

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 24, 1951

FIVE CENTS

TRIPLE CRISIS OF ZIONISM — II
A Discussion of the World Zionist Congress at Jerusalem

... pages 6-7

British Put Big Squeeze on Iran

... page 3

Pat McCarran: New Witch Hunt Boss

... page 2

Detroit Workers Vote With Feet

UAW "Practical" Slate Swamped in Primary

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Sept. 17—It is one thing to get the secondary union leaders in Detroit to reverse their decision on a hands off policy in the mayoralty campaign, and it is something altogether different when dealing with the rank and file.

For the results of the municipal primaries here last week showed that the hands-off policy was still in effect as far as the rank and file of the labor movement was concerned.

The mayoralty candidate whom the top brass of the union movement insisted MUST be supported, made the poorest showing of any labor-backed candidate in the last four primary elections.

County Clerk Ed Branigin got a little over 62,000 votes against Mayor Albert Cobo, who drew better than 138,000 votes.

In 1949 George Edwards received 114,173 votes to Cobo's 169,566 votes, in the primary election.

Way back in 1945, before the UAW-CIO had a streamlined, unified, and "practical" political action program, Richard T. Frankenstein got 83,857 votes to

incumbent Ed Jeffries 69,455 votes in the primary. And Frankenstein made a real showing in the November election.

LITTLE HOPE

Is it a wonder that today there is little hope, and no confidence, and much demoralization in UAW circles when it comes to the municipal campaign? Every dire prediction of the critics of the policy of tail ending the Democratic party came to haunt the UAW leaders this week.

Nor did Branigin endear himself to the ranks with his proposal for a pay-roll tax, because taxes are too heavy on property now! Last election campaign that was a major criticism of Cobo—for Cobo favored a payroll tax!

Two other aspects of the pri-

(Turn to last page)

THE OTTAWA CONFERENCE:

U.S. Pushes Allies Around; Seeks to Rearm Germany

By SAM FELIKS

The Ottawa conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is being held under the heavy overcast of the problem of the economic cost of the rearmament programs. Notwithstanding the official speeches of optimism, the hesitant attitude of every one of America's reluctant allies to the U. S.-initiated military program only mirrors the unpopularity of this program among their people back home.

Typical of the "democratic" character of these conferences is the fact that the Big Three is trying to decide the fate of Western Germany without the participation of the Germans. Inside of the N.A.T.O., the smaller nations have been chaffing at the lack of equality, or to be less kind—democracy, among the participants themselves. The smaller nations have been objecting in a polite manner of course, that they are being forced to merely approve decisions already drawn up by the Big Three—the U. S., Britain and France.

And in turn all the Western European nations have been objecting that the U. S. faces them with *de facto* decisions, or makes policy statements with which they feel they must go along. However, the

inclusion of Franco Spain into the N.A.T.O. is not being presented at this time. A bilateral military pact will undoubtedly be drawn up with Franco, and for all practical purposes Fascist Spain will be in the N.A.T.O.—via the non-veto route.

This "democratic" procedure is traced by *New York Times* columnist, Anne O'Hare McCormick, who does not dispute the validity of the critic's argument.

UNILATERAL DECISIONS

"As described by the critics here, the decision (to admit

Greece and Turkey into the "North Atlantic" pact) was made in the Pentagon, more or less forced on the State Department, communicated to France and Britain, and put on the Council agenda without consultation of the other members. Not all of these object, Italy, for instance, as a Mediterranean power, is strongly in favor of the proposal. But countries like Norway and the Netherlands, besides wishing to preserve the Atlantic character of the pact, resent being obliged either to bow to a *fait accompli* or to criticize publicly the policy of the U. S. Even the larger powers dislike being put in the position of opposing American decisions after they are made and announced."

This hierarchical structure of making decisions follows the positions of power in the Washington-dominated war bloc. The U. S.'s dominant economic and military power even precludes anything more than a formal adherence to democratic procedure—and often the formality is openly tossed aside. This is part of

(Turn to last page)

End of the Fourth International

By M. N. TRENT

What remains of the Fourth International has just concluded its third world congress in Europe. A brief report on its decisions, as well as the manifesto issued in its name, are carried in the latest issue of the Paris *Vérité*, organ of the French "orthodox Trotskyists." The congress resolutions are not yet published. The congress minutes, the record of the reports and discussions, are not published and they will not be; the Fourth International deems the practise of the three preceding Internationals of making public their congress debates unworthy of imitation. But even without the minutes, *Vérité's* account is enough to show the disaster visited upon this movement by its leadership.

As a revolutionary socialist organization, the Fourth International is finished. It has abandoned all that was fundamentally sound in the struggle against Stalinism that was long ago launched by Trotsky—whose good name it continues to degrade and abuse—and has surrendered politically to Stalinist barbarism.

Its phrasemongering and posturing are borrowed straight from Stalinism. Bombast, braggadocio, pomposity, smugness and complacency—all are there in full measure. To read what its leaders

now write with the utmost self-assurance about the Stalinist states of Eastern Europe and China and about Yugoslavia, you would never dream that they said exactly the opposite at their second world congress. To read their analysis of Stalinism and predictions about its development, you would never suspect that the same people wrote just the contrary three years ago.

MOVEMENT WRECKED

They have done all within their poor powers to wreck their movement, to reduce it to the disintegrating, demoralized state in which it finds itself, completely isolated from the working class and without any influence in it. At one time, the International lived a rich and full internal life, pulsing with the exchange of views of numerous tendencies within its ranks. And what is more, it attracted to itself many other revolutionary organizations of different origins and development.

Today, it has no attractive power for any such organizations; and from its own ranks it has expelled or repelled every tendency which is not in rigid conformance with the one that prevails. Yet, with that "priggishness" and "boastfulness" which Lenin detested and excoriated so much in the old Com-

unist movement, they brag and preen themselves with the grossest immodesty: "the majority of the sections of the International are integrating themselves successfully into the mass movement of their country"; and the work of their congress "as well as the political maturity which all the delegates displayed, represents the highest degree of political and organizational cohesion that the world revolutionary movement has attained since its inception." What is certain is that this claim does not represent the highest degree of humility. From that vice, which afflicts only little men, the Stalinists are entirely free; and so are those who are capitulating to them.

That is what the political line of the Fourth International now is—a capitulation to Stalinism. The congress manifesto makes this strikingly plain, both by what it says and by what it fails to say.

The entire first part of the manifesto is devoted to denunciation of capitalist imperialism, America in the first place, for its responsibility in the preparation of the third world war. The denunciation is entirely justified, it goes without saying. But by itself, it is not only cheap but a downright political lie. It can be found in any and every issue of *Pravda* and the *Daily Worker* and on the lips of every Stalinist; oddly

enough, the manifesto acknowledges this fact.

WHITEWASHING STALINISM

The denunciation becomes valid and the whole political truth, however, only if it is accompanied by a denunciation and repudiation of Stalinism, which bears its full share of the responsibility for the war preparations and the war danger. That is missing from the manifesto, which does not refer to it by so much as a word. During the Stalin-Hitler pact, the Stalinists denounced Anglo-French imperialism as being responsible for the second world war without saying a word about the responsibilities of Germany. Everyone, even dull people, understand that the Stalinists were whitewashing Hitlerism. The Fourth International now does exactly the same thing for Stalinism in connection with the third world war.

Instead of an attack upon Stalinism, the manifesto proclaims that it is on its side in the coming war. It pledges itself to the unconditional defense of Stalinist Russia and its subjugated satellites and to the triumph of the Stalinist armies. It has discovered that the third world war will be, or will soon become, an "international civil war" between the classes. The exploiting and oppressing

classes, represented by American imperialism, will be on one side. The workers, peasants and colonial peoples, represented by the Stalinist states and, in any case, led by them, will be on the other side. On that side will also be the Fourth International; indeed, it is there already, because that is the camp of . . . "the world revolution."

What, in that case, happens to the idea of "counter-revolutionary Stalinism"? Simple: it disappears! The Fourth International, at its inception and long afterward, justified its formation as the new international of the socialist revolution on the ground that Stalinism, as embodied in the Stalinist parties, their program, their principles, their policies and their social aim, had become counter-revolutionary, irretrievably and irretrievably counter-revolutionary. Stalinism was, not lightly but solemnly, characterized as the upholder of capitalism throughout the world and as the channel for the restoration of capitalism in Russia.

About all this, the manifesto has nothing to say, not one single word. Trotsky went so far as to say, when the second world war broke out, that if the war ends without a socialist revolution, Stalinism and its state, its social

(Turn to last page)

McCarran, New Boss of the Red Hunters Shows Panic as Criticism of Witch Hunt Tactics Increases

By GORDON HASKELL

A new contender is making his bid for the position of big chief of the red hunters. He has a good chance of making his claim stick. He already controls a commanding position from which he is able to defeat rival candidates before they get a good start. His name is Pat McCarran, senator from the sovereign state of Nevada, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Internal Security, and "inspector general" of the Subversive Activities Control Board which was created under the McCarran Act.

In the past year, Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin has been getting the limelight with his whole, unfounded or at least completely unsubstantiated charges that the government is honey-combed from top to bottom with Stalinist agents. Powerful as his impact has been on American society, his success depends on his ability to keep on making sensational charges week by week. And even for a man of McCarthy's vivid imagination and complete lack of scruples, that is no easy job.

Furthermore, he showed that he is only an amateur at these things when he blew the climax of his pitch almost at the beginning. Instead of working up from janitors to typists to stenographers and so on up the ladder, he started right off by accusing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense of treachery and treason. After that, he was pretty well washed up. Perhaps he can still get audiences to listen to him in parts of the country where the newspapers don't penetrate too easily, but his own blunders and

the Democrats will get him for sure.

A DIFFERENT BIRD

Pat McCarran is a bird of a different stripe, and he is sitting on a different and much more commanding perch. He has already wrecked the president's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights which had been set up expressly to study all phases of the "security" program as they relate to civil liberties. This he did by simply sitting on the bill which would have exempted the members of the commission from a law which prohibits any government employee from doing business with the government for two years after he returns to private life. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he has the power to stop such bills, and he used it.

He then proceeded to use the same powers to keep a tight leash on the Subversive Activities Control Board which had been created under the infamous McCarran Act. This board is empowered to decide, after hearings, which organizations are "subversive" as defined in the act. Recent appointments were made by the president last October. But when the nominations for permanent members of the board were sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee, nothing happened. For nine months this committee sat on the appointments, while the board was already holding hearings on the Communist Party. Throughout this period, members of the board knew that Pat McCarran was watching their conduct of the hearings carefully, and that if they were not conducted just as he thought they should be, their appointments would never be recommended favorably. It

must be admitted that this creates a peculiar atmosphere in which an "impartial" board is to conduct its hearings and deliberations.

In the meantime, McCarran's own subcommittee was going into high gear. Starting at first with closed hearings, and public declarations of its firm determination to avoid the public smear campaigns which have made the Dies Committee and its successors and imitators notorious throughout the land, the McCarran red hunters have now broken into the open like a pack of coon dogs in full cry.

We will not bore our readers with a summary of the dreary proceedings. It is the same old hash, served up by the same old crew of greasy cooks.

A SECOND LOOK

But there is one little difference. A lot of people who were impressed by this kind of show a year or two back have gotten sick and tired of it. The "evidence" dished up by the slimy crew of ex-Stalinists, ex-spies, and dollar patriots is no longer accepted as gospel, and even conservative journalists are taking a second look at the "revelations" made by these gentry.

There is no doubt about it. The red hunting-hand has been overplayed. Perhaps when the history of this nightmare period is reviewed it will turn out that it was none other than Joe McCarthy whose extravagance rendered the involuntary service of squeezing the goose which had delivered so many eggs of golden publicity just a mite too hard.

But that is for history. Right now, McCarran is riding high, and

he is determined that no one shall stop him. Furthermore, his position is so powerful that he can do much to suppress criticism of the actions of his subcommittee—much more than was ever within the powers of Martin Dies or Joe McCarthy.

Two recent examples have come to light. They are very instructive. For they show that the whole business of red hunting has now become so precarious that its high chieftains cannot stand the least bit of adverse criticism or publicity. This does not mean that a return to some degree of public sanity in the handling of Stalinism as a political movement is upon us. As long as the world struggle between Stalinism and capitalism continues that would be too much to expect. It is just possible, however, that the most spectacular phase of public "investigation" is getting groggy on its pins.

WHO COACHED BUDENZ?

But back to McCarran. In three columns this month, Joseph Alsop attacked the credibility of Louis Budenz who had been testifying for the McCarran subcommittee. Alsop pointed out that, unlike other men, Budenz seems to have the capacity of remembering more about an event the farther he gets away from it. Some time ago he was asked, by another committee, whether John Carter Vincent, former chief of the State Department's Far Eastern Affairs Division, was a Communist. Budenz refused to substantiate the charge, saying that he had to be careful in such matters. Some months later, Budenz stated positively that "from official reports I have received" when he was a

Stalinist leader he knew Vincent to be a "member of the Communist Party."

Further, Alsop pointed out that Budenz claimed that both Vincent and Lattimore were, to his certain knowledge, members of the CP when they accompanied Henry Wallace on his Far Eastern tour in 1944. Yet although they were Wallace's closest advisors, the recommendations made by the then vice president both during and after his tour were vigorously anti-Stalinist. Alsop hinted broadly that in view of these facts, there is a certain possibility that Budenz' memory was being "refreshed" by agents of the subcommittee as he went along.

The articles were officially brought to the attention of the Senate by Senator Lehman of New York, who called for an investigation of the charges, and moved to insert the concluding Alsop column in the Congressional Record.

POLITICAL PANIC

McCarran and his cohorts in the Senate went into a fury. They denounced Alsop in unmeasured terms, proclaimed that the honor of this great "deliberative body" was at stake, and refused to permit the column to be inserted in the Congressional Record. In short, they showed all the signs of panic.

But their tactics succeeded. Not only did the pages of the Record remain unscathed, but next day the Herald Tribune carried an editorial which all but disowned Alsop's column on this matter. It will be interesting to see whether any of the papers in which this column is syndicated will ban it henceforth.

There was another incident in which criticism of McCarran gave rise to the same signs of political hysteria. The fortnightly magazine The Reporter carried an article in its issue of August 21 entitled "McCarran's Monopoly" by Alan Barth. It detailed the senator's growing stranglehold on the red hunting racket. (To give credit where it is due, many of the facts in this article are taken from Barth's piece.) Because the State Department has the nerve to send this magazine, among many others, to its embassies and information centers overseas, McCarran moved to cut \$22,000,000 from the appropriation for the State Department's information program.

His motion did not carry. But the State Department withdrew that issue of the magazine from overseas distribution. The senator's bark, it seems, is more vicious than his bite, but his bite is quite vicious enough. From all this, a small moral emerges. The panic and frenzy with which McCarran and his friends react to the slightest criticism is a good sign. At the moment they can be successful in suppressing or at least frightening some of their critics. But their success will diminish as the criticism mounts. They can only retain their advantage if the critics yield to them, as the liberals did when the McCarran Act was being debated in Congress. Their strategy is based on a constant offensive. It can be disrupted and defeated only by people who take the offensive against them.

denouncing wild-cat strikes, with a feature article on "Wild-cats Cost Money," by the president of Briggs Local 212.

The appearance of this issue of the paper provoked much laughter in UAW circles, for its advocates, mainly Mazy followers, all won their reputation along with Mazy as fighting militants precisely because they used wild-cats to win concessions from Briggs which the routine contract did not give.

Of course, the UAW leaders say they will call a strike on speed-up whenever it is merited, but this is an evasion of the problem. For the companies are smart enough NOT to put into effect a speed-up program immediately affecting the entire shop directly. Rather they pick at groups of workers, and then the union leaders denounce the affected group for "minority" action.

Nor do the leaders admit that the grievance procedures of the industry are becoming so cumbersome, and take so much time, that waiting them out becomes almost impossible for the men in the shops directly and immediately affected. If a foreman adds to a man's job every day, it does the victim little good to know that maybe a month or so later, the company might be found wrong. Meanwhile he has been over-worked.

As a matter of fact, to present arguments against the limitations of a routine union outlook to the pressing problems of the day is to waste time and space, as far as the UAW leadership is concerned. They know all the answers to conservative unionism, for they spent ten years fighting against "rou-

Restless UAW Ranks Seek Action; Leaders Hope to Ride Out Storm

DETROIT, Sept. 16—There seems to be at least a slight touch of irony in the appearance of Walter P. Reuther, United Auto-workers Union president, at the CIO Oil Workers convention as a militant labor leader threatening the auto industry with a strike in 1955 unless it grants a guaranteed annual wage to the autoworkers.

For the militant program for 1955 which Reuther proclaims finds no counterpart in talking and acting tough now with the auto industry on crucial union problems facing the ranks in the shops NOW.

As a matter of plain record, never since its triumph in the UAW-CIO, has the Reuther regime faced as widespread unrest and demand for action from the secondary leaders and ranks in the shops as it does today. And the only response the Reuther leadership seems to give is to try to ride out the storm.

In the past three months, many GM locals have demanded a conference on key problems in the shops, to work out a unified strategy, and above all, to combat speed-up. Instead, the GM conference was postponed. As a result, many GM locals are calling their own conference in St. Louis to discuss these matters.

IN CHRYSLER TOO

A similar and perhaps more acute situation, confronts the UAW leadership in the Chrysler plants. Twice the shop committees of all Chrysler local unions have demanded a delegate conference only to be refused by the Chrysler UAW department. Local unions

also have passed resolutions to this effect. Reports are that the pressure campaign may bring such a conference soon. Ford Local 600 has also been demanding a national emergency conference to take up the issues before the union.

What is bothering the autoworkers? Speed-up, inflation, lay offs, short work weeks, and only the most routine of routine union answers. From the leadership which is unquestionably satisfied with its own record; but the ranks are not so satisfied, as testified to by the demands from local unions for NEW and more effective programs against the difficulties of the day.

Dozens of workers have been penalized for not speeding up in Chrysler plants; the chairman of the biggest local, Dodge 3, still is fired by the company, as is a chief steward. An administrator still reigns over the De Soto local.

The Reuther leadership faces adverse criticism of the contract signed with Hudson Motor Car Company. Hailed by the UAW press as "unique" it certainly lived up to that designation. UAW leaders proudly explained that the contract was the first time any corporation contracted to furnish a 40-hour week, except, to be sure, in extreme emergencies. A couple of weeks later, the Hudson workers were laid off for a week, making a mockery of the claims.

CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS

Instead of probing behind the superficial aspects of the wave of wild-cats, the UAW leaders rest solely on "contractual obligations," and the thing is carried so far that a whole issue of the Voice of Local 212 is devoted to

tinism," and they won control of the UAW not by promising to be better conservatives, but better militants.

How far the top leaders are losing contact with the ranks in the shops is shown by the persistent demands for special conferences and programs, by all secondary leaders, more of them pro-Reuther than anti-Reuther in the past. The stock answer of recent years, "We're your elected officials, we'll handle the problem," no longer meets with the response of yesterday.

Basically, the difficulty of the UAW leaders stems from two factors. They are trying to "stabilize" a union in a period of economic uncertainty and unrest (2) and they are caught on the horns of their dilemma of "sacrificing" for the national defense. Nor does the slogan "Equality of Sacrifice" catch any fire in the ranks because they went through that circus once, and saw what it meant, and they can read the profit statements of the companies in any daily newspaper.

NO, NO, A THOUSAND TIMES NO!

CHICAGO, Sept. 9—The University of Chicago's industrial relations center is helping Republic Steel to teach economics to workers. Beginning this month, 2,500 Republic employees will take a course leading to an examination containing, among others, the following questions:

"Can increased wages be paid out of profits? Is a salary of \$100,000 more than anyone is worth? Should wages be increased as fast as productivity increases?"

The correct answers, according to the university and the steel firm, are No, No and No.

British Tell Iran: "Give In or be Ruined"

By RICHARD TROY

The great crisis of the Middle East—the British-Iranian oil dispute—remains unsettled and may still provide a shock-weary world with new explosions. As a result of the relative success of the recent economic policies of the British government, designed to make Iran more humble toward the "advanced countries," a new twist in the five-month old crisis is developing. Unable to convince the Iranian government to compromise in its plans for nationalization of the British oil properties by long-winded argument, International Court orders, the mediating influence of Averil Harriman, or even by the closing down of the huge Abadan refineries, the British have resorted to various economic pressures to bring the stubborn Iranians to their knees, to make them "see the light." This new tactic amounts to a full economic and financial boycott and can do little to strengthen the already devastated prestige of the British Empire in the Middle East.

Last week the powerful Bank of England blocked the Iranian sterling balances in England thus seriously hampering Iranian international trade. Then it passed several restrictions on the convertibility of Iranian-held sterling which caused considerable consternation in Iranian banking and financial circles. A slow paralysis of business is the hoped-for result. The bank of Iran has already had to refuse applications for all import credits except for those ventures likely to earn dollars. The supply of dollars is dwindling fast and there is fear in Teheran that Iranian students in the United States may have to be recalled. The Iranian government, of course, sent a note or two of protest to the British in which they assert that the British actions represent an open breach of many previous agreements, and in this they are probably correct.

The next step the British took was to declare a boycott on all vitally needed goods ordered by Iranian concerns. This was followed up by an order which forced British ships now at sea to dump goods bound for Iran at the nearest available ports.

All this, of course, is on top of the fact that the revenue which formerly came from the Anglo-Iranian oil operations has been completely cut off. The resulting difficulties for the Iranian economy are not hard to imagine. And it is no more difficult to fathom the goals of the British strategy: to drive the Iranian economy into bankruptcy and thus to facilitate the striking of a new bargain over the disputed oil fields much more in favor of Great Britain. The immediate aim is to oust the "fanatic" Mossadegh and to have him replaced by a leader of more amiable stock, perhaps Said Ziu el-Din Tabalabou, the leader of the newly-formed opposition to the present government.

U. S. SUPPORTS BRITAIN

Evidently the American government is giving full support to the current tactics of the British. Last week the American ambassador in Teheran announced to Mossadegh that, due to "technical difficulties," the contemplated twenty-five million dollar loan from the U. S. might have to be postponed for some time. That this move will abet British designs seems clear. In addition, Averil Harriman, by refusing to forward an Iranian ultimatum to the British government, has indicated that he sides with the British in the dispute. At least, he said the Iranians had to take the initiative in making the first compromises.

These three groups had been searched frantically for new purchasers of its mounting oil reserves. Thus far only Afghanistan has signed an agreement. A dispatch two weeks ago spoke of negotiations with Poland and Czechoslovakia, and the government now speaks of coming to terms with the Soviet Union for huge oil shipments. But this cannot solve the problem since none of these countries have the proper transportation facilities. The hope exists, however, that such negotiations can at least frighten the Western powers into a more conciliatory frame.

There is little danger that the Mossadegh government, or any Iranian government supported by the present feudal social structure, will move into the Stalinist camp. But this structure is not necessarily eternal, and in any event the threat to do so has some real meaning.

SENTIMENT GROWING

There is considerable sentiment spreading throughout the whole Moslem world for a policy of independence from both great imperialist blocks, the American and the Russian. Recently, for example, the New York Times reported that the feeling is growing in Pakistan in favor of a policy of "playing the two Great Powers off against each other" in order to achieve their goals. For Pakistan this would mean abandoning the policy of complete acceptance of the American global line, a course which, it is felt, has not paid off. The Pakistani are particularly concerned over the failure of the UN in the Kashmir dispute, and they also feel a great solidarity with those Moslem countries which are resisting the attempts of the Western powers to retain hegemony over the whole Middle East. Moreover, they are particularly irritated with what

they consider the "solicitude" granted to Nehru's Indian government, and they are coming to understand that Nehru's independent stand on global issues has been a help rather than a hindrance in gaining this "solicitude."

The new developments in Pakistan are another sign of the growing resentment and awakening in the whole Middle East of which the Iranian dispute is only a part. And the British and American governments are simply pouring more oil on the fire with each step they take. As Marguerite Higgins, in an excellent column in the New York Herald Tribune put it, after writing that the British tactics may well succeed in overthrowing the Mossadegh clique, "This will not solve the oil crisis... the odds are that next time the explosion of anti-British and nationalist sentiment will be even bigger." She realizes, as do many State Department experts (to whom, she says, Acheson has turned a deaf ear) that Mossadegh is not the problem; that he only mirrors, in his obstinacy, the profound and widespread nationalist and anti-imperialist sentiment in the Middle East which cannot die away when one man, the "fantastic Mossadegh," fades from the scene.

It is her contention that large sections of the ruling bureaucracy—closely linked with the feudal landowning class—is prepared to come to terms with the British. They now regret that they gave Mossadegh such a free hand in this matter, and they realize that they have unleashed forces over which they have little control. Therefore, rather than let the chaos continue they are willing to return to the old arrangements, or something closely approximating them, incidentally, THEY managed to live quite well.

But Mossadegh's party has

stirred up—with the aid of the Stalinist Tudeh Party—too much nationalist passion among the Iranian masses to simply turn it off when it gets too hot to handle. Consequently, Mossadegh continues to get support in the land-lord-dominated Parliament.

A NEW OPPOSITION?

However, certain groups do exist which are willing to risk losing face with the masses, and these groups, which kept still throughout the long crisis, control about a fifth of the parliament. At present they are under the leadership of the aforementioned Said Ziu el-Din Tabalabou who is organizing a party to be known as the National Will. It is possible that he may have the Shah's backing; and no doubt he has channeled into his new organization those people who supported, like the Shah, the pro-Western liberal Ali Razmara, the premier of Iran who was assassinated last spring as a prelude to the nationalization act which he had opposed. Miss Higgins, incidentally, hints in her article that British bribes may have something to do with this development in Iran.

But it remains highly questionable whether such a party can gain power in the present charged atmosphere, particularly as the British policy becomes more ruthless and hated. And, even if the Mossadegh government should fall, the long-range problems remain unsolved. A real defeat for Iranian nationalism before the combined pressures of Britain and America will have a devastating effect upon future relations between the Western powers and the Middle East. Revenge will be continuously sought. And, as Miss Higgins says, the resulting explosion will be "even bigger."

Indonesian Govt. Arrests Opposition Leaders

By DAVID ALEXANDER

The recent announcement of the round up of altogether 2,000 "extremists" in Indonesia is a matter of some importance. The majority of those arrested consisted of members of the P.K.I. (Stalinist party), Murba ("Trotskyists"), and the SOBSI (the trade union organization), the latter being considerably influenced by the former.

Although the Stalinist party has fourteen deputies in parliament compared with four "Trotskyists," and also exercises considerable influence on the unions which have a membership of about 400,000, the Murba Party, under the leadership of Soekarni, is considered more dangerous to the government. This is due to the fact that the Stalinists, in their rigid adherence to Moscow's line, cannot exercise their own judgment on the spot in the execution of policy. The Murba Party, which might better be called the National Communist Party, has a number of intellectual leaders, and although there is reason to believe that there exists some liaison with the Fourth International, there is no direction from this body.

Murba claimed a membership of 80,000 in 1948. Until recently its views on Russia and world problems correspond to those of the Fourth International. They put a rather naive stress on imagined theoretical differences between Mao and Stalin.

The recent arrests involved the round-up of not only Stalinists and the Murba people, but also members of the right wing religious Dar-ul-Islam. The latter fanatics were not satisfied that the state was theocratic enough, and the disinterest of the PNI (Nationalist Government Party) in religion is well known, though officially denied.

These three groups had been

threatening the country's security and economy." The "Trotskyists" had been supporting strikes against all European concerns. Stalinists have been striking, sabotaging and destroying plantations because they fear the beneficial effect that successful mechanization might have on the country; they also fear the consequences of any American aid. The Dar-ul-Islam is a neo-fascist organization, and is said to be supporting tens of thousands of guerrillas in Southern Celebes.

Each of these organizations has its private army. The Stalinists are said to receive many of their arms through Singapore. Many of them come from the 2,000,000

stong Chinese minority, and there is reason to believe that they are in contact with Peiping as well as with the Huks in the Philippines. The situation is further complicated by the activities of bandits. These are led by disgruntled former government bureaucrats and army officers of the TKI (Nationalist Militia) which was the official government army at the time of the fighting with the Dutch.

The recent arrests were made because the influence of these groups was spreading. The economic situation has deteriorated recently due to the inflation of the rupiah, the inability of the gov-

ernment to exercise control over such wide territories with a population of 70,000,000, the overburdening of the bureaucracy with inefficient and inexperienced people, many of whom have been busy feathering their own nests, the widespread strikes, and the failure to attract enough foreign capital in view of all these factors.

Yet strange as it may seem, the economy of the country which is primarily based on agriculture and the extraction of minerals has been enriched considerably by the increase in the prices of strategic raw materials during the Korean war.

CP Leaders Convicted in Phony Trial

PITTSBURGH — Political suppression has just added a new triumph to its rapidly mounting string of victories in the unhappy state of Pennsylvania. A Pittsburgh jury has found two local Stalinist party leaders guilty of "sedition." The two men—James Dolsen and Andrew Onda—were convicted under an old state law dating from the infamous Palmer raids of the early twenties. The law provides up to twenty years for the offense. They have not been sentenced at this writing.

The trial lasted a record eight months. It followed a raid on local CP headquarters led by Judge Michael Musmanno. Musmanno—soon to join the State Supreme Court—is the author of a bill, now before the state legislature, outlawing all "subversive" organizations within the state and making membership in them a crime. Musmanno, together with former FBI informer Matt Cvetic, was the chief witness against the Stalinists.

Conviction was almost a fore-

gone conclusion. In this hysteria-ridden city, any ordinary juror would have been more than hesitant about voting for acquittal. Just to be safe, however, the democratic administration in Washington came to the aid of Judge Musmanno by indicting the two defendants under the Smith Act just before the case went to the jury. Since the two men involved are relatively small fry, they undoubtedly would not have been indicted otherwise—at least not as yet.

A high point of the trial was the arrest and jailing of the only local lawyer among the three defense counsels. The lawyer, Hy-men Schlesinger, is also charged with sedition. His trial is now pending.

Musmanno shows how really miserable a creature the labor officialdom is sometimes led to support when they stay within the framework of the two old parties. Once a progressive of sorts, Musmanno now makes ceremonial

statements supporting labor—such as calling the state police "cossacks"—but spends all his time and energy ostentatiously hounding the Stalinists. His standard reply to his critics is that they are "anti-catholic." He hurled this charge in bombastic language at one political opponent recently, only to discover that his antagonist was also a prominent Catholic layman. The leader of the local Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, Father Charles O. Rice, finally felt impelled to step in and patch up a truce.

At any rate, Musmanno gets ardent support of the CIO right in Phil Murray's home town. Not to be outdone, the current United Mine Workers' Journal eulogizes the man, primarily because he was once a miner many years ago. It's a sad day when the labor movement doesn't recognize its own turncoats. Someone should remind these gentlemen that Adolph Hitler was once a house-painter.

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.

Editorials

Stalin's "Full Communism"

A report from Moscow states that authoritative Stalinist spokesmen have declared that Russia today stands at about the half-way mark toward the creation of an industrial and agricultural basis on which it will be possible to start the definitive change from a socialist to a communist form of society. This economic base will be secured when production has been increased "at least threefold over the pre-war level" according to a discussion in the magazine *Bolshevik*, which should take place by about 1960 by current estimates.

The realities of Stalinist society are known well enough to our readers. We do not intend, at this time, to once again parade the facts which demonstrate that instead of socialism, what exists in Russia is a system of brutal exploitation of the working masses by a small ruling class of bureaucrats. We propose, rather, to re-emphasize once again the inseparable connection between the concept of democracy, and hence the struggle for democracy, and the fight for socialism.

As distinguished from other socialists, the Marxists have always carefully avoided the tempting pastime of constructing Utopias in which are laid down "blueprints" of a rationally organized society. They have contented themselves, rather, with stating only in the most general terms those conditions for such a society which could be scientifically extrapolated from the study of the social behavior of people under historically experienced circumstances.

In his little book *State and Revolution*, Lenin attempted to gather together and present in systematic form the schema worked out by Marx and Engels for these conditions. Writing in the heat of a developing social revolution, he sought to clarify for himself and for the conscious workers the fundamental guiding lines for their action once state power was in their hands.

The final goal is described more in terms of the possibilities envisaged for the development of the individual than in terms of social organization. Thus Lenin quotes Marx:

"In a higher phase of Communist society, when the enslaving subordination of individuals in the division of labor has disappeared, and with it also the antagonism between mental and physical labor; when labor has become not only a means of living, but itself the first necessity of life; when, along with the all-round development of individuals, the productive forces too have grown, and all of the springs of social wealth are flowing more freely—it is only at that stage that it will be possible to pass completely beyond the narrow horizon of bourgeois rights, and for society to inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs!"

But for this stage in the development both of production and of human beings to be reached, democracy must first have become a natural way of life to the whole of society. The abolition of private property in the means of production is a vital step in the realization of full democracy, but it is only a step. Democracy, as Lenin puts it, "signifies the formal recognition of the equality of all citizens, the equal right of all to determine the structure and administration of the state." But real democracy wherever there is universal suffrage. Complete democracy can exist only when this formal recognition of a right becomes an actual exercise of a function when "every one really takes part in the administration of the state."

The rise of Stalinism on the ruins of the Russian revolution has inflicted a terrible series of defeats on the socialist movement throughout the world. Equal to the physical defeat and destruction of socialist movements on both sides of the iron curtain has been the ideological confusion and disorientation introduced by Stalinism, to a point at which many socialists have lost the essence of the basic ideas for which they strive.

Thus, there are anti-Stalinist socialists today who will deny vehemently that socialism has been established in Russia, and even more vigorously that the stage of full communism, as it was sketched by Marx and Lenin, lies a few years ahead. Yet these same people will claim that because the Stalinists have abolished private property in the means of production they stand closer socially and historically to the establishment of socialism than do the workers in the capitalist democracies. Thus, despite their opposition, they fall into the ideological trap prepared for them by Stalinism.

Socialism and democracy are inseparable concepts. On this we stand with Marx and Lenin. As Stalinism abolishes all democracy, it is the mortal enemy of socialism and cannot possibly be a deviant and unforseen road to its development. Our struggle for democracy, conducted against both its Stalinist and capitalist enemies, is part of our struggle for socialism, and the struggle for socialism is, for us, the struggle for real, living, full democracy.

NOT IN THE HEADLINES...

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, minority groups, national and world politics—\$2 a year.



LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 39 September 24, 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

SCIENCE VIEWS THE FUTURE, by James B. Conant.—The New Leader, September 17.

A bit of frank crystal-gazing by the president of Harvard University who is also a prominent chemist. Politically, he predicts an eventual "great settlement" without world war, based on a general understanding that "no one can win" in an atomic war. This realization will have been preceded by a military-political stalemate produced by the re-arming of the capitalist powers.

"It is easy to be defeatists about the prospects for peace and freedom and to forecast the future only in terms of a global war. I have ventured to do otherwise and with all sincerity. To my mind, the prospects are far more hopeful than they were two years ago. The peoples of the free world have been awakened from their dreams of an easy peace, they have faced up to the realities of the mid-twentieth century. Before long, they will be armed and ready. When that day comes, the fear of Communist aggression will cease to haunt Western Europe. When that day comes one can begin to talk about a real settlement of the international situation."

Before this ending, the author predicts a number of changes in the power and food sources of the world. Atomic energy is much less likely to become the basis of industry than is solar energy.

"The practical utilization of this inexhaustible source of energy, together with the great changes in the production of food, has already had enormous effects on the economic and hence political relations of nations. With cheap power, the economical production of fresh water from sea water became a reality. The use of new techniques has made the world food situation in 1949 something quite different from what it was fifty years before."

"... The changed attitude toward population dates to the year 1951 when Nehru advocated the establishment of birth control clinics in India and 1961 when the biochemists made available cheap and harmless anti-fertility components to be added as one saw fit to the diet. ... The attitude of religious leaders of the world on this subject, so they say, completely altered without any diminution of religious feeling."

WORLD POLITICS

Brazil 1951: Vargas Works With Bourgeoisie; SP Follows Vargas

By V. F. MADEIRA

RIO DE JANEIRO, Aug. 29.—As was expected at the time of his election, President Vargas has doffed his demagogic mask and has integrated himself with bourgeois policy on the domestic field and with the U. S. imperialist camp on the international field. To be sure, he tries to drive somewhat harder bargains than did his predecessor Dutra, as was shown at the last Pan-American Conference of foreign ministers.

The outbreak of a crisis among his labor supporters has been restrained by the amorphousness of his mass support, by the impasse in the international working-class movement and by the relatively favorable economic conjuncture in Brazil today, in spite of the gap between prices and wages.

The bourgeois political forces have gone through a process of regroupment, as was also foreseen. Dutra's party united with Vargas in the Congress to support his administration, while the liberal UDN (National Democratic Union) plays the role of his majesty's opposition.

The most typical representatives of the big industrial bourgeoisie have taken possession of the leading posts in the centralized state apparatus which rules Brazil's economy. Virtually the whole of the Brazilian ruling class has solidarized itself with Vargas.

didates in the last election by its majority leadership [see LA, Nov. 20, 1950] marked the loss of the last opportunity to refit the SP to perform even the first and most elementary tasks of the socialist movement in the country.

With the failure of the Socialist campaign, the party managed to elect only a senator and a deputy, both of whom reneged on the program which was drawn up by the left wing. They were both elected in alliance with Vargas supporters in their respective states.

SP DECLINES

The SP, which in its beginning was a largely petty-bourgeois, semi-Stalinoid and semi-liberalistic grouping has declined more and more through electoral corruption. Through the agency of the parliamentary elements the influence of Vargas' demagogic movement has replaced the former influence of Stalinism and bourgeois liberalism. The former Stalinoid and liberalistic elements found, in the parliamentarists, the strong men capable of keeping the party out of the hands of the "Trotskyists."

The "socialist" senator and deputy cover their line with socialist turns of phrase. They explain

that the masses are with Vargas; the SP has to meet them halfway; its role must consist of pushing Vargas to act in accordance with the aspirations of the masses that voted for him, and of pushing Vargas to break with his capitalist environment. In a speech in the Congress, the "Socialist" deputy, Orlando Dantas, even drew a comparison between Vargas and Macdonald's Labor government of 1931 in Britain!

Dantas and the senator, Domingos Velasco, have a paper of their own, which does not belong to the party, and socialist elements may not write in it. In it they mix a fantastic cocktail of "socialism," demagogic slogans, petty-bourgeois nationalism and Christian-socialism. Velasco is a Catholic and he is against the law which is presently being discussed in the Congress to permit the right to divorce in some special cases not recognized by Brazilian law. Velasco also approved the appointment of the well-known Peronist agent in Brazil, Batista Lusardo, as Brazil's ambassador in Buenos Aires, on the ground that "U. S. imperialism is against such an appointment!" The leadership of the SP has refused to join even the reorganized Socialist International.

Read About Socialism!

- THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISMpage \$1.00
by Max Shachtman cloth 2.00
- SOCIALISM: The Hope of Humanity 10¢
by Max Shachtman
- MARXISM IN THE U. S. 35¢
by Leon Trotsky
- PLENTY FOR ALL: The Meaning of Socialism..... 25¢
by Ernest Erber
- THE ROLE OF THE PARTY in the Fight for Socialism (mimeo'd) 25¢
- THE ROLE OF THE TRADE UNIONS: Economic Role under Capitalism (mimeo'd) 25¢
(Both mimeo'd pamphlets for 40¢)

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Youth and Student Corner

Stalinist Youth Paper Supports Injustice of Student Deferment

By GERTRUDE BLACKWELL

The Summer 1951 issue of *New Foundations*, a publication which "especially affirms its friendship to the Stalinist Labor Youth League, portrays the deferment of students from the draft as a partial victory "wrested from the war planners in Washington." The deferment of students, however, does not represent a blow, partial or otherwise, against the war program, but is an essential step in the direction of a permanent war economy. Those who can only see that student deferments result in students being kept out of the army and consequently announce it as a "partial victory" are analyzing the problem in the most superficial manner.

Students are not being deferred from the army because the administration has any particular sympathy for their personal situation. Military leaders who supported the deferment plan have a special role in the military program for students. This may result in students being deferred from the draft but it does not signify that students will be exempted from an important status in the armament program.

A permanent war economy requires military manpower but it also has other more specialized needs. Modern warfare requires scientists, technicians, and propagandists to man its military machine. There is today no shortage of manpower for the American military forces but as numerous educators have pointed out, there is a shortage of trained personnel. Drafting of students from the colleges would tend to aggravate this situation.

Manpower vs. Technology

American imperialism cannot hope to overcome the Stalinist advantage of vast manpower reserves. Together with the satellite countries Russia has an overwhelmingly superiority in the size of its population. American military strategists must concentrate on improving their already existing superiority in technology. In order to meet the needs of its expanding armaments program, American capitalism requires in addition to large military forces, an army of trained specialists. The deferment of students reflects the long term thinking of military planners who understand this necessity.

In addition to the training of technicians, other types of specialists are needed. America is attempting to wage an ideological war against Stalinism, a war to win the peoples of Europe and Asia to its camp. For this task it requires propagandists who are politically educated with an understanding of national problems and history. One has only to scan recent educational news to become acquainted with the large numbers of new courses being offered in Russian history, Asiatic problems, seminars on a comparison of capitalism and communism, and the like.

American capitalism does not intend to exempt students from its military program; it is attempting to give them a status in it which will correspond to its special requirements. This is the real basis of the student deferment.

Students: Privileged Minority

There is, however, another reactionary consequence of the student deferment. A letter to the *New York Times* of April 10, 1951 by Kenneth R. Kurtz, Pennsylvania regional president, United States Student Association states, "Talk of an 'aristocracy of brains' is insignificant when compared with the 'aristocracy of wealth' which we now have in our educational system." This letter is reprinted in *New Foundations*, and accompanied by an article in which the writer contradicts him, stating that "Students do not constitute a privileged class, but big business which makes fabulous war profits does." For a publication which ostensibly has the interests of American youth at heart and vehemently declares that "youth demands a right to education," this is a remarkable statement.

College students in practically every country in the world, including capitalist and Stalinist, represent if not a class then certainly a privileged group. A young person from a wealthy family has little economic difficulty in attending college. A poor youth, however, even in those limited areas in the United States where free higher education is available, must make inordinate sacrifices to obtain a degree. The American student body is dominantly composed of children from middle and upper class families.

Kurtz points out that "for every student who attends our colleges, another student, equally qualified, is unable to go purely because of lack of finances." Thus, for every student deferred, a non-student must take his place in the army. It will be this student, who is "unable to go purely because of lack of finances," who will be drafted.

The social origin in this case may determine the life or death of the individual involved. The brunt of the deferment of students will be felt by sons of working class families.

There is another group in society, however, which will suffer specially from the deferment of students, a group

whose rights the Labor Youth League pretends to espouse. Are not Negroes discriminated against in institutions of higher education. The discrimination against young Negroes is greater than against impoverished young whites. It follows, therefore, that the young Negro will suffer most from the deferment of students because he will be least able to obtain a student deferment. The sons of "big business which makes fabulous war profits" will find it relatively easy to achieve student status. Not so, however, for the Negro youth who will have little choice but to be drafted into America's Jim Crow army. The editors of *New Foundations* did not deem it necessary to discuss this consequence of the student deferment.

In Kurtz's letter he states that "To those who oppose the plan (of student deferments) because of the fact that it works hardships on those who are qualified for college, and cannot attend for other reasons, mainly financial, I would only reply that my idea of democracy is not to bring everyone down to a lower level, but instead to raise all up to the highest level."

It seems elementary reasoning, however, that if all youth could suddenly find themselves financially able to attend college, there would be no deferment of students since the manpower needs of the military forces would require greater numbers of youth than would be available outside of the student body.

A Justification for Injustice

Even more important, this is a typical argument which seeks to justify a present, concrete injustice in the interest of an abstract ideal. We will certainly fight "to raise all up to the highest level." But while this fight is going on, we will oppose a procedure by which those who have already been placed on a lower economic level are given one more kick down the ladder.

The *New Foundations* article points out "We must fight on until all youth and the whole American people are deferred from the war program." We intend to carry on that struggle, but one of the ways in which our struggle differs from that of the Labor Youth League is that we do not regard as "partial victories" measures such as the deferment of students which serve only to strengthen the long term needs of American imperialism and adds to the existing discrimination against working class and Negro youth.

The article calls for making "our voices heard for peace" by "forums," "debates," etc. If the LYL wishes to make its voice heard for peace by debating its position on the student deferment with us we would be only too happy to assist the cause of peace, in our own way, by accepting.

IN THE ACADEMIC WORLD

Man Bites Dog - - Hurrah!

CHARLOTTESVILLE, Va., Sept. 17.—Dr. Colgate W. Darden, president of the University of Virginia, relieved Dr. Homer G. Richey of his assignment as Assistant Professor in the Woodrow Wilson School of Foreign Affairs today, on the recommendation of nine members of the Council of Deans.

The action came after the rejection of charges of left-wing bias made by Dr. Richey against John Gange, director of the foreign affairs school, and Alfred P. Fernbach and Charles Micaud, two associate professors. The charges had been rejected for lack of evidence, first by vote of a faculty committee, and last Friday by the action of the full membership of the Board of Visitors.

President Darden, in a letter to Dr. Richey, criticized "the manner in which you have attempted to arouse the passions of people already deeply troubled and apprehensive over communism against your colleagues, the school of which you are a part, and the university, under whose control it functions."

—Special dispatch to the *New York Times*

Next-A Labor Party! by Jack Ranger

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

25 cents a copy Order from:
Independent Socialist Press, 114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Triple Crisis of Zionism and

(Continued from Last Week)

By HAL DRAPER

III

The Ideological Crisis

Like (I) the political-partisan antagonism, and (II) the nationalist antagonism in the Zionist movement, the present ideological crisis also arose automatically with the fact of the existence of Israel. As we have explained, what is involved is the very reason for existence of the Zionist movement as a distinct movement, in the diaspora.

Before Israel came into being, the mission of the Zionist movement was clear: to work for the creation of the Jewish state. The non-Zionists did not support this aim, would not do so, and certainly would not contribute money to do so. But now, with Israel in existence as the Jewish state, virtually all in the Jewish community (not to speak of many non-Jews) are for aid to Israel, aid to its development, and interested in how the U. S. government treats it.

Of course, the Zionists can claim, probably with justice, that they are the best and most singleminded supporters of Israel, but this is hardly reason enough for the Zionist movement to continue in its present forms. Why not dissolve, for example, to give way to a broader "ginger group" of both Zionists and non-Zionists—that is, actually, a group not based on the Zionist ideology, in which the former Zionists can still be the spark plugs—if it is the broadest aid to Israel that is the object? This is what the soul-searching is about.

It is very clear that a large section of the Zionist movement has in fact decided that there is nothing for it but dissolution. This section is not heard from in the discussions that have raged because it consists of those who have already voted with their feet; for example, the more than 80,000 who quit the Zionist Organization of America in the last year or two.

In an important programmatic article in which ZOA leader Emanuel Neumann went through the problems before the World Zionist Congress at Jerusalem, to-be-or-not-to-be is the first question he raises (*Zionist Quarterly*, summer issue). "We may now proceed on the assumption that the question has been answered in the affirmative," he says reassuringly, while indicating that "doubts were entertained by some leading personalities in Israel—men who only yesterday had held positions of highest responsibility in the movement."

A REASON FOR EXISTENCE?

It is easy to answer in the affirmative but to find a reason for existence is harder. He presents two: (1) "a strong Zionist movement in the diaspora, with high morale, is indispensable to the state of Israel, for an indeterminate period," because of the state's precarious position. But as pointed out, a broader "Society of Friends of Israel" could be even more effective by dissociating aid to Israel from Zionism as a special movement, to which much of the Jewish community is antagonistic. And (2) "a vigorous Zionist movement is equally essential from the point of view of Jewish life in the diaspora, its health and vitality, its spiritual bond with Israel and the bracing sense of world-wide Jewish unity." Here again there is nothing distinctively Zionist.

The same is true with all other proposals heard for what Zionism can do today: community work, cultural work, etc. They are simply irrelevant to the basic problem. An organization like the ZOA might continue to exist in some such way for some length of time but not meaningfully as a ZIONIST organization.

"The time has come," writes Neumann, "for the World Jewish Congress to be merged with the Zionist movement, which can take over its functions as an important branch of its activity." It would seem to be more logical the other way around, to dissolve the Zionist movement into the broader organization, on the basis of Neumann's perspective!

But Neumann is aware there is another answer, which was indeed the answer which was shored before the noses of the American Zionist delegation at the Jerusalem congress. That is:

that the Zionist movement today can only be a movement, primarily and overwhelmingly, to bring all the Jewish people back to Zion, which is now incarnated in Israel—a *halutz* (pioneering emigration) movement.

This, of course, has always been viewed as one task of the Zionist movement, but only as one task, and especially in the U. S., a minor one. American Zionism has been primarily "philanthropic Zionism." Its day is over; such philanthropy could be distinctively Zionist yesterday; today it is not.

During the congress sessions, the Jerusalem Post took a bitter jibe at this type by quoting the definition of a "Zionist" as "a rich Jew who gives money to another Jew to help a poorer one go to Palestine." Reflecting the Israeli point of view, it is quoted bitterly and contemptuously. Now the Americans are wondering whether they can even be philanthropic-Zionists.

This soul-searching has been going on since 1948 but it was raised to new intensity and sharpness by Ben-Gurion's visit to these shores—on that occasion (at long last before catching the boat) when he finally appeared before a gathering of Zionists. He laid the meaning of Zionism before them, punctuated with table-banging. A Zionist, he told them, is a Jew who identifies himself fully with Israel by giving up all his allegiance and loyalties to the country of his birth or domicile and settles in Israel with his wife and children; no one can describe himself as a Zionist so long as he and his family remain living outside Israel!

If the American Zionists thought that this was a personal crotchet of his, they found at Jerusalem that the overwhelming majority of the congress agreed with Ben-Gurion, across all party lines. For convenience we shall refer to the "Israeli" point of view versus that of the Americans, but it was not limited to the Israelis. It was the Americans who were out of step and virtually isolated there on this question.

It has not been sensibly answered by the American Zionists, unless feeble squirming can be called an answer. They know they want to be Zionists and they just know that emigration to Israel is unthinkable for them—that's for the poor Jew who needs a refuge—and they find it hard to adjust themselves to the notion that there is a contradiction. But on the other hand, they also can see that their own view is no longer the basis for a movement.

In a very interesting article in the *Student Zionist* for February, the president of the student Zionist organization explains how his group groped its way through the question, spurred to quicker decision by the fact that, on the campus above all, lack of a clear viewpoint meant immediate disintegration. The viewpoint they came out with was that the organization could continue to exist only if its reason for being was to orient youth toward emigration.

While this is a basis for a movement, he rightly explains, it means a much smaller movement than before. But it is something.

But this decision cannot simply be made merely for lack of any alternative reason for existence. The whole situation brings the Zionist up before the question: Has this in fact, whether we recognized it or not, been the real meaning of Zionism all along, the rest being auxiliary or peripheral? If this is what is left of the Zionist ideology, what was that ideology?

"INGATHERING OF THE EXILES"

What is left of the Zionist ideology is indeed its heart and soul. What stares the American Zionist in the face, clearly for the first time, is indeed that which has always been the essential basis of the Zionist ideology, now no longer overlaid by rationalizations. From the Marxist viewpoint, it is no new discovery. For many Zionists, it is. It took the creation of the state itself to confront them with it. Their crisis consists only in the fact that they refuse to look it in the eye.

Ben-Gurion is reported to have said in New York: "I deny that there is a crisis in Zionism. There is a crisis—in some Zionists." In a sense, he was right.

That which is left of the Zionist ideology, and which has always been its essence, is summed up in the Zionist slogan "The Ingathering of the

Exiles." The Americans heard this phrase more often in two weeks in Jerusalem than they had in the U. S. in years.

Earlier this year an American Zionist commission headed by Israel Goldstein got up a new draft "Jerusalem Program." Its formulation of the task of Zionism was "to further the speedy ingathering into the state of of Israel of all Jews who wish to go and live there . . ." (*Congress Weekly*, May 28.) But they did not even try hard to get away with this sidestepping formula at the world congress. The slogan of the Ingathering of the Exiles rent the air at Jerusalem.

WHO ARE THE EXILES?

What "exiles"? Who are the exiles? World Jewry—the "Jewish nation." The tribes (Zionist term) were dispersed but are now to be rescued from the diaspora. The tribes have been in Galuth and are now to be brought "home" from their exile. This is the mission, the law, the constitution, the reason for existence for Israel, as Ben-Gurion said. Without this, Israel has no Zionist meaning.

Does that mean we all have to go to Israel if we are to be good Zionists? The American delegates were given a minimum program on this. Not that they were totally absolved from personal "self-fulfillment." Golda Myerson, in her rebuttal to Rabbi Silver, declared that "if American Zionist leaders had come to Israel and settled there after the state was established, it would have been an 'inspiring example' of immigration for American Jewish youth." (JTA, Aug. 20.)

At a press conference before the congress opened, Silver was asked whether he planned to settle in Israel; he countered with "Do you need another rabbi?" The smart retort was fittingly answered at the congress by an Israeli General-Zionist leader (anti-religious) who suggested to him that he come and establish a reform-synagogue movement in the country.

But the Israelis did not insist on the condition of personal "fulfillment." Their minimum demands were: (1) Send your children; (2) make emigration the main task of your organization; (3) compulsory Hebrew education in the Zionist movement.

On the last, Ben-Gurion had declared: "No one can be a Zionist who does not feel the duty of educating his children in the Hebrew language. . . . Otherwise, neither they nor their children have any connection with the Jewish nation. A Zionist can either live in the state of Israel or he must at least live in that spiritual state of the Jewish nation which is the Hebrew language." Another Mapai leader urged the Zionist leaders overseas to Hebraize their names.

The Americans protested in effect: But these demands are impossible, absurd, unreasonable. You obviously don't know us Americans. Our American Zionists don't want to go to Israel. There's no use you or us agitating them. They just won't.

Your job is to change that, to "Zionize" them, they were told.

The Americans protested but all they had to say, stripped of bluster, was: The Americans won't go because they're comfortable, secure and better off where they are . . . which is a perfectly good reason, for a non-Zionist.

THE TALMUD TO THE RESCUE

It is difficult to say which side was and is more outraged by the other's viewpoint. But it is not difficult to say which has a right to be outraged from the Zionist viewpoint. The Americans were saying in effect: Zionism is all right in theory—for some poor Jews in other places—but not when it's a matter of exchanging the fleshpots of America for the hard realities of Israel. Their first and last argument remained something like the Talmudic one which Neumann had quoted in his pre-congress article, from Mordecai Kaplan:

"Nothing can be more fantastic than to assume that a considerable proportion of American Jews can be persuaded to migrate to Israel. The Talmud enunciates the principle that an ordinance by which the majority cannot possibly abide should never be issued. Such an ordinance creates an unnecessary sense of guilt. It is destructive of peace of mind and soul. To find fault with Jews who are satisfied to make their permanent home outside Israel is to violate that sound Talmudic principle."

It would seem from the reports that among the American delegates only the president of Hadassah had the guts to blurt out in so many words what they believed: "We cannot accept the concept that we are in exile." But the Americans accepted the "exile" concept for the others! "Exile" apparently is only where they won't let you live. . . .

Most of the Americans were discreet enough not to be as plainspoken. They gave and give lip service to *halutzuth* and *aliyah* (emigration to Israel) but, resting on "realistic" grounds, mostly claimed to be helpless before the reluctance of their ranks. It was only thin concealment for the fact that they agreed with the ranks.

The Israelis blasted away. Dobkin of the Jewish Agency pointed out that the neglect of the *halutz* movement in the U. S. was illustrated by the fact that a

the Jerusalem Congress — II

single youth center in Brooklyn had a larger budget than the entire *halutz* movement in the country. It was reported that only 7000 immigrants had come from the U. S., Britain, South Africa and Australia since the creation of the state (and we do not know whether this figure includes those who later left).

"Zionist parents [in America] tremble at the thought that their children might become infected with the idea of emigration to Israel," charged Dobkin. The Americans were informed, by Nahum Goldmann, that the Zionist Ingathering of the Exiles also applies to Jews in "free countries where they are not forced to depart for a safer area. . . . So long as a majority of the Jewish people remains outside Israel, Zionism's aims have not been attained. . . . The function of Zionism . . . is to 'Zionize' both the Jews in Israel and those outside the Jewish state."

We have to quote further from Goldmann, perhaps the outstanding non-Israeli in the world movement and furthermore considered a "moderate," for both of which reasons he was elected president at the congress. In the polemic against the Americans, the overwhelming majority at the congress made the meaning of Zionism crystal-clear.

"Take away the Galuth," cried Goldmann, "and you take away Zionism." He is referring to the concept that Jewry as a "nation" is in exile.

This was re-emphasized and hammered home in more than one speech. Goldmann again: "Galuth does not cease being Galuth because Jews are happy and well-treated there. Galuth is not measured by good or bad treatment."

A MYSTICAL CONCEPT

And he added: "Galuth is a mystical concept. If you deny that America is Galuth, you might as well deny the need for Israel." (My emphasis.)

Of course, this is the concept which is also behind Ben-Gurion's definitions of Israel as a state founded on the "Law of the Return." In his August 8 speech he had said: "A Zionist must himself come to Israel as an immigrant," as he had said in New York. And he made clear that this was no new interpretation: "From the beginning Zionism meant for us only *halutzic* Zionism"—that is, Zionism as a movement to return the Jewish "nation" to Palestine.

The concept is as "mystical" for the majority as for Goldmann. Goldmann's use of that word was not an aberration. Even Neumann—even Neumann, spokesman for the anti-Galuth Americans—had to put it that way (in the article above-quoted) in explaining why the philanthropic-Zionist Americans choose to direct their philanthropy toward Zionism:

"They [in America] were in dispersion but had little sense of exile. . . . They wish to further the cause not only as a duty toward Jews less fortunately placed, but out of a deep, if mystic, sense of obligation toward the Jewish past, of identity with Jewish destiny and the vision of a nobler future."

The view that the Jews of the world, and not merely the Jewish *yishuv* in Palestine, constitute a nation in the Zionist sense is a view which can only have a mystical basis.

What in non-mystical terms is the "Jewishness" which they have in common and which is discussed at such great length? Religion? Not for the non-religious, secular Zionists, though we shall see what is happening on this. Common persecution? Yes; but if this is to be the basis for the concept of *nationhood*, it is an inverted acceptance of the anti-Semitic view of the Jewish people as a "peculiar people" with whom the non-Jew cannot live. The fact is that the Jews, in their dispersion, have become even more varied than most imagine:

THE "NATIONHOOD" OF THE JEWS

This is rather spectacularly illustrated by a passage in Ben-Gurion's August 8 speech, thrown in apparently not so much for its relevance in the context but because even he had just been "shocked":

"I was shocked to the core by the seriousness of the problems connected with the absorption and fusion of the Dispersions, when I saw the abyss lying between two types of Iraqi Jews that cannot live together, the townsmen and the hillsmen. Now we have brought them together at Halsa and at Bet Lydd and they cannot live together even though they speak one language and come from one country.

"I met a Yemenite, a Tunisian and a Moroccan. They demanded that separate synagogues be built for them. I learnt that where a Moroccan prays, a Tunisian will not perform his prayers, even though both pray according to Sephardic rites, although their cantillation differs. The Yemenite told me that Yemenites need two types of synagogues, one for the natives of San'a and another for those originating outside San'a."

It is rather extreme, but still these are Jews who speak the same language, come from the same country, and practise the same Sephardic rites. Then there are the others. . . .

Persecution, distress and need are driving the many and disparate Jews of the Dispersions to Israel, and the Israeli leaders have cause to be appalled at the task of welding them into one nation; this was a task also for the United States with respect to the many-nationed immigrants who were driven to its shores by persecution, distress and need, in spite of the fact that the pre-history of the United States (in its colonial development) had already provided a base. But if it is a difficult task, it is because it is not a "one-nation entity" (Ben-Gurion's term) which is "returning home." The great majority are fleeing their homes.

The "mystical" concept which is at the heart and soul of Zionism (in spite of the American Zionists' disclaimer) is that of tribal blood-solidarity. For the Zionist (in greater or lesser measure depending on the degree to which the individual's Zionist ideology is diluted by concessions to

other ideologies), it is inevitable that this mystic sense of tribal blood-solidarity should be their overriding motivation.

To be sure, it collides with class solidarity, both for the bourgeoisie and the working class; and for the latter, both in Israel and in the diaspora Zionist movement, it is an alien and corruptive element in any attempt to build a consistent, genuine socialist movement. It collides with the solidarity of internationalism; and most specifically, it collides with the need for a policy of equality, toleration and peace with the Arab peoples. Scientifically, ideologically, philosophically if you wish, it does not have much to recommend it above the "Aryan" theories of the Nazi theoreticians.

RELIGION, THE NATIONAL CEMENT

The Zionists set as one of their tasks to "achieve the unity of the Jewish people." Aside from anti-Semitism, which is doing this job more effectively than they, the outstanding common element of the various Dispersions is religion. Religious Zionism has always been only one kind of Zionism among many, but as Zionist ideology boils down more and more clearly to its mystic tribal core, it is the religionists who feel their ideological strength.

More boldly than ever could the Religious Zionist (Mizrachi) caucus at the Jerusalem congress adopt its manifesto, calling for greater efforts to preserve religious values and traditions "which have always been and must continue to be in the future the main guarantee for the unity of the Jewish people throughout the world."

But that's the Mizrachi, who have always said so. It is interesting to read the following from a leading theoretician of the traditionally secular American Labor Zionist movement, in a pre-congress article entitled "Notes for a Labor Zionist Program":

"A religious designation to denote the totality of Jewish life in this country imposes the duty upon the Jewish community to adhere to certain mores and observe certain rituals which have their origin in the Jewish religion."

It is, of course, not the "religious designation" which "imposes" this duty. It is the Zionist's search for the elements of nationhood. He continues:

"The same duty should devolve upon the individual Jew. The voluntary acceptance of a minimum of observances must be his spiritual membership dues to the Jewish community, even as his participation in its budgetary requirements must be his financial dues. This is necessary both to preserve Jewish identity in this country and to integrate the American Jewish community into the unity of Jewish peoplehood. We are approaching a time when the Jews of the world will no longer have a common living language. The cultural barriers between the Jews of one land and those of another are getting higher every day. In proportion as a Jewish community becomes integrated into the affairs of its native land and shares with the rest of the population fundamental values which do not belong to the Jewish legacy, the factors contributing to the fragmentation of the Jewish people will be strengthened. Only the preservation of meaningful Jewish traditions, the observance of Jewish holidays and folkways, and the fostering of modern Jewish culture and education, centered about and supplementing the creative efforts of Israel, will prevent Jewish disintegration." (C. Bezalel Sherman, *Jewish Frontier*, June.)

By "disintegration" he means assimilation. Sherman, no doubt, wishes the "observances" without the them, making of them not a ritual for the unseen God but a ritual for the hard-to-see nationhood. But in dealing with masses, as the Israeli leaders have to do, it is easier to eliminate the subtle distinctions. In Israel itself religion and religious observances play the role of a NATIONAL CEMENT. We have no doubt that Ben-Gurion and the secular Israelis have little personal sympathy for many of the excesses that characterize Israeli society in foisting religious practices upon all the people; but if there is less separation between church and state in Israel than almost anywhere else in the modern world, that scandalous fact is not solely due to the pressure or influence of the Mizrachi or the rabbis. It performs a nationalistic function.

At the Jerusalem congress, there was an attempt (most particularly, apparently, by the Mapam delegates) to put the Ingathering of the Exiles on another and seemingly less mystical basis. Mapam delegates repeatedly, while supporting the majority thesis in favor of the liquidation of the diaspora into Israel as the goal, direly "warned U. S. Jews that they might meet the fate of some European Jewish communities, which ignored the call to Zion and perished." The state of mind of the American Jews was compared with that of the German Jews before the rise of Hitler. Come to Israel, they argued in effect, because anti-Semitism will get you in the long run anyway.

DANGER OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Only a Lessing Rosenwald or his co-thinkers might deny the gross reality of this danger; it is surely true that anti-Semitism in the West may yet rise to the heights of Hitlerism. But this horrible prospect is only a part of another, with which it goes hand in hand: the deterioration, totalitarianization and brutalization of capitalist society in decay on the one hand and of Stalinism on the other. But the Mapam delegates were not making their point in order to urge a fight against anti-Semitism; their argument was: Flee from anti-Semitism, flee now before it is too late!

It is the theory of the inevitability of anti-Semitism. This theory can have only one of two bases: (1) The working-class, socialist and democratic forces in the world are inevitably doomed to defeat; or (2) anti-Semitism is inevitable as long as Jews live with non-

Jews, for reasons which cannot be less mystical and "tribal" than those we have already discussed. And as far as Mapam is concerned—it considers itself to be "left socialist" (actually Stalinoid)—it hardly subscribes to the first thesis. If any do, one may ask how much of a haven can be provided in such a world by Israel, which is surrounded by hostility even today.

Actually, the motivation of this argument is, again, an inversion of anti-Semitism itself: there is "something about the Jews" as such which makes persecution inevitable. . . .

At the Jerusalem congress, on this question of the Ingathering and emigration to Israel, a compromise had to be reached, as everyone knew in advance. Ideologically, it was a rotten compromise, as it had to be. The Americans accepted the formula "Ingathering of the Exiles" as the task of Zionism—with their own rationalizations in mind. But the draft formulation had read: "the redemption of the Jewish people through the Ingathering of the Exiles." They bogged at tying up the Ingathering with redemption, and the latter was struck out, in order to achieve a unanimous vote (the chauvinist Herut delegates abstaining). Furthermore, the document was represented as the "tasks" of Zionism, not the "aims" of Zionism, the latter being held over for the future.

THE EXPANSIONIST GOAL

We must mention, in addition, another aspect of the declaration adopted which did not figure in the debates (as far as the reports have shown, pending the verbatim minutes). But it appears in the text. Set as the task of Zionism is "the Ingathering of the Exiles in Eretz Israel."

"Eretz Israel" is not the state of Israel. It is the whole of Palestine, that is, all of the land which the Zionists from the very beginning set as their homeland goal. It can be achieved only by expansion beyond the borders of the present state in conflict with the Arab Near East.

The use of this term in the document is not simply a nostalgic nod in the direction of a sentimental aspiration. Discussion of the use of this term as against simply Israel may or may not have taken place at the congress (though it certainly did in the commission which drafted the declaration). The difference is highlighted by what happened with the draft for a new program which was prepared earlier this year by an American commission and which we have already mentioned. This draft read "ingathering into the state of Israel." Writing in the *Congress Weekly* for May 28, Joseph Schechtman, a leader of the Revisionists who participated in the commission's deliberations, reports that he proposed to amend it to read "land of Israel" or Eretz Israel. He leaves no possibility for misunderstanding:

"The alert reader will easily discern the fine point of difference of emphasis in the term 'State of Israel'—a recently established, internationally recognized, sovereign territorial entity—and 'Land of Israel'—the everlasting patrimony of the Jewish people, the unique object of Zionism. . . . A 'Jerusalem Program' cannot disregard the wider concept of 'Eretz Israel' in its Zionist program. In this respect, 'Eretz Israel' is different from the State, which is bound to be the bearer of the legalistic, static interpretations of the term 'Land of Israel.' The Zionist movement can and must remain the bearer of the dynamic interpretation."

It was "Eretz Israel" that appeared in the congress document. It was the Revisionists and their allies who particularly insisted on it. Quite possibly, the others might have preferred not to make explicit the expansionist aims which cannot be divorced from the Zionist ideology; if its inclusion was a concession to the Revisionists or under their pressure, as may possibly though not certainly be true, that was not because of any opposition to the concept. The mystic tribalism of Zionism cannot help being implicitly expansionist.

As the ISL's resolution on Israel and the Jewish Question makes clear (it appears in full in the July-August issue of the *New Internationalist*), it is necessary to differentiate clearly between Zionism and its distinctive ideology and the need and desire of dispossessed Jews of the world for a land of refuge. There are many other questions that ramify from the issues which came up directly at Jerusalem, bearing upon the Jewish question and on Israel. Even in limiting this article to the present crisis of the Zionist movement and ideology, as mirrored at the world congress, it has not always been possible to leave unmentioned the important problems that arise tangentially. But in the discussion of all of these problems, the Jerusalem congress will be of historic significance, not because it solved them but for the opposite reason—because it made clearer than before the historic impasse of Zionism in the diaspora.

'VPERED'

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

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

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

End of the 4th International — —

(Continued from page 1)

regime, would be revealed as the new barbarism.

The manifesto has nothing to say on this score, either, it goes without saying. The very term—"counter-revolutionary Stalinism"—always so outstandingly prominent in its documents of the past, is not to be found anywhere in the manifesto. It has disappeared, because the idea that it summed up has disappeared from the Fourth International.

A REVOLUTIONARY FORCE

Introduced in its place, as was to be expected and as we foretold, is a somewhat different idea: *Stalinism is a revolutionary force!* The Fourth International has finally learned, we see from the manifesto, that Stalinism has already played a revolutionary role not only in Yugoslavia but also in China, where it yielded to "the pressure of their own ranks" and took power, thereby achieving the "first ringing victories of the Chinese revolution (which) represents the most important event in world history since October, 1917." (This new myth about how the masses forced the Stalinists to take power in China is passed right over the old myth that the Chinese Stalinists wanted nothing more than to capitulate to Chiang Kai-shek.)

China and Yugoslavia are not all. From *Vérité*, we learn that the *Secretary's report to the congress*, which was adopted by 41 votes to 2, "characterized the countries of 'People's Democracy' as having acquired, beginning with 1949, a clear physiognomy of deformed workers' states and recommended the defense of these countries against imperialism as well as a program of political revolution against the bureaucracy similar to the Trotskyist program for the USSR."

It could not be put more delicately. From 1949 onward, the Stalinist satellite states "acquired a clear physiognomy of deformed workers' states." Is it only the physiognomy of workers' states they acquired or did they get the anatomy along with it? If it is clear today, why was it hidden from the penetrating eyes of the Fourth International in 1949? Where did they "acquire" this clear physiognomy, and above all, how did they "acquire" it?

Before 1949, they must have had the physiognomy, clear or deformed, of capitalist states. The process of losing that physiognomy and "acquiring" that of a workers' state has always been known, among socialists and among anti-socialists, as the socialist revolution. Who was it that, in the dark nights between 1948 and 1949, presided over the "acquiring" and carried through this highly encouraging transformation of the physiognomy of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania (and Eastern Germany)? The Trotskyists perhaps? No, for if there were any they were imprisoned or shot during this physiognomical transmogrification. The workers perhaps? No, for they were reduced to totalitarian police-state slaves without power or even rights during this process. It was all done under the exclusive leadership of the Stalinists who thereby become, not counter-revolutionists, but champions and organizers of the socialist revolution—deformed, distorted, arteriosclerotic or not, but nevertheless, fundamentally, the socialist revolution!

If Stalinism has carried through the socialist revolution in a series of countries, there is no need and no justification for the existence of another and independent "world party of the socialist revolution," as the Fourth International designates itself. If it complains that Stalinism is carrying through the revolution bureaucratically, it has room for existence only as a "left" or "democratic" opposition within the Stalinist movement. That, in point of fact, is its orientation today to form just such an opposi-

tion inside Tito's party, which differs from other parties of the Stalinist type like a hen's egg from a duck's egg. Only God knows why it does not yet propose the same course in other Stalinist parties.

It has in reality abandoned the Fourth International and the premises on which it was founded. It has given up the struggle

against Stalinism as the totalitarian and counter-revolutionary reaction which Trotsky called it on the basis of his fundamental analysis. The extent to which it opposes Stalinism is trivial in importance and has no basic political significance. It has capitulated theoretically, ideologically and politically to Stalinism. That is

the camp it claims to be in and, given its political position, that is where it must be.

Stalin may congratulate himself on the capitulation of the movement once organized and inspired by the uncompromising Leon Trotsky. We congratulate ourselves on being the comrades of Trotsky's oldest co-fighter, Na-

talia Trotsky. She has remained uncompromising and, breaking with the Fourth International which has lowered a great banner into the swamp of Stalinist reaction, has reaffirmed the great faith in the independence of the working class and its self-emancipation.

To each his choice.

U. S. and German Rearmament — —

(Continued from page 1)

the price Western Europe pays for its political subservience to American imperialism.

Aside from the nightmarish problem of economic disaster, the question of first importance is German rearmament. Despite the fact that Germany is not on the formal agenda of the Ottawa conference, it occupies a center seat in the consideration of a West European army. But this is another one of the decisions that will be made by the Big Three, and communicated to the "other" nations.

The rearming of Western Germany over the past two years has developed into a major goal of American imperialism. It means more than organizing German troops into a European army, for the integration of the Ruhr into the military plans for Western Europe is at stake. The price the U. S. will have to pay is accession to the German demands for national independence from the occupation.

DEMOCRATIC DEMAND

This democratic demand has the support of the entire German population. That the military occupation of a modern industrial country is continued, and not merely defended today, but viewed as a more or less permanent state of affairs for an indefinite period, is an indication of the neo-barbarism of modern imperialist struggles.

If one were to read the headlines or listen to the radio commentators, the impression is created that the U. S. is acting with magnanimous generosity toward Germany, that Western Germany is being carefully nurtured back into the "community of democratic nations." As soon as the West Germans can demonstrate their ability to democratically govern themselves—the occupation will end.

The Big Three policy toward West Germany under the North Atlantic pact was enunciated in May 1950 in London. The policy of *occupation in permanence* in the London communique was quoted at length in the May 22, 1950, LABOR ACTION:

"This regime is imposed on the Germans and on the Allies by the consequences of the division of Germany and of the international position; until this situation is modified it must be retained in accordance with the common interests of Germany and of Europe. . . ."

"... the pace (toward ending the occupation regime) will be set by the rate at which Germany advances toward a condition in which true democracy governs and the just liberties of the individuals are assured. Therefore, the Western powers wish to emphasize most strongly that the natural desire of the German people to secure a relaxation of controls and the restoration of the sovereignty of their country depends for its satisfaction only upon the efforts of the German people themselves and of their government." (Emphasis not in the original.)

As was pointed out at the time, one of these two statements is a barefaced lie. There is no "iron curtain" to hide the fact that Germany remains under occupation "only" because of the military necessities of the U. S. and its imperialist rivalry with Stalinism. Germany is needed as an advanced base for American military forces in Europe and it has

nothing to do with the instituting of a democratic regime.

NO CHANGE

The changes in this policy resulting from the Washington conference of the Big Three concluded earlier this month are more apparent than real. In fact, no change at all. The occupation will continue in a slightly altered form—but the occupation will continue.

The Big Three will sign a "contractual agreement" with the Adenauer regime later in the autumn. The "contract" to be drawn up will be more restrictive than the Japanese peace treaty, but it contains the same basic feature—the stationing of American military forces in the country.

The reasons for the continued occupation were stated by the *New York Times*' direct pipeline from the U. S. High Commissioner in Bonn, Drew Middleton:

"This is not because allied policy, especially U. S. policy, does not accept the urgency of giving West Germany greater economic and political freedom. It is because the details of that freedom, to be delineated in a contractual agreement between the allies and the federal government, are a great deal more complex than many government officials realize; because there are differences between the allies on some of the details and, finally, because the Occupation Powers are not prepared to sign a contractual agreement with the Germans until, in return, they receive via a Bundestag vote positive assurances of German popular support, rather than government support, of a contribution to the defense of West Europe."

The first thing about this point of view is that it does not even raise the fig leaf of national independence but only of "greater economic and political freedom," even if all conditions set forth are met. It is a continuation of the policy of removing some of the "inconveniences" of the occupation.

POLITICAL BLACKMAIL

The last reason, "assurances of popular German support," is the blackmail that the allies are using in trying to force the Adenauer regime to go all out to drum up support for German rearmament. But when Adenauer makes a speech calling for complete national independence, he is criticized by the Americans for following a "popular" policy. The popular attitude toward rearmament in Germany today is opposition to it. The Germans do not want to be the doormat for rival armies in a Third World War. What the High Commissioner's office demands is that Adenauer pursue an unpopular policy.

The West Germans have been using the attempts to integrate them into the N.A.T.O. in order to gain greater concessions toward their national independence. The Free Democratic Party, the more right-wing party in the Adenauer government, has demanded a complete end to all economic controls as the price of participation in the Schuman Plan.

The simultaneous opposition of the Social Democrats, the Free Democratic Party and elements from the Center party to both rearmament and the Schuman Plan has elicited the iron-fisted warning from the High Commission-

er's office (as reported by Drew Middleton):

"... If this continues to develop as part of a general campaign to extract more sovereignty from the allies in the contractual agreement, the signing of that document will recede into the more distant future." (My emphasis—S. F.)

The "contractual agreement" planned at Washington calls for retaining the following interventions in German domestic and foreign policy: approve basic changes in foreign policy and trade practices that would adversely affect Big Three or N.A.T.O. interests; station troops in Germany; intervene if the government is threatened by "communist" or fascist regimes, govern West Berlin, and negotiate with the Russians over unification. In addition there would be a modification of the High Commissioner's post.

TWO CONDITIONS

However, lest these are not enough, the adoption of the "contract" depends on two further conditions: (1) West Germany must enter into the Schuman Plan whereby the control of steel and coal industries would pass out of German hands, and (2) Adenauer has to commit (presumably with "popular support"), the government to rearmament for fear that the Germans would back out once the "contract" was signed.

The Allied policy in Germany wants to assure the control of the government in the hands of a regime that will not change any basic policies that the Big Three has set for Germany. With easing up in certain economic controls, the old industrialist groups

that financed Hitler's rise to power are back again at the helm of German industry.

MILITARISTS ORGANIZE

Another result of the Big Three policy of rearmament has been the formation of a federated German veterans' organization. There has not appeared, as yet, any opposition to the formation of this group from the High Commissioner's office. Ostensibly set up to work for veterans' welfare and return of war prisoners, its real function is reported in a *New York Times* dispatch:

"... Allied observers here predict that the federation will perform a more important function for the federal government."

"Representing as it will the men whose support must be won, the government thinks, if the German defense contribution is to be successful, the Federation will give Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and his cabinet an effective sounding board of Allied suggestions on the form that the defense contribution will take."

This federated veterans organization has for its leadership those members of Hitler's Wehrmacht who are alive and at liberty. Representatives are there from every branch of the former German military forces, including the hated Waffen SS, Hitler's Elite Guard.

The coming back into active and influential political life of these reactionary groupings represents no victory for German democracy. The proposal of a "contractual agreement" instead of a real peace treaty for Western Germany guaranteeing national independence only represents another maneuver in the cold war.

Detroit Election — —

(Continued from page 1)

maries added to the bitter pill which labor's "practical" politicians are swallowing this week. After bragging how they would "knock off" Louis Miriani from top spot in city council, the aforesaid gentleman came out on top!

The UAW-CIO refused to endorse Rev. Charles Hill, a Negro, for councilman, because he was too left-wingish. He is in the run-offs, while John Mial, a UAW secondary official, who is also a Negro, and was put in the race by the Wayne County CIO, drew a miserable 11,000 votes, and he needed at least 40,000 to be among the top 18. Miriani got over 126,000! Hill had over 40,000.

The poor showing of Mial reflects the loss of influence of the UAW in the Negro community here, something we have commented about in previous articles!

SAVE FACE

However, the UAW leaders are still trying to save face instead

of facing the facts of life. In an effort to avoid any analysis of the debacle suffered in the primary election, they point to the fact that their endorsements for councilman candidates are in the run-offs, with the exception of Mial.

This may convince someone not familiar with Detroit's politics, but it isn't cutting much ice in political circles here, for all those councilmen endorsed by the CIO would have won without its endorsement, and all the real practical politicians in town know it.

Even Branigin is beginning to sense it, for he also has announced he is not "labor's candidate." This will not help him anywhere. The autoworkers are too apathetic and demoralized to care, while the real estate interests, the Chamber of Commerce, and the auto companies already have a conservative candidate to their liking, Mayor Cobo, so it is unlikely that Branigin will find support there.

What Is INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM?

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

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