

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 2, 1953

FIVE CENTS

NO DOUBLE BOOKKEEPING!

An Open Letter to the  
American Comm. for Cultural Freedom

... page 4

George Orwell's Education in Spain

... page 5

Harry Truman and History

... page 2

## Spanish Free Labor Unites

The New York office of the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims announces that it has received information from contacts in Spain and France of the formation of an anti-fascist united front among the free socialist and labor movements fighting the Franco dictatorship.

At a meeting in France on December 29, representatives of anti-totalitarian groups met to lay plans for united action. The Stalinists were not invited. The call was issued to "political parties of 1936," including the Federal Republicans, the Republican Union, the Left Republicans, the Catalan Left Republicans, the CNT (anarchist unions), the UGT (socialist unions), the Socialist Party, the POUM and the Basque Nationalists. The SP, UGT and Basques, which did not attend, are to be invited to the next meeting, states the announcement.

## The Anti-Franco Fight Is Up to U.S. Labor

By ALBERT GATES

As Spain's free labor organizations, suppressed by the Franco regime, take new steps to unite their struggle against the Madrid dictator [see box above—Ed.], responsibility falls more heavily than ever on the American labor movement. For it is this country that has supplied Franco with new sinews of strength to prop it up, and there is a job to be done here.

It is a good sign that both in New York and Chicago, as we write, there has been new activity in the work of the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims. The next issue of LABOR ACTION will carry a report on the Chicago anti-Franco rally being held this week.

The life or death of the fascist Franco regime in Spain is not solely dependent upon the inner strength of the ruling hierarchy. The Caudillo's government is one of the most corrupt the world has seen; it remains in power only because it has enforced its reign by force of arms and constant surveillance over the population.

If that regime is not as imposing as Hitler's, or even Mussolini's, it is nonetheless an authentic, fascist police state. It came to power through a military uprising against a legally constituted democratic government.

### U. S. THE PROP

Even that uprising might well have failed had not the Axis given military assistance to Franco at the same time that the Western powers adopted a policy of "neutrality" in this war. The embargo against Loyalist Spain by the West not only reduced its military potential but also played into the hands of Stalinism, which then proceeded to destroy common anti-fascist front by a campaign of extermination of all anti-Stalinists while posing to the world as the only great nation which assisted the struggle.

At every important stage of development in post-Civil War Spain, Franco's regime seemed about to split asunder because of internal stress, economic disintegration, political feuding and the persistent and debilitating poverty

of the land, the big powers have come to the Caudillo's assistance. He has been rescued by loans, recognition and readmittance into international affairs—most notably and in spite of its anti-totalitarian program, into UNESCO.

The United States has taken the lead (who else could?) in bolstering up this rotten fascist regime. It has done this by the simple expedient of providing loans in order to bail him out of his difficulties.

(Continued on page 7)

WHERE'S THAT "FRESH LOOK"?

## Eisenhower's "Forceful" Policy Makes Allies Leery

By L. G. SMITH

The Republican administration has been in power far too short a time to be able to demonstrate with acts an approach to foreign policy different from that of its predecessor. It may be useful, nevertheless, to take a brief look around the world for the purpose of assessing some of the major problems faced by the administration, and to discuss them in the light of the few hints which have been dropped by the new government on how it intends to handle them.

The major formal policy statement made to date by the president is his inaugural address. It has been hailed by the "internationalists" of the Democratic Party as a statesmanlike repetition and reaffirmation of the policies of the Truman administration in the foreign field. As Senate Democratic leader Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas put it: "It was a statement, and a very good statement, of Democratic programs of the last twenty years."

Actually, all that this means is that Eisenhower cannot escape the world posi-

tion with which his administration is faced. His speech was a statement of generalities from which it can be gathered that his government has no intention of withdrawing to an "American bastion" and leaving the rest of the world to take care of itself.

One way or another, the United States will continue its interventionist policy. The question, however, is: exactly in which way? And that cannot be answered by a reference to a world struggle between the "forces of good and evil," even when this reference is made by the president of the United States himself.

If there is any difference in the approach of the Eisenhower administration to foreign policy from that of Truman it will probably consist in an even greater reliance on America's military might as a factor in policy-making. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson was fond of emphasizing that America must "negotiate from strength." It is to be expected that a military man, surrounded by powerful corporation executives, will find this idea even more attractive.

This is the dominant theme in an issue of U. S. News & World Report entitled "The New America." It is emphasized by the symbol of the screaming eagle which appears on the heading of each article.

"It is an America grown immensely powerful," starts one article, "with great military force at its disposal, that Eisenhower is inheriting. That American military power from now on is going to be the pivot for new U. S. policies from one end of the world to the other."

"Moves that America makes in the world hereafter can be made from strength, not weakness. U. S. policies can be positive and forceful, not hesitant and uncertain. Fear can be forgotten. Calm confidence can take its place."

### GLOWING VISION

After a glowing account of American might, based on "thousands of atom bombs" and "fields which ring the Stalinist empire," the article goes on:

"In case Russia launches a dawn attack in another 'Pearl Harbor' against the Western world, for example, American jet bombers based on Greenland can strike back at Moscow and Leningrad before noon of the same day. Simultaneously, other bombers from U. S. bases in North Africa and from carriers in the Mediterranean can wreck the centers of heavy industry in Southern Russia by lunch time. Additional bombers from Okinawa, Japan, Britain, Germany, and

(Continued on page 4)

(Turn to last page)

## It's the Curse of Midas, Mr. Wilson, That's What It Is

By BEN HALL

When the Eisenhower cabinet came up for Senate confirmation, the legislators were introduced to a group of upstanding businessmen eager to perform their unselfish duty to the nation. A bit of inquiry revealed that they owned big shares in auto companies, oil fields, banks, real estate, shipping companies . . . a veritable roster of Poor's Register.

"How to keep these private interests from coming into conflict with public duties?" was the question posed by the magazine U. S. News. Truly, a problem. Especially since an inconvenient law made it awkward for them to hold some of their stocks and still grant the community their valuable services.

Thus to the assorted injustices that plague humanity was added "the plight of the wealthy man"—to cite the compassionate phrase of the same magazine.

America, however, was saved from the disgrace and disaster of having to dispense with their talents. But not without sacrifice . . . their sacrifice.

As C. E. Wilson told the Senate Armed Services Committee: "I really feel you are giving me quite a pushing around. . . . But I am just human, and my God, I am making a great sacrifice to come

down here." And to quote Senator Capehart of Indiana on Wilson: he is "a great American making a great sacrifice in order to serve his country." Capehart, by the way, is a Republican.

### FUNNY, HE SAYS

Wilson earned—let us agree to say "earned"—\$600,000 a year on his GM job or as much as the annual income of 125 GM workers. This he gives up.

His GM stock alone, to mention nothing of his other holdings, totaled \$2,655,060. It will cost him perhaps \$30,000 in fees alone to sell this vast amount of stock, or an amount equal to the annual income of 8 GM workers. But he will pay.

And he has held these stocks

for many years even while they skyrocketed in price because he has confidence in American business. And now he must pay 26 per cent of the increase in the form of taxes when he sells. But he will pay.

And when these vast deductions are made, he will be left with mere cash—an annoying prospect to thoughtful capitalists in days of inflation—equivalent to the combined annual earnings of almost 1,000 workers in his auto plants. (That is, his former auto plants.)

When asked how he accounts for his success, he will undoubtedly explain, as he explained to the Senate Committee: "Now actually, it sounds a little funny, maybe, but I have been a great believer in our American system. [Why no, Mr. Wilson, it doesn't sound funny.] I have figured that if I worked in my job, the system would take care of me, I sort of neglected my own affairs, really, in a certain way—but they did pretty well because I worked at the things I was supposed to be working on."

And in the same spirit of neglect of self-interest, Wilson joins the government service. These sacrifices he perpetrates upon

# LABOR SCOPE

## DISCUSSION: IS CIO-AFL LABOR UNITY IN THE CARDS?

By WALTER JASON

Two important recent events indicate that despite the talk about labor unity, the next period may see greater rivalry between the AFL and the CIO.

The breakfast meeting and ceremonial speeches of George Meany and Walter Reuther are far more calculated to appease the urgent desire of the ranks in both major organizations for unity than to prepare the way for one united organization.

**Instead of the much needed united front against a Republican administration, there are signs that the top leadership of the AFL is permitting itself to be the conscious weapon for the weakening of the CIO.**

George Meany recently told *Newsweek* magazine that he was against the reorganization of the United Policy Committee, which marked the high point of cooperation between the AFL and CIO in recent years. Such a working together, of course, would have set a proper atmosphere for the fusion of the two organizations, based on mutual understanding and united interests.

The rude and unprecedented rejection of Walter Reuther's plea for an under-secretary of labor by the Eisenhower administration, through Martin Durkin, the AFL man who is secretary of labor, and the subsequent appointment of another AFL man for that post was a sign of the times. The AFL hopes to use its "in" with the Eisenhower administration to improve its position at the expense of the CIO.

### MANEUVER

The knowledge of the AFL that the CIO under Reuther's leadership faces difficult and stormy days, and that the CIO is far from united within, has stimulated the desires of the AFL bureaucracy to dominate the labor scene entirely, even at the expense of the millions of industrial union workers enrolled in the CIO.

"Cutting down to size" the CIO and Walter Reuther may appear as a shrewd tactical maneuver to the AFL bureaucrats, but in reality it is the weakening of the entire union movement that is in-

volved, for the weaker the CIO becomes, the less bargaining power the AFL retains. Its growth in the past decade has been due as much to the success of the CIO as to any drive of its own.

The same blindness that made them look on while the United Mine Workers took a beating at the hands of the Taft-Hartley Law under the Truman administration still beclouds the outlook of the AFL hierarchy. When the coal miners were fined heavily in court for violation of the Taft-Hartley Law, the entire labor movement retreated another step. Yet most AFL and many CIO leaders didn't mind seeing John L. Lewis "being put in his place."

During the eventful years of growth of the American labor movement from a mere 3,000,000 membership of the depression days to its present 15,000,000 figure, the outstanding characteristic of the top leaderships has been the narrow-minded outlook and rivalry that prevented genuine unity and the expansion of the union movement to at least double its present figure. Questions of power, prestige and revenue played a far greater role than the consideration of labor unity.

### SNAGS

**The very success of the union movement, in terms of organization growth, now operates to continue this deplorable situation. In the past fifteen years, the bureaucracy has lost its lean and hungry look of the depression days. The wealth and opulence of the union movement has given the bureaucracy a status in American society far beyond its early dreams. They never believed they could have it so good.**

Given this situation, it is hard for most people inside the union movement to visualize an amalgamation of the AFL bodies and the CIO industrial councils, with an indicated reduction of at least part of the staffs, since duplication of officers would not be necessary.

Many things are possible; but unity between the AFL and CIO textile workers union hardly fits in that category. The electrical unions are another case in point.

Organizational rivalries are greater than in recent years.

The fact that the basic question on which the CIO was formed against the AFL—industrial-unionism versus craft-unionism in the major industries—has been settled by history and removes the real source of the split, makes it difficult for the top leadership to justify separate organizations. Thus more eloquent speeches for labor unity may be expected. Negotiations may also begin in the next period.

### CHALLENGE TO CIO

Meanwhile, as the new CIO president understands, the AFL is going to do its best to weaken the strength and prestige of the CIO. Capitulation to the AFL rather than genuine working unity based on a common fighting program seems to be the aim of the AFL leadership.

For President Reuther the challenge of the CIO is its ability to organize some of the millions of still unorganized workers, above all to make a success of a Southern drive, after ten years of retreats and defeats at enormous cost.

The ability of the UAW-CIO to organize auto shops in the South and new war plants built by the auto corporations suggests that results along this line are realistically possible.

**Another factor that enters into this situation is the attitude of the CIO leadership toward the "second-class citizenship" which seems to be its lot for the next period in Washington, as compared to the AFL. An adamant stand and a clash with the Eisenhower administration would soon make the position of Martin Durkin as secretary of labor quite untenable; it would become obvious as a "winnow dressing" affair.**

It remains to be seen which course Walter Reuther follows. Building the CIO and rejecting the second-class citizenship status in Washington would strengthen Reuther's hand to force serious labor-unity negotiations. Caution and skillful retreat simply would weaken the CIO further, no matter how cleverly Reuther concealed it.

# Harry Truman And History

By GORDON HASKELL

Harry Truman has left the White House. He has played his big role on the stage of the nation and of the world. As every pundit has pointed out, only history can render a full verdict on his administration and on his personal contribution to it.

We are not concerned, at this moment, with an assessment of his administration. LABOR ACTION has analyzed it in detail while it was in power [see particularly our special issue on the Fair Deal, May 5 last] and we stand by that analysis. But the occasion of the departure of Truman from the presidency seems a fitting time to take a look at a narrower problem which can perhaps best be put thus: Who was Harry Truman?

That question was asked most widely when Franklin D. Roosevelt died, and the vice president, the little senator from Missouri, took his place. To wide sections of the leading people in the labor movement, to the liberal heavy thinkers in general, and to many rank-and-file citizens it seemed almost inconceivable that anyone could fill FDR's shoes, or even his office. And least of all did it seem to them that the job could be done by Harry Truman.

Truman was the incarnation of "Mr. Taxpayer" or "Mr. Citizen" as he appears in a million cartoons in our daily papers. His manner of speech and dress, his tastes and intellectual achievements, his attitudes and convictions and bewilderments seemed to be those of every small businessman, politician or attorney. And in his first years in office the only thing which seemed to distinguish him from the average was his tendency to speak out regardless of the consequences.

### "BIG MAN"

**But gradually Harry S. Truman seemed to take on stature. He and no one else made the final decision to drop the atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The very size of the explosion, the historical consequences of the act, were enough to make it appear that no ordinary man could have unleashed such a force.**

The office of the presidency is such that no one can hold it without doing big things. But despite this fact, although Truman's stature seemed to grow as he remained in office, it never really reached president-size until he won the election of 1948.

Just winning the election would have made him a bigger man than he was before when he inherited the job. But the circumstances under which he won it added cubits to his size. He stumped the country. He "gave 'em hell." He refused to give up when everyone else had thrown in the sponge—including some of the wisest and most experienced of our liberals: He spoke the language of the common people, and he told them what they wanted to hear. Of all the men in public office whom labor has called its "friends," Truman was the most open in accepting and working with and even wooing the labor movement's support, both in 1948 and 1952.

**With every big decision made by the government during the ensuing four years, Truman seemed to grow. He submitted budgets to the Congress running into the tens of billions of dollars. It takes a big man to ask for so much money, does it not?**

### IN SCHOOL

His messages on the State of the Union and on the economic past and future of the nation were quoted and commented on in all the papers, and reprinted in full in some. The views of ordinary men do not receive such treatment, do they?

At one time he appeared before both houses of Congress and asked that the railroad workers call off their strike or be drafted into the army; at another he issued a ringing denunciation of the steel barons.

He ordered the Marshall Plan and its successors into existence; he issued an executive decree ordering the setting up of a subversive list which really launched the political witchhunt in this country. He decided that the armed forces of the United States should enter the war in Korea. Ordinary men, little men, can't do things like that, can they?

We do not contend that Harry S. Truman is the same man today he was eight years ago. His grasp of national and world events has increased, and he has acquired a finer touch. There can be no doubt about it: the presidency of the United States is a great educational institution for any man who occupies it. Who knows—it may even be able to do something for Eisenhower.

**Yet, if ever there was an illustration of the relationship between history and the individual who occupies a key historical post, Harry**

(Continued on page 7)

## Clear It with the Legion, Says Hollywood

### Jose Ferrer and Huston Beg Absolution but the Patrioteers Are Gunning for Chaplin

By VICTOR SAVAGE

LOS ANGELES, Jan. 19.—In the past month the City of the Angels has witnessed two attempts, only one successful, by the American Legion to ban the showing of motion pictures in local theaters.

The first attempt was made the week before Christmas in connection with the premiere showing of the John Huston-Jose Ferrer picture "Moulin Rouge." Two days before the opening movie-town gossip Hedda Hopper warned her readers to expect trouble at the premiere. She had it on good authority that the American Legion was going to throw a picket line around the theater and that if this was the case she was not going to go (what's bad for the Legion is bad for Hedda).

**Her tip proved to be right for the Legion's "anti-Communist" pickets were well in attendance. From all accounts the only first-nighter who refused to cross the picket line was that symbol of popular American Culture, cowboy star Roy Rogers, who was obviously well aware that his action would be an example for all good American youth.**

### THEY CRAWLED

In spite of the pickets the film has enjoyed a fine run. But what amazes one was the fact that the picket line was thrown.

The lines of communication between various branches of the Legion must be in terrible shape, for John Huston and Jose Ferrer had both confessed penitence for past sins and had asked for and received absolution from Legion Director of Public Relations James O'Neil in New York two weeks in advance of the opening. Even George E. Sokolsky had absolved them in the pages of his column.

Three weeks later this fact was made known, somehow, to Pasadena's Lewis K. Gough, national commander of the American Legion. Speaking at a joint meeting of Pasadena's Kiwanis Club, the Chamber of Commerce and the American Legion at the Masonic Temple he told his audience that:

**"Their [Huston and Ferrer's] present attitude toward Communism shows satisfactory progress and they are indicating the type of cooperation we have requested in the past. They both indicate they will go all the way with us in fighting Communism and in this we want to encourage them and cooperate with them."**

The pickets were withdrawn. The motto "If at first you don't succeed try, try again" must have been in the heads of the local Legionnaires for on January 15 the Fox West Coast Theaters canceled the scheduled January 21 opening of Charlie Chaplin's new picture

"Limelight" at their three first-run houses.

This obsequious cancellation was ordered by the major circuit when they were advised that the American Legionnaires and others would picket and boycott the film.

Soon after "Limelight" was booked theater executives were briefed by officials of the Motion Picture Alliance (this was the group that awarded their Americanism medal to would-be fascist youth fuhrer Robert Munger, founder of U. S. college MacArthur clubs and a young Smithite, calling him a "young Lincoln") on the Legion's ban on Chaplin and of his alleged "red front" activities.

### NEW CENSORS

When pressed for an official statement on their witchhunt action the circuit made it known that it was not in the mood to be made a "guinea pig" to test Los Angeles' reaction to Chaplin or the picture.

**It was further learned that the distributor of the film, United Artists, would not seek additional booking here "until the picture is cleared by the American Legion" (Herald Express, Jan. 15) and that it "would withhold release of the film until investigation of Chaplin by the Department of Justice in regard to his re-entry into the**

United States is completed" (L. A. Times, Jan. 16).

Regarding this action National Commander Gough had this to say:

**"This is the same point of view expressed by the American Legion last October when we officially urged, withdrawing presentation of this film until the issues were determined and we commend both Fox and Loews, Inc. for their action."**

These reactionary methods speak for themselves in this day of witchhunting and subversive lists. They clearly show how strong the Legion has become as a quasi-official police censor.

They also show that private enterprise is no champion of even the elementary right of the people to see what they want to see. The first time the motion-picture industry circumvented this right was when it accepted the self-censorship system of the Hays Office, along with the resulting loss of quality to their product which was the end consequence.

What integrity and quality there is left in the industry will surely sink further if it accepts the censorship of the Legion. It will be no consolation, in this case, to see the disgusting spectacle of directors, writers, producers, and actors going before the Public Relations Director of the Legion to repent and beg for clearance.

# ISL Launches 1953 Fund Drive - Pitch In!

By ALBERT GATES  
Fund Drive Director

On February 15, the annual Fund Drive of the Independent Socialist League will begin. After a careful examination of the needs of the organization, the January session of the National Committee of the ISL voted to set the national quota of the campaign at \$11,500. The drive will last ten weeks, closing on May 1 with meetings and affairs on May Day.

### BUILD OUR PRESS!

In its official announcement of the Fund Drive, the national office of the ISL wrote:

"We approach this year's Fund Drive with our customary yearly debt to creditors and to your staff. The greatest burden is, as usual, carried by the national staff and it is able to bear this burden only because the Fund Drive relieves a considerable amount of the pressure on its individual members, though not completely. Our other creditors, you should know, also await our Fund Drive because that is when they expect a liquidation of our indebtedness.

They watch the weekly reports in the paper and make their demands upon us."

All of this, of course, will not come as news to our readers, friends and sympathizers. We could catalogue the dozens of reasons why the Fund Drive is indispensable for the continued functioning of the ISL and the maintenance of LABOR ACTION and the New International. But you are all familiar with them.

### YES, IT'S TOUGH

We should like to remind you, however, that the going gets tougher for us in this war-"prosperity" period. If there is a general prosperity based on a war economy, it certainly does aid the ISL and its press. The production of socialist ideas and the fight for socialism is never financially a prosperous endeavor, but never was the time more needful for it and at the same time so difficult. If you stop to think, if only for a moment, how many socialist periodicals remain in the country, you will see why nothing must be per-

mitted to endanger the existence of LABOR ACTION and the New International. They are pre-eminent in the field of socialist writing. Without them, the field of socialist thought and struggle would be barren.

### DIG IN

That is why we call upon everyone to assist us in our 1953 Fund Drive. The greatest burden in the Fund Drive is carried by the branches of the ISL and the splendid efforts of the Socialist Youth League. But they need your assistance and they have a right to call upon you to give aid to the cause of American socialism.

As you will see from the listing, the branches of the ISL and the units of the SYL are carrying the ball. They need the help of readers of LA. You have helped in the past; we know you will help us again.

Don't wait to make your contribution on the theory that the drive lasts for 10 weeks. As soon as you finish reading this appeal, send a contribution to the ISL, 114 West 14 St., New York 11, N. Y.

ISL BRANCH QUOTAS			
Akron	\$ 50	Pittsburgh	150
Streater	25	Reading	50
Buffalo	650	St. Louis	25
Chicago	1800	Oakland	500
Cleveland	200	Seattle	200
Detroit	500	Youngstown	100
Los Angeles	600	Indiana	75
New York	4000	Oregon	50
Philadelphia	250	SYL	1250
Newark	250	General	1075

### CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL's 1953 Fund Drive.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

# Voices Speak Up Among the European Population - S. African Resistance Gets Aid from Whites

### From The BULLETIN of Americans for South African Resistance

One of the most heartening developments in the South African resistance campaign has been the recent participation by white people in it. This is simply another indication of the way in which the Campaign has caught hold and has been growing.

Considerable publicity was given in the United States to the arrest on December 8 of Patrick Duncan, the son of a former governor-general of the Union, and of Manilal Gandhi, the son of Mahandas K. Gandhi. Along with them six other white people, seventeen other Indians, and fourteen Africans were arrested.

In this country the name of Manilal Gandhi is fairly well known, but that of Patrick Duncan is less familiar. A clipping from the November 28 issue of the Political Correspondent of Pretoria includes a statement by Mr. Duncan which indicates something of his point of view:

"We are approaching the greatest crisis in our history. It is no longer in the power of White South Africa to impose on Non-White South Africa discriminations based purely on color, not even by a drastic policy of internments, and within the lifetime of many of us our Non-White fellow citizens will be emancipated.

"All that is in the power of White South Africa is to choose whether the change will come with or without violence. If White South Africa turns today to naked force to preserve the present caste system it will be held responsible by history for the race war that will probably destroy our country.

"The African and Indian political movements are today pledged to the methods of non-violence. That is to say, they are putting Christianity into practice. They are refusing to consent to oppression; but they in their turn are refusing to injure their opponents.

"Such methods point to a future South Africa which will award equal value to persons of all colors, while at the same time allowing freedom to groups that wish to remain racially or culturally separate.

"I have had the honor to be accepted by the Indian Congress in one of their batches which will defy a law on December 8.

"I believe that the Congresses are in no way responsible for the recent sad riots. Since I believe in non-violence, I support the government in all legitimate action taken to suppress riots and to preserve life and property."

### NATIVES STIRRED

Mr. Duncan (on crutches as a result of a motor accident), Mr. Gandhi, and their companions were arrested for entering a native location near Johannesburg. The Rand Daily Mail of December 8 quotes Duncan further:

"The defiance campaign has done what no other African political move has done," he said. "It has brought in the ordinary Native man-in-the-street."

"What the Natives now wanted were new terms and cooperation with the Whites. Mr. Duncan told the press representatives that he did not see any particular role for himself in South African politics.

"But I look forward to the growth of the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress as a great responsible non-European movement."

"Dr. Malan's statement that the movement was Communist-inspired was incorrect.

"We know that there are Communists among them; but surely the fact that they have had to adapt themselves to passive re-

sistance shows that they are not calling the tune.

"If I thought this organization was Communist, I would not be prepared to cooperate with it."

"Mr. Swart's comparison of the movement to the movement of Mau Mau was not correct either. In the defiance campaign, not a single word had ever been said against the White man.

"He felt that, as an ideal, the old Cape maxim: 'Equal rights for all civilized people,' was a good one."

### SOME RESULTS

Other indications that the Campaign is being taken extremely seriously by whites are seen in several events. On December 9, the day after Duncan and Gandhi were arrested, four more white people were arrested. They were picked up on the charge, according to the New York Times, of "causing an obstruction by occupying post office seats marked 'Non-Europeans Only,' and refusing to leave when asked to do so." Among those arrested on this occasion was Albert Sachs, the son of E. S. Sachs, a trade union leader and author of the recent book, The Choice Before South Africa.

The total number of resisters who have been arrested to date, according to the New York Times of January 8, is 8,065. The City Council of Kimberley has been moved by recent events to enter into immediate consultation with representatives of the Africans, something which the Union government has refused to do. This certainly does not mean that any great concessions will be made, but it does reveal that broad sections of the white population are anxious to have some direct contact with the Africans.

### SUPPORT SPREADS

A recent letter from a representative of the South African Institute of Race Relations summarizes in brief points some major observations about the campaign. These observations are particularly interesting because the Institute is by no means a radical organization, and prior to June 26 urged the African National Congress to hold off on the launching of the campaign. His more important points follow.

"(1) Support for the campaign is spreading beyond the Cape urban areas.

"(2) A remarkable and unexpected aspect of it is the remarkable self-control of the resisters. We had expected that a long period of training would have had to be given.

"(3) The Movement gains much of its energy from younger men.

"(4) The campaign is training heroes and martyrs as well as leaders for future work.

"(5) The Port Elizabeth riot was not inspired by the campaigners or the African National Congress.

"(6) The African National Congress will have to be careful to keep control of the resistance movement, for if riots, etc., occur, the movement will get out of hand and break up.

"(7) To Europeans the campaign constitutes a great threat and it is likely to provoke strong resistance, particularly as few people will make the distinction between the riots and the campaign."

### SKEPTICS STILLED

Two other communications from responsible white people have come in which offer further light on reaction among whites to the campaign. One letter is from a correspondent in Cape Town:

"I myself am of the opinion that the campaign is growing in dimension. There was skepticism, indifference, or mild annoyance at one time among white South Africans about the campaign; it is still difficult for the whites, who, with few exceptions, have little personal contact with the non-Europeans here, to gauge the depth of resentment felt by the non-Europeans.

"South African Europeans, generally speaking, did not take the campaign seriously until the recent riots in Port Elizabeth, Kimberley, and East London, and Mau Mau trouble in Kenya.

"As far as can be ascertained in the absence of a judicial enquiry, these riots have no connection with the campaign. The African National Congress leaders both before and after the riots denounced categorically violence in any form. And there is no apparent reason to doubt their sincerity. The government has refused to set up a commission to enquire into the basic causes of the violence, but its spokesmen on public platforms attribute the riots to the resistance campaign.

They suggest a Mau Mau parallel as well, apparently to justify the strong measures they intend to take to stamp out the resistance movement. (They also blame Anglican clergymen, the United Nations, the South African Court of Appeals, the South African English press, the political opposition party, and other agencies of that sort, for the disturbances.)

"By international standards, there are not many liberal white people in South Africa. Of those liberals, a few seem to be increasingly sympathetic with the campaign. Others seem to have identified themselves more with their whiteness than with their liberalism since the riots.

"There seems little reason to believe that the government will agree to meet with the African leaders in order to discuss some of their demands, if by the African leaders you mean the African National Congress. On the contrary, government spokesmen have indicated that they might possibly be willing to talk to 'moderate' African leaders after they have stamped out disaffection, but that they would not consider talking to rebels, among whom they class African National Congressmen."

### BOOKS RECEIVED

- Received from the New American Library, publishers of Signet and Mentor pocket books, published January 28:
- The Age of Longing, by Arthur Koestler. Signet Giant, 352 pages, 35 cents.
- What to Listen for in Music, by Aaron Copland. Mentor, 160 pages, 35 cents.
- Episode in Palmetto, By Erskine Caldwell. Signet, 160 pages, 25 cents.
- Trouble in Tombstone, by Tom J. Hopkins. Signet. 144 pages, 25 cents.
- Moulded in Earth, by Richard Vaughan. Signet, 208 pages, 25 cents.
- Stripped for Murder, by Bruno Fischer. Signet, 144 pages, 25 cents.
- Reach to the Stars, by Calder Willingham. Signet, 160 pages, 25 cents.
- A Hero of Our Time, by Vasco Pratolini. Signet, 160 pages, 25 cents.

**Leon Trotsky's "STALIN"**  
The definitive biography of the Kremlin's master

This book is out of print, but we have a number of copies available for \$6.00.

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

# YOU and SCIENCE

## MORE ON SCIENTIFIC METHOD AND ESP

By CARL DARTON

The writer of a special column, turning out material at regular—and, too often, irregular—intervals, welcomes a reader who disagrees with his opinions as something of a windfall.

Comrade Coben's disagreement with us on ESP in the January 5 issue of **LABOR ACTION** appears to be on three counts: (1) we were too harsh and lacked discrimination in judging the scientific status of "extra-sensory" studies; (2) we tended toward the attitude of a class or "socialist" science; and (3) we did not condemn "official" science for being too conservative in its prejudices against new and novel ideas.

It will clarify matters to state that the article by Dr. Kennedy on ESP which we reviewed was part of a symposium on "Some Unorthodoxies of Modern Science" in the October 15, 1952 Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society. Also discussed were Velikovsky's astronomical theories as expounded in *Worlds in Collision* and the practice of "dowsing." Listed as a current unorthodoxy, but not discussed in detail, was the therapy Dianetics.

In addition, various scientists considered the proper means of validating scientific theories and beliefs. Anyone interested in resolving the disagreement between Comrade Coben and ourselves will find the above bulletin, at a dollar, a real book bargain. He will find also that our rejection of the scientific status of Dr. Rhine's work is shared by the writers therein.

Let us consider some of the points of Comrade Coben's objections. We "lumped together" telepathy, precognition, clairvoyance and psychokinesis. So does Dr. Kennedy. Dr. Rhine himself apparently considered all of these subjects of equal significance but investigated some more than others because of the "ease of experimentation." As noted above, the recognized scientists also had no compunction against throwing the Duke ESP experiments "in the same bag" as Dianetics.

### ANTI-SCIENTIFIC

On the question whether Dr. Rhine's experiments attempt to prove the passage of "thought waves," we feel that basically his work can be interpreted in no other manner. What does the term "extra-sensory" imply except the presence of mysterious non-material phenomena?

That science today recognizes that mental processes involve electrical and nerve impulses within the brain cells does not warrant the stretching of such concepts into "thought waves" between two individuals. Dr. Rhine himself seems to rule out the "radiations" of physics as an explanation.

More important yet in Comrade Coben's discussion is that he in-

fers that we are linking socialism and science together in a manner approaching that of a "class science." This we categorically deny.

The point we endeavored to make is that since our socialism is based upon a scientific analysis of society it is to our interest to combat all anti-scientific trends in society, in which category we, as others, place ESP. In so doing socialists may encounter no more and no less difficulty than they do in combating the enervating effects of religion.

This obviously does not mean that we must form anti-ESP cadres, etc.; nor is a "special socialist" attitude called for. We merely wish to expose irrationalism no matter with what pseudo-scientific veneer it may be covered.

Just as important also is the social role which the authority of "official science" may play. This of course is related to the question of authority in general. Though socialists are naturally rebels they can have little objection to submitting to the authoritative technical knowledge of the professions and trades. That under certain circumstances we follow the dictates of our doctor or our auto or radio mechanic, causes us no concern.

This principle we have followed in our column. Since we often touch upon other than our own special field of science and technology this resort to authority is absolutely necessary. If our efforts have any value at all it is because we endeavor to root our opinions in the fact and findings of recognized or established science.

### "ORTHODOXY"

We realize that, in considering what should be accepted as "recognized" science, one is walking on thin ice. Even the definition of science is an elusive thing. One definition, and a not altogether facetious one, is that it is what scientists think and do. The differing concept of "science" in Russia and the United States illustrates what can happen under varying social and political conditions.

However, over the years scientists have built up the experience and the principles by which to judge what is "good" or "bad" science. We are speaking of its interior value, of course. On the other hand, any "in-group" even in science can put too much emphasis on conservatism.

The defense of "orthodoxy" or authority in science is best expressed in the words of I. Bernard Cohen of Harvard University, one of the participants in the aforementioned symposium:

"Orthodoxy is a hurdle for every new scientific idea. This means that a scientific theory must have a considerable background of experimental data before it can be given any serious consideration. It must, above all, demonstrate by important results that it is

superior to the orthodox conceptions. As a result, orthodoxy imposes a process of selection, so that the number of new ideas that have to be considered by practicing scientists is considerably reduced. Had scientists no orthodoxy, and if they welcomed with avidity every possible idea that one might have, the scientific enterprise would be characterized by chaos rather than positive achievement and progress."

### QUESTION OF ENERGY

Does this mean that science turns its back on the new and startling? The whole history of science proves that this is not so. The new, however, must prove itself by established procedures that are included in the concept "scientific method."

Not that scientists any longer believe that there is One Scientific Method; rather they are realizing that each field of specialization or discipline must develop its own. However, the one unchanging element of all scientific method is rationalism. This, perhaps, is one of the few absolutes in science.

One additional quotation from the symposium (E. G. Boring, professor of psychology, Harvard University):

"The unorthodoxies come, and many of them go, and a few are absorbed into an orthodoxy which keeps changing with progress. It would not do for us to attempt to police enthusiasm, but it is important to understand it and its effects, to criticize it and to point out its dangers. Velikovsky may yet do us a service by becoming a paradigm for how a scientific belief is not to be induced, and Rhine, if I may here introduce my own opinion on ESP, may become the paradigm for the waste of energy when boundless enthusiasm is directed upon a poorly formulated problem."

We admit that in our original article we used the term "feeble-minded" in a somewhat loose manner when we described the mental status of those who engage in serious consideration of extra-sensory powers. However, the application of one's energy to the problem of ESP instead of one of the multitude of available fields of scientific research does seem to us to be quite foolish.

Future generations, socialist to be sure, may consider such interests as ESP as of no greater mental laxness than hydrogen-bomb research and far less dangerous. In any event it can be said that current ESP investigations lack social as well as scientific sense.

## AND IN THIS CORNER —

By PHILIP COBEN

I'm afraid I didn't manage to make my point of objection clear to Comrade Darton. Here it is again:

The "one aspect" on which I took issue with him was on "serious efforts to investigate the question" of ESP in the laboratory, an effort which he rejected in advance (that is, before scientific experimentation) as "itself proof of 'irrationalism,'" to be rejected by socialists.

I specifically stated that this issue "is quite apart from the validity of criticisms, by scientists such as Dr. Kennedy, of Dr. Rhine's procedures." That seems to me quite clear and the issue has nothing to do with most of Comrade Darton's rebuttal.

Neither "rationalism," the scientific method (One or Many), nor materialism rules out in advance (as Darton did) an open-minded inquiry into the possibility of extra-sensory perception. Scientific judgment must be reserved for all the evidence. Darton made it clear that he didn't need to wait for evidence to reject it because he already knows the answer, which he deduces a-priori.

He asks: "What does the term 'extra-sensory' imply except the presence of mysterious non-material phenomena?" That is a giveaway of the unscientific character of his approach on this point. The scientist's first job is to find out IF the phenomenon exists at all. Darton rules out the investigation because he knows beforehand that

# Curse of Midas — —

(Continued from page 1)

himself because, as he says, "I would like to be like Caesar's wife, you know, above any possible suspicion." America bows its head in gratitude.

Speaking of Caesar's wife—or in this case the wife of Caesar's wife—Mrs. Charles E. Wilson is a wealthy woman in her own right with total assorted stocks worth \$1,068,408. Of this, only \$709,408 worth is in GM stocks. But Wilson assures the committee that it will never influence him.

### FOR THE KIDDIES

Then, too, he is a family man worried about the future of his little brood of six children and thirteen grandchildren who deserve a little stake in life. Of course he will not sell all of his GM stock—some little he would like to give to them—not much, for he is a poor man.

As he told the senators, "I see no harm in giving them a little part of it. I cannot afford to give them much of it because I will have to pay gift taxes on it." Not much, only 20 per cent.

Wilson will forget that he ever amassed so impressive a fortune out of GM; he will cast the \$600,000 per year out of his mind; he will ignore the holdings of his wife and children and his children's children; he will dismiss from his mind the power he wielded, the generous bonuses and dividends with which he was showered. From now on, he will gaze upon the GM empire with a placid aloofness and an unflinching objectivity.

In his own words, as he empties the desk drawers in his offices in the GM building, "I have a sort of a feeling of nostalgia over it, because I have some marvelous friends in the company. Of course, they will still be friends of mine, I hope. I may see them socially or occasionally, but I will have no relationship with General Motors and the fine men who are running it would not want me to."

Ah yes, a man is only human. And then, too, GM contracts with the government are only five billion dollars or a very little more.

### YOU HAVE TROUBLES?

But try as he may, the man's money pursues him. It is the curse of riches.

Even after leaving GM, Wilson learns that he is still entitled to payments for years to come as follows: In 1955 he gets 604 shares of stock and \$203,585; in 1956 he gets 333 shares and \$130,793; in 1957, 195 shares and \$64,764.

Of course, Wilson brought to the committee's attention the fact that "as you see, the amounts are dropping off each year." But still, what to do with it all? He

if it exists it must be "non-material," and since the latter is impossible it cannot exist. Q. E. D. Surely that must remind one of something which was popular a few centuries ago.

Footnotes: (1) I never even mentioned the notion of "class science." (2) I know that enough authorities still lump the "unorthodox" Rhine with Velikovsky, Dianetics, etc. That is exactly what I was discussing. (3) I didn't ask him to condemn "official science." (4) The recommended book will not resolve the problem I am discussing. (5) I don't know how the question got in of relying on doctors and radio mechanics for their special knowledge. (6) Darton's new point is that investigation of ESP would not take priority over more important tasks. That may be true though it is irrelevant here. In any case, I wouldn't be interested in discussing what experimentation is worth how much energy; a good portion of the monographs in the technical journals might fall under such strictures, some of them ahead of ESP.

I myself do not believe the existence of ESP has been proved, by Rhine or anyone else. It is the methodological issue that interests me in this little argument.

can find no way to avoid the imposition.

Finally he agrees to go to extremes, but only after protest: "I really feel you are giving me quite a pushing around. . . . I will make one more commitment with you. I will take another look at it and if there is no way for me to dispose of it . . . any of this dividend equivalent that I receive in any increase in the value of the stock over the present market value, I will give it to charity. If I can't clean it any other way, I will do that. Is that satisfactory, sir?"

But the poor millionaires can never unload the heavy burden. After selling their holdings, they are left with enormous quantities of cash. While this may seem like a trifling problem to you and me, it is heart-rending to the rich man who hates cash and must have investments.

George M. Humphrey, the new secretary of the treasury, laid his plight before the committee: "If I sold everything, all my stock—and that would be a hardship—what would I do? Put the cash in the bank? Then I would have an interest in the bank. Buy government bonds? Then I would be in a position to influence the price of government bonds."

It is a 1953 version of the curse of Midas, indeed.

### NEW POINT FOUR

Senator Byrd sympathized with Wilson's similar plight: "I think maybe government bonds are going to be better investments than they have been," he remarked.

"I do not know just what a man can do," lamented Wilson, the poor millionaire. "I do not particularly want to go into the apple business, for instance." [Would one say this was an unkind cut at Eisenhower's great Republican predecessor in the White House?] "If there was a nice clean way without too much penalty for me personally to sell everything, I had and put it in government bonds, I would do it; but the penalty is too great, gentlemen, and I do not know why you should ask me to do it."

Just what can he do with this five-million-dollar white elephant in cash?

"Do I have to invest it in Canada, or Mexico, or some place else," he asked.

Excellent! He has it there. Just the thing!

Let Wilson invest a few millions in Canada or Mexico, better still in India or Germany. Then he can speak as a man with something more at stake than phrases when he urges them to join the great camp which fights only for democracy, civilization and Our Way of Life.

It will be the personal Point Four of our secretary of defense. He had confidence in the future of GM. Now he will display confidence in the future of Canada, Mexico, Europe, Asia. The possibilities are unlimited. It would arouse the world. . . .

Don't miss a single week of **LABOR ACTION**  
A sub is only \$2 a year!



## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 17, No. 5

February 2, 1953

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, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL  
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

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

Combination Offer!

## BOUND VOLUMES

(Completely Indexed)

For 1950

New International .....\$4  
Labor Action .....\$3  
BOTH .....\$6

Order from:

Independent Socialist  
League

114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

# Youth and Student Corner

## Stalinist Youth Show Doubts as They Get 'Clarified' on Russian Anti-Semitic Drive

By HENRY GALE

NEW YORK, Jan. 26—This evening the Labor Youth League (Stalinist youth group) held a public meeting to bolster the sagging convictions of its members on the recent wave of anti-Semitic trials and arrests in Stalinist Russia and its satellites.

Even before the meeting started we were introduced into the atmosphere that would hold sway inside. A few members of the Socialist Youth League were distributing last week's LABOR ACTION before the entrance while Stalinist hacks watched this activity apprehensively. Unfortunately for our worthy hosts, the backward nature of New York City climate prevented them from taking the kind of constructive action against this outrage which would have been indicated in an advanced People's Democracy such as Poland, and so they had to content themselves with posting a few budding GPU agents at the entrance.

After half of our SYL comrades had purchased tickets, these Stalinists suddenly woke up and refused the rest of us tickets to this supposedly public meeting. (That any of us at all were allowed in was no doubt due to the fact that the unfortunate ticket-sellers were grossly lacking in 'Communist vigilance,' if indeed they were not outright wreckers in the pay of Ben-Gurion.)

The main speech of the meeting was preceded by a short talk given by a leader of the Puerto Rican section of the LYL. This young man of undoubted good will informed the audience on the racist slander currently being perpetrated by the bourgeois press against the Puerto Rican 65th infantry regiment now in Korea.

The capitalist press, it seems, reported that this regiment does not fight as well as other American regiments. To socialist hearers, another question might have imposed itself: perhaps the charge reflects, rather, the unwillingness of Puerto Ricans to fight in Korea on behalf of their imperialist masters.

### FIVE LINES OF APOLOGY

Mainly, however, this talk aimed to create an amalgam of this press "slander" (about the Puerto Ricans' unwillingness to fight) and the "slander" about Stalinist anti-Semitism.

Contrary to our predictions, based on acquaintance

with the Stalinist doublethink technique, the main speaker, A. B. Magil, did not begin his lecture with the favorite Stalinist gambit—i.e., the Stalin Constitution states that there will be no discrimination, "outlaws" anti-Semitism, etc.

Instead he pursued five main lines of apology, mainly along the lines of "You're another!" The American bourgeoisie, which maintains its own Jim Crow system, is guilty of rank hypocrisy in accusing Stalinism of anti-Semitism; Zionism is not only "anti-Semitic" but also leads itself inherently to counter-revolutionary espionage activity (the first being 'proven' by garbled quotations from Herzl, Pinsker and Weizmann, and the second receiving no proof at all); it is not a question of anti-Semitism but of "anti Zionism"; the defendants were really guilty of espionage, etc., and this was basic to their prosecution (a line of argument flatly contradictory to the previous one, that they were convicted of Zionism); and lastly, anti-Semitism in Stalinland is inconceivable, since nowhere else in the world have Jews attained such heights.

The last point he sought to demonstrate by references to such leading Jewish figures as Rakosi (there is no doubt that, after Rakosi is purged, he will be able to find others—after all, there's always Kaganovich)—and by a really fantastic sophism: that the admitted failure of the Jewish autonomous region of Biro-Bidjan (in reality its liquidation) is a proof of the free status and contentment of Russian Jews.

### CONVENIENT "QUESTION PERIOD"

The "question period" at the end was managed in true Stalinist fashion. Instead of taking questions from the floor, in what some wreckers might consider the democratic way, ushers circulated among the audience and collected written questions which the speaker chose to answer or not, according to how accommodating they were to the line that he had just finished expounding. For example, although the socialists in the audience submitted a large number of questions, none were answered.

Instead, he discussed at great length the \$100,000,000 "Operation X" of the U. S. government, in response to a "question" asking him to "explain and clarify" this subject.

However, even in some of the obviously set-up ques-

tions, the real doubts in the minds of the audience came through. For instance, one question asked why so many of the defendants were Jews.

His answer was dumbfoundingly simple: These trials featured only a small group of spies and saboteurs; therefore, since they dealt with Zionist espionage, a large percentage of the defendants were Jews; however, this is only a small percentage of the total number of spies and saboteurs who have been captured in the workers' paradise; in the total picture, Magil stated, the Jews undoubtedly do not occupy a disproportionate part.

### CANKERS OF DOUBT

This of course leaves unanswered the question of the fate of these other spies and saboteurs. Haven't they even the right to a public trial? However, perhaps they can be content, for the time being, with Magil's assurance that their turn will come.

Another such question asked why there were no Western newspaper reporters admitted to the trials. Instead of answering, he merely rephrased the question with the hypothesis that there were no Western reporters in Prague who could attend what, he claimed, was a fully public trial. He gave no word of explanation why, even if there were no reporters in Prague at the time, they were not permitted to fly there from Vienna in a few hours!

That even such questions as these were chosen for answer shows the doubts that this anti-Semitic outbreak has injected into the consciousness of the Stalinists and their youthful periphery. Another demonstration of this was the unusually mild reception (for a meeting of this type) given to LABOR ACTION by the stalwarts present. Surprisingly few copies were ostentatiously torn up, and a majority of those distributed were kept and read by their recipients.

The effect of these trials and arrests on the large petty-bourgeois and Jewish New York City Stalinist membership and periphery was to be expected, but can very well be overestimated in view of the enormous capacity of these people for rationalization and self-deception. Nevertheless, such a meeting as this was evidence that the cankers of doubt have begun to eat their way into the Stalinist mind. More power to them!

## BOOKS and Ideas

### George Orwell: 'Homage to Catalonia'

# Orwell's Education in the Spanish Revolution

By ROBERT MAGNUS

Reading George Orwell's *Homage to Catalonia*\* (recently republished in an American edition with an introduction by Lionel Trilling), is a pleasant experience. Not because it is a great book, but because it is an honest book.

Great books about the Spanish civil war there are none. The number of dishonest books, even in English, would pave the streets of New York City. Orwell's modest contribution is a good example of what might have been accomplished by that cabal of journalists who "reported" the Spanish events; it stands out like pearls among the swine.

This work is not a systematic political analysis. Being in the nature of an eye-witness account of Orwell's experience as a POUM militiaman on the Aragon front and in the May Days in Barcelona, it is spotty and fragmentary, and does not even pretend to tell the whole story of the civil war. Yet there is more political insight in its few pages than in all the dank tomes written by the Anna Louise Strong's and the Louis Fischers.

"I am not writing a book of propaganda," says Orwell, and in truth the book fairly shines with his reticence for generalizations beyond his immediate experience and his hatred of fluff and bombast. This was enough to condemn it—in the eyes of Herbert Matthews of the *N. Y. Times*—as "one of the most damning to have been written and printed about the Loyalists." As a matter of fact, it is only damning to those habitués of the Popular Front who held the center of the stage not long ago and who have suddenly awakened to the "immorality" of Stalinism.

"I had accepted the *News Chronicle*-*New Statesman* version of the war as the defense of civilization against a maniacal

\*HOMAGE TO CATALONIA, by George Orwell, Harcourt, Brace (New York), \$3.50

The revolutionary atmosphere had vanished. Translated into *Liberalese* this would read: "The heroic popular enthusiasm which saved the republic from the hordes of fascism in the early days is now being replaced by Effective, Practical, Government-Controlled Action." This was the formula used by the liberals to cover over the profound social and political struggle which went on behind the Loyalist lines.

Orwell was not taken in. "The thing that had happened in Spain, was, in fact, not merely a civil war, but the beginning of a revolution. It is this fact that the anti-fascist press outside Spain has made it its special business to obscure. The issue has been narrowed down to 'fascism versus democracy' and the revolutionary aspect concealed as much as possible. . . . The central issue has been successfully covered up."

### AIR OF EQUALITY

The reason for this, according to Orwell, was that "it greatly simplified things to pretend that no revolution had happened. In this way the real significance of every event could be covered up; every shift of power from the trade unions to the central government could be represented as a necessary step in military reorganization. The situation produced was curious in the extreme. Outside Spain few people grasped that there was a revolution; inside Spain nobody doubted it."

Orwell at least could hardly doubt it since he had spent more than four months with the militiamen on the Aragon front. Today, in an epoch when socialism has been pushed back and totalitarianism threatens, his description bears repetition.

"I had dropped more or less by chance into the only community of any size in Western Europe where political consciousness and

disbelief in capitalism were more normal than their opposites. . . . However much one cursed at the time, one realized afterwards that one had been in contact with something strange and valuable. One had been in a community where hope was more normal than apathy or cynicism, where the word 'comrade' stood for comradeship and not, as in most countries, for humbug. One had breathed the air of equality. I am well aware that it is now the fashion to deny that socialism has anything to do with equality. In every country in the world a huge tribe of party-hacks and sleek little professors are busy 'proving' that socialism means no more than a planned state-capitalism with the grab-motive left intact. But fortunately there also exists a vision of socialism quite different from this. The thing that attracts ordinary men to socialism and makes them willing to risk their skins for it, the 'mystique' of socialism, is the idea of equality; to the vast majority of people socialism means—a classless society, or it means nothing at all."

### PROVOCATION

Orwell does a neat job of exposing the thick crust of lies which was built up around the May Days and the role played by the POUM (the left-wing socialist group) in this event.

"In the Communist and pro-Communist press the entire blame for the Barcelona fighting was laid upon the POUM. The affair was represented not as a spontaneous outbreak, but as a deliberate, planned insurrection against the government, engineered solely by the POUM with the aid of a few misguided 'uncontrollables.' More than this, it was definitely a fascist plot, carried out under fascist orders with the idea of starting civil war in the rear and thus paralyzing the government."

As a matter of fact, as Walter Krivitsky has shown, the seizure of the Telefonica was a deliberate act of provocation, engineered by the Stalinists under the command of the GPU and supported in one way or the other by all the bourgeois elements in Spain.

### TIME-TESTED

The POUM, then sunk in a morass of collaborationism, was far from aiming at a revolutionary seizure of power. The Anarchists, in the leadership of the majority of the workers of Barcelona, had retreated step by step in front of the developing counter-revolution. The May Days were a spontaneous and leaderless rebellion of the masses of Barcelona in answer to the provocations and outrages of the Stalinist party and the police.

Considering that the book was first published in 1938, that it treats the Stalinists (in line with the then current attitude) as just another "mistaken" working-class organization, and that it only deals with events in Catalonia from December 1936 to about June 1937, it is yet worthwhile reading from every point of view. Given Orwell's close connections with the British Independent Labor Party and the POUM, and his generally left-socialist, anti-Stalinist attitude, he was able to write an account which has stood the test of time and events.

Long out-of-print and scarce, but we have available a few second-hand copies in excellent condition—\$2.00.  
**Revolution and Counter-revolution in Spain**  
by FELIX MORROW  
Labor Action Book Service  
114 W. 14 St., N. Y. C.

# NO DOUBLE BOOKKEEPING!

## Open Letter to the American Comm. for Cultural Freedom

The Executive Committee of your organization, the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, has recently adopted a statement on "The Visa Problem" which deals with this limited aspect of the McCarran Immigration Act. The statement has led to much questioning by friends of the ACCF; and critics of the organization—we are concerned with the anti-Stalinist critics, of course—have been given reason to believe that their dim view of the committee's orientation is reinforced.

For it is the ACCF's orientation as a whole which is involved in this and not merely a particular stand.

We understand from the chairman of the executive committee, Professor George S. Counts, that the membership of the group will take up the Executive Committee statement. We believe they face a test of what the American Committee is, in their view.

The most important reason why the character of the statement has justifiably raised some eyebrows is that it refuses to take a stand on the notorious McCarran Act as a whole and, most especially, that it explicitly refuses to take a stand on "the general principles of the law."

Instead it merely makes some detail criticisms of only those provisions of the law which affect visas for visitors and some recommendations in this area.

The natural question is—why?

It has been all the more astonishing to many because the McCarran Immigration Act is scarcely a controversial subject among liberals of any stripe—or so we thought. The President's Committee report on the law is not a radical document nor by radicals, but it takes the McCarran monstrosity from stem to stern. In comparison the ACCF statement is . . . shall we say an evasion?

Senator Herbert Lehman is a liberal Democrat, but his denunciation of the act was a model of liberal indignation against an anti-democratic enormity, compared with the peculiar statement of the ACCF. His characterization of the law is before you for consideration, in terms which show that it is not only the visa provisions which concern the stated purposes of the ACCF:

The law, said Lehman, provides "an unfortunate occasion for the free world to note that the United States, in its immigration and naturalization policy, rejects the basic principles of freedom."

The law, said Lehman, "sets forth a triple standard of justice—one standard for native-born American citizens, still another for naturalized American citizens, and still another—and the most arbitrary and high-handed of all—for aliens and immigrants."

The law, said Lehman, means that "we say that equal justice shall be only for native-born American citizens; to others, procedures bordering on police-state methods may apply."

The law, said Lehman, involves "the question of racial discrimination. Shall our immigration laws make insulting distinctions between individuals on the basis of the color of their skin? Shall the law make a cruel differentiation between individuals on the basis of their national origin? . . . we have on our books a set of immigration and naturalization laws which are enough to shock any decent and fair-minded American citizen. These laws should make us hang our heads in shame."

The law, said Lehman, is "founded on the same principles and theories as were espoused by Hitler and Tojo."

Needless to add, Lehman is not the only one who has denounced the law in similar terms.

It may be that the very calm and objective political analysts of the ACCF's committee feel that Senator Lehman has been emotionally carried away—by what, perhaps?—but surely there is a challenge here presented to the ideals and objectives espoused in general language by the ACCF.

Then why has your committee elected to remain so conspicuously silent?

### The ACCF's Scope of Interest

Your executive director has vouchsafed us an answer on inquiry.

He explained that the immigration and naturalization body of the act as well as its "general principles" are outside the field of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom. He explained that "the ACCF is not a civil-liberties organization," nor, presumably, an organization set up on immigration problems, and that therefore it was concerned only with the difficulties experienced by scientists, professionals, etc., in coming to this country.

This simply doesn't make sense. Or rather, with this strange explanation, the American Committee for Cultural Freedom does not make sense. But in point of fact the explanation is contradicted by the whole of the ACCF's activity.

(1) Thus, if the ACCF must walk around the "general principles" and body of the racist McCarran Act because it "is not a civil-liberties organization," it is indeed peculiar that one of the pamphlets published by the organization is a pamphlet which deals with nothing but . . . civil liberties.

This is a pamphlet (Reprint No. 3) which republishes, for distribution by the organization, an article from *Commentary* entitled "Civil Liberties, 1952—A Study in Confusion."

We are not concerned for the moment with our opinion (detailed in *LABOR ACTION* for June 16 last) that this is an anti-civil-liberties article. It is, certainly, on civil liberties and nothing else. Nor is the difficulty over-

come when we note that the author of this article on civil liberties is also the present executive director of the ACCF, for surely the ACCF would not, for such a reason, make an exception which it would not make in the case of the somewhat more important McCarran Act. Nor can the explanation be that the article was so meritorious that someone had to reprint it in pamphlet form, since *Commentary* magazine itself has performed this service.

(2) Likewise: in issues of the printed *Bulletin* of the ACCF we find articles dealing with issues of justifiable interest for the Committee, which express quite categorical opinions.

There was, for example, one on the Willie McGee case—which opines that he was guilty, objects to the death sentence, and then swings into a denunciation of the Stalinists for abusing his case for party ends. Surely the McCarran Act is just as relevant to the ACCF's scope of interest. . . .

There was, for example, an article on the *Nation-New Leader* lawsuit which concludes that "Such an action [the *Nation's*] is incompatible with the tradition of a free market in ideas."

There was, also, an article describing the Congress for Cultural Freedom founded in India as an affiliate of the ACCF's parent body. The action of the congress which is headlined by the ACCF is "Indian Culture Congress Condemns 'Neutrality.'" . . .

We are naturally raising no question about the right of this body to express its opinion on "neutrality." The article even explained its connection with cultural freedom; for a resolution of the Indian congress (the only one chosen for quotation in the article) explained that "Neutrality is a danger, contributing to the weakness of the free political system, and therefore putting cultural freedom in jeopardy."

Again, we are not at the moment interested in discussing your movement's views on foreign policy, with which we disagree, but only in the fact that the ACCF suddenly gets very "narrow" in its concerns as a reason for tiptoeing around the McCarran Act.

### "Neutral" on McCarranism?

(3) Lastly: In startling contrast with this—perhaps new—limitation in the ACCF's scope, there are apparently no questions outside the field of "cultural freedom" when it is a matter of denouncing conditions behind the Iron Curtain.

We ourselves do not have the slightest sympathy with those sad specimens of "liberalism" and even sadder Stalinoids (not to speak of the Communist Party and its agents) who object to attacks on the Stalinist world as "contributing to the cold war" and who in effect cover up the crimes of the Russian regime. But we also can find no sympathy for those who keep a double set of books on the other side.

Thus the ACCF has no hesitation in condemning slave-labor in Stalinland, in speaking out against the Prague trials, in denouncing and analyzing every and any aspect of Moscow's totalitarianism. It does not stop short with only the "cultural" aspects of that tyranny, interpreted in some narrow sense.

We find, in fact, that even on the domestic scene, as in the cases discussed above under Points 1 and 2, the issues on which the ACCF is quite willing to go far afield from a narrow "cultural" interest are those issues which involve denunciation of Stalinism. It recognizes no boundaries here.

It reprints a pamphlet on civil liberties—although "it is not a civil-liberties organization"—when that pamphlet centers its attention on (what it represents as) pro-Stalinist influences among liberals.

It takes up the Willy McGee case because the issue involves the Stalinists.

It takes a stand on big issues of international politics like "neutrality" because it considers this part of the fight against Stalinism.

It carries an article about the *Nation's* disgraceful action because of the well-known Stalinoid influences on that magazine.

It really would not change the matter to remind us that the ACCF has also spoken out in some other cases, such as that of James Wechsler's banishment from TV. For surely you recognize that we are speaking of what is indeed the overwhelmingly emphasized orientation of the ACCF.

Once again we repeat—not to bore but to make sure no one can possibly misunderstand—that it is greatly necessary to expose the Russian totalitarians and Stalinist propaganda.

But if the American Committee is merely an "American Committee for Cultural Freedom BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN," while it treads gingerly in taking up the dangers to freedom at home, then two conclusions have to be frankly faced by its members:

(1) It is not primarily interested in cultural freedom, despite its title and high-minded stated aims, but in implementing the State Department's line all over the world, and

(2) For this very reason, it cannot even be an effective instrument in exposing the crimes of the Russian barbarians.

That is the crux of the issue that is highlighted by the "neutralist" position which has been taken on the McCarran Act.

In words at least, the manifestos and declarations of your movement do not leave room for such neutralism. Your manifesto, adopted at the international Congress for Cultural Freedom in Berlin in 1950, proclaims an interest in every question of democracy.

It addresses itself to "all men who are determined to regain those liberties which they have lost and extend

those which they enjoy." The congress "was organized to defend and uphold the values of our civilization," "to defend the principles of intellectual integrity and human solidarity."

Advocates of these great ideals cannot be silent on the McCarran Act, which is an enemy of human solidarity, which endangers the values of civilization, and which takes liberties away from our people.

**Above all, they cannot be silent merely because to speak out on THIS legislative crime, on THIS side of the Iron Curtain, will provide aid and comfort to the Stalinist propagandists who have their own ax to grind.**

For that is precisely the motivation (in reverse) of the liberal-Stalinoids whom you rightly condemn on grounds of simple honesty, truth and cultural integrity.

A pamphlet issued by the ACCF says: "We refuse to grant intellectual respectability to the active or passive accomplices of tyranny, terror and defamation."

You have the Stalinists and their dupes in mind, but it is a better statement than was perhaps intended. We recommend consideration of the meaning of "passive accomplice" of the McCarran Act.

An ACCF ad in the *New York Times* declared: "There can be no neutrality in the struggle for freedom of the human spirit."

Did this merely mean: "There can be no neutrality in the struggle for freedom in *Russia*" but not in the United States?

The ACCF wrote in an introduction to a pamphlet by Sidney Hook: "Whoever says he is neither for nor against Communism is really saying that he is not opposed to total cultural terror, to judicial frameups, to slave-labor camps, to absolute regimentation of thought, to international aggression and mass murder."

We agree with that sentence. And what is the ACCF "really saying" when it decides to be neither for nor against the "general principles" of the U. S. Congress's law against human solidarity?

### Yes, Put Freedom First!

The above is written on the assumption that the members of your Executive Committee, though refusing to take a stand on the McCarran Act as such, were and are "really" opposed to its heart and soul, its "general principles," its racist philosophy and provisions, its illiberal restrictions and straitjackets.

If this has been questioned to our knowledge—and it has been, in reports that some influential members of that body support the law as a whole—it is because your statement on "The Visa Problem" is written just as if these reports have a basis in truth. For the recommendations for change which you propose as a "practical and concrete" matter would not change the poisonous heart of the law, not even on the visa issue.

(1) It is true that "parts [of the act] are too vaguely worded" and that "This permits of almost any interpretation, and could be used to exclude practically anyone displeasing to a particular administration, party, faction, or even individual official."

But the same is true of most of your Executive Committee's proposed amendments! It recommends, for example, that the law should make separate requirements for temporary visitor's visas and for immigration visas. The former should be granted with least delay "unless there is reason to believe that the applicant intends to make use of his visit to engage in illegal or subversive activities."

Essentially that is just what the administration has been doing. At best, the proposal is merely for quicker action in the implementation of the act's wide-open and discriminatory principles.

It asks for other administrative exceptions also. In fact, after complaining that the act leaves too much room for administrative interpretation, it attempts to improve other sections by demanding that more should be left to administrative discretion than now!

It objects to another clause on the ground that its intent is "adequately executed" by other language in the law taken straight from the Smith Act.

Other proposals made would indeed improve the act—in details.

Your Executive Committee's main proposals for changes in the administration of the act center around better consular officials abroad to act on visas. It prescribes political qualifications for consuls which are not possessed by the leaders of the State Department! and it proposes this as a "practical" matter. . . .

Given recommendations for change of this order, it is understandable that questions arise about the views of influential leaders of the ACCF, whether or not the questions are justified.

"WE PUT FREEDOM FIRST," is the ACCF's slogan.

In its pamphlet of that title, the ACCF declares: "The task . . . is to change the present confused and poisoned intellectual climate. If we fail, we shall become guilty of a new *trahison de clerics*, and the responsibility before history will be ours."

We beg to make a slight amendment: A new betrayal by the intellectuals cannot be charged if they fail to change the poisoned intellectual atmosphere. It can be charged only if they fail to fight it, and most particularly if they contribute to poisoning the wellsprings of intellectual integrity themselves.

Of this, the "general principles" of the McCarran Act are a test, a test which the action of the ACCF Executive Committee has laid before the organization as a whole.

The EDITORS

# Vpered: On Moscow's Crises

The recently published issue of *Vpered*, No. 5-6 of 1952, is the first issue of this paper dedicated to an analysis of the current situation within the USSR as reflected in the materials of the 19th party congress, the new Five Year Plan, and Stalin's latest work on "The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR." The editors promise that in future issues of their paper there will be a series of analytical articles dealing with these problems.

*Vpered* is the organ, published in emigration in Germany, of the Marxist wing of the Ukrainian anti-Stalinist resistance, organized in the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party.

An article by Iv. M-ko, entitled "The Crisis of Dictatorship Becomes Acute," gives a general summary of the proceedings of the 19th party congress and deals with the new party rules of CPSU. Iv. M-ko states that the recent party congress was called together by Stalin especially in order to legitimize the new party rules which are to play an exceptional role in future party life.

The rules were invented by Stalin long before the meeting of the congress and none of the more or less important amendments proposed by rank-and-file members in the pre-congress discussion have been included. For instance, the congress did not include a proposal made by the Kharkov regional party conference to expel from the party anybody who may be characterized as a hypocrite and *Küttérer* before a superior party official. Iv. M-ko remarks that this is quite understandable, since otherwise Stalin would have to expel such hypocrites as N. Krushchëv who are well known as such in the party.

## ROT IN THE PARTY

On the other hand, the only amendment which the congress did adopt spoke of the duty of party members "to defend and strengthen the property of the state, the holy and untouchable basis of our system"—and the means, Iv. M-ko adds, of ruthless exploitation of the workers.

The new party rules have strengthened Stalin's dictatorship especially along the lines of the further amalgamation of the party with the state. Today in actuality there remains very little distinction between these two. But on the other hand the 19th party congress showed unmistakable signs of the acute crises which rot Stalin's party.

It was the first time in the history of the CPSU that a party congress broadly dealt with such questions as the corruption, moral rotteness, suppression of criticism, denunciations, embezzlements, bribery, hypocrisy, etc., of the members of the "most progressive" party in the world, of the "leaders of the world proletariat."

Iv. M-ko concludes that the prevalence of such vices in the party will inevitably continue because the party's absolute power over the people and the hierarchical structure within the party and within the whole society create very fruitful conditions for the spreading of such vices. "Stalinism marches to its end. It still lives only because the new classless society which has already been born under its shield is afraid of the threat of capitalist intervention "What Will the Representatives and Capitalist Restoration." Iv. M-ko says in concluding his article.

## IN UKRAINE

An article by Vs. Felix, entitled of the CP of the Ukraine Report

to the 19th Party Congress?" gives a thorough analysis of the political situation in this republic of the USSR before the Moscow congress. In fact it is not really an article but rather a digest of documents, facts, names, and figures, with some very far-reaching conclusions.

Vs. Felix points out that the CPSU, a couple of months before its Moscow congress, officially declared in its orders and central-press editorial articles that the "problem of the fight against Ukrainian nationalism is the central political problem of the present time and the main task of party members" (a direct quote from *Bolshevik*). In view of this problem and task the CP members in the Ukraine got busy with widespread propaganda to convince the Ukrainian workers and peasants of the evils of nationalism and the necessity to love the "older brother"—the Great-Russians.

For the first time in the history of the Soviet Ukraine the question of nationalities appeared in lowest cells of society: in the workshops, collective farms, workers' clubs, village "culture houses," in mass meetings of miners, Komsomol youth, in the lowest party and trade-union organizations.

Vs. Felix brings out an endless list of such cases, taken from reports in the local and central press, as in the lowest cells of society party propagandists made hundreds of thousands of speeches and reports on the question of the nationalities.

## WANT MORE SPEECHES

One figure will be sufficient here: according to the official report of the so-called Association for Spreading Political Knowledge, during the first six months of 1952 this body delivered 25,000 speeches and reports on the question of nationalities and "friendship with the Russian people," which were heard by 7,700,000 people in the Ukraine.

But just before the 19th party congress the Stalinists declared repeatedly that this was still quite an insufficient number of speeches, that there are still "very few" propagandists in the Ukraine, that the Ukrainian party organizations still pay an insufficient attention to this problem.

Simultaneously, during 1952, there began a purge of the Ukrainian CP. Vs. Felix lists scores of names of leading party officials on the regional level who were purged for paying little attention to nationalism or even for being nationalist-minded themselves. The purged party officials are replaced by new people sent from Russia who are Russians by nationality.

From an analysis of these facts, the author draws the conclusion that there is no "bourgeois nationalism" in the Ukraine, since there is no bourgeoisie. Stalin uses this label to slander the feelings of ordinary Ukrainian workers in order to compromise them and to frighten them with the possibility of capitalist restoration or fascism.

Today the situation is quite an unprecedented one. There no longer exists any "deviations" in the upper strata of society; those are almost completely terrorized, loyal to Stalin and to Great-Russian chauvinism. The rebellion grows from the very bottom of society and it is thoroughly revolutionary in its nature. It is not yet organized and, probably, even anarchical in its behavior. But this is only the beginning.

## THE RUSSIAN BOSS

Felix writes that the roots of this unorganized movement are in the social and economic contradictions of Stalinism as well as in its national contradictions.

What actually happens is the following: a Ukrainian worker or peasant sees that his superior, his boss and exploiter, almost always is a Russian-speaking bureaucrat who came to the Ukraine from

outside. He sees also that the product of his labor, be it steel or wheat, goes north to Great-Russia. His children, if taught in a Ukrainian university, are always sent to work to Russia, thousands of miles from home.

On the other hand this ordinary worker is no longer the illiterate and prejudiced person of the old tsarist regime. There no longer exists the "Ukrainian nation of villagers and foolish muzhiks." The workers and kolkhozniks read papers, listen to the radio, attend meetings, discuss politics.

## BEHIND THE NATIONALISM

In this way they learn at every turn that the party says that the "Russian people has helped the backward Ukraine in the whole course of the latter's history," that the "Russian nation is the superior nation in the whole world," etc. And he remembers his Russian boss, his steel and wheat which goes to the North, his sons who are sent to Siberia, etc.

The result is what Stalin labels "bourgeois nationalism." Stalin is not able to combat this popular movement, because in order to combat it he must liquidate the contradictions of his system. That is impossible. The flood of propagandists' words do not help at all, as the party reports show. On the contrary, they stimulate the movement.

The same situation, according to Vs. Felix's data, exists also in the other non-Russian republics of the USSR.

# The Anti-Franco Fight

(Continued from page 1)

Behind the powerful pressure campaign to assist Franco is a strong phalanx of reactionaries in the Senate, headed by Senator McCarran, and a powerful segment of American Catholicism. To them good and evil are determined by what one's attitude was or is toward the Spanish Civil War: good is represented by Franco and Spanish fascism, evil by support of the Loyalist government or opposition to Franco.

One of the most diligent and expensive lobbies that have operated in Washington in some years is the pro-Franco group. Its work was rewarded when Congress approved a \$62,500,000 loan to Spain in 1950. In 1951, a loan of \$125,000,000 was made through the Mutual Security Agency.

## SINISTER ROLE

These loans were granted precisely when a great mass struggle was occurring in Spain and the opposition to the regime was expressed in the outbreak of strikes. The fact that people were ready to strike in a nation with a police regime is evidence enough of how unbearable conditions remain for the mass of people. Jail, terror, death—nothing could stop this wave of protest and opposition to Franco.

The sinister role of Washington's Spanish policy made itself felt because, just when the regime was at its lowest point in some years, it could point to American assistance as evidence of international standing and as a promise of general economic improvement for the country, no matter how temporary.

Many ordinary people — not merely politically conscious socialists—have had difficulty trying to square the wordy declarations of the State Department to the world at large in its effort to organize an anti-Stalinist alliance of nations with the wretched policy toward totalitarian Spain. How can an American foreign policy of organizing a "democratic front against totalitarianism" be reconciled with recognition and aid to Spanish totalitarianism?

The answer to that question is that America has no "democratic foreign policy." It has an expedient military foreign policy, i.e., a foreign policy based primarily on

# Harry Truman

(Continued from page 2)

## S. Truman presents that illustration.

Calvin Coolidge was able to stay in the White House for four years with hardly anyone noticing his presence. But the United States of his day had few really large problems to meet. The United States of today bestrides three-fourths of the world like a mechanical monster, and the man in the drivers' seat cannot but appear to be endowed with powers which almost approach the superhuman.

## MOLDED

Of course, neither Truman nor anyone else in his position was or could be a free agent. He came to power as the agent of a political party which put him there. His actions were and had to be performed within the confines of political forces as they are today organized in this country. As LABOR ACTION is against the present political alignment, and against any government which is a product of this alignment, we were and will remain unsparing critics and opponents of the major policies both at home and abroad which were carried out by both Truman's administrations.

Yet, in the context of this discussion it can be said that Truman fulfilled his role probably not much better, and certainly not much worse, than it could have or would have been fulfilled by almost anyone else in his position. He did not go beyond, but

he also did not fall far short of the political understanding of most of the liberals who lead the labor movement and write weighty articles on how the world should be saved from catastrophe. His office and his times molded him and made him what he is.

## HISTORY MAKES MEN

Socialists are often involved in arguing with people who say that the achievement of real democracy in both political and economic affairs is impossible because we need exceptionally gifted "great men" to run the nation. The common people are too stupid, too ignorant, too selfish, and too limited to do the job for themselves. They do not have the large and gifted minds needed to grasp the complicated problems of their own country and the world. Above all other reasons, that is why socialism is impossible. So the line goes.

In refutation of these assertions there are a million proofs. But today we present as a major exhibit a very ordinary man who ran the government of the United States for almost eight years: Harry S. Truman.

This, of course, is not to say that great events do not need great and gifted men. But it is also true that, in their absence, in this case, the nature of the times and the nature of the office produced an ersatz synthetic version of that need. Everybody knows that man makes history; it should also be remembered that history makes the man.

military needs. That is why it cannot strike out boldly in this world in which the greatest strength lies in ideas and in high-minded political policy based on genuine internationalist, democratic ideals.

American foreign policy toward Spain is dominated not by political, but military considerations, and these alone. This is no great secret either; for the State Department admits as much, and the Pentagon is quite proud of its strategy which, in its heavy-handed military way, omits political considerations entirely.

## WASHINGTON SAFARI

A year ago, in response to appeals received from Europe, individuals and organizations in New York City organized the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims, with Norman Thomas as its chairman and Rowland Watts, of the Workers Defense League, as secretary. The committee organized meetings and picket lines in protest against the wave of arrests, military trials and executions which Franco had carried out against members and sympathizers of socialist and anarchist trade unions, the POUM and the Basque nationalists.

The committee also has been building or assisting similar committees in other cities which have held similar activities. Protests were sent directly to Spain as well as representations made to the State Department.

As part of this activity in behalf of Franco's victims, the committee sent a delegation, consisting of Norman Thomas, Rowland Watts and this writer to confer with a Mr. Byington of the Western European Division of the State Department. The purpose of the meeting was to make representations to the department in behalf of Franco's victims and the CDFLV.

The delegation called attention to the long list of persecuted unionists and political opponents whom Franco had victimized and protested that State Department policy had only bolstered the regime at home and abroad. In these representations, we could not but point out the great contradictions among the several policies pursued by the State Department abroad. Norman Thomas, for example, described to Byington and two other members of the depart-

ment how difficult it was for him to try to reconcile American policy in other parts of the world with that in Spain. This was particularly true in Japan, Thomas stated, where members of the Socialist Party showed full knowledge of what was happening.

## DANCING TO THE TUNE

What the delegation learned—and it didn't learn too much—was that the State Department was gingerly trying to dance out a difficult number under pressure from a Congress which had voted large loans to Franco and a Department of Defense which was demanding that Franco trade in some good military bases for these loans.

The State Department, it should be easy to see, was quite aware of the political turmoil which might be stirred up among the "Western Allies," but it was fully aware too of how strategically necessary the Spanish bases were in the opinion of the generals. It had no principled opposition to the loans, even though these might be embarrassing to real democrats. What overbalanced everything was the value of the military bases.

Besides, Congress was then making things quite uncomfortable for the State Department, and it could not afford (in a financial sense, too) to incur the further wrath of McCarran, McCarthy, et al.

American policy toward Spain is one facet of a many-faceted foreign policy growing out of the cold war. Its net effect is to bolster a menacing, rotten, totalitarian regime in Spain. The Spanish legacy of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin has been accepted by the United States.

## LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

## You're Invited

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

# Eisenhower's Policy

## The ISL Program In Brief

(Continued from page 1)  
France can strike other retaliatory blows anywhere in the Communist world by sundown."

This is what American foreign policy is going to be based on. The impression which such thinking is calculated to convey is appalling not only to us, but even more so to the peoples of Europe and Asia.

This magazine, which was ardently pro-Eisenhower during the campaign, seems to be telling its readers: "America can do just about anything she wants to. If you turn on your radio some morning before breakfast, and hear that the war has started in earnest, there is no need to worry. Go about your business as usual. With your after-dinner cigar you will hear that Russian military power has been destroyed, and it is all over but the mop-up."

### NOT GETTING BETTER

The boastfulness, the exaggeration of this issue of the U. S. News & World Report can no doubt be attributed to journalistic license. Yet it is not without significance that the advent of Eisenhower to power appears to have unleashed this kind of "thinking," this bellicose spirit among his supporters.

During the election campaign Eisenhower made much of the "fresh look" which he would be able to give to American foreign policy, and particularly to the war in Korea. After his return from that ill-starred country, he stated that his policy would be shown in "deeds," not words. The public speculation, no doubt based on well planted "leaks" from high sources, has been that in Korea greater military pressure will be applied than heretofore in an effort to make a truce on American terms more compelling for the Stalinists.

The newspapers of the country announced on January 26 that the biggest American military action of recent months had been launched on the Korean front. A heavy

concentration of planes and artillery were brought to bear on a narrow sector, after which several waves of American troops were sent to capture the objective.

It cannot be doubted that this action was supposed to be a demonstration of the feasibility of the new policy. "Very important persons" were on hand as observers (Chief of Staff Collins is in Korea), and they were given booklets which described each stage of the operation in advance.

The result was a bloody repulse of the American troops. The casualty figures have yet to be announced. What was no doubt planned as a dramatic demonstration of the "new" policy at the very beginning of the Eisenhower administration has proved a tragedy for many American families. Is this the "answer in Korea" for which so many Americans voted on November 4?

In other parts of Asia there has been a marked deterioration of the American government's position in recent months. Robert Trumbull of the New York Times reports that in India rumors have come to be widely accepted to the effect that the United States and Britain are going to build air bases in Pakistan and to arm that country.

The story seems to be that as Egypt remains cool to the idea of the Middle East Defense Organization, American and British eyes are shifting to Pakistan as the center of the Arab world in such a setup. Further, large numbers of Indians are now convinced that when Secretary of State Dulles comes to their country this spring he will seek to swing India definitely into the American camp in the cold war, and will apply pressure to have his way.

They too, it seems, have heard that American policies are going to be "positive and forceful," in the coming period.

### NATO RUNS DOWN

From the government's point of view, the situation has been de-

teriorating in Europe too. It is quite likely that this accounts for the immediate trip to that continent projected by Dulles and Stassen, despite their well-known "Asian" orientation.

Both the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the projected European army have been progressing rapidly in reverse. At the recent NATO conference it was made quite clear to the American military leaders that neither Britain nor the continental countries are in any position to fulfill the NATO commitments they assumed last spring.

France is backing away from the European army idea at a rapid pace, as this involves the rearmament of Western Germany. And the opposition to German rearmament inside Germany itself has been reinforced by the British government's arrest of a number of high-ranking Nazis without prior consultation with the Bonn government.

In fact, all the tentative steps which have been taken in the direction of some form of European economic and political integration seem to be grinding to a halt. The Tory government in Britain has been able to achieve a balance of trade with the dollar area which has considerably revived British capitalist self-confidence. Rumors are now abroad in Europe that the next step will be to establish convertibility between the pound and the dollar. Although this might be to the advantage of certain countries with strong currencies like Belgium, it would disrupt the economies of countries like France and Italy, and would force them to resume protective policies which would work in a direction opposite to that of freeing inter-European trade.

It is too early to know just what Dulles and Stassen will attempt in an effort to reverse this trend. But only two lines of action seem possible.

One is a major stepping up of American economic and military aid to shore up the tottering alliance in Europe. This seems virtually excluded by the mentality of the whole Eisenhower administration, and particularly by the alignment of power in Congress.

The other one is an application of the old technique of arm-twisting which was the resort of the Truman administration when all else failed. But at the present stage of developments it looks as if "more positive and forceful" arm-twisting is likely to have just the opposite effect from that desired by the government.

At least in England and Germany such tactics would probably strengthen the Labor and Social-Democratic opposition to the present governments. And in most of the rest of Europe they would probably strengthen no one but the Stalinists.

### "IFFY" HOPES

In the same issue of U. S. News & World Report referred to above (January 30), an article entitled "U. S. Ally—An Army of Asians?" unwittingly outlines the fundamental weakness of an American foreign policy based on military strength alone. The actual purpose of the article is to describe the vast potential of military manpower available in the non-Stalinist portion of Asia and to urge its development by America.

The article lists the countries of Asia one by one and states the number of men of "prime fighting age" in each of them. But in one case after another, even the pugnacious optimists of this magazine (who ascribe the views of their article to "men now high in U. S. councils") are forced to put an enormous political "if" in front of their claims.

• Indo-China could provide an army of 2.7 million "if given a feeling that its independence within the French Union is the real thing."

• Japan could furnish an experienced army with maximum manpower of nearly 9 million "if other Asian peoples could forget past aggression."

- Malaya and Singapore could provide an army of 625,000 men "if dealt with skillfully."
- Indonesia might be able to provide 7 million men "if those [Asian defense] plans gave assurances against revival of Western colonialism, which Indonesians distrust."

### SHAKY STRUCTURE

The article dismisses India's 35 millions of potential fighters since this country "shows little interest in any plans to oppose Communist aggressions in Asia." Only a "change in attitude" will help there.

But Pakistan has a potential army of more than 7 millions, and the only comment there is that it is "a British dominion." Of course, there are also the Philippines, and first and foremost, Formosa with at least one genuine "prime" fighting man, Chiang Kai-shek.

It appears that there are even more "ifs" than fighting men in the picture. And each one of these "ifs," passed over so glibly in the article, contains within itself a political problem which is made up of nine parts of social dynamite and one part of the stuff of the military dreams of "men now in high U. S. councils."

The present situation in the capitalist world is not a product of the policies of the Eisenhower administration. The shaky political and military setups in both Asia and Europe are a result of the general decline of capitalism on a world scale. The important thing to bear in mind is, that all the efforts of the American government since the end of World War II to bring health and vigor to this structure have led to the present situation.

The modifications in these policies which the Eisenhower administration seems to be proposing appear to be in a direction which can only hasten a world tragedy. If the labor movement, if Americans in general, don't speak up, on the theory that the new government must be given a "chance to show what it can do," they will share in the responsibility for what lies ahead.

In a column in the New York Post for January 25 the Fair Deal pundit Arthur Schlesinger Jr. starts out: "The new administration should receive all the support and loyalty it deserves." With that we agree heartily!

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 unremitting 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 worldwide 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!

## Labor Action FORUM • New York

presents

Next Thursday—Feb. 5 at 8:30 p.m.

Dr. MEHDI A. BENNOUNI

Member, Moroccan Delegation to UN General Assembly 1952; member, North African Independence Movement; founder of Moroccan Information Office in New York; editor and lawyer.

on

## The Struggle for Morocco's Independence

LABOR ACTION HALL  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

### And Three Forums in February on PROBLEMS OF WAR AND SOCIALIST POLICY

by  
Hal Draper  
Editor, Labor Action

Thursday, Feb. 12

#### WAR AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Discussing the national-defense element in the First, Second and Third World Wars.

Thursday, Feb. 19

#### LENIN'S "REVOLUTIONARY DEFEATISM"

Discussing Lenin's changing formulations of the slogan, and the opposition to it.

Thursday, Feb. 26

#### WAR AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Discussing problems of anti-war policy in the light of the new elements of World War 3.

### INTERESTED? Get Acquainted —

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE  
114 West 14 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.....

### HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE



#### LABOR ACTION

The Independent Socialist Weekly  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Please enter my subscription:  NEW  RENEWAL

Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00

One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

NAME .....

(PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS ..... APT.....

CITY ..... ZONE ..... STATE.....

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