

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MAY 25, 1953

FIVE CENTS

After Malan's Victory in S. Africa

... page 3

The New Crisis in the SWP—II

... page 6

The Couch as a Secret Weapon

... page 2

The CP and the Atom Bomb

... page 8

## SPOT-LIGHT

### Eisenhower Leads

For the past several weeks the nation has been kept in varying degrees of suspense over the administration's tax program. At one point, the strain created by contradictory reports on tax and budget policy coming from cabinet officers became so great that Senator Taft himself threw up his hands in disgust and demanded that the administration come clean on just what their policy was going to be.

With the "economy bloc" in Congress issuing almost daily communiques on how they were going to cut corporate taxes to the bone, and the Eisenhower wing of the GOP uneasily voicing demands that the president "exercise his leadership" the tension on Eisenhower reached the breaking point.

The result: a radio and TV speech in which he came out against any cut in taxes this year, and for a vague promise that the entire tax structure will be revamped next year to make it more "equitable." Such a promise can be counted on to arouse visions in the minds of each section of the population of a sharp drop in their own taxes while the other fellow gets the knife. After all, what could be more "equitable." "The other fellow" will turn out to be the great mass of the workers and other low-income groups. The interests of General Motors demands it; and their interests are the interests of . . . all the other big businessmen.

### Oatis Enigma

One of the strangest occurrences of recent times has been the freeing of William Oatis by the Czechoslovak Stalinists, and his behavior since he has returned to this country.

When Oatis was imprisoned and tried for espionage, the newspapers of this country went all-out in their campaign on his behalf. The Stalinists had hit the newspapermen where they live. At that time Oatis was described as a model newspaperman: tough, independent, inquisitive, courageous.

Now he has been released. He refuses to say that his indictment and conviction were a frameup. He refuses to say whether or not he actually was spying for the State Department. He refuses to condemn the Stalinist broad definition of "espionage," or their treatment of him, or their judicial procedure in general.

We would not pretend to know why. Several theories have been advanced, and they all seem equally good, at least until such time as Oatis opens his mouth: He is tired and confused by his experience and needs time to re-orient himself; he has been blackmailed by the Stalinists either through personal information they have on him, or by threats to the lives of friends and colleagues if he talks; in the months of questioning in prison, his confidence in capitalism was shaken, and he was at the least neutralized toward Stalinism.

It is all a great mystery, and very frustrating to the American press. But just have a thought for the old Bolsheviks who "confessed" at the Moscow trial, and were widely condemned as lacking moral fiber. The paragon of the American press is, after all, free . . .

### GOP Right-Wing: "Let Us Go It Alone"

## Stalinist "Peace Offensive" Strains U.S.-British Relations

By GORDON HASKELL

"I have not met anyone in the United States who does not want peace." — President Eisenhower in press conference, May 14.

This was President Eisenhower's contribution to the exchange of pleasantries which passed back and forth across the Atlantic during the past week.

That everyone wants peace, on his own terms, is one of those facts which is neither disputable nor enlightening. Wars are fought because the terms on which peace is desired are mutually incompatible for the rulers of the warring countries. And the danger of war in the immediate future lies in the presence of men with power in the world who believe that only by such means can their own aims be achieved.

The acrimonious debate between the responsible leaders of the British Parliament and a powerful group of senators in this country is not an accident. And it will not do to simply point out that the men on this side of the water are notorious irresponsibles; that they are not in control of American foreign policy. The fact is that they are a recognized and accepted part of the ruling party; that they have been able to impose their will on the party on a number of issues; that these views are known to be shared by a powerful section of the top military brass of the country, and that there is no good reason to be confident that these views are in fundamental conflict with

those of the top executives who run the government.

The present delicate situation in Anglo-American relations was precipitated by a speech made by Clement Attlee, leader of the Labor Party in the House of Commons. Attlee said: "It is worth while saying a few words about the United States. . . I hope they will cause no offense. I hope that no one will suggest that I am in any way anti-American. . . I merely want to state some facts. . . The American Constitution was framed for an isolationist state . . . one sometimes wonders who is more powerful, the president or

Senator McCarthy. . . There are elements in the United States that do not want a settlement in Korea. There are people who want an all-out war with China and against communism in general, and there is the strong influence of the Chiang Kai-shek lobby."

Attlee was simply pointing out a fact which is obvious to the whole world. His conclusion was that it is difficult for the British to be sure that even when a policy is outlined to them by the administration, it will be carried out. He was asking for direct British participation in the Korean truce talks in the interest of having British views exert some control or influence over American decisions. And finally, he put forth the known policy of both major parties in Britain for the inclusion of Stalinist China in the United Nations after a truce is concluded in Korea.

### EISENHOWER DODGES ISSUE

The direct representatives of the "Eisenhower team" have had little to say about Attlee's speech. In the press conference referred to above, the president side-stepped the issue. Even when asked directly whether the American government is for the eventual entry of Stalinist China in the UN, Eisenhower parried with a vague dissertation on the

(Turn to last page)

### Reuther's Statement Warns of Danger:

## Layoffs Loom in Detroit Auto Industry

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, May 16—The warning of President Walter P. Reuther, of the CIO, over the strong possibility of major auto industry lay-offs later this year because of the current high production rate follows along the lines of important trade and business publications.

The auto industry is producing now at a rate that would indicate an 8,000,000 production figure for 1953, while most estimates suggest a top market sale of 5,500,000. *Fortune Magazine* made this point recently. *Automotive News* likewise has had "view with alarm" stories.

Reuther pointed out in his statement that "efforts on the part of the industry to produce in excess of 60 per cent of their annual production during the first six months is both economically unsound and morally wrong." He warned that, "if Management persists in these efforts, it must assume the full responsibility for the unemployment and hardships that thousands of workers and their families will experience."

The basic reasons why the auto industry is going at such a terrific rate of production are not discussed by Reuther. A major factor is the possibility of war. If the Korean peace talks fail, and their is a greater intensification of war efforts, with a cut-down of civilian pro-

duction, the auto industry will be that much further ahead. The memory of June 1950 when the Korean war began haunts the profit-hungry auto industry.

### WAR AND PROFITS

Secondly, from a profit point of view, the high rate of production assures the greatest profit per car, even though the industry might be shut down for two or three months. Auto industry profits depend on output per man and not on the time or duration of auto production. "Economically," the auto industry knows its business, as its profit figures since World War II clearly show.

Of course, the Reuther statement serves to point up the basic responsibility of any impending lay-offs on the auto industry. But the fact remains that the United Auto Workers Union (CIO) is unable to intervene against excess work schedules because of present clauses in the five-year contracts relating to "management prerogatives," such as sole and exclusive rights to manage its affairs and direct its working forces. Another factor is the unwillingness of any sector of the auto workers to give up their overtime as a pressure move against the corporations, since the inflationary trend has made living far more costly than a 40-hour week pay can meet.

This aspect of the problem will be further illuminated by any steel union wage increase settlement, for again the auto workers will recognize that a four-percent yearly "annual improvement factor" payment is primarily a token recognition of the need for a real annual wage increase. The unrest in the auto industry is bound to reach new high levels if a steel union settlement is announced.

### SQUEEZE IS ON

Since at least one major auto corporation intends to make model change-overs late this summer, lay-offs are bound to come soon. Between the cost of living, and the proverbial job insecurity which has always marked the fluctuating auto industry production schedules, a new phenomenon has arisen to further plague the UAW-CIO. It is the two-job workers. The number of auto workers who work outside the plant for extra income is amazing.

In the face of such complex problems, and shifting moods and restlessness, not to speak of bitterness among the auto-workers, the statement of President Reuther is at last a recognition that "labor statesmanship" is not enough of an answer to satisfy the ranks. Nor will a long-range program for a guaranteed annual wage serve as a substitute for a solution to the pressing problems of today.

# David Dubinsky OKs Aid To Witch-Hunt Committees

By LARRY O'CONNOR

In the May 9 issue of the *Saturday Evening Post* an article appeared by David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, entitled "How I Handled the Reds in My Union."

David Dubinsky is not only the president of his union. He is also considered one of the most enlightened, liberal and "internationalist" minded of American labor leaders. Next to Walter Reuther, he is thought of as the type of labor leader who in this country most closely approximates the Social Democratic political and labor leaders of Britain and Europe. And in addition, if he is not the power in the Liberal Party, it would be hard to say who or what the power is.

For the most part, his article consists of a theory on how to fight Stalinism in this country, with a number of stories thrown in for illustration. The "basic" idea he presents is that what one must do is to identify and single out the individual Stalinist, and then bring every kind of moral, ideological and organizational pressure on him or her to break him from Stalinism.

That this is a very one-sided way of approaching the problem goes without saying. But that would not be too bad, if Dubinsky had confined himself to a discussion of how one should operate inside the labor movement in the struggle against Stalinism. He goes beyond that, however, and advocates this method as the way in which to fight Stalinism in society at large, and thereby falls right into the lap of the witchhunters.

Here is what this leader of American liberalism has to say about it:

"Right now the Kremlin's outfit in this country is groggy from the blows rained on it, and can be given a knock-out punch. Every effort to expose the communists should be continued. The Congressional investigations of un-American activities should not be hampered, but, on the contrary, should be aided and encouraged. Investigations and a search for knowledge and information are a primary function of a democratic legislative body. Those who berate informants on the communists as 'squealers' are at best indulging in a childish prejudice. In effect they give aid and comfort to the mortal enemy of our nation."

## THE "SAWDUST TRAIL"

He goes on to say that he cannot condemn every ex-Stalinist who does not immediately turn and inform on his former associates because "it isn't given to all of us to have the strength of character to admit mistakes and hit the sawdust trail to conversion in public."

We do not need, at this moment, to once again go into the whole question of the methods of the current Congressional investigations, their purpose, and their overall effect on democracy in this country. Suffice it to say that these investigations have been condemned by a whole series of respectable academic organizations when applied to the schools (see p. 5); by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. as applied to the churches; by any number of anti-Stalinist labor organizations as applied to the labor movement.

For some time it has been clear that the actual effect of these Congressional investigations has been to intimidate large numbers of people whose connection with Stalinism is in the distant past, or who never had any such connection. We have insisted that what is involved is not simply an attack on the Stalinists, but that in the long run if this kind of attack is permitted to continue and is condoned, it will spread out into an assault on socialists, liberals and the labor movement.

## A LIGHTNING ROD?

Since Dubinsky wrote the above, a couple of things have happened which have brought home just what is involved. The most telling punch at the complacency of the Dubinsky's has been McCarthy's attack on James Wechsler, editor of the *New York Post*. This strikes close to home. After all, Wechsler is not the only ex-Stalinist of note who is "vulnerable" to this kind of attack. It is even rumored that in Dubinsky's own organi-

zation, not too far removed from the organizational summit, there are people whose relationship to the Communist Party was at one time far more intimate and powerful than that of Wechsler. Is it possible that one purpose of this article was to act as a sort of lightning-rod to deflect any possible bolts from striking in the inner sanctum? It may be thought unkind to point out that it is McCarthy's view that the only genuine proof of anti-Stalinism is collaboration with the un-American committees and turning names of former associates over to them.

Since the Wechsler episode, David Dubinsky seems to have sensed the danger. In a speech at the convention of the ILGWU he said that: "the tactic of dragging genuine anti-Communists before Congressional committees solely for sensational purposes and personal revenge makes a mockery of American ideals, defeats the very purposes of the investigation and renders invaluable aid to the enemy." At least that seems to be an attack on McCarthy. Until Dubinsky is in a position to decide what the "purposes of the investigations" should be, however, to support them in general, while criticizing their "abuses," is neither the course of wisdom nor of valor.

## The Neurotic Theory of Stalinism — II

# The Couch as a Secret Weapon

In last week's LABOR ACTION, James Fenwick referred to the Pentagon announcement that a number of American prisoners of war returned from Korea had "succumbed to Communist indoctrination," and that they were being sent to a Valley Forge hospital for "medical and psychological treatment." He then discussed the political implications of the theory on which such a procedure must be based: that Stalinism is a neurosis.

In the current article Fenwick derives an appropriate "military" strategy from this Pentagon theory, and goes on to discuss the relationship of some of the most influential American schools of psychoanalytic theory to the politics of our time.—Ed.

By JAMES M. FENWICK

Not wishing to enlarge the war budget, a matter on which we see eye to eye with our old comrade (in arms) Eisenhower, we propose the diversion of, say, a half billion dollars or so from the tank program, which has proved a bust in any case, for the construction of psychological training centers throughout the country.

As young men come of draft age, instead of sending them to army camps for training in close order drill, care and cleaning of the rifle, personal prophylaxis and similar obviously outmoded subjects, we would send them to these institutes, where they would, after a preliminary analysis of each student, which would serve as a sort of psychic inoculation, be given accelerated courses in two subjects: the Chinese language, and techniques of psychoanalytic therapy.

While this was in progress we would cut down production of heavy and medium bombers and step up production of flying boxcars for the transportation of air borne troops.

Then at the proper logistical (and, needless to say, psychological) moment we would march our new soldiers up the ramps into the planes, take off, and parachute them all over China to attack the problem of Stalinism for the first time in a root sense.

## THE JUMP MASTERS

For the assault waves, as a demonstration of the seriousness with which the program is to be viewed, we would propose as one of the jump masters Harold Lasswell, the author several years ago of *The Psychopathology of Politics*, a crude book which sustains the current Pentagon thesis. We would gladly reserve

# LABOR SCOPE

## STEEL UNION PREPARES FOR POSSIBLE STRIKE

Last year, steel workers lost an average of \$364.88 each during their 8-week strike. But, by March 31 of this year, 35 weeks after the strike had ended, they had averaged \$380.80 in increased pay won by their strike. In other words, the financial loss of the strike had been completely cancelled out. Such is the front page report in *Steel Labor*, official newspaper of the United Steel Workers Union (CIO). "The 1952 strike," it maintains, "paid dividends."

The report is of more than academic statistical interest. On May first, the union reopened negotiations with the big steel companies under the terms of its contracts which run until June 1954 but which allow the union to open up the question of wage rates and to strike. The union is obviously not eager for a strike now; last year's experience is too recent; the political climate is uncertain and raises annoying problems that the CIO has hardly begun to consider. The steel workers demand a "wage increase" without specifying an actual figure and request general and not-binding discussions on the guaranteed annual wage and pension-insurance provisions. These are modest proposals; they are mildly put; and should be settled amicably by reasonable men.

But one never knows . . . will the steel bosses be reasonable and mild? Or will they decide unexpectedly to force a showdown? These are the questions obviously in the minds of union leaders as they prepared their report on last year's strike. They are cautious men . . . so cautious that they realize the need for being prepared for what they do not want or expect.

"Nobody really likes to strike," writes *Steel Labor*. "A responsible union always exhausts every avenue to reach a peaceful settlement before resorting to that drastic action. . . . Down through history, however, circumstances have forced strikes and people have suffered losses, which prove to be temporary in most cases. . . . But strong unions, collective bargaining and, yes, even strikes, have moved the Steelworkers and the rest of the nation along the road to higher wages. . . ."

Newspaper reports have been sparse on the little publicized steel negotiations. But the union is aware of the tense possibilities that lie even in the most humdrum dealings with representatives of millionaire corporations.

places for any members of the William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation who would care to maintain the thesis of their programmatic founder, Harry Stack Sullivan, of whose ideas on a basic social change Gardner Murphy pointedly says, "The attitude toward radical change as something fearful, with the emotional tone of 'far side of chaos,' is curious in a psychiatrist who dealt with getting patients to face chaos in tearing down their existing modes of operating in order to establish better homes. . . . Sullivan presents the radical as motivated principally by destructiveness, as someone who 'shows no durable grasp of his own reality or that of others, and his actions are controlled by the most immediate opportunism.' Yet Sullivan's description of a group life that distorts the majority into inferior caricatures of what they might have been seems at least to leave room for the possibility that radicalism may have some other basis besides personal maladjustment. Perhaps in some cases at least the courage to challenge a frustrating society is an expression of strength rather than weakness."

We will be glad also to reserve a place for Talcott Parsons (the well known Harvard sociologist, and contributor to *Psychiatry*), of whom the late Irving Howe once had some kind words to say. We are even willing that when Parsons jumps, with his couch, therapeutic, folding, M-1, strapped to his back, he carry with him any one of his books on sociological theory for the purpose of handling any small, residual Chinese societal problems. His books have, so far as we are concerned, the advantage of already being written in Chinese.

## A FALSE APPLICATION

Modern psychoanalytic theory, is one of the great conquests of the human mind. It is unfortunate that in the situation under review the resources of modern psychiatry are being applied in an impermissible way. It is to be hoped that the current approach to the Stalinist indoctrinated PWs revealed by the Pentagon will provoke at least a moderate amount of discussion in psychoanalytical circles.

This applies in particular to the Washington School, whose general orientation is easily assimilable into Marxist theory. Marx and Engels long ago, without expansion into the realm of psychology since their basic orientation was political, were the first to lay down the broad principles upon which socially oriented psychoanalysis bases itself.

The chief criticism which can be levelled against it is that, however radical its criticism of capitalist society may be, it does not transcend it. To the discredit of

its practitioners there does not seem to exist even a liberal movement for socialized psychoanalytical therapy comparable to the one for socialized medicine. That does not argue well for a field the scope of whose social diagnostic and prescriptive pretensions is so large.

In fact, in common with almost all bourgeois thought in the United States, no matter how radical, psychoanalytical theory bears the impress of the increasingly conservative times.

## COLD WAR TAKES TOLL

Erich Fromm, for example, whose *Escape from Freedom*, an exceptionally stimulating book, which for all of its contradictions, questionable formulations, and false emphases, ended by stating that a relatively non-neurotic world could begin to be built only on the basis of a democratic socialist society, now maunders that "we must make democracy work." He suggests that a non-theistic humanistic religion (whatever such a beast is) is worth investigating, that we must begin with ourselves, and that in any case he has no answers, that he seeks only to pose problems—all of which is crashingly platitudinous and promises badly for one of the most fruitful thinkers of a new science which, for all of its pretentiousness, offers enormous promise for the full development of humanity.

But the basic fact of our times, as is shown well enough by this minor but fully illuminating episode in the cold war and the decline of world society, is that the primary problem confronting mankind is a politico-economic one upon which all others depend, with one degree or another of closeness and interaction.

Now available!  
COMBINATION OFFER—

BOUND VOLUMES  
(Completely indexed)  
for 1951  
and 1952

Labor Action .....\$3  
New International .....\$4  
BOTH (for 1 year) .....\$6  
BOTH (for both years) ....\$11

Order from:  
Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

**SOUTH AFRICA** Growing Repression and Growing Extremism

# After the Victory of the Malan Racists

By GABRIEL GERSH

When Malan's Nationalist Party won the 1948 election, the leaders of the United Party shrugged it off by claiming that the *Apartheid* electoral cry of the Nationalists had caught them off guard. Expecting to win, the United Party did not exert itself in the 1948 campaign. But after five years of Malanism, the United Party leaders expected the South African white population to restore them to power. It has turned out differently. Although the United Party conducted an energetic campaign and its leaders were careful not to say or do anything which should antagonize the white population, the Nationalist Party was elected by a landslide. Its majority in Parliament is now bigger than before.

**With racial propaganda going full blast, the Nationalists carried the rural districts, where there is a heavy concentration of Malan followers. Such is the weighting in favor of the rural areas that five urban votes are needed to equal the effective parliamentary value of four rural votes. The Nationalists calculated before the election that they needed only 38 per cent of the votes in order to receive 55 per cent of the seats. Even with their majority of 29, the Nationalists cannot match the strength of their opponents in popular votes. However, their parliamentary majority gives them a strong hold on the nation.**

Complete master in the political field, the Nationalist Party may now be expected to introduce legislation which will supersede the constitution. Ignoring history, the Nationalists hold that the constitution had been imposed on the Afrikaners by the British. New legislation will therefore end this "state of constitutional enslavement" and enable the Union Parliament to have "complete control over its own acts"—phrases which mean, in reality, that the Nationalist Party will most likely establish an Afrikaner dictatorship.

**TIMIDNESS AND VACILLATION**

In many ways, Malan's strength is due to the timidness and vacillation of the opposition. The United Party, led by General Smuts until his death, has little cohesion and sense of direction. Its aim is to restore the status quo ante Malan; to carry on in the old familiar ways, with the whites on top and the Blacks down below, but tempering this with a certain degree of spirit and mercy. During the last Parliamentary session, for instance, the United Party leaders agreed with some of the worst of Malan's racial measures; and in the last election, the United Party leaders said that if their party returns to office, it would amend, and not repeal, the present segregation laws.

At present, the only remaining restraint on Nationalist extremism is in the economic field, where Malan cannot match the mastery of his opponents. Unfortunately, this restraint is not very strong. It is a measure of the hopelessness of South Africa's future that the diamond and gold mining industries control much of the general wealth of the country. These mining industries depend for their profit on the use of cheap labor and, therefore, favor the enforcement of *Apartheid* policies. Although there are a handful of manufacturers who realize that South Africa must say good-bye to the purely extractive capitalism of mining and develop a skilled African labor force, it remains true that the mining interests set the pattern of the South African economy.

The mining interests, therefore, are unlikely to regard with any misgivings the failure of their party—the United Party—to win the election. Indeed, they may even feel happy about the Nationalist victory, since they can continue to enjoy the benefits of cheap labor. Since they cannot hope for a coalition between

the United Party and the Nationalists—some of the leading advocates of coalition were defeated in the election—the mining interests may now feel that they should shift their support to the Nationalists.

**GRIM FUTURE**

What is the outlook for the natives and non-Europeans in South Africa? For these 11 million people, the future is indeed grim. The white population of South Africa have endorsed a ruthless policy of white supremacy, a savage resolve to keep the natives for ever as a subject race. Violent repression of the passive resistance movement will be enforced with greater severity; the Group Area Act will be implemented, with the best areas reserved for the whites; the unlimited powers of the government will be used to outlaw any incipient movements which threaten to destroy Nationalist supremacy; and the Malan government will try to disfranchise thousands of colored voters.

**There is a prospect of growing extremism among the whites and non-whites. The African, Indian and Colored leaders have based their passive resistance on the principle of multi-racial democracy. Those leaders of the passive resistance movement who are not in prison can still protest against the outrages of the Malan regime. With violent repression of passive resistance, it may be that they will be unable to continue to command the support of the non-whites. It is impossible to predict how much longer these leaders can restrain their followers from using violence. Angry voices shouting for a "Black Africa" can already be heard; and the activities of the Mau Mau in Kenya will not go unnoticed.**

Fortunately, there is a minority of whites who believe that something effective must be done to stem the tide of events. This minority realizes that so long as the white men hold to a system of racialism and economic exploitation they show themselves incapable of realiz-

ing a higher standard of living for the whites and Blacks. Until this system of racial crucifixion is abandoned, this minority argues, the white man must suffer the imminent danger of extermination by a race war.

**A DIFFICULT COURSE**

It is doubtful if this small liberal minority can influence the immediate course of events. What it can do, however, is strengthen its position so that it can exert influence over the ultimate course of events. Whatever evils may befall South Africa in the coming days, it is unlikely that the whites will be driven out of the country. Sooner or later they will have to yield to the demands of the non-whites.

A beginning will have to be made in welding a common alliance against all forms of racialism; and the appalling tragedy now is that there is no such beginning.

Yet a few whites have been taking a leading part in the passive resistance movement; and another handful of white trade unionists have tried with much self-sacrifice to uproot racial bigotry. It is time for these whites to unite with each other and find a means of cooperation with the Indian and African passive resistance movement. This is a very difficult course. But it is the only course of salvation and hope for the white and Black communities in South Africa.

**LONDON LETTER**

## Labor Makes Sweeping Gains In Local British Elections

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, May 13—This week an astonishing thing happened. In the local council elections, Labor gained 688 seats and lost 136. Their gain was uniform in the county boroughs, in London, in urban districts and the Scottish boroughs. This would suggest that there had been a swing of opinion in all areas, as most of the gains were from Conservatives masquerading as "Independents."

The Labor Party captured control of the town councils of the following (mostly industrial) districts: Manchester, Plymouth, Leeds, Nottingham, Oldham, Swindon, Dewsbury and Stoke Newington (in London). They have, of course, had a majority on London County Council for many years.

The gains of Labor were very surprising in view of the highpowered propaganda about the country's improving economic position, about a surplus with the European Payments Union, and about the definitely improving food supplies. It seems that Mr. Gaitskell's analysis of the budget and the economic good fortune of this country had found a receptive audience. [This refers to Labor's criticism of the Tory budget in the House of Commons.—Ed.]

**THE GALLUP POLL AGAIN**

What clouds the issue, however, is the following fact. A Gallup Poll printed and copyrighted by the *London News Chronicle*, which is the most reliable indication

of public opinion I have seen, shows that nevertheless the opinion of the people of this country has been increasingly favorable over the past few months to the Conservatives.

What conclusions can we draw from this 'signal' contradiction; the majority feeling in the country is pro-Conservative, but Labor wins the local elections? I would suggest the following possibilities:

- (1) The Gallup Poll did not take a representative sample. I do not rule this out, although it has always been fairly accurate before.
- (2) The Conservatives did not manage to bring out all their voters, or these voters did not happen to live in districts which had local elections this year.
- (3) The people have seen Conservative policy locally, as in libraries, washhouses, housing estates, etc., and do not think they are socially conscious enough. In national and international politics they have not yet apparently come to this realization.

With a shamefacedness which only Stalinists could show, the *London Daily Worker* came out with the news about "Sweeping Labor Gains," omitting, however, to mention that they themselves had gained no seats and lost seven.

**Churchill's Speech**

Other news this week is of Churchill's speech on foreign affairs to the House of Commons. He added little to what was known of his previous views.

Of interest, however, was his personal attempt to capture the cold war initiative. Churchill is a wily enough bird to realize that so far there has been little real change in the Stalinist attitude to the West.

He realized that if a "settlement" were to come, it would be by nature of a meeting between Malenkov, Eisenhower and presumably himself. From a practical administrative standpoint the less people involved initially, the greater the chance of success for the negotiations assuming that Malenkov really desires a settlement. Details could be worked out at a later date by all nations concerned.

From a socialist point of view, such a meeting could only spell a sell-out, as at Yalta and Potsdam. What they would want to agree on would be the division of the world into spheres, in which each could carry on his own dirty work in peace.

Presumably the West would turn a blind eye to the oppression in Eastern Europe, as it was not their business; and similarly the Stalinists would ignore Western imperialism.

If such an agreement to end the "cold" military war is reached, we have a duty to history and the oppressed peoples to continue the ideological war with a view to modifying the "Eastern European" system more in accordance with the views that we share with the Russian people of what constitutes a just society. If the British government had in fact done this, they would not only help to render the Stalinist system unstable, but would have exposed the moral contradictions of imperialism. Needless to say, the two imperialisms would rather share the spoils.

## ACLU Denounces Government 'Harassment' Of Harry Bridges on Repeated Charges

The American Civil Liberties Union said this week that it hoped the U. S. Supreme Court would reverse the perjury conviction of labor leader Harry Bridges because the prosecution was an harassment amounting to an abuse of due process of law. Argument on the case is scheduled for May 4th.

The Union's statement, made public by its executive director, Patrick Murphy Malin, emphasized that the Union was expressing no opinion as to the truth of the government's charge that Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, perjured himself in naturalization proceedings in denying past membership in the Communist Party. It also stressed that support of the civil liberties principle of due process in the Bridges case did not alter its vigorous opposition to Communist totalitarianism. The Union said that the question of Bridges' alleged membership in the Communist Party had been raised in two previous legal proceedings without being finally answered affirmatively, and that a third prosecution on the same point was harassment. "It seems to us that this continual harassment on the same issue, over a period of ten years, amounts to a violation of that due process of law required by the Fifth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution."

"Three legal proceedings brought against a man, always involving the question of past membership in the Com-

munist Party, reflects an attitude of persecution which is not consonant with American democratic concepts. Regardless of the nature of the proceeding, political or otherwise, if the idea of due process is to be preserved, individuals must be free of the need constantly to defend themselves against the same accusation.

"The ACLU does not, of course, take any position with respect to whether Bridges was or was not a member of the Communist Party, and it affirms its unalterable opposition to Communist totalitarianism. But it repeats once again its firm conviction that, in opposing Communist tyranny, American democracy cannot employ the methods and tactics of that tyranny.

"It hopes the Supreme Court will reverse the conviction."

From the ACLU Feature Press Service, May 4.

To the above LABOR ACTION would only like to add that the government's persecution has not weakened Stalinism in the West Coast longshore union, but rather has given the Stalinists a legitimate issue on which to draw support from militant unionists. This simply re-inforces our conviction that the only progressive way in which to fight Stalinism in the labor movement is by offering the workers a better program and leadership, and defeating the Stalinists with them.

Have you read . . .

**"NEXT—  
A LABOR PARTY!"**

by  
**Jack Ranger**

*A discussion for trade-unionists of American labor's greatest lack and greatest need.*

**25 cents**

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

# YOU and SCIENCE

## Pope and Kremlin as Scientific Oracles

By CARL DARTON

The Pope's recent "approval" of psychoanalysis again raises the question of the relation of the Roman Catholic Church, as well as other extra-scientific authority, to science.

Speaking before the Fifth International Congress of Psychotherapy and Clinical Psychology, the Pope, according to a dispatch in the New York Times (date line Rome, April 15), encouraged the use of psychoanalysis as an aid to modern healers provided: "the truths established by reason and faith and the obligatory precepts of ethics are observed."

This pronouncement should be considered not as evidence of the continual adjustment of science and religion but in the broad aspects of the relation of extra-scientific authority to science.

What do we mean by extra-scientific authority? We can explain this by pointing out that science as it has developed over the past few centuries has increasingly had a dominating influence on our lives. In so doing it has more and more encroached upon the entrenched privileges of established institutions. Though we are far from a scientific age, science has developed into a coherent social force directing our activities more than dominant authorities like to admit. Science itself has become an authority which all other institutions have to contend with. Other social authorities have endeavored to draw upon science's prestige without relinquishing their own privileged positions. Thus we have the Pope's statements today on psychoanalysis; last year, among others, on cosmogony and technology. We have Stalin in his day laying down the line on semantics, and the Communist Party on genetics. These pronouncements of Catholicism and Stalinism are of extra-scientific authority as distinct from the accepted "authoritative" findings of science itself.

Our discussion on this question is based in part on articles in recent issues of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*. (June, 1952, "Science and the Catholic Church—Two Documents"; "Statistics in the Soviet Union," S. A. Rice; "Does the Neutrino Really Exist," S. M. Dancoff; and in the March, 1953 issue, "Catholicism, Communism, and Science," L. Moran.)

### SCIENCE AND AUTHORITY

This question of authority within versus that over science must be increasingly understood and resolved as society develops toward greater complexity and resulting centralized ideological control. It will be with us both in a reactionary or a socialist society. The difference is that under reaction there is fundamentally no hope for a permanently healthy science, while in a progressive society it will be the task of socialists to see that science flourishes and blooms both for its own and society's benefit. On the other hand science and reaction either under capitalism, Catholicism or Stalinism are basically incompatible.

It is in L. Moran's article listed above in which the authority of Catholicism and Communism (read Stalinism) is counterpoised to the "authoritativeness" of science. Moran begins his analysis by characterizing Catholicism, Stalinism and science as three powerful coherent forces contending for ideological leadership in society. We cannot blame him too much if he overlooks the now quiescent voice of democratic socialism and the working class in general. Nor do we take the op-

portunity now of castigating him for mistakenly identifying Stalinism with communism. We will, however, substitute "Stalinism" where he uses the term "communism."

Such is the social prestige of modern science that both Stalinism and Catholicism seek to convert its findings to their own ideological purposes. In the words of the Stalinist Maximov "Natural science increasingly confirms the correctness of the principles of dialectical materialism." The Pope states: "According to the measure of its progress, and contrary to affirmations advanced in the past, true science discovers God in an ever-increasing degree."

Moran makes the point that a successful science, as physical power, is indispensable for the success of Communism while Catholicism does not inherently depend on science. Also while science does not attempt to define True Catholicism or Communism, both the latter try to define True Science.

### SCIENCE AND PROPAGANDA

To quote from Moran's article: "We are inclined to look with some skepticism upon these attempts to convert the social prestige of science into an instrument of propaganda. We find a strong moralistic element in the attitude of both the Pope and Maximov. They clearly mean that True Science is what science ought to be, according to presuppositions not found in science itself. Dancoff (in 'Does the Neutrino Really Exist?') on the contrary is concerned with science as it actually operates, and he obviously knows more about operating science than does the Pope or Maximov. It turns out that the Pope and Maximov are dedicated to diverse but equally idealistic notions of 'orthodoxy' in science, while Dancoff accepts science as it operates in concrete historical fact. And so it is that the scientific orthodoxy of Dancoff conforms to the actual work of the scientists. 'True' science for him consists in careful and ingenious collection of data combined with good suitable or appropriate non absolute theory."

We have discussed scientific orthodoxy earlier in the year on Extra Sensory Perception and we do not wish to revive that discussion here. However, we do believe that Moran's thoughts on the subject are of value. He writes that while scientists may agree that there is no "voice" of scientific orthodoxy as such, the epithet "unscientific" and its rightful use would imply the existence of such a "voice." Thus the collective experience of science has the authority to "condemn dishonesty, carelessness and incompleteness in the collection of data; [it also] proscribes those barren and parasitical theories, sometimes called metaphysical, which may not go contrary to the data known at the time, but which have no fruitful consequences for the future of scientific development."

We do not wish to express approval of all that Moran writes, but we believe that it is in the scientific tradition to stress more of that with which we agree than the areas of disagreement. As to Moran himself he admits to have been raised in the Catholic faith but goes on record as follows:

"As to the authority of the Pope with respect to defining True Science, he has no power whatsoever to convert actual operating science into something different. It remains what it is, in spite of his opinion, and he can certainly express in a speech mistaken notions as to what it is. At least one Catholic declines to follow the Pope in his 'endorsements of the teachings of modern cosmogony,' saturated with temporary theoretical constructions as they are."

Don't miss a single week of  
**LABOR ACTION**  
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

# MARXISM for TODAY

## NEW MARXIST WORKS OF HISTORICAL ANALYSIS By PHILIP COBEN

Picking up from our April 27 column, where this column started what was going to be a series of notices of recent Marxist publications: for this week we want to bring to the reader's attention a couple of booklets which are likely to be overlooked but which definitely should not be missed.

Both have recently been published as part of a line of "College Paperbacks" (paper-bound booklets) by Henry Schuman, Inc.

### THE DECLINE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE WEST, by Frank W. Walbank.—Henry Schuman, N. Y., 1953, 98 pages, \$1.00.

Under this title, the author, who is professor of ancient history and classical archaeology at the University of Liverpool (Britain), has written a brilliant Marxist analysis of the social and economic bases of the decline of the Roman empire and of the ancient slave society.

And it is not only good; it is in our opinion far and away the best discussion of the subject to be found. Please consider this a "rave notice."

For socialists the subject is of far more interest than may appear. What Professor Walbank is dealing with is a period in history in which a social system collapsed, in fact, the outstanding case of a previous historical period in which a social system went down to its doom without being succeeded by a progressive society or being overthrown by a new progressive class.

The attention of Marxist historians has usually been fixed, quite understandably, on the period of transition between feudalism and capitalism; the transition period between classical civilization and feudalism has been much neglected. In Marxist literature, perhaps the only attempt comparable to Walbank's was made by Karl Kautsky, in the middle section of the latter's *Foundations of Christianity* (which, by a coincidence, has just been republished). But Walbank has the advantage, of course, of having available the results of modern scholarship, and in any case his work puts Kautsky's in the shade, as far as analysis of this subject goes.

Walbank's does not purport to be an historical survey of the period, as its size would indeed indicate; it is devoted to asking and answering the question "Why?" Nor is it written explicitly in Marxist terms; on the contrary.

For those who are more closely interested in the period, it provides the key to understanding the voluminous material on the social development of Roman society which is contained in such studies as Rostovtzev's great work on the *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. Obviously, because of its brevity if nothing else, it is far from being the last word, but it is an addition of first-class importance to the arsenal of Marxist historiography.

### WHAT IS HISTORY? by V. Gordon Childe.—Henry Schuman, N. Y., 1953, 86 pages, \$1.00.

Here is a fifth in a series of invaluable works by the eminent British archaeologist who writes explicitly as a Marxist historian. In this one Childe discusses theories of history, beginning with a consideration of the problem of historiography as a science.

In Chapter II, under "Example of an Historical Order," he sketches the development of technology as motive force of social development. In Chapters IV-VII, he analyzes "Theological and Magical Conceptions of Historical Order," "Naturalistic Theories of Historical Order," "History as a Comparative Science," and "History as a Creative Process." The Marxist view is presented under the last-named head.

Throughout, Childe gives to his analyses the special emphasis of his approach through the subject of archaeology—an approach which lends a high degree of freshness and new insight to his discussion.

As we once mentioned in LABOR ACTION in reviewing a previous work of his, Childe is a Stalinist fellow-traveler but very much a British-type fellow-traveler—that is, he is one of those British pro-Stalinist scholars who does not let his Stalinist leanings (such as they may be) get in the way of his independent thinking-through of Marxist problems. For some other remarks on Childe, see the above-mentioned review in LABOR ACTION for March 24 of last year, dealing with his book *Social Evolution*.

All of Childe's works are, as it happens, now available in very inexpensive editions, and students of Marxism should have all of them. For convenience, we list them below:

*What Happened in History*.—Mentor pocket book (New American Library), 35 cents. Out of print in this edition but probably still around second-hand book stores. Childe's most valuable work for general reader.

*Man Makes Himself*.—A Mentor pocket book (New American Library), 35 cents.

*Social Evolution*.—Originally published by Henry Schuman in hard covers for \$3.00, but now available in the above-mentioned "College Paperback" edition for \$1.00.

*Progress and Archaeology*.—Published in England by Watts & Co. as No. 102 of the Thinkers Library, 2 shillings.

*What Is History?*—reviewed above.

## ALL BOOKS REVIEWED

in  
**Labor Action**

are obtainable from

Labor Action Book Service

114 West 14th St., New York

## Chicago Anti-Franco Rally

By PAT GREGORY

CHICAGO, May 15—"Stop Franco Terror" was the theme of a rally held here today on the campus of the University of Chicago. The purpose of this meeting, held under the auspices of the Chicago Committee to Defend Labor Victims of Franco, was to raise funds for the defense of prisoners now awaiting trial in Spain.

The first speaker, Carl Shier of the Shop Committee, Local 6, UAW-CIO, attacked the policy of American aid to Franco Spain. He pointed out that the American labor movement officially supports the struggle of its Spanish brothers against Franco's tyranny. Shier charged that there is little logic in considering Franco's government an ally of freedom on the basis of his anti-communism, and that, in aiding him, the United States is fostering and augmenting the suppression of the Spanish people.

"Why aid Franco?" was the question asked by Dick Christopher, secretary of the Foreign Policy Committee of the In-

dependent Voters of Illinois, the ADA affiliate in the state. He argued that it was not only an outrage to the democratic peoples of the world, but also a policy of dubious military necessity. Franco, whose army is weak and whose government is unstable and unpopular, would be, at best, an unreliable ally.

After Christopher's speech, a message of greetings from Prof. James Luther Adams of the Meadville Theological School was read. Adams had been scheduled to speak at the meeting, but was unable to attend. A letter of thanks from one of the organizations aided by the committee, the POUM, was also read.

The final speaker was Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION. Tracing the development of the pro-Franco policy of the U. S. government, from the 1946 resolution of the UN for diplomatic boycott to the 1950 switchover by the Truman-Acheson administration, Draper discussed the nature of the foreign-policy thinking in Washington which led to the present line, which has acted as an important prop of the Caudillo's shaky regime.



LABOR ACTION

May 25, 1953

Vol-17, No. 21

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Asst. Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

# Youth and Student Corner

## Columbia Association of University Professors Blasts Witch-Hunt

By PHILIP HEIFITZ

With the closing of the current semester several matters relating to academic freedom have occurred at Columbia University. A meeting of the Columbia Chapter of the American Association of University Professors passed a resolution which expressed strong dissatisfaction with the recent statement by the Association of American Universities (composed essentially of university administrators). The AAU essentially endorsed, at its recent national convention, the current witchhunt in the universities and supported the principle of the discharge of Stalinists as being unfit to teach *per se*.

The meeting of the Columbia chapter of the AAUP went on to adopt by a unanimous vote a statement covering what was felt to be the four salient points brought to the fore by the current "investigations." After the usual preamble the statement by the Columbia group states in part:

### THE RESOLUTION

"1. The current investigations of American educational institutions are unnecessary and unwise. We do not question the legal right of legislative bodies to investigate educational institutions . . . [but] we believe that the colleges and universities of our country are vigorously and in the main successfully pursuing the great ideals which are their proper and historically recognized goals. Accordingly, we deplore the current investigations as both unnecessary and unwise: unnecessary, because there is no substantial cause for concern over the devotion of our teachers to the scholarly objectives of their profession; and unwise, because these investigations are creating, both within and outside academic communities, an atmosphere of apprehension and distrust that is doing untold harm to the cause of free inquiry far outweighing their possible benefits and is threatening the right to dissent which is the foundation of civil liberties in a free society.

"2. The refusal of a witness to testify before a legislative investigation is not in itself a proper cause for dismissal from an academic post. The surrender of rights which are guaranteed by the law of the land is not a condition for membership in the teaching profession [emphasis mine—P. H.]

"3. Fitness to teach must be tested solely by an individual's actual conduct. The basic test of the fitness of a teacher should be his professional competence and personal integrity as demonstrated in his teaching and research. No one is fit to continue in the teaching profession who employs his classroom, or any other relations he may establish with his students, as an opportunity for biased propaganda or for the advocacy of any legally defined subversive activity. However, failure to satisfy standards of professional competence and propriety must be proved by evidence based on a man's actual conduct. Membership in any lawful organization does not, in and of itself, constitute sufficient ground for disqualifying a person from continued membership in an academic community.

...4. Decisions concerning an individual's academic fitness should be made by the faculty . . . every decision to dismiss as well as to appoint, whether in respect of persons with permanent tenure or of persons without such tenure, should be adopted only upon the recommendation of competent representatives of the teaching and research staffs."

In addition to this very strong statement several members of the law school have indicated their willingness to discuss with members of the Columbia faculty any legal matters regarding the rights, duties and responsibilities of any person called to testify before an investigating committee. The meaningfulness of this action on the part of the Columbia University academic staff will depend upon how vigorously they defend their organization and each other in the event of a pointed Congressional attack upon them.

### POLL OF STUDENT OPINION

The student point-of-view with regard to the question of such investigations has

been determined by a poll conducted by the student government body known as the Columbia University Student Council. The CUSC polled 565 students in 50 classes picked at random from 15 of the University's schools. The poll asked eight questions connected with the general problem of Congressional investigations, some of the more interesting are listed below with their tabulated answers:

"In principle, do you believe that Congressional committees should investigate the political views and affiliations of faculty members? Yes, 22 per cent, No 73 per cent, no opinion, 5 per cent.

"Do you approve of the present Congressional investigations into the political views and affiliations of faculty members? Yes, 16 per cent, No 76 per cent, no opinion 8 per cent.

"When a teacher under Congressional investigation for his political views and affiliations refuses to testify on the grounds of self-incrimination, do you think such refusal should lead to reconsideration of his employment at Columbia? Yes 39 per cent, No 51 per cent, no opinion 10 per cent.

"Do you feel that any Communist Party member of Columbia faculty should be

discharged, or do you feel that only those who attempt to indoctrinate students should be discharged? Any member of the CP 31 per cent, only indoctrinators 56 per cent, neither 10 per cent, no opinion 3 per cent.

While there are certain inconsistencies in the above answers, in general, the Columbia students seem to feel about as their teachers on the question of the witch hunt.

### DISCRIMINATION

Finally a note on racial discrimination. Last month the Columbia chapter of the Students for Democratic Action circulated a petition requesting the president of the university to set December 31, 1958 as a deadline for the elimination of bias clauses in the constitutions of all student organizations (this was aimed mainly at the fraternities). Since they obtained the necessary signatures the measure was referred to a college referendum which was held during the first week of May. Of the 1509 votes cast 1011 were in favor of a deadline which was taken to be in 1960.

## Yale Students Support Strike

By BOB BONE

An Thursday, May 7, after several months of fruitless negotiations, 450 maintenance workers at Yale University went out on strike. To some 26 demands presented at various times by the union, President A. Whitney Griswold has replied with 26 regrettable, but nonetheless firm refusals. A staunch Jeffersonian liberal, President Griswold has tempered justice with mercy by issuing the following statement to the press: "I understand the position of our employees now on strike, and am sympathetic with their desires for improvement."

The union president responded to these heartfelt condolences by pointing out that Mr. Griswold's sympathy was the only thing the workers had received from the university in the last two months.

The union is unaffiliated and includes maids, janitors, campus police, gardeners, landscapers, power-house employees, etc. Starting wages for unskilled workers were 95c an hour under the old contract, while the top wage for skilled

workers was \$1.70. The union is currently pressing only four demands: a 10c increase across the board, a union shop, premium pay for work on Sundays, and a guarantee that no union member will be bumped from his present job as a result of the university's proposed student employment program.

### FAVORABLE RESPONSE

Student and faculty response to the strike has been, on the whole, favorable to the union, and for the period just before final exams, somewhat remarkable. Yale Divinity students have volunteered to assume picket duty for a full week, in one fairly large campus area. Some 285 man-hours of picketing are involved. *Focal Point*, campus anti-war organization, is cooperating in this picketing, and has sponsored a union speaker at its monthly film series, which attracts a substantial student audience. Students for Democratic Action have been collecting funds for the strikers,

and have initiated a campaign of distributing small lapel tags announcing the wearer's support of the strike. Some faculty members at the Yale Law School have refused to hold classes on the struck premises, meeting instead outdoors, or at a nearby community center.

At present writing it looks like hard sledding ahead for the union. A permit to hold a mass meeting on the New Haven Green has been denied by the Republican Mayor. The company (pardon, the University) has shown no signs of yielding. On the contrary, it is using supervisory employees as strike-breakers, and smearing the union through the local press. It remains to be seen, however, whether the university will dare to face commencement with uncut lawns, classrooms which look like pigsties, and the threat of a mass picket-line which the graduating class must cross in order to receive its diplomas.

## Negro Wins in Atlanta Election

For the first time since Reconstruction days a Negro won nomination to Atlanta's Board of Education in a city-wide primary on May 13.

Dr. Rufus E. Clement, president of Atlanta University, got 22,259 votes to 13,936 for J. H. Landers, a white candidate who has served on the board since 1927. Nomination for this post is equivalent to election.

Two Negroes were also elected to the City Executive Committee, but they came from Atlanta's predominantly Negro Third Ward. Dr. Clement said that less than half the votes for him came from Negroes, and added: "The people of Atlanta were ready to put a qualified per-

son on the board no matter what his race or color. It's a good day for Atlanta. It isn't a personal victory. It's a victory for the people."

Racial prejudice was not the only obstacle which Dr. Clement had to overcome in winning his office. Two days before the election, his right to be a candidate was challenged on the ground that he had shown "left-wing sympathies." The City Executive Committee, however, by a vote of 5 to 4, voted him the right to run. The charge against Dr. Clement was that the House Un-American activities committee had listed him as a former member of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

## AN APPEAL FOR FAIR PLAY

We are a group of Yale students like yourselves who have carefully weighed the issues in the current dispute between the University and the Union, and in our opinion the Union has legitimate cause to strike.

We are not concerned here with persuading you to our point of view, but rather with appealing to you to refrain from acting as a strike-breaker for the University.

Cooperation with your Master's Office in cleaning entries, mowing lawns, etc., is strike-breaking! The Council of Masters, in requesting the Master of your College to organize clean-up crews on a "volunteer" basis, is clearly demonstrating

the University's intention of breaking the strike with student "volunteers," if the student body is willing to cooperate.

To the striking workers, this dispute with the University, which is largely over wages, is a deadly serious affair. To them it is not a matter of a little exercise with a lawnmower, followed by free beer from the Master's Office. They are literally fighting for their bread.

"One who takes the place of a striker," according to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, is a SCAB. . . .

**DON'T SCAB ON THESE STRIKERS FOR A CAN OF BEER!**  
Student Committee  
For Yale Strikers

### NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, socialism, minority groups, national and world politics—for \$2.00 a year.

## The New Crisis in the SWP — II

# Is the Stalinist Revolution 'Progressive'?

By ALBERT GATES

The current factional struggle in the Socialist Workers Party emphasizes the necessity for clarity on the Russian question. Socialism will never make any genuine progress unless and until socialists understand the nature of the Russian state and the phenomenon of Stalinism. Yet confusion in the socialist movement on these questions is still greater than on any other.

Norman Thomas, for example, believes that Russian society is a form of state capitalism, and that because socialists are opposed to capitalism, they must be opposed to communism!

Others, less socialistic than Thomas, see Russia and Stalinism as purely political phenomena, the representatives of totalitarianism in struggle against democracy, and they proclaim the central struggle of our times to be largely between these two political forms. They overlook entirely the social nature of both Stalinism and bourgeois democracy and are largely ineffective since the great majority of the people of the world, particularly those who inhabit the colonial world, are concerned primarily with a solution of their pressing social problems into which they incorporate the struggle for democracy.

The bourgeois world accepting the Kremlin's holiday declarations that Russia is a socialist state, carries on an ignorant and stupid campaign against Stalinism as "socialism."

### The SWP Position

Close on the heels of this view is the conception of the Fourth International and its co-thinkers of the Socialist Workers Party that Russia is a "degenerated workers' state," with a totalitarian political regime resting on the progressive foundations of a nationalized and anti-capitalist economy.

They conclude, therefore, that in any struggle against Western imperialism that might be waged by this regime, either defensively or offensively, the "unconditional defense" of this state is mandatory for all socialists. It is fortunate for socialists that this view does not have greater support than it now enjoys.

The Independent Socialist League describes Russian society as a vast totalitarian, slave state, in which the working class has long ago been socially, politically and economically disfranchised. The evolution of the internal struggles in post-revolutionary Russia brought to power the bureaucracy as a new exploitive class, a development quite different from any prognosticated by either defenders or opponents of the Russian Revolution. This new power is revolutionary and counter-revolutionary at one and the same time. In its expansion it is revolutionary insofar as it destroys capitalist property relations; it is counter-revolutionary because it destroys the socialist movement and the organized working class, substituting for them the new exploitive society of bureaucratic collectivism. This dual nature of Stalinism is precisely what the SWP and its co-thinkers in Europe do not begin to understand.

On the basis of the ISL view no socialist can have any doubts whatever about his attitude toward Stalinism. His attitude has to be one of irreconcilable opposition to Stalinism in all its forms. To confuse Stalinism with socialism and the Stalinist counter-revolution with the socialist revolution is fatal for the future of socialism.

The SWP and the Fourth Internationalist movement have done exactly that. They see in the expansion of Stalinism, in the establishment of the Eastern European satellite states, in Yugoslavia and China, the rise of the socialist revolution. The methods by which these states were established were, in the eyes of the Fourth International and the SWP, of secondary importance. If these methods were not to the liking of these two movements, if they violated their pre-war conceptions, so much the

worse for the conceptions. The movement, they say, has to bring itself up to date, discard old and outworn conceptions and recognize the reality of our times. And the reality of our times is that Stalinism, whether riding the wave of mass rebellion, or substituting its own military power for the action of the masses, has advanced the socialist revolution.

### Secondary Questions

In our previous article we said that the struggle in the SWP is the reflection of a serious political crisis and that all the differences, no matter how they are manifested, emerge from the main difference on the question of Stalinism though it may appear that there are no real differences on this question. If the struggle appears to take on a "bizarre form" in which secondary issues appear to be the most important in the struggle, it is only because the embarrassed majority finds it more convenient to concentrate its fight on the secondary questions.

The differences which have developed on the nature of the SWP and its tasks is a case in point. The Cannonite majority has tried to make the issue one solely of "loss of faith in the independence of the party." The Cochranite minority, however, raised the question of the role of the party, proposing that it transform itself into a propaganda group because of its views of Stalinism today. These views emanate from their belief that Stalinist expansionism is, despite their own severe criticism of it, synonymous with the expansion of socialism, if not in its purest form, then in the only form that has yet appeared in our time.

### Differences Muddled

The organizational ideas of the minority follow logically from this premise. If after all, the Stalinist parties all over the world, backed by the "degenerated workers' state" are leading the revolution, what historic role is left for the Trotskyist movement? Obviously only that of seeking to rectify the theories and correct the mistakes of those who are doing the job. In countries where the Stalinists already are leading decisive masses, this can be done by entering the "revolutionary movement" and attempting to contest for leadership of the masses with the present misleaders. Where the Stalinists have a large following, but do not control the masses, the job can best be done by a propaganda group which seeks to influence the "most politically conscious" (read Stalinist) workers and intellectuals in its own direction.

The differences between the two factions on Stalinism are really quite muddled. The minority makes its views very clear. It says, in summary, that the post-war period has seen an expansion of Stalinism. New states were established in this expansion. In Eastern Europe there has been a consolidation of "deformed workers states." Why deformed? Because they were not the product of a revolution of the masses. They were set up directly by the Kremlin in the image of Russian society. That is, the bourgeoisie as a class has been abolished, property has been nationalized and the land has been collectivized. Thus they could not be "degenerated workers' states," the product of the degeneration of a proletarian revolution. Since they could not degenerate from such an event, but as yet in the image of a genuine, blown-in-the-bottle, "degenerated workers' state," they can only be described as "deformed workers' states." In this the minority re-echoes the view of the 4th International.

The cases of Yugoslavia and China, however, are different. In Yugoslavia, there was a revolution; in China likewise. These states are different; they are still in the process of development, unfinished states, so to speak. In China, for example, there is a workers' and peasants' state developing toward a "dictatorship of the proletariat."

We must, says the minority, revise our attitude toward Stalinism. If Stalinism has not ceased to be counter-revolutionary, it has shown us another side, namely, a revolutionary side, which if it is not due to anything inherent in the nature of the phenomenon, is due, at least, to the pressures of the mass revolutionary movement in the world. Stalinism assumes the leadership of this movement not only because it fears the revolution but also because it rests on a progressive social foundation in Russia, nationalized property.

### Reconciliation with Stalinism

In Europe, the 4th International concluded from a similar analysis that the place of the so-called official and orthodox Trotskyists is in the mass movements of Stalinism. In criticizing the past failings of the Trotskyists on this score, it comes pretty close to a reconciliation with and apology for Stalinism as we shall shortly demonstrate. The 4th International says quite frankly that its perspectives were wrong; that it was mistaken above all in the failure to see the expansion of Stalinism as the rise of the socialist revolution in a distorted form. It calls upon its co-thinkers, therefore, to alter their views and reorient themselves vis-a-vis Stalinism.

That is precisely what the minority in the SWP is seeking to do, and it meets the stiffest resistance of the majority who object to the orientation but on rather flimsy grounds, because of its own agreement with the views briefly outlined above.

In proposing a reorientation of the SWP in the United States toward the Stalinist and Stalinoid movements, the minority insists that these are the most "politically conscious" sections of the American working class, and that the Stalinist movement is "rife with conciliation to Trotskyism!" It attacks Joseph Hansen of the majority because he wrote understandingly of the feelings of the American workers about the totalitarian regime in Russia, the slave camps, and police rule. This attitude, on the part of American workers is reactionary, says the minority, because they are merely expressing the propaganda of the ruling class.

The minority concludes that the majority is merely "hopped up" about trade union prospects, the existence of which it denies. The majority, it says, substitutes "faith and hope" for realities" and is "making a mystique of the party." The majority succumbs to the pressures of anti-communism, is guilty of Stalinophobia, of sectarianism, of resistance to work in the

(Continued on page 7)

Now Available

FOR THE FIRST TIME IN YEARS

KARL MARX  
CAPITAL

Vol. II  
\$6.00

Vol. III  
\$7.50

These volumes, published in India, contain the same translation as the American edition

Order from

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

Send remittances with your order

**BOOKS and Ideas**

**"Malenkov," by Robert Frazier**

**Malenkov as the Type of the New Stalinist Bureaucrat**

**MALENKOV.** by Robert Frazier.—Lion Books, N. Y., 159 pp., 25c.

By JACK WILSON

This first of an inevitable flurry of books about Malenkov stands up surprisingly well, considering the country, America, and the social atmosphere, McCarthyism on the rampage, in which it appeared. For the author, Robert Frazier, certainly does not share many of the current myths about Stalinism, nor does he suffer from an extreme case of Stalinist phobia, an occupational disease quite prevalent among most writers on Russia, China, or the war today.

As a primer on the "Russian question" this brief pocket book has some merit. Its history of the triumph of Stalinism in Russia is generally accurate. This by way of showing the climate in which Malenkov and the other present Stalinoid types developed into men of power.

Neither Stalin as the "logical" successor to Lenin, nor Stalinism as the "inevitable" outcome of the October Revolution are given much weight. Nor are the infamous Moscow trials taken very seriously. Quite the contrary.

How Malenkov moved through this fantastic epoch, maneuvering from a position of a suspected Trotskyite to the

confidential secretary of Stalin, helping to prepare the purges, and then to his present position makes quite interesting reading. What frightful totalitarians this new leader and his co-horts must be is emphasized over and over again.

**PEACE OFFENSIVE**

However, Frazier also points out the many difficulties of the "new regime," and gives cogent reasons why a "peace" offensive is a necessity for Malenkov and associates. Likewise he raises some interesting questions about the relationship between China and Russia. He sees the possibilities of conflict between China and Russia, or in terms of leaders, between Mao Tse-tung and Malenkov, without falling for the superficial analogy of Mao and Tito.

Of course, no biographical sketch these days is considered worth a pinch of salt unless at least one chapter is devoted to a psychoanalysis of the individual and his sex life. Naturally, a pocketbook couldn't miss this analysis. However, even here, Frazier makes some shrewd observations on "What Makes Malenkov Run." "Unlike the old Bolsheviks who were motivated by rebelliousness and a certain passion against poverty, injustice, suffering, and idealism, Malenkov, as with the other young men now in control of the Presidium, joined the revolutionary army first and was instructed in Communism later." The

author adds: "Can the principles of psychology as conceived and practiced in western nations during periods of relative freedom be applied to those reared in the patriarchal authoritarian police state, which for many years had more people than it could comfortably supply with material goods, where death, dislocation, civil insecurity, repression of all liberties, mistrust on all levels of existence, and the persecution of the innocent was a rule—where freedom of movement is an unheard of thing and living conditions so utterly at variance with that of the Western world as to stagger the imagination? A man is a paranoiac only if his feelings of persecution are based on a delusion, but where they are founded in fact, he is a realist and entitled to become suspicious, morose, anti-social, withdrawn and secretive." Worth thinking about.

In all his discussions of Russia today, and possibilities for tomorrow, Frazier seems to have gathered together the best informed opinion in the Western world and used it as the basis for his book. His chapters on Beria and Molotov seem quite accurate, especially Molotov, whose career many of us have followed for many years.

His sober conclusions are along these lines: It is erroneous to expect Malenkov to resort to foreign adventures and aggressive actions in order to consolidate all opposition against the external foe.

The reason for this is that the Soviet empire will undergo its greatest strain in war, both in the satellites, and within its old orbit, the Ukraine, etc. As for China he expects a tug of war between Mao and Malenkov within the family. He sees more trends toward "national Stalinists," in the satellites.

"The inactive but live volcano under the Kremlin is the biggest force for peace in the world," Frazier emphasizes. This is the beginning of wisdom and knowledge in the struggle against Stalinism. This kind of approach gives Frazier's book a note of sanity and reason in a country where hysteria and fear are far too frequently the only reaction to the subject of Stalinism.

**MALENKOV**  
by  
**Robert Frazier**

A Lion Books Original

160 pages 25¢

Order from  
**Labor Action Book Service**  
114 West 14th St., New York

**Is Stalinism 'Progressive'? — —**

(Continued from page 6)

conscious areas of the working class, engages in useless election activity, and reflects a sterility of leadership.

**U. S. Stalinism Is Different**

Some of these charges are perhaps true, and are possible to make because of the ambiguity of the position of the majority on the major issue in dispute. Formally it would appear that the majority views on the Eastern European states, on Yugoslavia and China coincide with the minority, and, in turn, with those of the 4th International. But in its reply to the minority proposal to concentrate all efforts on the "politically conscious" Stalinist movement, the majority contends that Stalinism in the U. S. is a miserable and discredited movement with no following among the masses and no standing in the labor movement. Therefore the decisions of the 4th International in relation to such countries as France and Italy with their mass Stalinist parties, can have no bearing whatever on the SWP. On this ground the majority makes out a limited legal and political case for itself.

The minority, however, counters with the position that the policy of the "independence of the party" is a bankrupt one. It has proved to be a failure. The party has declined, and has little influence. The party is isolated and cannot hope to make progress with its present perspectives. The only arena which offers any possibility of existence, let alone growth, is the one which they propose and which emanates from their position on Stalinism.

Since the disputes center on the question of the meaning of the decisions of the 3rd Congress, let us briefly refer to these decisions and assess their real significance.

In explaining that Stalinism has not changed, that the Russian state has not become capitalist (this refers to the basic 4th Internationalist thesis that Russia has only two alternative roads of development: either to socialism, or back to capitalism), Michel Pablo, the spokesman of the 4th International wrote:

**The Third Congress**

"On the USSR, we reaffirm its character as a degenerated workers' state; with basic arguments we refute the characterization of 'state capitalism' and we refine our programmatic attitude on the question of defense.

"We take a position for the defense of the 'People's Democracies' and of China against the war of imperialism as we do for the USSR.

**"On the Communist Parties, we make clear wherein they are different from the reformist parties which are tied to the bourgeoisie; their contradictory nature; their relationship with revolutionary movements of the masses.**

"Finally, so far as these movements are concerned we make clear our attitude of unconditional support, irrespective of whether their eventual leadership at a given stage is Stalinist or Stalinist-influenced. . . .

"Far from the importance of the defense of the USSR against imperialism having diminished in any way whatever, it remains in our opinion more vital than ever, especially when a united imperialism approaches the moment of the final reckoning of accounts. . . .

**" . . . Our attachment to the USSR permits us to be in the same camp as the world revolutionary force opposed to imperialism, permits us to find the road to the teeming revolutionary masses in Asia and in Europe in particular; permits us to be with them today in their struggle against the preparations of imperialism for war, tomorrow in their inevitable assaults against its direct power. . . .**

"We have made clear that the CPs are not exactly reformist parties and that under certain exceptional conditions they possess the possibility of projecting a revolutionary orientation, i.e., of seeing themselves obliged to undertake a struggle for power." [Emphasis in the original.—A. G.]

**"The Revolutionary Tide . . ."**

An editorial in the November-December, 1951 issue of the *Fourth International*, under the editorship of George Clarke, one of the leaders of the minority, enthusiastically endorsed the views expressed by Pablo. The editorial apparently represented the common view of the whole leadership of the SWP. At

**There's No Angel Around**

to finance Labor Action. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dimes and dollars of independent socialists and your subscriptions.

**A sub is only \$2.00 a year—  
Subscribe now!**

least, no criticism of its contents has yet appeared. Its ecstatic, flamboyant and turgid comment went in part as follows:

" . . . the supreme test of revolutionary leadership, which the 4th International alone of all tendencies of the working class has met . . . was able to skillfully diagnose existing reality, to speak clearly of the march of events. . . .

**"What is this reality? It is not merely the approaching encounter between states with different social systems. It is the merging of the two big phenomena of our time—war and revolution—into one. Trotsky wrote prior to the last war that either the revolution would stop the war or the war would produce the revolution. Many, even in the Trotskyist movement, in artificially transferring this correct statement to a greatly altered situation, were led into error. They visualized the outbreak of war as a sign of the defeat of the workers' movement. . . . [Emphasis in the original—A. G.]**

"Not the least of the achievements of the 4th International Congress was its correction of this error. There have been no shattering defeats for the workers' movement anywhere in the world since the last war. . . . On the contrary, the revolutionary tide has been moving from continent to continent. Temporarily subsiding in Europe, it swept like a flood over China. . . ." [Emphasis mine—A. G.]

**Example of Self-Delusion**

Here you have a classic example of self-delusion, of seeing the counter-revolution as a workers' revolution and of confusing the elemental revolt of the colonial masses with the Stalinist counter-revolution. No wonder this self-hypnotized editor can say "there have been no shattering defeats for the workers' movement anywhere in the world." The victory of Stalinism and the workers revolution are obviously "symmetrical phenomena" and the expansion of Stalinism only brings socialism nearer!

These, then, are the great contributions of the 4th International, and these are the views the SWP has officially upheld. Because it has upheld such pernicious, anti-socialist views, because it identifies the counter-revolution with socialism, the SWP is mired down today in a factional struggle which may seem senseless to the average observer. But it is anything but senseless.

(To be continued)

# "Peace Offensive" — —

(Continued from page 1)

different interpretations which different countries give to the significance of the recognition of a foreign government. (It may be remarked that his views on this question are regularly repudiated by the government when the recognition of Franco Spain is raised as an issue.)

But if Eisenhower tried to smooth over the turbulent waters of inter-allied disagreement, not so the right wing Republicans in the Senate. First and foremost, of course, was McCarthy who referred to "Comrade Attlee," and accused him of having joined Dean Acheson, the former secretary of state, in past compromises with "treason."

McCarthy accused Attlee of attempting to "blackmail" the United States "into accepting a communist peace" by threatening otherwise to withdraw their support to the United States. If that was Britain's intention, McCarthy shouted, "then I say to them, 'withdraw and be damned.' And let's sink every accused British ship carrying material to our enemy." The United States, he cried, can "go it alone," for this nation has "the guts, the strength, to win its battles." The galleries, it is reported, applauded heavily.

Senator Dirksen of Illinois followed hot on his heels with very definite "blackmail" threats of cutting off all financial aid to Britain. "Foreign aid will be on this floor one day soon. I, for one, know what I am going to do about it. We will have an occasion to act."

## GO IT ALONE?

Senator Jenner of Indiana attacked Churchill as violently as he blasted at Attlee. "Churchill did not oppose the sell-out to Red China. He said only that we should wait until we have an armistice first. . . . This is the thanks we get for the billions we have given to Britain. Twice we saved her from defeat. Again and again we have saved her from bankruptcy. Now we are told to come to terms with Britain's friend and our deadly enemy, even if we must bypass the Constitution to sell out our country."

And finally Senator Knowland of California: "Our chief ally has joined . . .

other UN members in urging a Far Eastern Munich. . . . We must be prepared to go it alone."

Those are ominous words, not for the Kremlin, but above all for the American people. "Let's go it alone," "we have the guts," these are hardly the words of men who "want peace" now. They are also not the ravings of a drunk agitating his fellows in some local bar, or even of an orator cheered on by bellicose businessmen gathered at an American Legion convention. These are men of power within their own party and in the country at large.

The difference of approach between the British and most other allied governments on the one hand, and the United States on the other was brought into further focus in the truce negotiations at Panmunjom. The last move of the Americans, as we go to press, was to introduce a new plan which departs markedly from the resolution passed in the United Nations last year, and reluctantly endorsed by the American delegation. It appears that behind the scenes diplomatic resistance to this plan by the allies has been so powerful as to compel the State Department to call a recess in the truce talks while it tries to straighten out the differences.

## ECONOMIC CONFLICTS

Side by side with these political sources of friction march the economic conflicts which are heading toward a crisis. With drastic cuts in financial aid for Europe in prospect, the British and other governments have been demanding that the United States lower its tariff barriers so that they can sell goods on a competitive basis in this country. Under the slogan "Trade, not Aid," this demand expresses the desperate feeling of European capitalism that the narrow economic road which it has been treading for the past few years with such difficulty is closing up before it.

But the American capitalists, fully entrenched in both the legislative and executive sections of the government, and themselves confronted by the deflationary impact of a reduction in the arms pro-

gram, are in no mood to grant tariff concessions now. Rather, the tendency is to scrap even the inadequate reciprocal trade treaties, and go out on a protectionist spree.

If nothing happens to change the direction of movement in the economic field, it can be expected that the present frictions and recriminations between the United States and her allies will appear, in retrospect, to have been an area of blissful harmony. This prospect was outlined by Alastair Forbes in the conservative London *Sunday Dispatch* (before the recent mud-slinging match) as follows:

## MALENKOV'S BEST HOPE

"There are grounds for believing that a man who is in Eisenhower's position and has been no match for McCarthy will scarcely fare better at the hands of Malenkov and Molotov, especially as the aims of these three powerful men are the same, to reduce the effective strength of the U. S. and her Allies militarily and economically.

"McCarthy's economics which we can already see nipping in the bud the concept of 'Trade, not Aid' are Malenkov's best hope of securing an early crisis in the capitalist world. McCarthy's economics in American and NATO strength should make it possible for Russia to impose her will on the U. S. and her allies within less than five years. . . ."

Mr. Forbes gives McCarthy far too much credit. On economic matters, his mentality is but a reflection of the thinking of a large and powerful group of capitalists and politicians in this country. And over and above them stands the nature of the world capitalist system itself which quite independently of their will is moving slowly toward crisis and disintegration. The whole history of the Marshall Plan and its successors, and their long-run ineffectiveness shows that this disintegration can be damned up and delayed. But it cannot be stopped or reversed.

This is the fact which liberals and conservatives alike cannot understand. But events will teach them. We can bank on that.

# The CP and the Atom Bomb

By JASPER RIDLEY

Since 1948 the Communist parties in every country of the world have been waging a vociferous campaign for the prohibition of the atomic bomb. It is therefore interesting to note that their abhorrence of the atomic weapon is of comparatively recent origin.

The atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, and reported in the press in Britain on the 7th. The editorial in the [London] *Daily Worker* on the 7th of August stated "The employment of the new weapon on a substantial scale should expedite the surrender of Japan. Valuable lives in the allied nations will have been saved by the new discovery."

Next day on the 8th of August, the *Daily Worker* stressed that the invention of the atomic bomb was a strong additional argument in favor of the need for cooperation between the three great powers: "It will enormously increase the strength of the three great powers in relation to all other countries."

On the 11th of August the *Daily Worker* in an editorial criticizing the Japanese government for delaying their

unconditional surrender, stated "One week ago any suggestion of such a rapid victory would have been dismissed as a fantastic example of wish-fulfillment. . . . All this has been changed almost overnight by the use of the atomic bomb and by the entry of the Soviet Union into the war. For the peoples of the world this is marvelous and inspiring news which will be greeted with intense joy in all democratic lands"; and later in the same editorial article it stated: "The use of the atomic bomb has mercifully shortened the war with a consequent saving of human life."

On the 13th of August the *Daily Worker* showed for the first time that it considered that all was perhaps not well where the atom bomb was concerned. In its editorial entitled *Russia and the Bomb* it criticized those conservative newspapers which were saying that the atomic bomb had caused a swing in the balance of military power away from the USSR in favor of Britain and the United States. "It is indeed a shock," wrote the *Daily Worker*, "to find that the first use of the atomic bomb against a Fascist enemy and in the interests of world peace, should be immediately followed by Tory press speculation on its advantages as a threat against a great ally who is at this moment fighting by our side." In the same issue it published an interesting article by J. B. S. Haldane suggesting that atomic bombs should only be manufactured under international supervision and that, for example, each factory in the United Kingdom manufacturing atomic energy should be in charge of an American, a Brazilian, a Chinese, an Egyptian, a Russian and a Briton. Neither Prof. Haldane nor Prof. Bernal expressed any condemnation of the use of the atomic bomb against Japan, or suggested that there was any moral objection to using the bomb in future wars.

On the 14th of August the *Daily Worker's* front page carried the headline *Japs Still Trying to Haggle*. Under this headline there was an article denouncing the Japanese for their delay in accepting the Allied armistice terms and the article criticized the dilatoriness of the Allied powers in allowing this Japanese procrastination. The following passage was print-

ed in outstanding print: "There was no official hint of the length of delay that the Japanese are to be allowed before the full force of allied power—including the atom bomb—is loosed against them in a blow intended to be final."

The French Communist paper *L'Humanité* hardly mentioned the atomic bomb at all. On the 8th of August it contained the following passage: "The atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima seems to have caused considerable destruction. American reports suggest nothing less than the disappearance from the face of the earth of a town of 300,000 inhabitants. . . . The effect of the discovery is considerable. Nevertheless the Vatican has been pleased to disapprove of it! May we be permitted to express our surprise, because when the Nazis had the privilege of waging total war with a total cruelty the Holy See was not equally indignant."

Finally it is interesting to note the article published in the Italian Communist paper *L'Unita* on the 10th of August 1945. The article was written by Mario Spinella and was entitled "At the Service of Civilization." It stated "The news that an atomic bomb was dropped by the American Air Force has made an enormous impression throughout the whole world and has been received on all sides with a sense of panic and words of condemnation. This shows, it seems to us, a curious psychological perversion and a doctrinaire obedience to a form of abstract humanitarianism. Those who today feel pity for the fate of Japan do not feel that the dropping of the new terrible weapon of destruction has put an immediate end to the bitter war being waged in the Far East. The atomic bomb—like the Soviet intervention—should be seen as a positive contribution to the sudden elimination of the last great Fascist power in the world and to the rapid institution of that peace for which all decent persons and all peoples feel such urgent need. So we do not share the sense of terror which has been expressed in certain press comments because we bear in mind the concrete use which was made of the fearful engine of destruction."

From *East Europe* (London) April 30.

## The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a 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!

## 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 (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

## The Handy Way to Subscribe!

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:  
 1 year at \$2.  New  
 6 months at \$1.  Renewal  
 Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

A great thinker on the problems of American socialism—

**Marxism in the United States**  
by LEON TROTSKY

35 cents. Order from:  
Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.