

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 3, 1953

FIVE CENTS

**David Dubinsky Proposes a Plan:
McCarthyism Without McCarthy**

... page 6

**Norman Thomas' SP and Those
'State Department Socialists'**

... page 7

Portent in Detroit

... page 2

Is the GPU Planning to Kill 'Jacson,' Trotsky Assassin, Before Release from Jail?

By L. G. SMITH

Jacson-Mornard, the murderer of Leon Trotsky, will be up for parole shortly, after serving twelve years of a twenty-year sentence.

It is to be expected that the Stalinists are concerning themselves with Jacson's future after he gets out of jail.

Although by this time there is probably no informed person inside or outside the Stalinist movement who doubts that Jacson was an agent of Stalin and the GPU, a public disclosure by him of the individuals who helped him in the task of gaining access to the Trotsky household so that he could perform his foul deed would be a serious blow to the Stalinist movement, and especially to the secret Stalinist apparatus in more than one country.

Jacson's continued existence thus is a threat to the Kremlin, and hence it is logical to expect that the GPU will seek to put an end to that existence.

In this connection, LABOR ACTION has been informed from Mexico of an incident which occurred some two months ago.

Sinister Episode

At that time, Natalia Trotsky was visited in her home at Coyocan by a well-spoken, middle-class Mexican woman. This woman told Leon Trotsky's widow that her husband was in the same jail as Jacson, in an adjacent cell. She claimed that her husband had been framed up on a narcotics charge. He was to be released in a few days, and asked permission to see Natalia to convey to her certain information concerning Jacson. Natalia replied that any information he wished to convey could be sent by letter.

The woman then asked whether Natalia Trotsky or someone else could visit the jail for her to receive the information. The answer was no.

Several days later, the same woman returned, and once more asked for Natalia Trotsky. This time she was not available, and the woman spoke to someone else in the house.

She showed a typewritten letter from her husband, conveying the idea that he had a great admira-

tion for Leon Trotsky and would like to perform a great service for his widow. He, like everyone else in the jail, hated Jacson who lorded it over all the other prisoners.

The person to whom the letter was shown pointed out at once that if the "service" intended was the killing of Jacson, this was directly contrary to the interests of Comrade Natalia or of the Trotskyists, but would be of the greatest benefit to the Stalinists. The woman thereupon asked for a match and burned the letter in the presence of the person to whom she had been speaking. That ended the incident.

It is perfectly clear to Comrade
(Continued on page 2)

AFTER THE STALEMATE TRUCE

The Guns Are Silent— Politics Has the Floor

By GORDON HASKELL

The guns are silent in Korea. Young men on both sides of the front can think of life again, and not only of death. Peasants in North Korea stand up in their fields and wave at American planes, rather than cower in foxholes from the napalm which used to rain from the skies. The vast majority of the peoples of the world heave a sigh of relief. The truce has been signed. For Korea, and hence for all of us, a breathing spell is here.

Except for the soldiers who have lived with death for so long, there are no signs of jubilation over the truce. The Stalinist press proclaims it a great victory, but the proclamation has a hollow ring. The American press, reflecting the views of the most powerful political figures in the country, has an anxious, tentative, almost fearful tone. No responsible politician dares oppose the truce. But at the same time, there are plenty of powerful voices raised to warn against the dangers inherent in it for American policy, particularly in Asia.

The American government tends to look at Stalinist expansionism primarily in military terms. This is inevitable for a government and a ruling class who themselves depend

on their own military strength as the chief means of opposing Stalinism, of maintaining capitalism throughout the world. Thus we find the warnings from Senator Knowland and others running along familiar lines: the Chinese Stalinists will now be free to throw their troops into the struggle in Indo-China; they will be able to attack Formosa; or they will reorganize their forces for a resumption of the war in Korea.

Although it is not absolutely excluded that the Stalinists may attempt a military action against Formosa, or intensify their aid to the Vietminh forces in Indo-China, these are not the real or most serious dangers for American policy in Asia which flow from the truce. The dangers are the old ones which have little direct connection with the war in Korea: the continuation of the national and social revolutions which have been shaking Asia since the end of the last war, and a split in the American alliance over the way to deal with these revolutions.

RHEE CALCULATES

It is obvious to everyone, of course, that the end of the fighting in Korea does not end the cold war. It ends, or at the very least discontinues, a military episode in that war.

The political conference which is to follow has not the slightest chance of unifying Korea and thus at least putting a period to that particular aspect of the international struggle. Syngman Rhee's policies continue to threaten the truce, even as it stands today. And if the great powers involved were, by some political miracle (short of a Yalta-type horse-trade), to agree to a free election to be held in that country for the purpose of establishing a unified government the political and social form of which would be based on the will of a majority of its people, it is quite clear that the Rhee forces would accept the popular will only if it gave them supreme power in the country. There is no reason, further, to believe that the Stalinists would agree to their own political and probable personal extermination if such a political solution to the unification of Korea could be

(Turn to last page)

SPOTLIGHT

It Occurred to Him

With that diplomatic skill for which the Eisenhower administration is noted, the finesse in foreign affair which has so impressed, depressed and oppressed Europeans, the president of the United States undertook to launch the election campaign for Adenauer on the same day that the chancellor made his first stump speech.

So artful and delicate is the strategy of Washington that one gets the subtle impression of a bull gracefully crashing through the well-known china shop.

On Sunday Adenauer opened his party's campaign in the German general election by speeches in Dortmund and Cologne. The same day in Washington where the number of people eligible to vote for Adenauer is very small, Eisenhower released a letter to "My dear Mr. Chancellor" which praised him and his policies, and especially made the point that if Germans want reunification the obvious thing for them to do is to tighten their links with the U. S. war camp.

This follows so evidently from the "if" that Eisenhower did not bother to explain such an elementary question as how the integration of Western Germany into the European Defense Community brings German unity nearer.

How this blurb for Adenauer happened to coincide with the opening of the German campaign is adequately explained by Ike to anybody's satisfaction. He says that "it occurred to me that it might be helpful if I were to write you a letter. . . ."

Of course, it will not occur to any German that Washington is putting the "Made in U. S." brand on its man Konrad—that it, it will not occur to any German below the age of 6. However, the Social-Democratic Party is likely to explain it fully even to that section of the population before the campaign is over.

The Social-Democrats have already vigorously protested the Eisenhower letter as a piece of propaganda and an "attempt to yoke the heroic acts of the East Berlin workers who died to the faulty EDC policies of the federal chancellor which are accused by millions." That's just what Eisenhower did.

Rolling Balls

The independent nomination of Rudolph Halley for mayor of New York City by the Liberal Party has set some balls rolling which are likely to push the Liberals toward independence faster than the leadership thinks even now.

For example, the "left wing" of the city Democratic machine has nominated its own candidate in the party primaries against incumbent Impellitteri, who is the choice of three borough leaders. The "left wing" candidate is Robert Wagner Jr., incumbent borough president of Manhattan. Who is the "left wing"? Why, Tammany (the Manhattan part of the organization), plus Ed Flynn (the Bronx end).

The Liberal Party, in its past maneuvers, has claimed to be ready to work with nice Democrats provided only that they separate themselves from that ol' debil Tammany. Well, it happened. But Tammany's man turns out to be Wagner, whom the Liberal Party has supported in the past as a good liberal-type Democrat, who this time rushed in a positive frantic sweat to oppose that good liberal-type Democrat Halley at the polls. It may be that the Liberal Party will have to explain to the electorate that all the good things they used to say about Wagner when they were supporting him were made under a misapprehension—"misapprehension" being a code-word for the old Liberal Party policy of deals.

(Turn to last page)

Portent in Detroit: Unemployment Rises

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, July 25—Just three days before the New York Times carried a story by its Detroit correspondent on the crisis in the auto industry, one major manufacturer permanently laid off almost 6,000 employees at one large plant.

This event, reported neither in Detroit's newspapers nor in the Times, points up the auto production crisis in sharpest form, and suggests strongly that the long-feared downturn has begun.

Combined with the already announced war production cutbacks, the slowdown of auto production indicates a stormy period ahead for many auto workers. For once, the predictions and warnings of President Walter P. Reuther of the CIO and the United Auto Workers correspond literally with the facts in the case.

As Elie Abel, in the Times wrote: "They [the manufacturers] differ on the question of how far and how fast the curve will drop; whether the giant industry faces a gentle settling to a lower plateau, or a toboggan slide."

GLUT

Some manufacturers are moving rapidly to begin production of 1954 models in the hope of stimulating the sales market. The glut of used cars and the many evidences of a buyer's market cools off any optimism even on that score, except among the professional sales forces of the auto manufacturers. These hucksters are incapable of admitting to themselves that routine platitudes like, "Good selling will do the job, normal conditions will bring healthy competition, the best will survive," are mere rationalizations.

For the impact of auto cutbacks and big layoffs is bound to permeate the entire economy in which auto is considered the bellwether industry.

In an area where the "depression psychosis" is part of the psychological make-up of every individual with experience in the auto industry, the political effects of the rough days ahead point to drastic changes in the needs and feelings of Michigan's population.

"Some layoffs of the automobile workers appear to be inevitable, coinciding perhaps with extended shutdowns for changing dies and fixtures to produce the 1954 models." This is indeed painful reading for the auto workers.

Nor is there the consoling comfort of increased war production to take up the slack. To the contrary. The dramatic shutdown of the Kaiser-Frazier plant at Willow Run, causing 12,000 employees to lose their jobs permanently, is a harbinger of days to come in that field. Unless, of course, a sudden and rather unexpected shift in the world situation takes place.

LESS THAN ROSY

It becomes quite understandable that magazines like Business Week, in its current issue, preoccupy themselves with the nightmares of "boom or bust." And when a top-rank economist like Arthur Burns, President Eisenhower's closest adviser on these matters, derides "the romantic idea that business cycles are or can be eliminated," the conclusion seems inevitable that bad economic weather ahead is a sound forecast.

In economic terms, a "recession" involving 5,000,000 unemployed (as T. V. Vance suggests in the current issue of the New Internationalist) certainly will not be a depression of the 1929-37 character. Many prominent economists and business magazines agree with that estimate.

However, the political effects are incalculable. And these will surely effect both the future of the Eisenhower administration and the political action of the labor movement. The best of all possible worlds seems somewhat less rosy, even for the most case-hardened labor bureaucrat.

LABOR SCOPE

THE T-H AFFIDAVITS FLOPPED; NEW BILLS UP

By BEN HALL

Moves are now under consideration in Congress to rescind the Taft-Hartley affidavit provisions. But we hasten to add before mass protests pour in from aroused members of Senate and House investigating committees, the changes are suggested not because the law is undemocratic but because it seems too liberal and lenient.

The law provides that leaders of unions must sign affidavits denying membership in the Communist Party; if they fail to do so, their unions are denied the privileges to which they might be entitled before the National Labor Relations Board, and cannot be "certified" by the board as a union with which a given employer might be legally compelled to bargain. At one time, this seemed to the congressional mind like a brilliant scheme for breaking the hold of CP or CP-sympathizing union leaders over their ranks without the time-consuming and annoying democratic task of explaining to workers why they should dump their own leaders.

HASN'T WORKED

But it seems that it hasn't worked out so well.

For one thing, some unions have displayed a remarkable tenacity in holding on without the recourse to the NLRB, the Mine Workers for example, and it is feared that even if CP union leaders could be locked out of board hearings, there would be no guarantee that they would lose out in their unions. But that is not the main annoyance.

In order to get around the law and still utilize every possibility, some CPers resign from the party but remain sympathetic to it or perhaps retain a secret membership; others resign from their union posts and allow non-party sympathizers or fellow travelers to take over; still others, according to these same re-

ports, simply lie and sign false oaths.

The law takes the fight against Stalinism in unions off the plane of political discussion of program, policies, and puts it in the realm of cloak-and-dagger police action, summoning for duty squads of the growing army of snoops and dicks fanning out into every field of life.

But it has one shortcoming in the eyes of perfectionists who are still trying to invent an automatic machine for detecting and isolating "Communists" operated exclusively by mechanical power and allowing total conservation of the effort of brain cells. In the last analysis, the law makes it necessary to prove, legally, even with actual evidence, that those accused of being Communist Party members are so in fact.

And although the NLRB has reported to the Department of Justice 400 cases of suspicious affidavits, the department has been able to obtain only five indictments and only one conviction.

A LA MODE

Three congressmen—Senator Butler of Maryland, Senator Goldwater of Arizona, and Representative Lucas of Texas—have devised bills aimed at correcting this anachronistic defect in the application of the affidavit provision, namely, its curious implication that a man is innocent until proved guilty.

One simple idea is to suspend the rights of any union while its leadership is under investigation of charges of signing false oaths. If this would hamstring the effectiveness of any union, it would have recourse as early as years later, through appeal to many courts.

Another scheme is to turn the whole business over to the Subversive Activities Control Board which would simply determine for itself, and thereby for everyone else, without the fuss and bother of affidavits, that a union is CP-controlled and write off its NLRB rights.

This approach appeals because it is so à la mode. The subversive board need only gather just enough evidence to convince itself and need not bother to amass enough facts to convince others; this makes for speed and efficiency, if not democracy.

Still another plan, in combination with the others, would forbid employers outright from bargaining with unions found to be "Communist-dominated."

The labor movement, by and large, has opposed the Taft-Hartley oath requirement and can be expected to take its stand against these proposed laws whose threat to every union is obvious.

Plan to Kill Jacson? —

(Continued from page 1)

Natalia that this was an approach to a new farm-up attempt by the Stalinists. If Jacson is killed, they would like nothing better than to be able to link his death to some fantastic plot of vengeance on the part of the Trotskyists.

If the Stalinists murder him, they would then be able to deflect from themselves the clear guilt implied in the elimination of an agent who has now become dangerous to them, and at the same time pin it on their political enemies. The whole idea is completely in the GPU pattern.

The behavior of the woman was such as to increase Comrade Natalia's natural suspicions, as she gave the distinct impression of having learned her little piece by rote.

HE'S DANGEROUS

For the Stalinists, Jacson has become doubly dangerous since his full identity and that of his family have been established. In the past few years it has been conclusively proved that his real name is Ramon Mercader, that he is a Spaniard, and that his mother, an old GPU agent who first introduced him into the secret apparatus of Stalinism, is living in Paris with a son and daughter, while his brother, Luis, is a hostage in Moscow.

It is further known that the mother, Caridad, has softened in her later years, and regrets that she convinced her son to kill Trotsky and subsequently spend twelve

years in jail. Now that she knows that the critical date of his parole is approaching, it is not at all excluded that she might make the whole plot public so as to make his murder superfluous to the Stalinists.

On the other hand, in view of this possibility, it is evident that her own life is not safe from the Stalinist assassins. Thus Ramon Mercader, who has always been a most devoted son, also has an incentive to tell the whole story, both as a tenuous protection for himself and as a protection for his mother.

WARNING

The danger to the Stalinist secret service which Jacson-Mercader represents may be a serious one. A number of people were obviously involved in the far-flung plot which brought him in touch with an American Trotskyist in England, stretched over France, and ended in the tragedy in Mexico.

Although most of the people who could

be traced as having had any direct connection with the whole affair disappeared right after Trotsky's death and have not been heard of since, there must have been others, in the immediate background, whose traces were so well covered that the GPU did not think it necessary to get rid of them. Some of them may even have left the Stalinist movement since then, but their mouths could be opened if Jacson should publicly point the finger at them as accomplices of the assassin.

The incident reported from Mexico should be a warning that the Stalinists may well have much more in mind than a simple "disappearance" for Jacson. It is one of their most common practices to attempt to pin the responsibility for their own crimes on their opponents. That is why we seek to give the widest possible publicity to this incident, and to warn the Trotskyist and socialist movements to be on guard against any other frame-up attempts that may be made in the future.

SECOND NEW ENGLAND ANTI-WAR CAMP AND SUMMER SCHOOL

September 6-12
Harvard, Mass.

Faculty will include

George Houser, Gordon Haskell, Lewis Coser, etc.

For reservations and further information, write to
DOT BONE, 230 Prospect Street,
New Haven, Conn.

Read the NEW INTERNATIONAL America's leading Marxist review

Pamphlets by LEON TROTSKY

The first eight pamphlets listed are by Trotsky, and are editions published in Ceylon by Lanka Samasamaja Publishers.

Revolution in Spain (January 1931)	\$.25
The Lesson of Spain: the Last Warning (Dec. 1937)	.25
Marxism and Science (Speech, 1925)	.15
Against Social-Patriotism (1916)	.10
Europe and America (Speeches in 1924 & 1926)	.30
Whither Europe? (Speech of 1926, included in the above)	.15
I Stake My Life! (Speech on Moscow Trials)	.15
In Defense of October (Speech, 1932)	.15
The Zimmerwald Manifesto (The famous anti-war declaration of 1915)	.10
The Last Words of Adolf Joffe	.10

Package price for all
10 pamphlets—\$1.50

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.
(Remittance must accompany
all orders)

LONDON LETTER *Bevanites vs. Attlee vs. Trade-Union Bureaucracy at Margate*— Left Wing Girds for Key BLP Conference

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, July 21—There can be no doubt that this year's Labor Party conference at Margate (September 28-October 2) is going to be one of the stormiest in its history. The following points at issue will have to be fought out at this conference:

(1) "Challenge to Britain."

The responsibility will devolve upon the delegates for moving amendments to this document produced by the National Executive Committee. The real question is: Has the NEC carried out the instructions of last year's conference or not?

(2) Foreign policy.

Now that the NEC has decided not to place before the party membership or conference any document dealing with the Labor Party's foreign policy, delegates will take the opportunity of closely cross-questioning the NEC and the Parliamentary Labor Party leadership on its attitude to the multifold problems facing a Labor government in the field of international relations.

(3) Industrial policy.

The acceptance of posts on the Tory Steel Board by three trade-union leaders will come up at the Trade Union Conference also, at least as sharply as at Margate. The overwhelming majority of the Labor Party members and trade unionists consider the action of these trade-union leaders as nothing short of a deliberate affront to the Labor Party and its policy of steel nationalization.

(4) Cooperative policy.

Since there is hardly a reference to the role of the cooperative movement in Labor's new program for Britain, it is not surprising that the leaders of the

Cooperative Party are up in arms against "Challenge to Britain." The deliberate omission—how else can the cooperative movement interpret it?—of any reference to this important section of the labor movement will be taken up at conference both by the co-op leaders and the delegates from the constituency party branches.

(5) Party leadership.

The blunt, stupid attack by Deakin (of the Transport and General Workers Union) on Arthur Greenwood, the chairman of the NEC and treasurer of the party, taken in conjunction with his slighting reference to Attlee, has shown all too clearly that the right-wing trade-union leaders are not satisfied with the "weak-kneed" policy of Attlee.

For Deakin and Lawther, "Challenge to Britain" is a major concession to Bevanism, and as such is not satisfactory to their way of thinking. What they want is a "strong," "aggressive" right-wing leader who can put the constituency parties in their place. They believe that Herbert Morrison is the man for the job.

Not trusting the constituency parties to place him back on the NEC, they are engaged in a backstairs intrigue to get him on the NEC by electing him as treasurer. This post is now held by Greenwood, who has refused to play the role of stooge for the right-wing trade-union leaders on the NEC.

It seems more than likely that a second attempt is being made to push Attlee out of the leadership and replace him with Morrison. (The first attempt took place at Morecambe last year.) If Dea-

kin, Lawther, Williamson and Lincoln Evans succeed in this sordid intrigue, any victory will be but a Pyrrhic victory.

Similarly, the moves afoot to replace Mrs. Irene White in the Women's Section post of the NEC with Mrs. Bessie Bradock (a militant right-winger) will backfire. This also goes for the National Union of Municipal Workers' insistence on removing their "neutral" delegate on the NEC, Captain Mark Hewitson ("neutral" between the right and left wings).

(6) Conscription.

The Amalgamated Engineering Union has placed on the agenda a "Shinwellite" resolution calling for reduction of National Service (the draft) from two years to one. (Emanuel Shinwell has been its main proponent.) This will lead to a head-on clash with the right wing.

It is almost certain that new points of issue will have arisen by the time the conference meets. The important thing to bear in mind about these issues is this: they are all inseparably linked together. Delegates will be faced with clear-cut decisions—right or left.

The other interesting development that is being studied very closely here is the split or rift between the Labor Party right wing and the trade-union right wing. The pressure of events reinforced by the ever-insistent pressure of the rank and file, on the one hand, and the stubborn refusal of the Big Four trade-union leaders, on the other has expanded the scope of Bevanism and deepened its appeal. The very survival of the Labor Party as a labor party—i.e., as a party broadly representative of the views and opinions of the three sections of the movement is now at stake.

Tom O'Brien, chairman of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, and a puppet of the Big Four, castigated

those people who think that the TUC is just a glorified industrial committee of the Labor Party. His own conception of the Labor Party is simply this in reverse. For Deakin-Lawther-Williamson-Evans, the Labor Party is a glorified political subcommittee of the TUC General Council. Or, to be more frank, the Labor Party is conceived as being a megaphone for the Big Four.

The reassertion of the guiding organizational principle of the Labor Party is alienating the right-wing trade-union leaders, and at the same time forcing the right-wing Labor Party leaders (whose basis and very political existence stems from these organizational principles) to compromise still further with the Bevanism they so heartily detest.

All this is background to the publication of the Resolutions for the 52nd Annual Conference of the party. Amendments to these resolutions have to be sent in by constituency parties by August 14.

Only one resolution gives support to the NEC. The rest are critical and are described by the press as "Bevanite."

RESOLUTIONS

There are no less than 30 resolutions on nationalization, all of them calling for a further extension. Ten deal with the administration of the nationalized industries, all of them advocating either full, 50 per cent, or part workers' participation in the nationalized boards. Fifteen are devoted to foreign policy in general terms. Eighteen are concerned with colonial policy. Twenty-six cover national insurance and war pensions, benefits and allowances. Thirteen demand the abolition of the House of Lords. Fourteen call either for reduction or abolition of National Service.

One of the most thorough of all the resolutions submitted comes from Liverpool, Walton Constituency Labor Party. It runs as follows:

"This Conference restates its fundamental socialist belief that war arises out of the contradictions of the capitalist system of production. It recognizes that these general contradictions, which led to the First and Second World Wars, exist today in the period of declining world capitalism in a more acute form, threatening the very fabric of society itself.

"Basing itself upon the lessons of 1914 and 1939, it believes that temporary agreements between the big powers, which are nothing more than an "armed truce," cannot remove the dangers of a third world war.

"Against the policies and plans of the imperialist powers, whose program of rearmament is a confession of bankruptcy; against the policy of the Russian totalitarian bureaucracy which seeks to defend and extend its privileges and rule against the interests of the people, this Conference calls upon the Labor parties of Britain and Europe to organize the workers in the struggle for the Socialist United States of Europe.

"It believes that only such a policy will bring about real unity amongst the European nations, permit the planning of Europe's resources and industries, aid the underdeveloped countries to remove the causes of oppression and bureaucratic rule, and offer the peoples of Europe, to whom our fate is tied, a socialist alternative laying the basis for a lasting peace and prosperity.

"It declares that the present proposals for a European 'parliament' and the unification of Europe's resources advanced by the representatives of the various capitalist governments have nothing in common with the above aim, but at best can only serve the interests of this or that group of monopolists and financiers.

"Recognizing the enormous responsibility which history has placed upon the British Labor movement, this Conference declares itself neither for Washington nor Moscow, but for the program and policy of international socialism."

Socialists throughout the world will watch with anxious anticipation the proceedings at this forthcoming conference. For if a left majority repudiates the right wing for the third year running, it is difficult to see how the whole leftward direction and movement of the party can be decelerated.

The fury of the right-wing trade-union leaders, their desperate and ludicrous antics to reverse the leftward trend, seem to indicate that for them at least it is now or never. If they fall again, the Labor Party may come of socialist age.

Trends in French Socialism

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, July 22—The 46th congress of the French Socialist Party (SFIO) took place in the first week of July, in the middle of a positive development for this most fossilized of all social-democratic parties.

The SFIO, which had supported all French center-governments succeeding themselves since 1945 with varying degrees of ineffectiveness, had suffered catastrophic losses in popular prestige. As an illustration, its membership had declined from 338,625 members in 1945 to 108,437 in 1952. Then for the first time since the war it joined the ranks of the opposition against the Pinay government in 1952 and has remained there since. The result has been significant, if not spectacular. In the municipal elections this April, the SFIO scored important increases: a net gain of 297 seats, representing an increase of 2.3 per cent. At the same time, the recruitment of members to the larger local federations has shown a marked increase.

It could have been expected, then, that the congress would stress a policy of independence from the clerical, capitalist and colonialist forces that dominate French political life, and from the American influence that stands behind them. Unfortunately, the congress did little in response to the popular feeling, so clearly expressed at the polls, for a more independent and militant socialist policy.

The majority program for internal politics calls for a vague "Front démocratique et social" of which it is hard to tell as yet whether it is not an electoral maneuver tending to resurrect a center government. A proposal for a "Front démocratique et révolutionnaire" by Marceau Pivert, who leads a left wing in the SFIO on the basis of a rather timid third-camp position, was defeated.

A debate took place on the European Defense Community between the majority, who, echoing the American line, favor the integration of Western Germany into the project, and the minority, who would prefer to wait for big-power negotiations and the unification of Germany before ratifying the treaty. As against a similar debate last year, the minority gained a considerable number of man-

dates, which also represents a sign of growing tendencies toward independence.

LEFT-CATHOLICS

Another movement should be noted because it is spontaneous, rapidly growing and because it responds to the same need for an independent left which is asserting itself, under a different form, inside the SFIO. It is the movement crystallizing around *Esprit*, a review with a left-Catholic, socialist, sometimes Stalinoid line.

Sometime ago the editors of this review thought it would be a good idea to establish groups in Paris and elsewhere which would use the review as a rallying point and function as meeting places for various left-wing tendencies in the labor movement. The main purpose of these groups was supposed to be a means for getting the review sold, to assure a steady supply of material for it and, perhaps, to extend its intellectual influence.

The response to this initiative far exceeded the timid framework in which it was conceived. "Groupes *Esprit*" started forming spontaneously in various towns such as Strasbourg, Grenoble, Agen, as well as in French-speaking Switzerland and Belgium.

In Paris, the editorial board had 200 people on its hands within a few months, and is now trying to decide what to do with them. In Strasbourg, two groups formed simultaneously and independently of each other, and existed for a while side by side until they were eventually related by the Paris office.

The composition of these groups varies widely, because they are seized upon as a pretext for reorganization by widely divergent people. It seems, though, that unlike what one could expect, they are not formed exclusively by intellectuals but by different elements of the population such as trade-unionists, clergymen, farmers, intellectuals, militants of various ship-wrecked movements who are trying to recapture a foothold in political life.

Politically, these groups are formed mostly by socialists and socialist sympathizers who are repelled by the corruption of the official socialist movement

(SFIO) but who have more or less important differences with the CP and prefer to maintain their political independence.

Stalinoid tendencies exist, as they exist everywhere here, but they are not predominant and reflect a certain confusion in the non-Stalinist left rather than an active influence and participation of Stalinist elements.

The *Esprit* movement cannot become an independent socialist party, and it is to be hoped that none of its leaders will overreach themselves to the point of making the mistakes of the RDR all over again. On the other hand, the significance of this increase of political life around *Esprit* should not be underestimated; it is part of the "molecular processes," a ferment in the French working-class movement and a prelude to new alignments on the political scene.

BELGIAN 'BEVANISM'

The tendencies toward the left in the socialist movement are not confined to France but have extended to her immediate neighbors. The Belgian Socialist Party congress in the last week of June was preceded by the congress of the important Socialist Federation of Brussels, in which a new left wing made itself heard, giving a hard time to the reformist bureaucrats, especially Mr. Paul-Henri Spaak.

The political complexion of this tendency can be described as "Bevanist," even though it seems to get some of its ideas from the Stalinists. It calls itself "Socialist Movement for Peace" and launched a manifest immediately after the congress of the Brussels federation, stating that the "socialist contribution to the defense of peace seems hesitating, confused and ineffective," and coming out in favor of "armistice in Korea, recognition of the Chinese People's Republic and its admission in the UN, a peaceful solution to the Indo-Chinese problem, the unification of Germany after free elections, development of East-Sea trade."

It accepts in its ranks only SP members and has already signed up numerous militants as well as 7 senators and 12 deputies. Although the right wing has been sniping at it—"party splitters, pro-Stalinists, etc."—the official socialist press has ignored it so far.

WORLD POLITICS

MARXISM for TODAY

South African Resistance Due to Explode

The growing explosiveness of the conflict in South Africa between the African movement for freedom and the racist Malan government is vividly described in the following account by Professor Emmett Murphy, who has just been expelled from the Union by the South African government because of over-friendliness with his black students at the University College of Fort Hare. Professor Murphy's view is from a letter to George Houser, secretary of Americans for South African Resistance, who has published it in the ASAR's bulletin.

The professor writes from the point of view of a liberal sympathetic with the "non-violent" principles on which the African resistance has attempted to base itself, but what he brings out, to his own regret, is the growing feeling that the approach and policies of the resistance movement are too limited.

ANTI-WHITE FEELING

"The reports we have seen in the American press appear to be accurate. The Non-Europeans in South Africa are treated harshly and unjustly in a thousand ways; there is no area now left in the U. S. where Negroes receive treatment as stern and unfair as in South Africa.

"We feel that there are two opposing forces at work in South Africa today that sweep all else before them. They are the anti-black, nationalistic power seekings of the Nationalist Party (and by a substantial number of supporters of the United Party), and the nationalistic movement of the Africans, which is fast becoming anti-white. We in America must recognize the growing anti-white feeling among the Africans. It is not a deep color prejudice such as many whites possess; it is more a desperate last-resort of self-protective activity. It has been so difficult for the Africans in South Africa to know who their white friends were, and to see them taking a definite stand, that in their desperation they are moving toward the feeling that there will be prejudice against Africans as long as a white person retains power in the country.

"This trend is not affected, as nearly as we could tell, by people like Duncan or Reverend Scott. The better educated Africans are simply beginning to say, 'We know there are a few whites who do not hate us and want to oppress us, but they are so few and there are so many others who pretend to be friendly while they are working against us that we must wrest power from all whites before we will be safe.'

"As the Nationalist Party and most whites in South Africa grow more extreme and harsh in their attempts to keep the blacks down, so the various African political organizations and most blacks get more extreme in their ambi-

tions to remove the chains which have bound them and to assume control of their own destinies and their land. White liberals are being progressively squeezed out of power by the extremists in both sides, as are African and Indian moderates. Unless a new element enters the picture, we feel, a violent clash between the two forces is inevitable.

"Mild and hesitant steps will not relieve the tension for long, as many liberals and moderates in South Africa believe. The only thing that will be effective will be a quick granting of fundamental rights to Non-Europeans and embarkation upon a huge program of social and economic progress for all the people. It is our opinion that at least 75 per cent of the Europeans in South Africa are unswervingly opposed to this much.

"The African and Indian leaders we know are sincere in their belief in the use of nonviolent resistance. They operate against more and more violence from the Europeans, however, and find occasional difficulty in restraining their people from meeting violence with violence. More and more influential Africans are reluctantly accepting the opinion that nonviolence will one day prove useless, and that their people will turn to violence. They do not want violence, of course, and the more aid they get from whites in the outside world the more effective will be their non-violent methods.

BEGINNING TO WONDER

"My general feeling is that South Africa is a world on the brink of chaos. The whites go out of their way to boast and brag of their power and prosperity, yet they are at the same time being consumed by a deep anxiety and fearfulness. They provoke the Africans often and seem to be almost anxious for the day to come when the Africans arise and can be put down once and for all by brutal force. The philosophy of liberalism is a dim and scarce heard voice crying in the wilderness of fear and hate.

"The Africans are suffering more and more, and are increasingly feeling their sufferings. They are becoming disillusioned with the ideals of moderacy, courtesy, and peacefulness. They are pushed off the sidewalks, they are legislated against, they are shamed for being unable to improve themselves, and they are slapped down when they try to improve. They are still willing to try peacefully to alleviate their lot, but they are beginning to wonder if civilized methods will ever bring more than sneers from their white rulers.

"The country is in a mess and is due for violence, in my opinion. My sympathy, though not with violence, is wholeheartedly on the side of the Non-Europeans. This sympathy, though we made no open and official statement of it, is in essence what caused us to be forced out of the country. A person in South Africa today who obviously, however quietly, treats the Non-Europeans on a purely equalitarian basis and fraternizes often with them is a danger to the government, and we are examples of how clearly the government recognizes this."

Socialist Youth League

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

I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.

I want to join the SYL.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE

STATE

SCHOOL IF ANY

TWO KINDS OF NATIONALISM IN THE WORLD

By PHILIP COBEN

We are in receipt of a letter from a reader—signed "Arthur Steier, Non-Socialist" (just like that)—who complains that after nine months of reading LABOR ACTION we have left many unanswered questions in his mind with respect to some fundamental ideas about the socialism viewpoint. That is all right with us since we hope that he will be stimulated to learn more about the basic ideas of socialism than LABOR ACTION purports to cover—by reading, for example, such books as *The Fight for Socialism* by Max Shachtman.

One point that he raises, however, we have dealt with both specifically and generally several times, and in case we haven't done so in the last nine months, now's the time to do it again. Here's what our non-socialist friend writes on this question:

"I have read time and again of your hostile attitude toward nationalism, and yet you support, without reservation, the nationalist-inspired movements in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. Even in Germany, your idea of the ultimate victory is the unification of the peoples of East and West Germany. Needless to say, these oppressed men and women have justification for their grievances, but when they cry 'independence' before religious and social barriers can be settled, and when they resort to terrorism to promulgate their violent feelings toward foreigners (a situation which would be condemned if practised by Americans), I can't see how many liberals and socialists alike react with complete sympathy to this type of nihilistic activity. I wonder what the attitude of LABOR ACTION would be toward the 'independence' movements of the 'language republics' within the boundaries of India, or, for that matter, the 'independence' movement of that little town in the Southwest which claims it was never legally ceded to the U. S. by Mexico in 1848."

DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLE

Now there are many tricky aspects to the question of nationalism, to be sure, and every case is by no means an open-and-shut question, but we don't think it is mainly these aspects (some of which we have discussed in these columns) that trouble our correspondent. The question is whether we agree on the following starting-point, which is by no means peculiar to socialism but rather is a fundamental democratic idea.

It is the right of every national people to be free of foreign oppression, rule themselves, and determine their own fate.

In some cases (the "tricky" ones) it might be necessary to get into a discussion of what constitutes a national people; that might be so in relation to the Indian "language republics" referred to, if we knew just what our friend was talking about specifically. We needn't get into it here.

There are certain things that follow from the above-stated simple principle, for "liberals and socialists alike." The first is the difference between the nationalism of an oppressed people and the nationalism (better, chauvinism) of the people who are their oppressors. It doesn't require much "theory" to see that.

You can't throw all "nationalism" into the same bag. The Nazi ideology was nationalistic, and in its case that meant their glorification of Germany as the rightful overlord over all other peoples. It was imperialistic nationalism. The French resistance against the Nazi occupation was also "nationalistic" that is, it was a national-liberation movement.

NATIONAL-LIBERATION

Our simple principle has no trouble in distinguishing between these two "nationalisms." One proclaimed its rights to oppress; the other fought for its right to be free of another nation's oppression. And that is what determines the socialist attitude, as it should determine the liberals'.

It is also a guiding line in mixed situations. Among nationally oppressed peoples, one also sometimes finds chauvinist elements. That is one reason, incidentally, why we do not support simple nationalism "without reservations"; on the contrary, socialists in a national-liberation movement have very definite objectives for which they fight within that movement even as they support the cause of independence from the foreign foe.

In many places in "Africa, Asia and

the Middle East," there is colonialist domination by Western European powers (as in Tunisia, Morocco, British Africa) and arm-twisting pressure on small independent peoples by the economic and political power of the bigger capitalist states; and here there is a problem of national-liberation on various levels just as there is in the satellites of the Russian empire.

It should be quite obvious that all this has simply nothing to do with a crackpot group in a Southwest town—not that we know of the case, but we do know about the small town in the Middle West in 1917 which refused to recognize the state of hostilities with Germany on the ground that the town council hadn't declared war.

WHY INDEPENDENCE?

The national unification of Germany is not our idea of "ultimate victory" but only a democratic necessity quite short of socialist victory. Our correspondent agrees the German people are "oppressed" but doesn't see why "they cry 'independence' before religious and social barriers can be settled." It is really very simple.

They want independence because they want to settle their own internal difficulties themselves, and not have them "settled" by a foreign oppressor. Americans ought to know all about that because we made a revolution ("terrorism," our friend calls it!) while our own internal affairs were in an awful mess. And we Americans were quite right to do so, since only we could settle our own affairs in the interests of our own people and not in the interests of a foreign overlord. (Parenthetically, the obstacles to German unity are not religious, but we'll skip it.)

The "terrorism toward foreigners" in East Germany was the unarmed uprising of a people against the Russian heel over their own land, wasn't it? If Americans ever face that situation, we guarantee to applaud our correspondent if he ever "practises" such action.

So there is "nationalism" and "nationalism," and what the socialist tries to do, and what the liberal ought to try to do, is to look behind the word at the political and social program for which people are fighting, at the political and social consequences of different classes' activity. There is a lot more to the Marxist method than that, but it is a good beginning.

THE BENDING CROSS

A BIOGRAPHY OF
EUGENE V. DEBS

by

Ray Ginger

Now, while they last
only \$1.00

Order from:

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

NOW—IN ENGLISH
THE FAMED "VOLUME 4"
OF "CAPITAL"

Karl Marx's
HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC
THEORIES

PART ONE

Langland Press—337 pages—\$5.00

Order from

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



LABOR ACTION

August 3, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 31

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 MASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Political Kaleidoscope in New York City—IV

The Decline of the Old-Party Machines: New Opportunity for the Liberal Party

By WALTER BARRON

In the election of 1951, Rudolph Halley's election as City Council president on the Liberal Party ticket, following Vincent Impellitteri's election as mayor the previous year on the "Experience Party" ticket, again accentuated how the idea of a "solid machine vote" was an obsolete notion in New York City. Even more important for the future of city politics, the Liberal Party was now definitely a political force, not merely either a protest group or a balance-of-power group.

The initial course of the former national television favorite in office was mixed. Of course, he continued his "gang-busting" line in public statements; on that score he definitely remained the "reformer." His relation to the Liberal Party varied; although he publicly insisted that he was both a Democrat and "responsible to no one," yet several of his leading assistants were Liberal Party people. Halley has, furthermore, never made his peace with the regular Democratic organization.

Nevertheless, at first he had few policy differences either with the administration or the regular Democrats, except for his early opposition to an increase in the sales tax that Impy had successfully proposed. That was to change drastically recently.

Meanwhile, the Democratic Party organization and its blood-brother rivals in the administration continued to have rough times. The hearings of the State Crime Commission last fall were even more revealing about city politics than the Kefauver hearings, though they had much less public impact. Most of the attention went to the waterfront, with detailed accounts of what everyone knew—the existence of every species of racketeering under the cooperation of the shipowners and the feudal barons of Joe Ryan's longshore union, dominating the victimized and terrorized longshoremen.

There was an assumed tie-up with local politics, indicated by such items as the importance in local affairs of the "Mr. Big" of the waterfront, William McCormack, and the regular list of public officials at the various dinners to honor Ryan. There was, however, nothing resembling definite evidence. That was not necessary for the public. Indignation needed but a hint to become intensified.

The 1952 Campaign

But more telling about municipal politics, though with much less direct effect on public attitudes, were the appearance of various Democratic district leaders. One admitted that he sold nominations for judgeships to the highest bidder. Bert Stand, former Tammany secretary, admitted he had no regular income, but managed to be supported by his brother, a very successful lawyer to whom "good contacts" proved very important.

This was still no Seabury exposé, but it was enough to add more hostility to the city political leaders from those who had already lost so much of the allegiance of 1948-49. There was more of the same in the news—a sewer-contract scandal in Queens, a bookmaking scandal in the city's lost island borough, Richmond, in which a deposed Republican county leader was implicated.

What effect all this had in the national elections of 1952 is not too clear. With the supposition that "corruption" in the Democratic Party was a vote-getting issue for their opponents, if a subordinate one, the results in New York City may have been partially grounded in recent municipal political history. The Democratic city leaders were apparently convinced it would have little importance. They thus were able to convince the rest of the party in the state to nominate John Cashmore, the Brooklyn borough president, for United States senator.

Cashmore had in no way been involved in any recent revelations. In fact, he had thoroughly supported and had possibly been the prime mover behind Brooklyn District Attorney Macdonald's investigation into bookmaking, the inquiry that led to the Harry Gross case. A dapper political figure of the old school, Cashmore would have been a perfect running mate for Jimmy Walker. But the Liberal Party would not take such an obvious machine product and a large number of voters later agreed. As has often been the case, the Liberals were forced to run their own man almost by default—George Counts, famed Teachers' College professor and a party vice-chairman.

Liberal Party Gaining

The Liberals had their most successful campaign in national and state elections. Stevenson got about 400,000 votes in the state on its label, 335,000 in the city. Counts got 460,000 votes—400,000 in the city. For the Democratic Party in the city, the results were, in contrast, very disappointing. The Stevenson Democratic city vote was only a little more than Eisenhower's. Cashmore got about the same number of votes in the city as did Senator Ives, the Republican candidate.

Another solid organization candidate had flopped. These elections had shown that the Democratic Party appeal, per se, was at its weakest. Either the Republicans or Liberals might pick up some of the lost votes; in municipal elections it might be wide-open for anybody.

That was the appearance in November. It may be quite different now. The Republicans may not only have lost their chance to become a serious rival to the city Democrats for the

first time in history, but it may be found that they have replaced Tammany as the leading target of indignation.

As this series of articles on the recent history of New York City politics concludes, the nominations are about set for this year's election.

Rudolph Halley is the head of the Liberal Party ticket. The Democratic leaders of the five boroughs are split, with three favoring Mayor Impellitteri, and Manhattan leader DeSapio and Bronx leader Ed Flynn supporting Manhattan Borough President Robert Wagner Jr. The Republican leaders, after biding their time before making their decision on the mayoralty designate, have put up Harold Riegelman. The municipal City Fusion Party has, at least tentatively, nominated Samuel Liebowitz, the former famed criminal lawyer turned "tough" criminal judge.

The various "good government" organizations, led by the newly formed Citizens Non-Partisan Committee, are frantically upset that a coalition ticket against Tammany has not been worked out. A Democratic primary struggle is certain, with not only the two major factions involved, but dissident district leader Robert Blaikie also putting himself up as a possible nominee.

We conclude the series, then, with a summation and analysis of the background of political forces leading up to the present campaign.

The essential theme has been the decline of what is still called Tammany. Actually the term is best applied to the New York County (Manhattan) Democratic organization, which has long since lost its dominance over the other boroughs in local politics. The entire Democratic Party has lost its former hold over so much of the city electorate that came from the work of its political machine.

The Machine Rots

The first LaGuardia victory in 1933 left the Democratic machine relatively intact. The LaGuardia administration's re-election in both 1937 and 1941, which was crucially assisted by the support of the labor movement and the then united American Labor Party, were not resounding blows. The Democrats still had an apparently going organization, buttressed by the appeal, plus patronage, of the Lehman state administration and the New Deal Washington administration. There was little puzzlement when in 1945, aided by the support of the now Stalinized ALP, O'Dwyer became mayor. His re-election in 1949, without ALP support but with the official support of the AFL and CIO, was in line with the national pro-Democratic sentiment following Truman's 1949 victory.

But the organization itself was not healthy. The municipal political world dominated by patronage appeals was no longer all-powerful. Good jobs were around only for those on the top; for the others, there were many easier ways of making a living than bell-ringing. The machine could thus count on few cohorts, and the few around battled furiously for the comparatively meager spoils. Except in the Bronx, the organization resembled not a "machine" but an antique collection of watchworks in which the different parts sometimes worked together.

The O'Dwyer administration seemed to be run by a palace guard, regularly in conflict with most of the organization leaders, who were in turn jealous and fearful of their mayor and ever apprehensive of a brewing set of scandals. After O'Dwyer resigned, after the scandals hit the front pages, and after the Democratic label lost some of its automatic national support with the Korean war, the organization flopped on its face in three successive elections. This was most apparent in two special local contests, when Impellitteri beat them in the election for mayor in 1950 and Halley did the same in the election for council president in 1951. But even in state and national elections the loyal machine stalwarts, like gubernatorial candidate Lynch in 1950 and senatorial candidate Cashmore in 1952 proved to be sore spots on their respective tickets.

Set-up for a New Movement

All their opponents, possible "independents" as well as the Republicans and Liberals, were gaining. However, many now regard the Republicans as the greatest enemy in city politics. It all began when the state administration, under the complete domination of Thomas E. Dewey, overdid its defiance of sentiment in the city and passed a new rent-control law permitting 15 per cent minimum raises.

But the Dewey administration was only starting. City government in the United States is completely dependent on state government sanction. Such a basic traditional right as taxation is not permitted municipalities without state approval. This is usually accomplished by some deal between the state capital and City Hall.

But this year, Dewey, feeling renewed power because his man, Eisenhower, had compensated for his own two previous defeats in national elections, dictated the financial policy of the city. Before he would permit his legislature to give the city power to raise real-estate taxes, the city government was required to accept his package deal, centering in the idea of a City Transit Authority. The Authority, half of whose original members were to be appointed by Dewey, would have the power to raise fares without any necessary approval by anyone else.

Obviously realizing what this would mean, all city officials were in opposition. However, most of them, led by Impellitteri, expressed a few words of protest for the record and then yielded. Not so with Halley and Wagner. They not only publicly kept up the fight against the Dewey proposals, but voted against its acceptance, even though that would prevent the sought-for new taxes. The Authority has now been set up,

fares have been raised as expected, and a member has already resigned in protest.

The Dewey role in city politics made any Republican-Liberal coalition this year very unlikely. It became virtually impossible when the Republicans rejected the one mayoralty candidate both might have agreed to, "liberal" Congressman Jack Javits. Apparently, Dewey and company felt confident that the 1952 national swing and indignation against the local Democrats would allow them to go it alone—in fact, confident enough to flaunt most of the city electorate in recent months. (The other suggested explanation is Dewey's desire to re-elect Impy.)

The situation is now perfectly set for the Liberals' independent role. Neither of the traditional major parties can command any regular allegiance. Most of the "independent" political groups, from the Americans for Democratic Action to municipal reform organizations, will be compelled to support the Liberals. Wagner's selection as Democratic nominee may be a serious obstacle, for he would have some of the same general appeal as the Halley slate.

The Tammany era is about over; the Dewey era is very shaky. Win or lose, 1953 can make the Liberal Party.

Socialist CO Jailed

LOS ANGELES—Vern Davidson, recently secretary and organizer for the Young People's Socialist League, was arrested here on July 16 on the charge of refusing induction, reports the Davidson Defense Committee. Davidson has requested classification as a conscientious objector on political grounds but this was rejected. He is the first socialist in a leading post to be arrested for opposition to the draft in many years.

Bail of \$2500 was raised by members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Socialist Party in Los Angeles.

BOOKS and Ideas

THE SALVAGE, by Dorothy Swaine Thomas, with assistance from Charles Kikuchi and James Sakoda. University of California Press, \$7.50.

This is the second volume in the Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study. This book offers a probing examination of the evacuees from War Relocation camps who were given "loyalty" clearance and were permitted to resettle in the Middle West during 1943 and 1944. The first part of the book is a sociological portrait of Japanese American life in the midst of isolation and segregation from the general American community. Much of the information is attributable to James Sakoda, himself an evacuee, who was responsible for analyzing data revealing the "statistical lives" of almost 25,000 evacuees. The second section contains fifteen life histories of Nisei resettlers. Much of this information was presented by Charles Kikuchi who had done extensive work for the study while confined in a relocation center.

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

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

David Dubinsky Proposes a Scheme: McCarthyism Without McCarthy

By HAL DRAPER

Speak of the devil. . . . For the last two issues, our "Spotlight" column has devoted itself in good part to viewing with alarm a trend which we discerned in the so-called "fight against McCarthyism." It seemed to us potentially more dangerous, from a long-term point of view than the specific "McCarthyism" of McCarthy.

It is the tendency, in the course of combating the "excesses" of McCarthyism, to accept every basic principle of civil liberties which McCarthy and his ilk base themselves on, while eschewing the junior senator's "techniques" and "methods."

Now David Dubinsky, president of the Ladies Garment Workers Union and the power in the New York Liberal Party, comes along to make a detailed proposal ("Instead of the McCarthy Method") which does just that in institutionalized form.

Under that title, he presents a scheme in an article in the New York Times Magazine for July 26, which, he says, was offered by the recent national convention of his union, "with some modifications and suggestions."

"Responsible" McCarthyism

Dubinsky's proposal is almost overtly a plan to do everything that McCarthy is doing but to do it under "responsible" auspices. It is a scheme to strip McCarthyism of its "bad" side, which is due to Joe, and retain its "good" functions, but under the control of men who won't hunt headlines, men of "imagination and alertness, sobriety and substance," "broadly representative" and "experienced." And they will do it better.

He puts it in practically just these words:

"... the important task today is to meet the problem that created McCarthyism by adopting a more effective, more American way to do the job he is doing with such brutal ineptitude and such damage to our world position." (Our emphasis.)

We will see what the "good" McCarthyites are supposed to do, in spite of the fact that Dubinsky throws in the required quota of phrases about "avoiding slander," "democracy," etc.

For a Scientific Witchhunt

What he objects to in McCarthyism is its "fanciful exaggerations," "smears and slanders," "unreasoning, destructive hysteria." He wants to put the witchhunt on a scientific basis. He deplores "the excesses of some of our congressional investigators" but it is perfectly clear that he wants to do their purge job, only right. He objects to ignorant maligning of "innocent" persons. All that is the bad McCarthy "method."

The rest of McCarthyism is proposed as "Instead of the McCarthy Method."

He objects to the "McCarthy method," for one thing, because "it interferes with the careful work of our security agencies by trying to do on page 1 of our newspapers what should be done quietly, secretly, and professionally by our agencies of counter-espionage," and he leaves no doubt that this thought applies equally not only to counter-espionage but to thought-police directed against "the Communist menace."

There is only a quick bow in the direction of the labor-statesman platitude that the Communist "faith" cannot be fought with "threat and terror" or "fear," but with a more vigorous democratic faith. Yet the "good" McCarthyite instruments that he wants are obviously set up to combat Stalinists with threats (non-hysterical), terror (non-headline-hunting) and fear (without fanciful exaggerations).

What is this program? It envisages two new agencies. Swinging into its concrete descrip-

tion, Dubinsky unlooses an initial gem: "This program would take the Communist issue out of politics and out of the hands of the politicians."

And to implement this program to take the Communist issue out of politics and out of the hands of the politicians, the first agency he proposes is—a commission appointed by the president "to guide the nation on every aspect of the Communist problem." Both agencies are "designed to supplement the regular functions of such invaluable established organizations as the FBI." The plan, then, is as much "out of politics" as the president or the FBI are.

The President's Commission

The purpose of this first agency, the President's Commission, is to take over the "good" functions of McCarthy's committee, Velde's outfit, etc. What is it to do? First, it is to "map an integrated policy for coping" with the Communist movement. Who is to do the "coping"? The present non-McCarthyite official network of FBI cops, stoolpigeons and spies, dicks, finger-men, "subversive lists," etc.? Dubinsky does not discuss this, taking it for granted. He is concerned only with taking McCarthyism away from McCarthy.

Secondly, this commission is to be an investigating agency, as the McCarthyite witchhunters are now. "Its investigations would be conducted in complete privacy, but it would have both the authority and the duty to make public its findings whenever it felt disclosure was in the public interest." If, as a result of these "completely private investigations," "disclosures" are made labeling men, movements or ideas, what recourse can there be to correct injustices? None whatever; the victims will have to be satisfied with the consolation that they are being branded by "responsible" people, rather than irresponsibles. What rights are possessed by those investigated? Dubinsky's answer is that something ought to be done to make sure that the investigations are fair and that elementary rights are not snuffed out. That is, he wants to jump out of the window with a firm resolve not to hit the pavement too hard.

Dubinsky's idea of protecting rights is amply indicated by his remark: "The FBI . . . has demonstrated that it is possible to do a first-class job of ferreting out the enemies of our country without trampling on the immunities of the innocent." In fact, he presents the FBI as the model for the operation of his scheme as far as "respect for personal liberties" is concerned.

Thought Police—Dubinsky Style

But the crux of the matter is that, in all this, with all the non-existent "safeguards" and everything, Dubinsky is assuming—*simply assuming*, so far have things gone in the U. S.—that it is in the democratic tradition to set up a super-governmental agency to organize snooping and surveillance over the political beliefs of individuals. That is implicit in all of it.

And that is a thousand times more important than disputes among the snoopers over the "technique" with which it is to be done. In the long run, not even the most despotic totalitarian state could long tolerate the operation of police-state methods by "fanciful exaggeration," "headline-hunting," and the other objectionable features that Dubinsky finds in McCarthy's type of McCarthyism.

What Dubinsky himself proposes—*liberal that he is, anti-McCarthyite that he is*—is the institutionalization of the witchhunt system in permanence.

The second part of the Dubinsky plan is a "Private Information Center." This is obviously to do "responsibly" what *Red Channels*

and *Counterattack* do "ineffectively." But it is to do it.

The count against these present notorious institutions (which are not mentioned by name) is, Dubinsky implies, that their directors' interest is just to make money. He wants an institution which will work the purge blacklist system for its own sake, not filthy lucre. He complains that at present "there is no reliable sources of information to which they [private organizations] can turn for light on front organizations or on individuals with a consistent record of identification with Communist causes." Why is such a "reliable source" needed?

In sole illustration Dubinsky points to the blacklist needs in the entertainment field, warning against blacklisting of mere innocent dupes. But it is unmistakable that he is proposing a "good" and sound, "reliable" and effective BLACKLIST, rather than an unreliable one.

Is radio actress X really a fellow traveler, or was she a Communist? The "Private Information Center" will really give us the goods on her. If she is proved guilty of the "crime" of "knowingly" joining a couple of front organizations, then the American people must be protected from the peril of listening to her voice in the Mr. and Mrs. Newlywed soap operas. Is it true that Charlie Chaplin sympathized with Russia? Is Henry Morgan subversive? Is Skelton a Red as they say? Get your reliable information here!

Wanted—A Reliable Blacklist

David Dubinsky's expertise on the whole subject, demonstrating his own reliability as a fountainhead of advice, is shown by a reason he gives why a "reliable source of information" is necessary. The FBI "properly" prohibits private access to its files, he says, but he notes that one of the tasks of the "Private Information Center" will be "to establish confidential access to information in the government's possession." What about the subversive lists? Unsatisfactory, says Dubinsky, for the following reason:

"The attorney general and the Subversive Activities Control Board get up lists of Communist-dominated organizations and committees, but the process of classification is so time-consuming that many of the organizations have already done their damage or disappeared before the list is published."

This authority is, of course, thinking only of the SCAB, which operates under the McCarran Act. And even in the case of the SCAB, he does not remark on the reason why its procedure is so "time-consuming." This is simply because the McCarran Act prescribes certain semi-democratic forms before an organization is put on its list. Naturally, this is not "efficient," not half so efficient by far as the simple expedient of tagging an organization by the say-so of a few men in a "Private Information Center."

But our expert on these matters apparently does not know—or was not told by his own experts—that the attorney general's subversive list suffers from no such democratic prejudices, any more than would be true of Dubinsky's own projected outfit.

The "Private Information Center," incidentally, is to be financed and set up by "businessmen, unionists and other community leaders" concerned with the problem of preventing infiltration (infiltration into jobs, for instance, too?) as well as "churches, schools, newspapers, the agencies of mass entertainment and culture, the political parties"—all, in their majority, noteworthy for their constant concern to preserve the democratic amenities, prevent smears and slanders against suspected radicals, and safeguard civil liberties. . . . Dubinsky offers an ILGWU contribution in advance.

A Monstrous Scheme

David Dubinsky's scheme is a monstrous one in every implication. It is not an indication that he, personally, is any less sincerely concerned with civil liberties than he claims, or that he is any worse in this regard than thousands of other Stalinophobe liberals. It is fundamentally an indication of how far liberalism in this country has degenerated in its capitulation to McCarthyism and the non-McCarthyite government witchhunt system.

The Moscow radio need only broadcast an accurate condensation of his scheme to convince the millions in Europe who fear the police-state trends in the U. S. that their fears are more than justified.

It is not a program for an attack on Stalinism. It is a program for the gutting of democracy, to defend democracy. It is a program to defend civilization from the barbarians by barbarizing the defenders. It is a schematic presentation of the widespread bankruptcy of democratic liberalism. It is a justification of the challenge we have given that *only* socialist democracy can think in terms of defending democracy, by extending democracy to the fundamentals of the whole social system.

Norman Thomas' SP and Those "State Department Socialists"

By PHILIP COBEN

We have talked about "State Department socialists" before, meaning the kind of self-styled "socialists" in this country who consider it their job to do the dirty work of apologizing for and whitewashing the U. S. government's foreign policy in the world. It's a term that has had its analogue in every country, particularly the "kaiser's socialists" of Germany in the First World War.

Now it all becomes literal. Norman Thomas has raised the question of the "State Department socialists," existing and would-be, with the State Department itself. He demands no less than the "right" of American socialists to act as shills for Eisenhower's policies in the cold war.

Before us is an exchange of correspondence between Thomas and a personnel officer of the State Department, Scott McLeod, printed in the *Socialist Call* (July 24) and accompanied by an indignant article by the Socialist Party's national secretary, Robin Myers. The SP thought this material so damaging (to the Republicans, apparently) that it also sent it in special news releases to the press. Damaging it is.

The outstanding feature of these three documents is that (a) they leave not a shadow about what the issue is; and (b) no one quite mentions it forthrightly.

Policy-Determining

Thomas wrote to McLeod with an inquiry to the State Department:

"What is your policy and the policy of the administration on the employment of socialists in civil-service positions? In general, what is your position on the employment of socialists in some branch of the State Department, for the Mutual Security Agency in particular?"

What exactly is the SP concerned about in this inquiry? "Civil service positions"? That term may suggest to the reader only file clerks, office secretaries, comptometer operators, etc. Needless to say, that isn't the point. Thomas' letter has a paragraph *hinting* at what is in his mind. After noting that "It is by now clear [to Thomas, at any rate] that the Eisenhower administration, like its predecessor, but unlike considerable sections of the public, recognizes the very important distinction between socialists and communists," this consisting in the fact that "you do not challenge the loyalty of socialists as socialists," the SP leader makes his pitch:

"I should assume that a socialist would scarcely be appointed to a policy-determining position involving, for example, the management of our natural resources, but there have been socialists who have worked honorably and successfully in the State Department and in various lines of State Department activity abroad, where often America must deal with socialists in office or as the major party of opposition. What is your present policy with regard to the employment of socialists in such positions?"

Thomas then explains that he wants to know because, for one thing, "it falls to my lot to advise young men and women, democratic socialists in their general beliefs, on the matter of their seeking employment in the government," and he wants "to be able to speak with some authority." Besides, he says, he is writing a book on civil liberties.

McLeod Is Delighted

While we mull this over, let us note the reply that came from the State Department via McLeod, whose official title is Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

Officially McLeod merely replies that the *civil-service* application forms do not inquire about political affiliations (except with respect to the Communist Party or "any group advocating the overthrow of our constitutional form of government"). He also catches Thomas up by pointing out that the MSA, in which Thomas expressed particular interest, is not a State Department agency.

But as far as his "personal views" are concerned—that is, as concerns the *actual* policy of the department regardless of the forms—McLeod is "delighted" to make clear that no socialist would be "knowingly" employed "in policy-making positions within the Department of State."

Then, speaking momentarily as administrator of the Bureau of Security for the Republican Party he adds, no doubt with equal "delight":

"Insofar as I have knowledge, this is the first public acknowledgment that socialists have been employed in the State Department, as the Republican Party alleged in the last campaign. I think your statement is noteworthy for this reason, and I share your view that our correspondence should be made public."

He goes on to say that if he finds any socialist still around, he will use his "best efforts" to remove him.

"I might add," McLeod goes on to say, "that I cannot agree with your implication that it is necessary for the Department of State to employ socialists in order to deal successfully with the socialists in the governments of other nations, any more than I feel it necessary to employ Communists to conduct our negotiations with the Soviet Union. Neither would I expect other nations

to provide capitalists or Republicans to conduct their negotiations with this nation."

It's Brutal

Well now, what are they arguing about? "Civil-service positions"? "Policy-making positions"?

On the surface, it would seem, it is "policy-making positions." So McLeod puts it. And on the basis of the literal wording of Thomas' letter, he appears to be justified in so doing.

But is Thomas, seconded by the Socialist Party, actually complaining, in the name of civil-liberties and other good things, that the Eisenhower-Dulles government doesn't permit socialists (even Norman Thomas type of "socialists") to hold "policy-determining positions" in running the foreign affairs of this country?

This, it might be thought, passes belief even for cynical people who long ago came to the conclusion that nothing could possibly be too muddleheaded for the public-spirited citizen who unfurls the banner of SP "socialism" to the air in his back pocket.

But much as we may wish to denounce Mr. McLeod for distorting Thomas' innocent question, we cannot do so. The SP leader easily sees why socialists cannot determine policy in such a fundamental and socially decisive field as *natural resources*. He is not entirely blind to the basic differences between socialists and the Republican executive committee for big business, and anyone who thinks so is slandering him. Socialism represents such a rock-bottom social break with the ideology and program of capitalism that a socialist could only be, in constant conflict with the government if he attempted to do work of a policy-determining sort in this field of *natural resources* where the issue of socialism-versus-capitalism is posed in all its historic acuteness, as everybody knows. . . .

But on such a matter as war and peace, international policy, the destiny of the world and its next atomic war, imperialism at home and attitude toward imperialisms abroad—come, come, Mr. McLeod (writes Thomas in effect), aren't you drawing the line too fine? Can't we "socialists" work "honorably and successfully" for you there?

No, says McLeod so very brutally, you're loyal and all that, but we'll determine our own policy. You "socialists" go determine your own.

Lucid Distinction

To the unaided intellect, this would seem to be A-B-C. But the national secretary in whom the SP rejoices, Robin Myers, knows just what's wrong with it. What's a "policy-making position"? she asks McLeod. She suspects. She is willing to grant, being enlightened about these things, that "socialists—party members or not—cannot make policy for a Republican administration," but who said that one is in a position to *make* policy just because one is in a policy-making position? A prejudice. A quibble. Is she then for the right of socialists to hold policy-making posts that do *not* make policy? She won't be caught in *that* trap either:

"But socialists claim an equal right with all other American citizens to *influence* policy," she points out lucidly, "and we claim an equal right with all other citizens to apply for, receive, and hold, positions in government service in accordance with individual ability and responsibility for the particular job."

Now if McLeod permitted us to hold a letter-determining position for him, we would reply to Robin Myers somewhat as follows:

"Dear Miss Myers:

"Pursuant to Standard Form 57 and special form DS-668, I wish to point out to you that policy-influencing positions do not come under the head of civil service. As a matter I am delighted to call to your attention the fact that you hold a very important policy-influencing position at this very moment, namely, your position as editor of the *Socialist Call*, not to speak of your eminent post as national secretary of the Socialist Party, in which capacity you have the inestimable privilege of writing editorials of protest on your own front page. I am also prepared to believe, in the absence of knowledge to the contrary, that you applied for, received and hold these offices in accordance with your individual ability and responsibility for the particular job.

"This, I am bound to declare in amplification of previous memoranda, is the proper relationship between people who call themselves socialists and a government like others which proudly represents the interests of big business and industry: we will determine the foreign policy of this capitalist government and you protest and fight against it."

We are afraid, however, that this would not satisfy Robin Myers or Norman Thomas, for the former is clever enough to make the distinction between "fundamental policy-making decisions" (which ought to be done by Congress, she says, and not by the State Department) and the "subordinate policy-making functions of appointive officials"; and with regard to the latter, "the official who cannot carry out such policy is incompetent for his job regardless of his party." Presumably also, *competent* for his job regardless of his party (i.e., his views), and presumably also, our State Department socialists would be happy to leave the Republican office-holders in control of the State Department's "policy-determining" activities even under a socialist president. We are ready to believe this, incidentally, and therefore do not impute insincerity to the *Socialist Call's* protests; for Norman Thomas' social-

democratic co-thinkers in various countries have done just that or its equivalent many a time.

'Socialist' Fronts

But let us stop poring over the lucubrations of either Thomas or Myers in an effort to find out what this fuss over socialist "policy-determining" or "policy-making" officials is about. As we indicated, the real point of issue is somewhat plainer than that obscure antiquated weapon known as a pikestaff; and it isn't about garden-variety "civil service" jobs and it isn't about real policy-making posts.

It is in actuality about the grade in-between, which neither McLeod or Thomas mention—namely, posts of *political responsibility* in the State Department, in which the official has *personal responsibility* for executing the going cold-war policies of the Republicans and U. S. imperialism.

An ambassador, for example, is not supposed to "determine" or "make" policy, though he can influence it both by his advice and his actions on his own initiative, but no bright child will doubt that a government must insist on ambassadors who sufficiently agree with the policy they have to pursue. The other side of this is: a man who accepts such a post, to swing the hatchet for a policy which he considers ruinous and contrary to the interests of the people, is a sad prostituted creature who deserves no one's respect, even if he does not commit the enormity of calling himself a "socialist."

But it isn't even a question of ambassadors. The truth is that Thomas is thinking of such posts (we choose a typical example at random) as Labor Adviser to an MSA delegation or embassy in a foreign country.

It's not supposed to be "policy-making." And as a matter of fact, it is not—though these small fry may often think that they are playing a role. What they find themselves actually doing—naturally, with the very best of intentions—is lending a "socialist" cover and camouflage to the reprehensible foreign policy of Washington in supporting the forces of reaction in the world in its alliance against the Stalinist totalitarians.

These types—who may have been the "young men and women, democratic socialists in their general beliefs—who sought Norman Thomas' authoritative advice on their careers—go into such mousetrap jobs believing that they can really act as socialists. "After all," they reason, staring the salary and emoluments in the face and rejoicing in the fact that they are not being tempted by such fleshly considerations, "suppose some reactionary had my job; what would he do? Why, he'd antagonize every labor leader and socialist in the country, make a sorry mess of the great need for a democratic alliance against the enemy, sabotage the 'left' forces because he can't tell the difference between them and the Communists; whereas I—ah, I can cleverly give a pinch of aid here, a smidgin of encouragement there, a good word in the other place, for the benefit of the 'right' people, who can really be our allies and whom we need to defeat the enemy of us all. . . ."

He meets these foreign labor leaders and socialists, who want to know what's wrong in the head with those people back in Washington. Our non-policy-making policy-maker lets them know (ever so skillfully) that, personally, he's also disconcerted by America's pro-Franco line and other regrettable features of the policy he's supposed to represent—and isn't it so encouraging for them to know that they have a friend in the American court? But American imperialism isn't so bad as they think, after all (we've got to set them straight on that too), and, above all, they will be much happier going along with Washington's demands if they're talked into it by someone who really (honestly! between you, me and this bottle of beer) disagrees with its "excesses" and "imperfections. . . ."

About Principles

We took a Labor Adviser only as an example, of course. It might be any other post of this caliber. And this is what the Thomas-McLeod correspondence is about.

In this dispute we are afraid that we cannot wholeheartedly line up with either camp. It is a pity that it has to be a McLeod who tells our would-be State Department socialists where they belong in the ranks of the fight for a democratic, socialist foreign policy. But that is just about the only admirable thing about our government of big business: it knows whose class government it is and it doesn't mind proclaiming it publicly.

On the other mind, we don't mind saying publicly, ourselves, without any fear or intent of unduly influencing the policy of these dinosaurs, that they are stupid. There is nothing "unprincipled" about a capitalist government's using "socialist" catspaws for its dirty work abroad, when it has the required type of "socialist" available and paying dues; for one of the "principles" of capitalist governments is duplicity, hypocrisy and the skill to use fronts where that is necessary. It is under no obligation to feel anything but contempt for such "socialist" shills of imperialism, but, after all, it doesn't have to say so to their face! Norman Thomas does indeed have reason to feel aggrieved.

As Robin Myers says in her perspicacious way: "serious problems are raised by the exchange of correspondence . . . for members of the party," her Socialist Party, as well as for all democratically-minded Americans. The problem: some "policy-determining" inside their own movement.

The Guns Are Silent—

(Continued from page 1)

worked out and if the vote went against them.

Thus the political conference can be expected at most to seek a stabilization of the division of Korea. Despite Rhee's threats, if the American government really stands firm in denying him any hope of military support for a South Korean attack on the Stalinists, he will be compelled to bow to the inevitable. That, at least, would be the course of reason.

Yet, as we have pointed out in the past, Rhee's actions have not been a product of mental infirmity. He has publicly appealed to the support of the "Formosa" section of the United States Senate. He knows that there and high up in the military councils of the U. S. there is considerable support for a purely military solution to Korea. Both he and Chiang Kai-shek know that their regimes do not have the slightest possibility of winning the support of the peoples of China and Korea in such numbers as to give them hope of regaining power over their respective countries by internal revolutionary means. Thus they seek support from the "military solution" school in the United States, and in turn are willing to engage in any adventure which will make it possible for this school to get its policies accepted in America.

U. S. PUSHED

At the present time, it appears that there is a danger of a resumption of the war in Korea or of purely military actions in the rest of Asia stemming from the capitalist camp, and not only from the camp of Stalinism. This does not mean at all that the Stalinists are less prone to seek conquest by military means in general. But the events in Eastern Europe, the rumblings of the purge in Russia, the further indications of some kind of conflict between the Russians and Chinese in North Korea, the economic problems which are squeezing the Stalinist rulers of China—all of these factors will tend to restrain the Stalin-

ists from military adventures in the immediate future.

To be sure, the war in Indo-China may continue and even be intensified by the Stalinists. But to date the war has preserved its almost purely domestic character. That is, it has been fought by Indo-Chinese against the French imperialists. And it has been fought so successfully that there would appear to be no reason for the Chinese to intervene on the side of the Vietminh in any manner other than possibly increasing material aid to them. That would pose more sharply for the West the question of whether to increase their imperialist forces there, or to pull out of the country. But it would not constitute a new Stalinist aggression.

The Stalinists will most probably continue along the lines of their "easy" policy in conducting the cold war. That gives them the best chance to try to cope with their problems at home and at the same time to split the Western alliance, or at least to bring about serious disension in its ranks.

But the dilemma for the American government is far greater. For this country, neither domestic nor foreign problems are lessened by a relaxation of international tensions. They increase.

At home the economy is in precarious balance. Even the most optimistic prophets of the capitalist system are exceedingly cautious in their predictions for the future. At best they see a "recession" toward the beginning of next year. The international repercussions of such a recession can well be exceedingly grave. The shaky economies of Europe are in no condition to stand a serious contraction of the American and world markets. Their capitalists are already yearning for the markets of the East, and a setback in the United States could make that yearning a real stampede.

More immediately, the conflict in the West will be over the recognition of Stalinist China and its admission into the United Nations. The British government has already announced that it will press for such admission either before or during

the political conference over Korea. Although the Eisenhower administration has tried to keep its hands as free as possible in this respect, it is quite clear that the "Formosan" senators in the U. S. and their allies would wage an all-out fight against American agreement to the admission of the government of China to the UN. Nothing in the history of the Eisenhower rule would incline one to believe that he will be willing to stand up to the Senate on such an issue.

BREATHING-SPELL

Thus, the American government stands as a big obstacle to a slowing down of the pace of the cold war. It is the Americans who are urging the French to stand firm in Indo-China. It is the American government which will continue to oppose a normalization of relations with the actual government of China. It is powerful groups in the American government which give moral and political support to Rhee and Chiang of a character which may induce them to stake all on a military adventure.

The breathing spell may be a very short one, and in any event will be an uneasy one. Stalinism still represents as great a social threat on the world scene as ever. Capitalism continues to be enmeshed in the net of contradictions and conflicts inherent in its era of decline. If left to themselves, the only end to the breathing spell will be another blood-bath either in Korea or elsewhere.

There have been many in the liberal and socialist camp in this country who have justified their support of American policy in the cold war on the grounds that only by building up this country's military strength could the peoples of the world get a breathing spell. Independent Socialists have asked: a breathing-spell for what?

Now the breathing-spell is here. It has not been brought about so much by the accumulation of military strength as by the disaffection and even revolt of the peoples under the Stalinist heel. That force has proved far more effective in curbing Stalinist imperialist militarism than all of this government's planes and guns and even atom bombs. The peoples of Stalinland have not only made a mighty contribution to bringing about a slackening of the pace of the cold war: they have shown the way in which the breathing spell can be utilized to create a completely new political situation.

COULD BE A TURN

So far, however, the socialist and liberal groups and individuals in the West have not shown the same ability to turn the breathing spell into a real victory for the peoples of the world. In this country, the labor, liberal and socialistic supporters of the American side in the world struggle for power have drawn no serious conclusions for themselves, have enunciated no policies which could wrest the political initiative in their part of the world from the hands of the classes which have shown themselves so helpless to meet the social threat of Stalinism.

It is only the idea of the Third Camp which can do this. For the Western world, this means primarily a declaration of complete political independence from the parties and governments which have shown their political and social bankruptcy since the end of World War II. In the United States it means an end to the politics of tail-ending the two political parties which represent the capitalist-military ideology of futility and disaster. Only a labor party in this country, based on the organizations of the working people, and expressing their domestic and foreign interests can give assurance to the masses in Stalinland and the rest of the world that America's power will be used to promote peace and freedom in the world.

If the breathing spell is just a lull in the struggle between the imperialist giants, humanity will have missed a historic opportunity. If the breathing spell is used to re-form the forces of the Third Camp and to organize their struggle against the two war camps, mankind will look back on it as one of the great turns in the fortunes of the race.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City
specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.
Send for our free book list.

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!

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

Now Averell Harriman, that other good liberal-type Democrat has rushed in to support Wagner, even though Halley is already in the race; and though the worldly-wise Liberal leadership understands how these things happen with good liberal-type men, the Liberal Party rank and file may be either less forgiving or less cynical the next time Harriman's name comes up.

Another Democrat has also intervened to solve a problem for uncertain Liberal Party members, the problem of whether Halley should or should not run in the Democratic primaries. Robert Blaikie, the "insurgent" Democratic district leader, made a statement which ought to put the question to rest. Calling on Halley to get into the Democratic free-for-all, Blaikie said:

"I can't see a man who calls himself a Democrat not taking advantage of the primary to get Democrats to support him and to become the candidate of the Democratic Party where he could reorganize his party from top to bottom. You can't reorganize it by running as a Liberal. You would then be obligated to the Liberal Party and have to take their recommendations, which would be to build up the Liberal Party."

That couldn't be put better or more convincingly. Every good Democrat who wants to refurbish the old party machine ought to want Halley to run in the primaries—and every good Liberal Party member who wants to build up his own party as the alternative to the discredited party ought to be against this step. Liberal leaders who have been playing with the idea ought to take a course with Blaikie, who knows where he stands.

Ideas in Indo-China

We don't know how the dispatch got into the Scripps-Howard press (N. Y. World-Telegram for July 22) but one by John Robbins from Saigon (Indo-China) verges on the subversive. This foreign correspondent for the reactionary chain writes an earnest answer to a question that has been bothering him.

Why is it that Ho Chi Minh's Vietminh soldiers fight so ferociously against the French, while the Vietnam puppet state's army of the French (who are de-

fending the Bastions of Democracy against the red beast) don't see why they should fight at all?

Re the Stalinist guerrillas: "Put yourself in the shoes of an enemy—a soldier of the Vietminh. . . . Your idol is an old man named Ho Chi Minh. . . his smiling goat-bearded face which you see on your banners and your posters personifies all your hopes for a free Indo-China. You know your enemy. It is the 'French imperialists,' fighting to keep your country a colony. . . . All of you, officers and men, live the same sort of life. Your ration is a pound and a half of rice a day. You all wear the same padded cotton uniform, sleep on the same sort of cots, and suffer the same hardships. . . . You're not afraid of the French. . . . You have no medicines to help you. . . . Why, then, year after year, do you go on fighting? Where do you get the strength to march through the jungle? How do you find the energy to make your ferocious attacks on the French blockhouses? . . ."

Correspondent Robbins comes to the conclusion that "the answers lie in the field of ideas. The Vietminh soldier is fighting for what he thinks is freedom. . . ."

But the Vietnam soldier who comes from the same stock? He eats better; has medicines; has better arms (supplied by the U. S.); better technical training.

"But what does he have to fight for?" His emperor, Bao Dai, who cheers on his soldiery while hunting tigers and elephants in cool green forests? "Freedom?" Not while he sees the French all around in the positions of power, while "the Vietnamese prime minister and the top Vietnamese general both are hanging onto their French citizenship." As far as he knows, the French will still be the bosses after the war is over. "Why fight for that? he asks."

That's as far as a Scripps-Howard correspondent can go. Maybe there is a freedom to be fought for which is neither the Stalinist deception nor the French fake? . . . But that's a Third Camp kind of idea, and every practical person knows that this is a peculiar notion of Independent Socialists and such. So the Stalinists keep on mobilizing the people's aspiration for freedom, and the U. S. keeps on sending the very best of arms for Bao Dai's soldiers to surrender to the Vietminh.

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