To be sure, nobody was very enthusiastic or excited. One UAW leader set the tone for many delegates when he said, "Sure Branigan is a weak sister but we haven't got any other choice." Another spoke more pungently: "I can hold my nose and vote for Branigan. I can't stand that skunk Cobo at all."

Unquestionably, this makes for fine campaign material and slogans. "Hold your nose and vote for Branigan. A Weak Sister is

(Turn to last page)

## The Japanese Treaty and the 'Power Vacuum'

By HAL DRAPER

"Oh, what a great day this can be in history!"—Pres. Truman, in San Francisco, at founding of UN, 1945.

"Over all lies the feeling that this is anti-climax, the end of the San Francisco dream of 1945."—Anne O'Hare McCormick, from San Francisco, N. Y. Times, Sept. 3, 1951.

"As Brooks Atkinson says, it is better to win a war than lose one, but not much better."—James Reston, N. Y. Times, Sept. 4, 1951, in a mood.

The treaty-signing ceremony, called a conference, for the U. S. pact with Japan has just opened with a speech by President Truman, as we go to press; but no one doubts that everything important has already happened except the calling of points of order.

Two things have happened: (1) Washington has made its deal on Japan, while even its most friendly supporters in the foreign chancelleries and in the press look on with fingers crossed; and (2) the U. S. has shown that it can stage the most cut-and-dried international gathering seen since the Iron Curtain since another American president once speechified about "open covenants openly arrived at."

The first will have historic consequences, but the second already

augurs what sort of consequences they will be. The U. S.'s tactics in organizing and operating this pseudo-conference can scarcely be laid to either stupidity or clumsiness—not alone, anyway—and the day is getting late for continued talk about America's "inexperience" in foreign diplomacy, as if accounting for a parvenu's lack of manners at the dinner table.

The rules for the conference laid before the delegates by the U. S. and Britain have a reminiscent air to this writer. Since we are not accustomed to attending treaty conferences, this must have some other association, non-diplomatic. It is not far to seek. The rules have exactly the smell of many a Stalinist "united front conference" we have attended.

ATROCITY

The free, equal and sovereign nations invited by the United States to grace its hall will have no right to debate the treaty for which they are called on to raise their hands; nor to amend it. (Nor to "obstruct its passage," writes the Times news story in an understandable slip!)

The free, equal and sovereign delegates will have the right to make the record in an hour's "statement," and if they are positively garrulous they may answer any direct question for five minutes. The U. S. appoints the secretary-general of the conference. The U. S. appoints the chairman, who will preside until he gets good and ready to turn the affair over to an elected chairman, which will not be until the steamer rules are adopted, according to the press. No one can talk about points of order, although the concession is made that they will be voted on. The very first rule limits the conference in blanket fashion to the "terms of the invitation extended by the gov-

(Turn to last page)

# Gov't Gets Ax Out For Hawaii Judge

By GORDON HASKELL

Last week LABOR ACTION commented briefly on the action of Federal Judge Delbert E. Metzger in reducing the bail of seven accused Stalinists arrested in Hawaii who are charged with violating the Smith Act. Metzger had reduced bail from the \$75,000 per person asked by the Department of Justice to \$5,000 per person with the comment that "bail was never intended as a punishment."

In normal times, this act would hardly have aroused much comment. But the times in which we live are far from "normal," or at the very least, they are very different from what used to be considered normality in the United States.

No sooner had Judge Metzger's ruling been announced in the press than he was attacked viciously in the Senate. If the attack had come from Senator Joe McCarthy, one could well shrug it off as one of those things. But it was led by none other than Senator O'Mahoney, Democrat of Wyoming, who has long been considered one of the outstanding liberals in the Senate.

"The action of Judge Metzger is an outrageous act which, in my judgment, will speedily terminate the Judge's services in Hawaii," said O'Mahoney. And he went on to claim that his judgment was supported by assurances from Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman that the judge will be reappointed when his term expires on September 28.

## BRAZEN DEMAND

At the same time that the judge was being threatened from the legislative halls with the loss of his job, the executive arm of the government was seeking to remove him from handling the case of the alleged Stalinists.

On August 29 Acting United States Attorney Howard K. Hodick asked Judge Metzger to disqualify himself from hearing any aspect of the case on the ground that he would be biased in any prosecution under the Smith Act. He cited Metzger's remarks earlier this year in acquitting thirty-nine witnesses charged with contempt of Congress for their refusal to answer questions before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Judge Metzger replied that he could not properly disqualify himself for any reason set forth by the federal attorney, as the comments he made at the conclusion of the previous trial had no bearing on this case. "I have no personal prejudice in favor of the defendants. I do not feel the affidavit (of disqualification) was made in good faith."

This act by the Department of Justice indicates that the Truman administration is willing to go to almost any lengths to railroad the Stalinists to jail. Imagine! Here is an attempt to get a judge to disqualify himself in a case involving civil liberties simply because at some previous time he had expressed himself strongly against governmental practices which sought to deny such liberties to Stalinists!

## WILL METZGER GO?

The government's vicious prosecution tactics, which were denounced by the New York Court of Appeals in the Remington case, remain unabated. In this case, moreover, the same government whose Department of Justice confronts Judge Metzger in court with its brazen demands also and

## Get ALL your books

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

We can supply you!

# LABOR GOPE

MURRAY, GREEN DISH UP SAME OLD HASH FOR LABOR DAY

By L. G. SMITH

at the same time threatens him with loss of his position if he refuses to bow down.

Will Judge Metzger's judicial head be forfeit to his stand in this case? Will he be removed from the bench as an example to any other judge who may regard his devotion to the Bill of Rights and his oath to uphold the Constitution above his obligation to bend his knee to the anti-red hysteria?

We will know the answer before the month is over. We are not informed about Judge Metzger's record in general matters of law, or his reputation as a liberal or a conservative in political leanings. But in the circumstances this does not and cannot be of any importance. If he is not reappointed, that will be nothing but another blow struck at the crumbling bulwarks of civil liberties in America. If there is a shred of democratic feeling, let alone of simple political intelligence left in the bosoms of the liberals, and specially of the labor leaders, they will apply all the pressure they can bring to bear on Truman to keep Judge Metzger on the bench.

For by this time, every liberal, and above all, every worker who realizes that civil liberties are absolutely essential to the continued existence of a free labor movement in this country, must understand this simple fact: the heading ruthless drive to destroy the Communist Party by legal action is a much greater threat to continued democracy in America than the existence of this discredited, totalitarian political gang in our midst. We must continue to fight the Stalinists politically, to educate the workers to an understanding of their true political role until what little influence they still have been eliminated. But today's chief danger to democracy comes not from them but from the powerful government drive which is for the time being directed against them.

For by this time, every liberal, and above all, every worker who realizes that civil liberties are absolutely essential to the continued existence of a free labor movement in this country, must understand this simple fact: the heading ruthless drive to destroy the Communist Party by legal action is a much greater threat to continued democracy in America than the existence of this discredited, totalitarian political gang in our midst. We must continue to fight the Stalinists politically, to educate the workers to an understanding of their true political role until what little influence they still have been eliminated. But today's chief danger to democracy comes not from them but from the powerful government drive which is for the time being directed against them.

For by this time, every liberal, and above all, every worker who realizes that civil liberties are absolutely essential to the continued existence of a free labor movement in this country, must understand this simple fact: the heading ruthless drive to destroy the Communist Party by legal action is a much greater threat to continued democracy in America than the existence of this discredited, totalitarian political gang in our midst. We must continue to fight the Stalinists politically, to educate the workers to an understanding of their true political role until what little influence they still have been eliminated. But today's chief danger to democracy comes not from them but from the powerful government drive which is for the time being directed against them.

For by this time, every liberal, and above all, every worker who realizes that civil liberties are absolutely essential to the continued existence of a free labor movement in this country, must understand this simple fact: the heading ruthless drive to destroy the Communist Party by legal action is a much greater threat to continued democracy in America than the existence of this discredited, totalitarian political gang in our midst. We must continue to fight the Stalinists politically, to educate the workers to an understanding of their true political role until what little influence they still have been eliminated. But today's chief danger to democracy comes not from them but from the powerful government drive which is for the time being directed against them.

For by this time, every liberal, and above all, every worker who realizes that civil liberties are absolutely essential to the continued existence of a free labor movement in this country, must understand this simple fact: the heading ruthless drive to destroy the Communist Party by legal action is a much greater threat to continued democracy in America than the existence of this discredited, totalitarian political gang in our midst. We must continue to fight the Stalinists politically, to educate the workers to an understanding of their true political role until what little influence they still have been eliminated. But today's chief danger to democracy comes not from them but from the powerful government drive which is for the time being directed against them.

For by this time, every liberal, and above all, every worker who realizes that civil liberties are absolutely essential to the continued existence of a free labor movement in this country, must understand this simple fact: the heading ruthless drive to destroy the Communist Party by legal action is a much greater threat to continued democracy in America than the existence of this discredited, totalitarian political gang in our midst. We must continue to fight the Stalinists politically, to educate the workers to an understanding of their true political role until what little influence they still have been eliminated. But today's chief danger to democracy comes not from them but from the powerful government drive which is for the time being directed against them.

For by this time, every liberal, and above all, every worker who realizes that civil liberties are absolutely essential to the continued existence of a free labor movement in this country, must understand this simple fact: the heading ruthless drive to destroy the Communist Party by legal action is a much greater threat to continued democracy in America than the existence of this discredited, totalitarian political gang in our midst. We must continue to fight the Stalinists politically, to educate the workers to an understanding of their true political role until what little influence they still have been eliminated. But today's chief danger to democracy comes not from them but from the powerful government drive which is for the time being directed against them.

For by this time, every liberal, and above all, every worker who realizes that civil liberties are absolutely essential to the continued existence of a free labor movement in this country, must understand this simple fact: the heading ruthless drive to destroy the Communist Party by legal action is a much greater threat to continued democracy in America than the existence of this discredited, totalitarian political gang in our midst. We must continue to fight the Stalinists politically, to educate the workers to an understanding of their true political role until what little influence they still have been eliminated. But today's chief danger to democracy comes not from them but from the powerful government drive which is for the time being directed against them.

A study of the Labor Day messages of the two largest labor bodies in this country would be well worth the while of every thoughtful worker in the labor movement. The messages, delivered in network broadcasts by William Murray, head of the AFL, and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, were about the only sign on a national scale that this day is supposed to be dedicated to labor.

Bill Green made a vigorous attack on the failure of Congress to pass price-control legislation and predicted that this would be the big issue in the 1952 elections. "Labor is preparing for that test," he said. "We are going to get out a full vote. Before the elections take place, labor will expose the shameful record of the coalitionists and call for their defeat, whether they be Republicans or Democrats."

This kind of thing has been going on for so long that it is taken seriously by very few workers, and least of all by the people who run the Democratic and Republican Parties. They know very well that as long as labor has no party of its own, when the elections actually roll around the leaders will urge their memberships to vote for whichever candidate seems less reactionary at the moment, regardless of his past record.

And they know, further, that the workers have become so indifferent to this kind of politics that when the decisive moment arrives their votes will be influenced more by all kinds of other considerations than by the urgings of their "leaders."

## MURRAY'S L-P RECORD

As if to make the pointlessness of his political tirade even more obvious, old man Green continued: "Do the Tories in America want to do what the Tories in

Britain did—drive labor into the camp of the Socialists? Do they want to do what the Tories in other nations have done—force a desperate people to embrace communism?"

Any Tory who happened to be listening to that broadcast could well take another sip of his cocktail, turn the dial, and leave a sigh of contentment. "Good old Bill Green," he could say to himself. "As long as the workers keep him up there, everything will be all right. And if we ever do drive them into the socialist camp, it will be over his dead body."

Phil Murray of the CIO spoke over the radio too. He attacked corporate greed and blamed it for the "fact that you, the American consumer, will be paying higher taxes and higher prices than you should." He pointed out that the big-business lobbies, in addition to preventing effective anti-inflation laws, "have been largely successful in getting a tax law that puts the average man's taxes up and the rich man's taxes down." He went on to say that "there are influential spokesmen for powerful interests in this country who scorn the wholesome philosophy of equality of sacrifice."

Everything he said was true, and also nothing he said can give the workers any guidance as to what they should do to remedy the situation. The years have gone by, and the elections have gone by, and the great potential political strength of the organized industrial workers has been thrown away in all of them.

The business lobbies, representing a handful of men and huge amounts of capital have their way, more or less. The millions of men and women in the labor movement . . . they too have a lobby which has its way less and less.

And just because this is true, we have every reason to expect that Murray and Green and the whole ossified labor officialdom they represent will have to change their political ways, or they may wake up one fine day to find themselves at the tail-end of the labor parade rather than at its head. And if, in the course of this drastic shift in position, it should happen that they get trampled under the feet of the workers who are moving toward a labor party well, they can always content themselves with the thought that they held back the clock of history just as long as was humanly possible.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

As a matter of fact, upon more reflection, perhaps the imaginary Tory we described above suffers from overconfidence. It is a state quite naturally induced by the empty toothless railings and threats uttered by Green and Murray. But the truth is that the Tory policies are driving the workers, if not right into the camp of the socialists, at least into an independent camp of their own. And neither Green's admonitions nor Murray's incantations will make the Tories change their ways.

# On the Anniversary of the Old Man's Murder— THE MONUMENT OF LEON TROTSKY

By BEN HALL

It can be done. The Russian Revolution of November 1917 looms in history as an ineradicable reminder that it is possible for the working class to take power, to begin the building of a socialist society, to take the road to freedom and equality. Leon Trotsky, assassinated eleven years ago by a Stalinist agent, was one of the great socialist theoreticians of the Russian Revolution, one of its leaders in action, its historian, and in the days of its defeat by Stalinism the defender of its great traditions.

And in this defense, there was nothing scholastic or pedantic; it was inseparable from the task Trotsky set himself of preserving socialist consciousness in the world working class so that it might be prepared for its historic role as the democratic, liberating force in society.

Bourgeois writings on the Russian Revolution and criticism of it pursue the directly opposite aim: to undermine socialist consciousness and to destroy the class confidence of the working class. "You cannot take power" is the moral they drive home, "and if you do, it can lead only to totalitarianism. Look at Russia today; there is your socialism!" They would wipe out the lessons of the Russian Revolution and destroy it as an inspiration for the continuing socialist struggle.

In carving up history and piecing together its own falsified version, Stalinism seeks the same end. It portrays the revolution as the work of Stalinism; it too presents its own bureaucratic, totalitarian self as the genuine continuators of its traditions: "If you abhor capitalism, if you yearn for socialism, you must support us."

## They Must Falsify History

And this bureaucracy, enjoying state power over millions of peoples and possessing all the material advantages of power, could not feel secure in the pursuit of its aim until it had murdered Trotsky, an exile in Mexico, who enjoyed the ideological support of only a few hundred followers and whose power lay only in his ideas. In August 1940, it succeeded in killing Trotsky.

But it failed in its political objective. The Stalinist organizers of the assassination planned to pass the murderer off as one of Trotsky's own disillusioned followers. But not a single intelligent individual in a position to judge objectively would swallow this falsehood. Everyone knows today whose hand guided the man who struck the blow.

In a distorted fashion, the Stalinist bureaucracy has succeeded in claiming the heritage of the Russian Revolution; but not as it had planned and hoped. "Stalinism flows from Leninism"—such is the chorus from semi-socialists, ex-socialists, and ex-Stalinists who repeat the Stalinist claim. They, in their own way, help the Stalinist bureaucracy to ornament its totalitarianism with the emancipating ideal of 1917.

They see the working class as it is, burdened with terrible defeats, and not as it can and will be. They do not see the proletariat reaching out for power. They conclude that it cannot; it must not; and in fact, they must reinterpret history to prove that it has not.

For if the Russian Revolution demonstrated that the working class did take power, then it proves that such potentialities exist for the workers of the world. They now make the revolution a chapter in the rise of Stalinism, not in order to justify Stalinism but to efface the socialist revolution from their own memories and facilitate their attachment to American capitalism.

## Lifetime of Action and Theory

But while they accept Stalinism as the legitimate offspring of the Russian Revolution, they find it impossible to accept the authenticity of its forged birth certificate and they scoff and sneer at its contrived autobiography. With the Stalinists, our no-longer-socialists and not-quite-socialists insist that "Leninism leads to Stalinism" but at the same time they know that Stalinism falsifies and lies about the story of Lenin and Trotsky and of the authentic leaders of Russian socialism. Such an uneasy compromise and combination between historical truth and political distortion cannot endure.

The advance of democracy and the progress of the working class requires that socialism and the traditions of the Russian Revolution be emancipated from the pretensions of Stalinism. We can be confident that the first renewed wave of working-class advance will set things in their proper perspective, that the world will begin to understand that an unbridgeable gulf separates the two.

If this is true, it will be the accomplishment of one man more than any other—Leon Trotsky, whose lifetime work of action and theory was too firmly founded to be wiped out by the clumsy manipulations of bureaucratic book-burners.

In the last six years of his life, Trotsky sought the founding of a Fourth International, a new world party of socialist workers, to lead the struggle out of war and capitalist decay. The cumulative effects of the victory of Stalin, the rise of Hitler, the crushing of the Spanish working class and the outbreak of World War II succeeded one another with such rapidity and inflicted such cruel blows upon the working class that this goal could not then be achieved. It is clear that the restoration of the class-consciousness and confidence of the working class will not take a swift or easy road.

But the attempt had to be made. And everything that politically was possible for one man to do, he did.

His writings on Germany were a succession of powerful indictments of the policy of the Social-Democrats and

Communists who finally permitted Hitler to come to power without raising a finger in defense of the working class. While the one hoped to find some safe haven, even in a Hitler-dominated Germany, and the other calmly assured the masses that the victory of Hitler meant nothing more or less than the prelude to the victory of the working class, Trotsky hammered away; a Hitler victory will mean the wiping out of the German working class as a social force for decades to come and a terrible strengthening of world reaction. And he called, tragically in vain, for a united front of the German working class to smash fascism before its assumption of state power.

Read today, his analysis of the German events gives us the key to understanding the role of fascism as a social force. And he applied all the lessons of the Russian Revolution and of the German defeat to orient the French working class in the period of its rise in the middle thirties.

## The Real Revolution

His *History of the Russian Revolution* is not only one of the world's great literary and historical masterpieces, it is itself an impressive contribution to the struggle for socialism. In its pages, we see the Russian working class cram a whole epoch of political and social experience into the few short months between February and October 1917. It sifts the policies and programs and weighs the parties before giving power to the Bolsheviks. Thus, in less than a year, it rises from a class oppressed by the most tyrannical autocracy of its day into the ruler of Russia. Fables about a Bolshevik "conspiracy" dissolve into thin air. Not by trickery or cunning but in open, forthright political struggle the Russian workers and peasants decided for the establishment of their own government. It was in a burst of the Democratic self-activity and initiative of the masses that the Russian Revolution took place.

Read today, the *History* reveals in dramatic form the difference between this and the seizures of power by Stalinism after World War II. In brief, we will learn the difference between the socialist and the bureaucratic revolution.

The working class can forge its party; it can create its instruments of political power; it can take power; it can put an end to war. Naturally, it will not do so in every country in the same way; its history will not be a simple carbon copy of October. But the inspiring lessons live on in Trotsky's great work.

The Russian Revolution was not to be permitted a peaceful democratic evolution toward socialism. For three years, the czarist generals, the landlords, the capitalists, aided by the imperialist powers of the world fought a merciless and bloody civil war to overthrow the Russian workers' government. This exhausting battle, following in the wake of four years of World War I, weakened the Russian working class. And the conditions of the civil war inevitably weakened and undermined democracy.

## When Others Bowed Down

When the civil war came to an end, the preservation of the working class character of the regime required a sharp turn toward a restoration of democracy and a reinvigoration of initiative from below. In 1924, Trotsky wrote that the working-class party which fails to make a decisively required political turn runs the risk of being transformed into an instrument of an alien class. It seems clear, looking backward that the Bolshevik party did not make its turn soon enough.

The Stalinist bureaucracy was able first to conquer within the party and then proceed to crush it as a party of socialism by wiping out its revolutionary cadres. Given the unfavorable turn of world events and the onerous economic and social position of the Russian working class, with all the backwardness of Russia, it is probable that no policy could have saved the proletarian state. The fact remains that the bureaucracy was able to triumph through the old forms, with all the trappings of historical continuity. Thus it could come forward not for what it was, the executioner of the revolution, but as its executor.

Trotsky was among the first of the outstanding leaders of the revolution to begin the struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy and he did not falter in this struggle during his whole lifetime.

In 1923, he fought within the Russian Communist Party for a "New Course" toward democracy. Even though his demands were put forward diplomatically and in a limited sense, it was enough to arouse the hatred of the collective Stalinist officialdom who sensed immediately that their rights and privileges were being threatened from below. The defeat of Trotsky was the beginning of the open drive by the bureaucracy for power culminating, after years of repression against the individuals and institutions linked to the revolution, in the terrible totalitarianism of today.

During the "Red Decade" when every liberal was a "friend of Soviet Russia," i. e., an apologist for Stalin who learned to admire his brand of socialism, Trotsky tirelessly explained in scores of works that this Stalinist bureaucracy was not a socialist but an anti-socialist force; that socialism meant a tendency toward greater equality while the bureaucracy was the defender and "planter" of inequality; that the bureaucracy rose above the working class, that it led away from socialism. The socialist direction of the Russian economy and of Russian society can be restored only by the defeat of the

While this aspect of his views proved invalid, the validity of his fundamental thesis stands up stronger than ever. The defense of democracy, the preservation of national freedom, the stemming of the tide toward reaction . . . are inseparably linked, not to the manipulations of bureaucrats, benevolent or not, but to the independent socialist struggles of the international working class.

And it is in this spirit of democracy and socialism, in this basic tradition of Trotsky's life and work, that independent socialism finds one of the indispensable sources of its tradition.

bureaucracy and by the re-establishment of democracy for the masses. The hope of socialism lay not in the bureaucrats above but in the people below. This he preached—to those who were then enchanted with the power of Stalinism and fascinated by its "economic democracy."

Now these "friends" of Russia lavish their affections upon other bureaucrats. They once saw "socialism" in Stalinism. And now that they flee in horror from Stalinism, they discard their "socialism," or at least that awful caricature of it that they themselves had erected in their own minds.

## Context of an Error

While their flirtation with Stalinism prospered, Trotsky continued the theoretical defense of socialism and of the Russian Revolution. Stalinism, he pointed out, is not the result of the seizure of power of the working class but is the sapping of that power by an anti-socialist bureaucracy. It flows not from what the revolution accomplished, but from what it did not and could not accomplish in an isolated backward nation. Stalinism was not put in power by the Russian working class; it came to power by defeating the working class and it could do so only because the revolution remained limited to Russia, and because the proletariat in the advanced countries of Western Europe was unable to make its revolution.

Regardless of the gaps that remained in his theories about Russia or even his errors, it was his contribution, to carry on for decades, almost single-handed, the theoretical defense of the traditions of the Russian Revolution—as indispensable prerequisite for the revival of revolutionary Marxism. And it is his work that stands as the point of departure for any socialist analysis of Stalinism today.

His gravest error was the formula he devised in the last decade of his life which can be tersely summarized as "nationalized property equals workers state." So long as the means of production in Russia were state-owned, he insisted, we must consider Russia, even under the Stalinist bureaucracy, as a "workers state," and consequently, he concluded, we must be for its defense in any war with a capitalist power. It was the dispute over these views and our rejection of them that was the basic cause of the split in the Trotskyist movement in 1940 and of the formation of the Workers' Party.

That was eleven years ago, only a few months before the death of Trotsky. Today, a group of self-styled "official" Trotskyists spend their time constructing a bizarre system of politics almost exclusively out of reminiscent scraps and fragments of this error in Trotsky's ideas, torn out of the context of the revolutionary content which he could give even to his mistakes.

In the expansion of Stalinism, in its bureaucratic overwhelming of nationalities, in its victories in establishing totalitarian states, it sees the creation of a galaxy of "workers' states," without and against the working class. In the bid of Stalinism for world domination it sees the pending proletarian class struggle. It follows that they cannot explain why the independent working-class socialist struggle is at all necessary, except perhaps for esthetic reasons. And it follows that they can find no convincing reason for their own existence as a political current outside of Stalinism.

## One of the Sources

Unlike his self-appointed executors, Trotsky imparted even to his errors a revolutionary content that provided their own antidote. Totally alien to him was any conception that the tasks of the socialist revolution could be carried forward behind the backs of the working class by any bureaucracy, least of all by Stalinism. Paradoxical though it may seem, he could persist in the "workers' state" theory of Russia only because of his confidence in the viability of the working class and its social role and his conviction of the basic social impotence of the bureaucracy.

In his view, the Stalinist system was unstable and doomed to rapid disintegration. The bureaucracy, he contended, was essentially a bourgeois organ of the working-class state and, like every such bourgeois instrument in the working-class movement, was essentially a tool of imperialism. In the course of the world war, it would inevitably collapse, either by surrendering to the pressures of world imperialism by restoring capitalism or, more likely, through overthrow by the proletarian revolution. In any case, its doom was sealed. It would be absurd, he insisted, to give to this vanishing social group the status of a new ruling class at the very moment when it was about to disappear from the stage of history.

Events have exploded this facet of Trotsky's views. The Stalinist bureaucracy has held power; it has maintained and extended its nationalized property as the source of its power; and now it appears clearly on the world scene not as an agent of capitalism but as its deadly rival for the exploitation of the earth, including the working class.

While this aspect of his views proved invalid, the validity of his fundamental thesis stands up stronger than ever. The defense of democracy, the preservation of national freedom, the stemming of the tide toward reaction . . . are inseparably linked, not to the manipulations of bureaucrats, benevolent or not, but to the independent socialist struggles of the international working class.

And it is in this spirit of democracy and socialism, in this basic tradition of Trotsky's life and work, that independent socialism finds one of the indispensable sources of its tradition.

# What Makes Truman Indignant?

President Truman's quick and forthright action in the case of Sergeant John R. Rice makes an appealing human-interest story, and no doubt does credit to the depth of his feelings about discrimination—against American Indians.

The story about Truman's off-the-cuff telegrams was front-paged everywhere. Rice was killed in action in Korea. His body was shipped home for burial in Sioux City, Iowa, where his wife had purchased a burial lot in the Memorial Park Cemetery (private). Racism stayed with him to the open grave. When a group of Winnebago Indians showed up, the cemetery director learned the horrid truth from Mrs. Rice, who is not an Indian. The sergeant was not a "member of the Caucasian race," being instead a 100 per cent American by blood. He could not be buried in the ground reserved for the descendants of "Caucasian" immigrants

# 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. ....

# YOU and SCIENCE

## A Marxist Theory of Energy and Matter

By PHILIP COBEN

The aim of this column is not to review a book but merely to bring it to the attention of our readers who are interested in the subject. It is not new (1948), but has not been published in this country, and deserves being better known.

It's R. L. Worrall's *Energy and Matter* (Staples Press, London), and should be equally interesting to students of scientific theory and the philosophy of science from the Marxist point of view, regardless of their agreement with its thesis.

Above all, it will be a welcome change for those who (like the present writer) are made sick to the stomach by the writings of most of the Stalinist and Stalinoid professors on dialectical materialism and science, one example of which we plan to review in a coming column. The attempts of bourgeois professors and ex's of the Sidney Hook type to discredit the Marxist approach to science and philosophy are as nothing compared with the effectiveness of the Stalinists in so discrediting it by their vulgarizations, in the guise of explaining and defending it.

Worrall is a British non-Stalinist Marxist (what the rest of his politics are we do not know nor is it relevant) and primarily a scientist rather than a philosopher. Except for his introduction, he does not (as far as I recall) even use the traditional terms of Marxist philosophy, nor does he recall to me. He is not engaged in explaining Marxist materialism; he is using it as a guide in proposing a solution to some fundamental problems of scientific theory, in the light of present-day scientific knowledge.

As Engels wrote: "With each epoch-making discovery in the sphere of natural science, materialism has to change its form." There are, to be sure, "Marxists" (even outside the Stalinist cohorts) who think that the heights of "orthodoxy" are reached when one demonstrates that appropriate quotations from Marx and Engels are sufficient to clear up the problems of modern scientific theory. These people are not "orthodox" but merely stupid, ignorant, or sterile.

The problem which Worrall addresses himself to is more or less "What is energy?"—"What is time?"—"What is motion?"—"What is space?"—from the point of view of materialism in the context of present-day knowledge. Just as a long list of scientists-would-be-philosophers headed by Jeans and Eddington have given their idealist answers, Worrall presents a materialist working hypothesis.

### Materialism as a Guide

We have no intention of trying to summarize his view here in a pregnant paragraph—even if we could, which is doubtful. Nor are we calling attention to the book because we think it is the materialist answer. What we found most admirable about the book is the example it gives of how to approach these problems as a Marxist; not in the spirit of applying a rule-of-thumb formula which is guaranteed to shoot out the correct answer like a slot-machine, but as a guide to a concrete analysis.

In his introduction where, as we mentioned, Worrall does comment explicitly on dialectics, he makes only a few basic remarks on his approach. For his basic epistemological viewpoint, he quotes an article by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen, who wrote in 1935:

"Any serious consideration of a physical theory must take into account the distinction between the objective reality, which is independent of any theory, and the physical concepts with which the theory operates. The concepts are intended to correspond with the physical reality, and by means of these concepts we picture this reality to ourselves . . . the correctness of the theory is judged by the degree of agreement between the conclusions of the theory and human experience. This experience . . . in physics takes the form of experiment and measurement."

He adds: "From the standpoint of modern materialism, matter is that which exists independently of thought. . . . The principles of dialectic materialism are not a dogma to be imposed on science; they are derived, like any theory of a particular science, from observations, and can be confirmed by scientific experiments. . . ."

But this is only in his introduction. The body of the work is devoted to the thesis that "In the light of modern materialism, space, time, mass and energy are seen to be the quantitative aspects of four mutually related modes of existence of matter—extension, motion, inertia and motivity." To this end he first examines "Matter, Energy and Ether in Newtonian Physics" and then the "Principles of the Theory of Relativity" in the first two chapters, before going further. Mainly we want to say: Read it.

### For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL



## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 37

September 10, 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, L. G. SMITH, BEN HALL  
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIKS

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

# READING from LEFT to RIGHT

## THE MAGIC OF NATIONALISM, by Patrick O'Donovan.—The Reporter, Sept. 18.

A report on the first African colony to be governed by Africans: the Gold Coast under Kwame Nkrumah. Mainly it makes one wish for a more adequate account, but little enough of any kind has appeared in the U. S. press.

The Gold Coast is still under a British governor with veto powers, but when "the first democratic elections ever to be held in Negro Africa" took place and Nkrumah's Convention People's Party gained a huge majority, the new "Leader of Government Business in the Crown Colony of the Gold Coast" took over enough control to make it "virtually impossible for [the governor] to use [the veto] without destroying the whole edifice of government." How far Nkrumah will go toward self-government and what Britain will do, if anything, is still in the cards.

In any case, the Gold Coast is in the van of the new African nationalism, along with Nigeria and its native leader Dr. Azikwe (known as Zik). As it happens, both men were trained in the U. S. (not in Britain, shattering tradition), and by further coincidence in the same American university, Lincoln University in Pennsylvania.

"In America, he [Nkrumah] was just another angry Negro protesting against the status of his race, and protesting against a foreign power rather than the U. S. He became a professor of African history. During the Second World War he made conventional [sic!] anti-imperialist speeches."

Further on, we are told derogatorily that he "uses Marxist clichés—and even sometimes describes himself as a Marxist—but today Communism has become, so to speak, the automatic philosophy of revolt." Nkrumah absorbed his Marxist ideas (one of the things that could stand further elaboration) in England, following his student days in this country, apparently in contact with the CP. But there is no indication that today he has any pro-Stalinist or pro-Russian leanings. But "he and his people tend to look on the struggle between Communism and the West as no concern of a colonial people."

The pre-war Gold Coast was "from the British point of view, the ideal colony"—that is, the people were exploited in silence by British sahibs. "But since the war, more than 30 Africans have died in public disorders; there have been strikes and riots and looting, all conducted against a background of nationalist thinking."

Nkrumah's government has just about got started. Its head "is absolutely honest and absolutely single-minded," but of it we learn only that steps have been taken to spread education among the people, that it needs capital investment, and that Nkrumah "has maintained an easy relationship with the white civil servants, who now call him 'Sir' or 'Mr. Minister.' In the attempt to produce a modern state out of a traditional colony, he is attacking the power of the great chiefs, some of whom oppose his reforms."

We want to know more.

### BOOKS and Ideas

# Sagas of Working-Class Struggle

SAGAS OF STRUGGLE: A Labor Anthology, by Samuel Colton.—Claridge Pub., New York, 128 pages, \$2.25.

It may sound kind of dull to describe this little book as an anthology of selections about the labor movement, but it isn't that kind of anthology. The pieces are obviously selection to give non-union people or new union workers a lively, even touching, emotional feel of why men organize and how they organize and the spirit of struggle for labor's rights; and it does that.

Since it's a small book, we won't complain about the pieces that belong in it and aren't there; except to say that if Colton had to include a couple of pieces of poetry, he should have gone to Arturo Giovannitti or Marcus Graham's anthology for his selections rather than to John Beecher.

First selection is from George and Helen Papashvily's *Anything Can Happen* on "Why George Quit a Good Job." It's the one about how George gets led into becoming a strikebreaker, without knowing it until he's inside the besieged factory, by a professional scabber, and how he got out.

Meyer Levin's *Citizens* contributes "Gonna Wear My Union Button" about the invasion of the steel mills by the CIO—and about Ladislav Wyznowieki's fight to get his job back on the big crane.

Three of the selections deal with racial antagonisms as an internal difficulty of the union movement, in the same personal vein. Two are so-so, from Edward McSorley's *Our Own Kind*, but the third is a gem from Oscar Ameringer's autobiography *If You Don't Weaken*. The latter tells how the Negro and white dockworkers of New Orleans organized together, after wising up that they had been cutting each other's throat at the instigation of the white-supremacy bosses.

### A LESSON IN JIM CROW

The story winds up with a vignette: the state legislature has sent State Senator Cordell ("the composite portrait of the Kentucky colonel seen in whiskey advertisements") to settle the strike in which the black and white workers have been fighting shoulder to shoulder; the chief spokesman of the strikers' committees

are Ellis, for the Negroes, and Scully, who combines an Irish temper with "an ingrained hatred of bosses, irrespective of race, nationality, religion and state of moral turpitude." Ellis hasn't any compunctions about using the derogatory racist term instead of "Negro," and we'll give the conversation as Ameringer does; for his rough-hewn sense of racial solidarity is a deal more meaningful than that of some folks who are always very, very careful to say "Negro." The scene:

Senator Cordell: "The idea! The ve'y idea! White men gon-spirin' with niggas against the honoah and prosper'ty of the grea-at pot of N'yo'l'ns; against the honoah and prosper'ty of the gre-at State of Louisianah itself! The idea, the ve'y idea, white gen'lemen of honoah compelled to heckle like penny-pinchin' tradas ovah a few pennies mo'hless with a na'cel of watah rats and niggas. Ah shall not continya this disgraceful, shameless bickerin' to' another second. I am leavin' . . ."

Ellis: "Please sit down, senator. We're not here to save the honor and prosper'ty of the great State of Louisiana. We is here to settle the strike. That's what they sent you down here for. Your job is to see to it that we work the longest possible hours at the least possible pay. Our job is to make your crowd pay us the highest possible wages for the lowest possible amount of work. Now let's get down to business. What's more, we've won the strike already, else you gentlemen wouldn't be here to talk compromise, honor and prosper'ty."

Scully: "Oh, we're water rats, are we? And white trash, are we?"

But you can't run your goddam port without us. Can you? I guess before long you'll call us nigger lovers too. Maybe you want to know next how I would like it if my sister married a nigger? Well, go ahead, ask me. But take it from me, I wasn't always a nigger lover. I fought in every strike to keep the niggers off the dock. I fought until in the white-supremacy strike your white-supremacy governor sent his white-supremacy militia down here and shot us white-supremacy strikers full of holes . . . let me tell you and your gang, there was a time I wouldn't even work beside a nigger. You got 'em on the loose. You made me work with niggers, eat with niggers, sleep with niggers, drink out of the same water bucket with niggers, and finally got me to the place where if one of them comes to me and blubbers something about more pay, I say, 'Come on, nigger, let's go after the white bastards.'"

### FOR THE FACTS OF LIFE

There's a section on the great Lawrence strike, on the struggle of the Danbury hatters, and a half dozen more, including one on the fight of miners not long after the turn of the century which explains better than any treatise why the diggers cleave to their union today through thick and thin. Especially interesting is the account of the miners' "child unions"—"junior locals" of child workers about 10-16, run by themselves.

Which reminds us to mention that, besides non-union and new union people, the book is a good start for an older child's education on the facts of social life.

P. C.

### 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.

# Youth and Student Corner

## A Dissenting Opinion on United-Front Policy with Student Stalinists

To the Editor:

There are several points in the SYL articles by Don Harris [in the Youth and Student Corner] that I wish to contest. His main point is that student socialists must, in relation to the different forms of campus Stalinism, "isolate them politically and organizationally to the end of having them democratically ousted." He gives two main reasons: we can be more effective without their presence in a fight; and their ideology is "directed toward defending the interests of a totalitarian social order." That is, they are hypocrites.

Harris points out correctly that student socialists may participate in united fronts with Stalinists as long as the front is not dominated by them or used to promote its specific ends. My emphasis would be on the latter point. But he then goes on to say that we should make an effort to keep them out of positions of responsibility and, eventually, propose their ouster altogether.

I believe friend Harris' program is in serious error, at least insofar as the student left-wing movement is concerned. As to the point of being more effective without Stalinists, he is wrong. Any progressive movement on the campus today is bound to be labeled as "red." This cannot be prevented by attacking the Stalinists. As a principled socialist you will be labeled nevertheless. If you keep mum, totally ineffective liberals may find themselves in control and unable, normally, to handle the situation. Or the Stalinists will take over. If you do not keep mum, you will be labeled. It is up to you to overcome the label by an intelligent appeal to your fellow students.

Furthermore, in most cases today liberals on the campus, assuming a petty-bourgeois radicalism, will not act without the Stalinists if they will act at all. So, if you do not wish to act alone, you must act with Stalinists both in case liberals will not move without them and in case liberals will not move at all: for, believe it or not, some Stalinists are often quite effective organizationally.

In that connection, it would not be amiss to point out that YPAers are often tactically stupid and more or less controlled by a sectarian LYL bureaucracy. Thus they usually suit themselves on tactical, rather than theoretical, matters. On the other hand, the Sweezyites are far more scientific and unsectarian and I have found them good comrades in many a campus fight. The latter group is having slow but sure success within many YPA groups and, in the future, one

must suspect that the tactics of YPA will improve correspondingly. They will make less foolish mistakes, will fly off the handle less, and will not drag in as many extraneous matters as previously.

As to Harris' second point, we know that there is a general pro-USSR orientation both within YPA and within the ranks of the Sweezyites. Liebknecht pointed out, however, that "the main enemy is in our own country." It makes little sense to attack the USSR while fighting on a campus issue, just as it makes little sense to defend her. We cannot change Russia; we can split our ranks in the fight against our imperialist class. If YPAers would admit that they were hypocrites, the problem would be solved. But their usual answer is: "But there is democracy in Russia." The majority of them are thus fighting for the same ideal as we: democracy. They think it is somewhere it is not. The point is not to oust them from the local fight for democracy, but to convince them that their ideals are not present in Russia. And one does not do this during a meeting on academic freedom.

In fact, where a coalition is involved, I have found the Sweezyites especially useful as allies in preventing liberals from taking over. The latter usually both things up, à la California, by succumbing to compromises and palliatives. The run-of-the-mill liberal is far more dangerous in a position of authority than the Stalinist providing you have proved to the Stalinist that your main enemy is reaction at home, not American Stalinism. In that case he will listen to your council even though he knows of your general anti-Russian orientation.

There are many potentially good socialists in the YPA ranks. It is a serious error to break the ranks of the left in these times by emulating the American Legion, even though that emulation be on a more scientific plane. "Any organizational advance for the CP" does not necessarily represent a defeat for the peoples of Eastern Europe. CP, first of all, is a dangerous generality for pro-USSR forces, many of which are getting fed up with the CP-USA. If YPA forces win an academic-freedom fight, it is a victory for us as well. Just as a victory for us is a win for them, too. On the campus at least the enemy is one. Wherever possible the fight should also be united.

Marty MARTEL

## No United Front with the Totalitarian Agents of Russian Imperialism

The question of the attitude of student socialists toward Stalinists remains an important one even at this late date. Therefore we welcome the opportunity presented by Comrade Martel's letter to discuss our point of view further.

The point of view of cooperating with Stalinists on the campus still has currency among liberals and some socialists. There still persists the idea that although you may oppose Russia and Stalinism in the general sense, on a particular local issue it is quite a good idea to invite them into united fronts.

Comrade Martel's letter speaks for this conception. What is involved in carrying it out is that you "keep mum" on the reactionary totalitarian role of Stalinism, as Comrade Martel himself suggested. You simply devote yourself to the danger at home without fulfilling the elementary political task of pointing out the connection between the attacks on civil liberties at home and the imperialist rivalry between the U. S. and Russia.

This cold war is the central political fact in the world today. The attack on civil liberties, while primarily directed against the Stalinists as the political agents of the rival imperialism, reaches out to endanger all of our political liberties. We are not merely opposed to this anti-democratic hysteria at home but we are opposed to support of either of the rival imperialist blocs.

Comrade Martel, in his eagerness to fight the enemy at home is proposing that we join forces with those who support the rival imperialism abroad—Russia. He proposes that we shelve our criticism of the reactionary role of Stalinism in order to direct our attack against capitalist reaction at home.

However, the case of the liberals does not parallel that of the Stalinists because they support American imperialism. For insofar as the liberals DO fight for civil liberties here, they are opposing the policy of the "enemy at home" without supporting Stalinism. But can the same be said for the Stalinists? Obviously not.

### Are the Stalinists "Left"?

When we attack the CP and Stalinists, it is not a device on our part to avoid being labeled "red"—that is, our attacks are not "red-baiting," as Comrade Martel would infer. Nor is it "emulating the American Legion, even though that emulation be on a more scientific plane."

To mouth these phrases is to repeat the crassest line of every Stalinist and Stalinoid. To do so ties up the socialist criticism of Stalinism with the reactionary criticism. We do not denounce Stalinism because it is socialist, or "progressive," or "left," but rather because it is none of these.

Comrade Martel not only erroneously believes that the Stalinists are part of the left, but that the practical local issue can best be achieved by including the Stalinists. What attracts him here is the fact that, compared to the liberals, the Stalinists have an organization and are more competent organizationally. We can only point to the sad and tragic case of the East European socialists who also thought Stalinism to be of the left and were impressed by their organization, and paid for their errors with their lives.

Comrade Martel states: "It makes little sense to attack the USSR while fighting on a campus issue, just as it makes little sense to defend her. We cannot change Russia, we can split our ranks in the fight against our own imperialist enemy." According to this line of thought, there should also be no objection to united fronts with groups of the type of the Nazi-American Bund in World War II, which also fought "our own imperialist class" and its policies—in the interests of an imperialist rival.

The comparison raises a basic issue, the social and political character of the Stalinist movement as an anti-socialist, anti-working-class and anti-democratic movement. That there are worthwhile individuals

sucked into this movement is of course true; but that raises only a secondary question of tactics in some cases.

In the local situation, Comrade Martel's objections to the Stalinists is on the ground that they may dominate the united front or they may use it to promote their own ends. On this there is agreement. The inference is that he would withdraw from the united front if the Stalinists did dominate it. But at the same time he states an objection to excluding the Stalinists from positions of responsibility and their eventual ouster.

We are not particularly interested in whether the Stalinists become less sectarian and adventurous in their campus activities with or without the aid of the "more scientific" Sweezyites. We are interested in isolating the Stalinists and exposing their reactionary role.

By inviting the Stalinists into united fronts and acting as if they are part of the "left," you contribute to the confusion about the Stalinists. You do not educate those liberals and Stalinoids who have all sorts of illusions about the progressive nature of Stalinism. Rather this policy strengthens these illusions. We do not object to the fact that the Stalinists may be tactically stupid, but we do object to the fact that the Stalinists defend a totalitarian regime.

### Basis for Capitulation

The fact many CPers and even YPAers or "Sweezyites" believe that Russia is democratic cannot be the decisive criteria for inviting the Stalinists into the united front. We can win over those elements who have true socialist sentiments by educating them to the reactionary nature of Stalinist society and by demonstrating that we can participate in a militant fight for democratic rights.

While this is a statement of a general point of view, as it was stated in the original article, we cannot allow ourselves to be isolated by refusing to enter united fronts in which the Stalinists are participating. It is rather our duty to enter in order to break the liberal illusions about Stalinism and to prevent the united front from being manipulated toward a reactionary end.

The main problem with the liberal on campus is that of getting him to participate in a defense of democratic rights. By and large the liberal is not organizationally efficient and does not carry out a militant campaign. One of the tasks of the student socialist is to participate in the organization of broad groups that will defend civil liberties. But to state that "the run-of-the-mill liberal is far more dangerous in a position of authority than the Stalinist providing you have proved to the Stalinist that your main enemy is reaction at home, not American Stalinism" is sheer political fiction that provides the basis for a capitulation to Stalinism.

A victory for YPA or for other Stalinist front groups can not be looked upon as a victory for democratic rights, no more than the victory of the Stalinist armies in China or Korea would represent a victory for the democratic and progressive forces. To persist in believing this myth, as we have learned from the national and international scene, can only have disastrous effects for the socialist movement.

Editor, Youth & Student Corner

The Standard Biographical Work—  
**"KARL MARX"**  
 by Franz Mehring  
 British edition, cloth-bound—\$3.00—while they last  
 LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
 114 West 14 Street. New York 11, N. Y.

# The Socialist Left And the Social-Democracy

## Some Problems of the European Marxist Movement

By MAX SHACHTMAN

The political development of the American working class in the next few years will be of enormous importance in deciding the fate of the world, and of Europe primarily. But, in turn, the development of the European working-class movement will have equally powerful effects upon the road that will be traveled by the working class of the United States and other countries.

**This is the reason for our intense interest in the socialist movement of Europe and the reason why we venture from this distance to express our opinion about some of the problems that face it.**

Insofar as a free working-class movement exists in Europe, it exists only in the western part of the continent. In the Stalinist countries, it has been completely totalitarianized, that is, destroyed. In the capitalist countries—England, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, West Germany, Italy, the Scandinavian countries—virtually the entire working class that thinks in terms of the socialist goal is divided in its allegiance between the traditional or somewhat renovated social-democratic parties and the Stalinist parties. A very small minority, existing only as tiny groupings or as isolated individuals, want to see the working class organized into an independent socialist movement free of the cancer of Stalinism and of the outworn, futile policies of the old reformist parties.

### The Isolation of the Vanguard

On the whole, this minority is quite right and shows socialist good health in its general belief that if the European working class continues to follow the leadership of Stalinism or the present social-democratic parties, it is sure to suffer new and bloody blows, and even terrible disasters, in the crucial years to come. On the whole, we of the Independent Socialist League firmly share this belief and are convinced that real progress will be assured only when it is likewise shared by hundreds of thousands and then millions of the workers who aspire to socialist freedom.

Yet, this belief alone has not proved to be enough to overcome the complete isolation from the European working class and the continued stagnation in which the vanguard socialist minorities and individuals find themselves. Where a working class still follows the leadership of the political parties and ideas of capitalism, it is not surprising that the genuinely socialist movement should find itself reduced for a period to a more or less isolated minority. But where the working class has broken with capitalism, has organized its own class parties, and has reached a relatively high stage of socialist consciousness, as is the case in virtually all the countries of Europe, there is no good reason for the isolation of the advanced socialist groups.

**Years ago, we urged upon all our comrades and friends in Europe: Give up your illusory and sterile "organizational independence" and enter unhesitatingly into the organized political movement of the working class. This recommendation is ten times more urgent and indispensable today.**

### Into the Arena

The European workers are organized, on the whole, into two political movements. One of them is the Stalinist party. But for socialists to enter it would be the last word in folly and futility. Apart from all other considerations, the simple fact is that it is impossible to put forward and work for socialist and internationalist ideas in any Stalinist party.

That is not at all the case in the other political movement, the European social-democracy, which is best exemplified by such organizations as the British Labor Party and the German Social-Democratic Party. It is in these organizations that every socialist, every Marxist, every revolutionist and internationalist should find his

place and his arena of action.

The defects and shortcomings of these parties are or should be known to every socialist; the blunders and even crimes which are committed by their leaderships are not less well known. We have pointed them out in our press and we shall not fail to continue to point them out. But what is most important for the present is that they represent the mass movements of the politically organized and socialistically inspired workers in which the socialist vanguard in Europe today can find its most natural, most fruitful, and most indispensable political arena—can find and must find it.

### It Will Happen Again

These workers are not always satisfied with the policies and activities of their parties. Their dissatisfaction takes many forms: they remain in the party but are not active in it; they leave the party to join some demagogical party of capitalist reaction; they leave the party and, desperate and duped, join the party of Stalinist reaction; they leave the party and become indifferent to political life of any kind. But they have never left the mass parties, and it is sure that they never will, in order to join some tiny organization no matter how correct its program is or seems to be.

Individuals may do that; dozens or even hundreds may do that; but the hundreds of thousands who make up the big working-class political organizations do not. The whole history of the socialist movement proves it. To our knowledge, there is not even one case to show an exception.

There is one other form, not mentioned above, that the dissatisfaction takes: the more militant, more aggressive, more conscious workers rally around a movement that is launched within their party for the purpose of changing its policy and its leadership. That has happened dozens of times, in dozens of countries, and it has proved successful in numerous and decisive cases.

**It can happen again. It will happen again, provided the most conscious socialist elements do not stand aside but participate side by side with these workers in the mass organizations and help them, with comradeship, loyalty and patience, to go through their experiences in the most progressive way and as rapidly as events permit.**

### The Case in Britain

In Britain, for example, any socialist who remains outside the Labor Party is guaranteeing the nullification of all his socialist efforts and helping to guarantee the domination of the organized working class by the conservative and bureaucratic elements of the Labor Party itself. The wide and spontaneous response which the declarations of Bevan and his friends have met with, is one of the most encouraging signs of the still untapped socialist possibilities in the working class that is organized in the Labor Party, and it unmistakably indicates where every socialist should be in Britain today.

The fact that the Independent Labor Party continues to remain outside the Labor Party is deplorable. The ILP has within it a pro-Stalinist tendency which is like fetters on its feet. The

pacifist tendency which has a high degree of influence in it is, at best, utopian and downright anachronistic. Both tendencies incline to support the present ILP policy of presenting candidates against the Laborites candidates in elections; the efforts of other ILP militants, who see the situation and the needs of socialism clearly, to have the party abandon this fatal policy, have not met with success.

The ILP is therewith disabled completely from exerting any progressive influence upon that vast section of the British working class which, in its own way, wants a socialist policy and leadership in its party, and wants an independent socialist government in office. If the ILP militants do not succeed, and soon, in bringing their party into the Labor Party, the decline from which the ILP has steadily suffered can only continue.

### In Germany

Much the same problem in Germany.

Recently, as our readers know, a more or less local splitoff from the West German Stalinist party, led by Joseph Schappe, finally decided to form the Independent Workers Party (UAP). It is encouraging to note that there are communist workers who break from the Stalinist party in the name of revolutionary socialism. There will be more. It is likewise encouraging to note that the UAP is not hostile to Stalinism only in order to adopt the program of reformism, and has not rejected Stalinist imperialism in order to accept American imperialism. Its reliance on Titoism will, we trust, prove to be shortlived.

**However that may be, we are compelled to record the formation of the UAP as a grave error, and the decision of the German Trotskyists to join in its formation an even graver one. The place of every socialist militant in Germany is in the Social-Democratic Party, which is the political organization of the overwhelming mass of the German working class.**

The hostility of revolutionary militants to the traditional German social-reformism, its program, its history, its leadership, is entirely understandable. So is the desire to see the development as quickly as possible of a genuine proletarian socialist party in Germany. But the road to it does not lie through the formation of tiny "independent" parties. In Germany especially this has been proved by a dozen examples in the past, and we are regretfully sure that the UAP will not be long in furnishing another example, if it doesn't already.

### In France

Even in France, no other sensible policy can be recommended to the left-wing socialists. We say "even in France" because the French Socialist Party is undoubtedly the most wretched of all the European social-democratic organizations, and that from every standpoint.

But in France, too, it is a question of alternatives, and there is no serious alternative to the course of joining the SP. Not a few attempts have been made in the past few years to form a political movement independent not only of the Stalinists but also of the Socialist party. For different reasons, every attempt has failed. But at bottom, there was one reason: the masses of workers—and it is masses who make a movement, a party—will not abandon their allegiance to the big workers' parties in order to join a politically correct but tiny organization.

**And in their way, they are quite right. They understand that the important problems of our time can be coped with only by large class organizations, and they retain the hope that the inadequate policies and leadership of their present organizations can be altered to the point where they can cope with the problems effectively. Right or wrong, it is necessary to share the experiences they must go through in the attempt to realize this hope.**

(Continued bottom of next page)

Read

THE NEW  
INTERNATIONAL

America's Leading Marxist Magazine

35 cents

\$2.00 a year

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

## THE LABOR GOVERNMENT'S NATIONALIZATION IN BRITAIN

To the Editor:

I wish to express my sincere gratitude for the copies of LABOR ACTION and the *New Internationalist* which you have sent to me, and my admiration for the high standard of these journals.

I feel, however, that I must correct a wrong impression of the English political scene which was given to readers of LABOR ACTION by the ISL resolution on the British Labor government. The fundamental error in this resolution is the assumption that the action of the Labor government has been anti-capitalist. This the authors of the resolution seek to prove by citing the nationalization of basic industries.

They overlook the vital fact that, with the exception of the steel industry, nationalization was never seriously opposed by the English capitalists. The railways were already tied up ready for nationalization in 1939, and the owners, both of the railways and of the coal mines, were saved from almost certain financial ruin by the action of the British Labor Party. Both were running with great difficulty and have made losses under nationalization.

The capitalists did not object to losing their property because they now receive fat dividends without any responsibility. Instead of a risky investment the shareholders now have a guaranteed security, for their dividends are paid out regardless of the financial position of the industry. Moreover, they are guaranteed by the government not only to the present holders but to their successors in perpetuity.

It is quite untrue to say that nationalization strikes at the heart of the capitalist property system when it has in fact stabilized the financial position of the capitalists. Also the old owners have now got well-paid jobs as the executive boards of the nationalized industries, and have actually become members of the new bureaucracy.

The hostility of revolutionary militants to the traditional German social-reformism, its program, its history, its leadership, is entirely understandable. So is the desire to see the development as quickly as possible of a genuine proletarian socialist party in Germany. But the road to it does not lie through the formation of tiny "independent" parties. In Germany especially this has been proved by a dozen examples in the past, and we are regretfully sure that the UAP will not be long in furnishing another example, if it doesn't already.

### You're Invited

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

## The Socialist Left and the Social-Democracy in Europe—

(Continued from page 6)

In France, as in every other country, it cannot be done within the Stalinist party, which most of the workers support in one way or another. But it is possible to do it within the Socialist Party. The alternatives are to waste valuable time and even more valuable effort in trying to maintain such sterile Stalinoid sects as the French "Orthodox Trotskyist" organization or to withdraw from any socialist political activity, as so many despairing militants have done.

It should go without saying that entering the social-democratic parties is no more a cure-all for the isolation of the Marxian socialist movement than it is, in and of itself, a policy for socialists. We suggest nothing of the kind.

The social-democratic parties, insofar as

of socialism in Britain by urging support for the Labor Party. For progressive workers to vote for the discredited and incapable reformist clique is as futile as for class-conscious U. S. workers to support Truman and the Democrats.

E. C. DAVIES

Correspondent Davies raises two questions in disagreement with the ISL resolution: the significance of Labor nationalization in Britain, and attitude toward the Labor Party.

There is no doubt that the nationalization of basic industries in England was greased by the sad economic plight of some of them, particularly coal and the railways. But we go further to add that the nationalizations were made possible, not merely by the plight of this or that particular industry, but by the catastrophic decline and disintegration of British capitalist society as a whole. On this wider backdrop the nationalization of the steel industry is not an unexplained "exception," as it is for Davies while he himself does not seek to account for his exception.

The fact is that the coal industry in particular has been in crisis for decades and it was not nationalized by any of the would-be "patchers-up" of capitalism, including the preceding Labor governments. In addition, the British picture is not adequately described even by listing the major nationalizations. The 20 per cent of the economy which has been nationalized plus the controls imposed on the economy give the state a much longer lever of control than the bare figure indicates. (For this, see the article by Max Shachtman in the *Jan-Feb. New Internationalist*—the resolution only refers to the fact.)

The heart of the ISL resolution is the point that such anti-capitalist nationalization is not equivalent to the road to socialism, and it further discusses the meaning of the bureaucratic nationalizations that have taken place. But since our correspondent does not touch on the actual conclusions which we do draw, we will only refer to the resolution itself for this.

It is in connection with this trend toward bureaucratization of the state economy that we deal with the phenomena to which Davies points: the compensation policy of the Labor government and its maintenance of the "denationalized" capitalists as a moneyed power in the way he describes. But he points to these phenomena as supporting his view that the government has merely acted toward "patching up" the decaying fabric of capitalism. We submit that this is very loose thinking.

The heart of capitalism is not the fact that some people have a lot of money and have an insured income from securities, but

has to do with the ownership of the means of production. The "historic role of reformist social democracy by patching up the decaying fabric of capitalism" has been to put the capitalist industries as a whole on their feet as capitalist industries, and ensuring the profit of the capitalists. The nationalization of a number of the most basic industries does not yet abolish capitalism, to be sure, but it does strike at its heart.

It is not relevant to point out, as we also do, that the nationalized industries are often in the hands of ex-capitalists who "have actually become members of the new bureaucracy." That phrase, which is Davies', is revealing. It points to the non-capitalist and non-socialist line of development which is historically one of the roads before British society if the working class fails to assert its own power in the direction of genuine socialism.

We think the resolution already pointed out the dilemma which cruelly besets comrades who think along Davies' lines. It is: Since they equate anti-capitalist nationalization with the road to social-

ism, then they must conclude either that the Labor government is merely "patching up," etc., or they must agree that Attlee is on the high road to socialism. In our view, the *sine qua non* is the realization that anti-capitalist nationalization is not equal to socialism. This is the great theoretical conclusion which, we believe, has to be drawn from the experience with Stalinism as a social system. (If, on the other hand, Davies believes that the Russian Stalinist system is also capitalism, then there is an entirely different and prior discussion to be had.)

Even apart from all this is the attitude of socialists toward the Labor Party. Our view is that left socialists should be in the Labor Party as a militant left wing fighting against the policies of the Attlee leadership. To compare this to adopting a similar attitude toward a capitalist party like Truman's Democrats is to show a lamentable disregard for class lines.

Unfortunately, the Attlee leadership is not yet visibly "discredited" in the eyes of the majority of the British working class, in favor of a more radical line, if this is taken to mean anything else than dissatisfaction and dis-

content with its policies. The British workers look on the Labor Party as their party; there is no other party of labor for them to look to. We refuse to believe that Davies would prefer that the Labor Party become "discredited" in favor of a Tory comeback.

There is indeed "no practical alternative" for the British workers. If they are critical of its policies, it is the job of left socialists to deepen this discontent in the light of a genuine socialist program; it means that their work has fertile soil. But it would be quite sterile to stand outside of what is in fact the mass political movement of the workers. If the Labor Party cannot be won to a genuine socialist policy, which means both a different policy and a different leadership (and that is not decided in advance either by the lessons of history or Marxist principles), it is only through a fight in this direction that a meaningful new socialist vanguard can be built in Britain. Meanwhile, we think, the number of British left socialists who stand apart in a void (with excellent criticisms) is one of the sadder features of the British political scene.—Ed.

## CIVIL LIBERTY AND STALINISM: QUESTION OF INITIATIVE

To the Editor:

I am accepting your invitation to take the floor on the "civil liberty and Stalinism" issue. Unlike Cutler I have during the last year or so moved away from Barrett's position to yours. One point, however, must be stressed not only in fairness to him but because it may help clarify the dilemma that Cutler and others find themselves in. Barrett's proposal for a legal struggle against totalitarian groups was predicated upon the socialist and labor movement's taking the initiative in such struggle and not waiting for the government to do so. Waiting passively would mean the inevitable smear and witchhunt campaign we are now witnessing which, I imagine, is no surprise to Barrett. Taking the initiative would have meant forcefully demarcating democratic movements from Stalinists and fascists, thus giving to the government notice that proposed legislation was to be directed only toward totalitarian groups. The government, Barrett argued, would be further placed on the defensive, since it was always posing as a sworn enemy of racism, etc. I suppose he may still feel that his position implied a necessary condition which the labor movement did not fulfill. Your titling, "legal gimmick," incidentally, commits an error similar to the NI's years ago, "Can fascism be suppressed by law?" It misleads the reader into thinking that the Barrett-Cutler thesis depends only upon a legal weapon of struggle; this, of course, is not the case as you in-

dicating in the body of your argument this time. You did not do so in the last reply and in your answer to Barrett.

I think you also miss the point on Lenin's "formula." He would have been faced with no juridical problem had he been concerned merely with punishing specific acts of intervention on the part of anti-Bolsheviks. He was seeking a formula to enable the Bolsheviks to apprehend, if necessary, individuals who had not yet committed acts but who were capable of doing so on the basis of their ideological position. . . .

ANDREW KELSEY

We take it that the main point made by our correspondent Kelsey is that, so to speak, the "course" would be taken off the otherwise anti-democratic imposition of controls on freedom of speech and opinion if this were to be done by the government on the initiative of socialists and the labor movement rather than on its own. Without going over the previous argumentation in these columns on this subject, we do not see how this can be claimed even in hindsight. Certainly, for my own part, the case against the government witchhunt and its methods does not and cannot depend on any such qualification. And as far as anyone else's viewpoint is concerned, the addition of Kelsey's interpretation or qualification would be a hard case to support. For one thing, there were many who made this demand on the government with regard to the fascists (my articles mentioned Max Lerner

and there were the Stalinists, besides others). The main result, as regards Lerner for example, is that he is in a rather uncomfortable position in arguing against his own thesis now when it is applied to the Stalinists. And it is supposed to explain: "I was for it then because I took the initiative; I am against it now because I, the government, took the initiative?"

It is not a matter of "giving the government notice that proposed legislation was to be directed only toward totalitarian groups." Anyone can give notice—including notice to a suspicious character that the gun you put in his hands is to be used only in self-defense. As we pointed out before, the government—into whose hand you thrust this weapon against civil liberties—is not one that we can trust. All the "notice" we give it will be fine for salving our consciences (perhaps) but it is the government, not we, that will decide how it will be used, and according to its lights, not ours.

The point which Cutler raised concerned prosecution "for belonging to an organization that supported interventionists"—that is, an organization presently engaged in military overthrow of the state. We dealt with the point as he raised it. Joining or belonging to such an organization is not an opinion but an overt act. We added, furthermore that, in any case, the problem of democratic rights in the midst of a civil war raging over the land is not the problem before us.

Hal DRAPER

they represent the politically-organized working class, we regard primarily as the most favorable, most encouraging and most necessary political arena for the advancement of a socialist policy. We do not consider it a contribution to socialist progress when, for example, the "Orthodox Trotskyists" join the British Labor Party in order to disseminate the reactionary idea that Stalinist Russia is a workers' state, that Stalinism has spread the socialist revolution throughout Eastern Europe and Asia, and that the working class should work for the victory of the Stalinist barbarism in the coming war. Anything but that!

We do not think for a moment of setting down every tactic that the socialist left wing need follow in the social-democratic parties of Europe. But their basic aim ought to be clear.

It is to convert these political organizations of the working class into genuinely independent socialist and internationalist parties. It is to make them the big political rallying centers of all socialist and democratic opposition to Stalinism, on the one side, and to capitalist imperialism on the other.

**It is to make them at the same time a socialist alternative to capitalist rot and reaction and a democratic alternative to Stalinist totalitarianism and slavery. It is, above all in Western Europe, to weld together a democratic, socialist, internationalist power capable of withstanding Washington and the Kremlin.**

Every European socialist knows how many millions there are who want that, just that. There is no more urgent task that independent socialists have today than to help bring it about.

# Japan and the Power Vacuum—

(Continued from page 1)

ernment of the U. S., a copy of which is annexed." Nominations for "all elections" are explicitly excluded by the rules—since the elections have virtually already taken place.

All this, of course, merely formalizes what has already been made clear in advance. It is a diplomatic atrocity.

But this diplomatic atrocity is not merely a "bad" way of doing things, to be separated from the content and political meaning of the treaty to be signed. It is due to the latter. More specifically, it is obviously and patently due to the fact that most of the delegates present are holding their noses, and will sign the treaty (those who do) under what amounts to duress from the U. S. Department of Arm-Twisting; and the U. S. is afraid of an open and frank debate in San Francisco.

Various press correspondents and foreign diplomats have professed astonishment that the bosses of the conferences—with the treaty itself and a majority of votes in their pockets, should be so worried about what the Russians will do or say at the affair.

### WHO'S GAGGED?

"Because the U. S. cannot be certain that everything will happen exactly as planned and on schedule, there is an edginess which is reflected in blustery statements," writes Marquis Childs.

The N. Y. Times' Anne O'Hare McCormick writes: "The free world has once again been maneuvered into a position where its delegates are waiting glassy-eyed to hear what the Soviet delegation is going to spring on them." A "Paris" journalist, watching this prelude with astonishment," she reports, wonders how "Russia can cast this strange spell over the rest of the world."

The spell-casting wizards in the Kremlin worked this wonder by a simple abracadabra: announcing they would come. The U. S. is not afraid of what they may say, in itself. It is afraid of the other delegates getting out of hand under Russian demagogic prodding.

In fact, according to McCormick herself, it would appear that the delegates have been just as glassy-eyed waiting to find out

what the U. S. has sprung. She mentions that "Canada and Britain have been complaining . . . because they were neither consulted nor informed on the provisions of the pact. The outline of terms published in today's New York Times [Sept. 31] was news to the delegates here, and their comments indicate that they think a decision of such importance to all should be discussed more widely before the subject is closed."

No, Acheson's hatchmen at the conference are not merely afraid of some magic incantations that the Russian necromancers will recite in their hour's statement; nor are they so deathly concerned about straitjacketing the conference on time (even with Russian filibusters to be expected) because they have a train to catch.

It is the "free world" they want to gag, most particularly.

This is so because the Japanese treaty which has been fostered by the U. S. and which is being foisted upon them is a declaration of bankruptcy for Western politics. That appears in different ways to (for example) the corrupt Manila government, which is "discontented" with the treaty, to the Indian government which has washed its hands of it, to the Australians who mutter in their beads about it like most of the other delegates, and to us as socialists.

### CIRCULAR PLOT

The Philippine leaders' gripe is on reparations. One of Nehru's complaints involves his view of returning Formosa to Stalinist China. The Australians and others think in terms of revival of Japanese militarism as if that were something inherently Japanese, to be guarded against only by another Versailles-type treaty. None of these viewpoints is ours. But they all stem from the same point.

There was a movie which illustrates it. It was a fantasy with a circular plot. It ended with the same scene that began it, with the implication that the events were fated to repeat themselves as if caught in a whirl of time.

That is what the Japanese treaty means to most of the world. The different nations represented at San Francisco may have different objections to the plot, but what weighs like lead upon their minds is the feeling, "This is where we came in."

We as socialists have no sympathy for the blood-vengeance demands for reparations and indemnities upon the Japanese people. We have no tender feelings about "wrongs" to the new Stalinist totalitarianism in China. We do not think the way to guard against a nation's militarism is to impose a foreign militarism upon it. These are all "solutions" within the framework of imperialism.

The road to a progressive solution for the peoples of the world lies outside all of this. It lies in an answer to the problem which was excellently posed by James Reston, the N. Y. Times' end of the State Department pipeline.

### TO FILL THE VACUUM

The right question which he asks is: *Who and what shall fill*

the "power vacuum" in Asia opened up by the collapse of Japanese militarism?

Pre-war Japan, he writes, "provided a barrier against the expansion of Soviet power into south and central China. She was engaged in a policy of aggression, as cynical as Hitler's, but she also was engaged in a policy of containment of Soviet power, long before the United States thought of the phrase."

"What the U. S. is trying to do now is restore some kind of equilibrium throughout this entire area. The instruments at hand are not always ideal, but the area has to be policed and policemen must have police stations."

This is the sophisticated version of State Department thinking, and it is with this reasoning that the delegates will raise their hands in San Francisco, even while cursing U. S. arm-twisting. To fill this power vacuum, Japanese militarism must be rehabilitated, but this time (they hope) under the control of American militarism, lest Russian militarism rush to fill the vacuum. The same social classes that yearn for a revival of Japanese imperialism must be given a green light, with American imperialism as the cop, in order to stop Russian imperialism.

Within this framework, every power vacuum must be filled with some imperialist power, at every turn of the cycle.

But there is another power that can fill this vacuum.

It is an independent federation of the free Asiatic nations.

It does not exist today because the Nehrus, like the Yoshidas and Quirinos, tied to the capitalist world, cannot and will not break their essential ties with the master of the capitalist world, the United States, much as they may grumble and hold back when the master cracks the whip for its own interests.

The new governments of Asia, which have just torn themselves free from political domination by imperialism, are still tied by all the threads of the bourgeois classes that dominate them to the

capital of the capitalist world. And so they are fragmented and individually helpless before the power of the U. S. on the one hand and of Russian totalitarianism on the other. Together they are a World Power.

### ROAD FOR ASIA

Japan's ties, especially economic, are with Asia, not with the West. The "Greater Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere" was a demagogic slogan of pre-war Japanese imperialism, by which it meant its own mastery over Asia, but it could be a demagogic slogan (and not merely a meaningless one) because it appealed to a real need of the whole Asian continent.

An independent federation of free Asia—independent of both imperialist blocs—could be a magnetic force and a pole of attraction for all those forces in Indonesia which (the press reports with alarm) are turning to the Stalinist center of power in Asia; to those in the Philippines who are drawn to the Hukbalahaps against Quirino; to those in Indo-China who see only the choice between the Stalinized Viet-Minh and the puppet Bao Dai. An independent federation of Asia

could enforce an independent Formosa, that independence both from Chiang and Mao which the Formosan people themselves desire. An independent federation of Asia could give to a Japan which is not an American bastion nor under the control of a revived Zaibatsu clique, its natural role in the economy and organization of the continent, whether Japan is or is not a part of such a federation to begin with. An independent federation of Asia could make its treaties with Washington, military or otherwise, as a power and not as a puppet or serf.

It is in the stirring anti-imperialist movements of Asia, and in the first place in the strong socialist movement of India, that lies the power to break out of the vicious circle of imperialism that is symbolized by the Japanese treaty.

Nehru is not at San Francisco. Neither is Burma. That is fine. Their failure is that they (especially Nehru) have also failed to call together the men of free Asia for their own treaty, for their own union. Nehru is not at San Francisco, but he is also nowhere else. But behind Nehru are the revolutionary forces of a continent.

## SYMBOL

The Advertising Council, in the interests of the fight against inflation, has a poster and car card out to dramatize the danger.

Featured is a presumably venomous snake labeled "Inflation." Over it is a forked stick, symbolizing the anti-inflation program. The slogan is: "Hold It Down!"

The forked stick which is shown is an unusually honest representation of the anti-inflation program. It won't possibly work.

Trouble in this case is that the prongs, which shouldn't be more than two inches or thereabouts, are much too long to permit any pressure on the head. It could hold down a rattler or copperhead no more than Congress's tax bill can hold down prices.

It has only one advantage over the latter: it has no fangs itself, being merely useless.

### Shielding Our Boys

The U. S. army's European Command has banned the GI production of the Broadway play "Mr. Roberts" (about the navy) because of the strong words used in it. It is "not considered suitable for presentation under official sponsorship on military posts."

Might teach the servicemen to use bad language.

### For the Scrapbook

"Since the outbreak of the war, the regime of President Syngman Rhee has jailed 24,329 Koreans on charges of 'war crimes against the government.' Hundreds of these prisoners are political leaders who have opposed the extreme conservative and corrupt Rhee administration."—N. Y. Post, August 23, in news item.

### SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

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

- I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.
- I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME.....  
ADDRESS.....  
CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....  
SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).....

## IUE-CIO Convention—

(Continued from page 1)  
every shop in the ensuing year to a point at which they cannot even force NLRB elections.

The main Singer plant at Elizabeth, New Jersey, with over 10,000 workers fell last year. The former UE rank and file is now through with UE. The same thing has happened at Schroeder Valve in Brooklyn. An outstanding victory was chalked up at the Jersey City, N. J., Emerson plant of 2,500 workers, where large sections of the Negro workers were won to the CIO.

### DEMOCRATIC UNIONISM

District 4 has succeeded where others have floundered because, in the main, it carries on a constant, militant, democratic brand of unionism. It wins contracts far superior to those of the UE. It betters working conditions in the shops and it allows a full democratic expression of its membership.

The result has been heartening. The district is healthy and growing. Let all who think of how to beat the UE consider the example of District 4.

Since no president or secretary treasurer will be elected at the convention this year (they are elected every two years, while conventions are annual), there will be no contest for office. This of course tends to ease things up, since no top official feels himself immediately threatened. This does not mean that the convention will necessarily be completely smooth and uneventful.

If President Carey should, for

example, demand unanimous votes as he did at the last convention, there is bound to be resistance. Last year the District 4 delegates took sharp exception to this attempt to create a docile convention.

On the agenda there undoubtedly will be the GE negotiations and others now going on or coming up in the near future. The problems of organizing the industry and of these negotiations will undoubtedly be the chief concern of the convention.

## UAW Top Brass—

(Continued on page 5)

Better than No Sister at All." Is it a wonder that the ranks seemed to remain confused and apathetic?

Three very short comments on the election campaign were heard before the vote, for which one critic had the dubious distinction of being attacked as a New Yorker. It was a rather sorry affair.

Actually, the only heat engendered at this meeting was around the suggested endorsement of Louis Miriani, Common Council president, which issue was left unsettled from the previous meeting. THE WORD was out on this too, and after a sharp debate, the CIO council voted overwhelmingly against endorsement to the bitter disgust of many key delegates who thought that if the UAW leaders were going to practice "practical politics," they too should be allowed to make an endorsement as "practical politics."

The whole proceedings were put in their proper perspective

during a little discussion on endorsing Eugene Van Antwerp, former mayor bitterly opposed by the CIO, who is now running for councilman. Starting from the theme, "He ain't a bad guy," to the refrain, "He's a pretty good guy," the delegates themselves (including Roy Reuther, major domo of the affair) "laughed heartily, when a minority critic got up sarcastically" to close this debate before some delegate runs away with his new-found enthusiasm and makes a motion having this council go on record apologizing to Van Antwerp for ever opposing him.

Now the UAW leadership has "saved face." They have a "candidate." At the expense, of course, of a chance the UAW had to break with the policy of tail-ending the Democratic Party.

It remains to be seen, however, in the September 11 primaries, how this "face-saving" has affected the ranks. This is a political event worth waiting for.