

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 15, 1955

FIVE CENTS

## TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: An Appeal for a Fair Hearing

... page 7

## ISRAEL AND ZIONISM:

TRENDS IN THE ISRAELI ELECTION

... page 2

ZIONISM AND STALINISM: A Parallel

... page 6

## Landy Case: The Real Pathos

... page 3

## Does the FBI Work For Franco Too?

Belatedly we want to call attention to a shameful incident of collaboration between the FBI and the Franco government's own brand of fascist witch-hunting—belatedly because the news item appeared in the N. Y. Times of May 26.

The case concerns an American GI who had served in the North African campaign and in the U. S. navy after the war, then gathered his savings to set out from his Long Island home "to see the world." Instead, Angel Elardo spent the spring in a Spanish jail. The Madrid correspondent of the Times said that "His crime, according to the police, was that he had repeatedly volunteered that he did not like the way Genarilissimo Franco was running the country," but no charges were preferred against him at the time of his imprisonment.

It might have been imagined that the American authorities would have had enough influence with the Franco government to secure the quick release of an American citizen jailed on such grounds. One might even imagine that if the Spanish dictatorship did not release him, the American eagle would be insulted.

What actually happened was quite different. The fascist regime requested the American government to make a political investigation for it into the political views

and affiliations of its victim. And the FBI did just that, for Franco. It took six weeks before reporting back to the fascists that their imprisoned American citizen was not a Communist, during which time Elardo spent 12 days in solitary confinement, having finally been charged with "the crime of insulting the chief of state."

After the FBI gave the victim a political clearance, the U. S. consulate in Spain was able to obtain his release, after 2½ months in prison, on condition that he leave the country.

What we want to know is this:

(1) Why didn't the U. S. government, in all its vaunted majesty, insist on the freedom of a citizen from this police-state persecution?

(2) If the FBI had found, somewhere in its unevaluated files and dossiers of anonymous denunciations, stoolpigeon reports, neighborly rumors, and assorted data, some kind of evidence that Elardo was a "Communist," even evidence as good as that against Ladejinsky or Professor Peters or Val Lorwin et al.—would then the FBI have reported this to the fascists and would Washington have fought as hard or fought at all to obtain his release?

Is the FBI now working also as a part-time auxiliary for any dictator or police state that gets itself allied with Washington?

## Newton's First Law Of Politics for the ADA

It is good to hear the AFL-CIO and also Americans for Democratic Action take cuts at the Democrats for their spineless yessing of Eisenhower in the recently ended session of Congress. Everybody is blaming everyone else for the particularly empty record (outside of an item like the \$1 minimum wage), and everyone is right as right can be.

As far as Republican responsibility is concerned, the labor-liberal elements can say "I told you so," but what can they say about the bankruptcy of the party for which they ask votes as the hope of America, and whose bankruptcy is their own? The present Democratic Party is perhaps the most cowardly political opposition to an administration ever seen in the history of this country.

But at least the labor-liberals spoke up with a piece of their mind publicly, and one can hail this as much better than nothing. But what is to be done about it? How can they hope to put some backbone into a party which is not even willing to make a fight against the incumbents which would seem indicated by the mere fact that an election is nearing.

The trouble with the labor leaders' and ADA's gesture is that they are committed in advance to support the Democrats, no matter what they may say in resolutions, because they have no alternative party of their own to support, and the Democrats know this.

Not only that, but the ADA knows it too. It is reliably reported that at a recent National Board meeting, the ADA leadership decided on its tactics in anticipation of the Democratic Party convention. Did

it draw up a liberal platform to push, perhaps? It seems not. The leaders of this liberal organization decided that at any given party convention it could successfully push only one point, and for 1956 this was going to be—party loyalty. Loyalty to the Democratic Party, naturally. The issue was going to be the non-seating of delegates of the Shivers type.

It is a trenchant comment on the level of American politics, and specifically of liberal politics, when it takes the left-wing force in the old capitalist party to rally around the elementary issue of party regularity.

We need not present the "practical-politics" rationale for this liberal futilitarianism; it is well known, and has been running liberalism into the ground for longer than the ADA's lifespan. As the party becomes more and more sure of liberal-labor allegiance, and therefore more disregardful and scornful of any gestures of appeasement in this direction, the very issues on which "practical politics" has to take its stand shift further and further to the right, away from any meaningful liberalism.

This flows from the Newtonian Law of politics: Push a man, and he's got to move TOWARD you, in order to resist. But the Democrats feel a push only from the right-wing elements in the party and in the country; they feel only a right-wing threat; and so they move back in that direction.

As long as there is no labor-liberal alternative to supporting the Democrats, complaints against the Democrats' record will only be good for the conscience.

## Second Honeymoon With the Russians?

By PHILIP COBEN

Here is the straw in the wind—the big wind of the "Geneva spirit" that has been sweeping in since the Russians decided on the tactic of the "new friendliness":

### "THE VOICE OF AMERICA IS CHANGING ITS TUNE"

—so headlines the Times. "Since Summit Meeting It Has Done Less Denouncing," goes on the subhead.

To underline this, the Washington dispatch notes some anxiety about the non-governmental propaganda agencies run by Radio Free Europe, privately financed by Americans.

"But adjustment to the new order is likely to prove more difficult for the privately run and more hard-hitting Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberation in Munich. Radio Free Europe broadcasts to the satellite countries and Radio Liberation to the Soviet Union.

"Even for many on the Voice staff the new tone of conciliation is hard to take. The permanent foreign-language staff have to be United States citizens, but many have left Communist-ruled countries sufficiently recently to have vivid memories of suffering. They tend to regard their broadcasts strictly as a form of psychological warfare. But they have little individual freedom in determining the content of their broadcasts and must fall in line with the new psychological 'peacefare.'"

A whole world of politics—or rather the whole difference between two worlds of politics—is contained here, in miniature.

It illustrates our thesis that for American capitalist foreign policy the only alternatives that exist are the reactionary ones of preparation for imperialist war or imperialist peace.

For them, "peace" means a political as well as a military truce with the totalitarians. For them, as for the Stalinists themselves, political whitewashes go along with diplomatic deals.

It is not here a question of exaggerating the importance of the Voice of America itself. On the contrary: as we have emphasized in the past, the Voice reflects Washington's constitutional incapacity for effective political warfare, and it would be hard to exaggerate its ineffectuality, except as a reminder of Western hostility to the Moscow rulers. It is the symptomatic significance of the change of tune that is relevant.

Likewise it is not a question of predicting any long-continuance of the current "Geneva spirit"; no one knows, and Washington is cautiously and suspiciously feeling its way even as its tune changes. What is clear is that, implicitly, U. S. capitalism is indicating to the Russians that political payment goes along with any diplomatic deals that may be made.

During the honeymoon period of World War II, when Russia was our "noble ally," American official and unofficial politics went all-out in a whitewash of Stalinist totalitarianism. Life magazine could paint Uncle Joe as a relative of Abraham Lincoln; Hollywood could make the notorious film *Mission to Moscow*; a big publisher, Harper's, having already printed off Trotsky's new book *Stalin*, could store the

whole supply in its cellars in order to suppress the critical work for the duration of the great friendship; in the labor movement right-wing labor leaders could collaborate enthusiastically with the Stalinists in suppressing militant unionism in the name of national unity . . . this whole story has been detailed elsewhere.

If a second honeymoon is due, it is not necessarily a question of a repeat performance of this great whitewash, in which Stalinist totalitarianism was positively painted up as a new democracy with all the same vast resources which in the last cold-war period have been carrying on the anti-Communist witch-hunt. But it is clear that for the imperialist mind, it is not possible to pursue a policy directed against the outbreak of war while at the same time pressing a political attack against Stalinism.

For us Independent Socialists, on the contrary, a genuinely democratic and anti-imperialist program of political warfare against Stalinism has always been the alternative counterposed to the U. S. program of military alliances with every reactionary in the world backed up by flaunting of the H-bomb and military bases pockmarking the entire world.

The subject might be called: "Their 'Anti-Communism' and Ours."

We can leave to the quarrels of Democrats and Republicans (and liberals and McCarthyites) any dispute over who's "more anti-Communist" than whom.

What is hammered home by the change of tune is the contrast between two fundamentally different types of "anti-Communism"—two distinct genera which cannot even cross-breed.

Theirs is the "anti-Communism" of the leading ruling class of Western capitalism which faces the imperialist threat of a rival exploiting system.

Ours is the anti-Stalinism of revolutionary socialism, based on the interests of the working class which is threatened by this rival exploiting system, and not only by its historic enemy capitalism.

What this points to is the basic configuration of world politics today: the triangle of forces.

The world picture today is not simply the old duel between capitalism and socialism; nor the new one between capitalism and Stalinism. Just as the new Stalinist despotism is both anti-capitalist and anti-labor; just as the old capitalist exploiters seek to suppress both Stalinism and the masses of people at home and in the colonies; so also the movement that fights for socialism must be intransigently opposed to conciliation with either of the boss systems. This is no less so when the two brands of exploiters get together for a deal, however transitorily!

No more than in the war will Independent Socialism go along with a second honeymoon. But while it lasts it will prove day by day the Independent Socialist view that the fight against Stalinism can be carried on consistently and to a progressive end only by those forces who are at the same time consistent enemies of the capitalist power.

# Trends in Israeli Election Show Discontent with Government

By AL FINDLEY

In the Israeli election to the 3rd Knesset (parliament) on July 26, the results upset the predictions both of those who gained and those who lost.

The largest losers in the balloting were the two main coalition parties, the General Zionists (conservative) and the Mapai (right-wing laborite).

The General Zionists were reduced from second place to third in numerical standing in the Knesset. In the last session they had 20 deputies; now they have 14.

The trick which this party attempted in the last weeks before the election—going into opposition—did not help them. It had pulled the same trick in 1950, but this time the electorate judged it as a part of the government.

The General Zionists lost in the general wave of a protest vote against conditions as they are, despite the fact that they had made a record of fighting within the coalition. In addition, they seem to have lost some of the middle-class vote that has come to look on the party as the representative of the upper-class merchants and industrialists.

To some extent, the decline in the votes of the General Zionists represents a return to normal. Organizationally the General Zionists are weak in Israel. In the 1950 elections, they were surprised when they became the second strongest party. Unless they can recapture some of the special conditions of 1950, they should decline, relatively to the other Israeli parties, and particularly relatively to the Progressive Party, which is the other Israeli wing of the world General Zionist movement.

## WHY MAPAI DECLINES

The losses suffered by Mapai were more surprising. Everybody had expected it to come out victorious. Ben-Gurion had even predicted that it would get a majority. (Whether he believed this or not is immaterial to the point.) The victory of Mapai in the May elections to the Histadrut (trade-union federation) seemed to assure like success in the parliamentary contest. But the voters decided otherwise, and they reduced the representation of the party from 45 to 40 deputies in the new Knesset.

To be sure, there is no change in the fact that the Mapai is still the largest single party and also the party in the central strategic position politically. But the results should bring serious soul-searching among Mapai members. The Mapai reached its height in 1947 with 47 deputies, and it has gone down since then. In 1950 it declined to only 45, and now in 1955 it is down to 40 in this steady slide. Surely there must be rea-

sons for the uninterrupted descent, reasons that no doubt interest all Mapai supporters.

For one thing the record of Mapai in the government is clear. It has placed "national" and "state" interests (as it conceives these) above the rights and needs of labor and of the new immigrants. It has followed a policy of reducing the standard of living of the Israeli people in the interests of armaments and in the interests of increasing investment in machinery and long-term projects. In addition, it has made sacrifices even of its minimum social-democratic platform planks in order to meet the demands of its bourgeois and religious coalition partners.

Only a radical turn in Mapai policy—one which recognizes that the needs of the workers should not be subordinated to "state" and "national" interests which are set over against these needs—could return Mapai to an upward path.

## NEW TURN NEEDED

For example, in order to reduce the gap between exports and imports, and raise productivity the state has decreed a reduction in the standard of living of the people and in investment in machinery.

This policy, however, reduces the desire of the workers to increase their productivity. As even the more enlightened bourgeoisie has learned, the human factor is most important in raising productivity. The workers need greater incentives. It is no accident that in Russia machinery is almost on a par with U. S. industry but productivity is very much lower.

Attention to the needs of the workers and especially of the new immigrants would benefit Israel. Primary attention to the needs of the state as heretofore practiced will benefit neither the people nor Israel.

Among the secondary reasons for the decline of Mapai are also: overconfidence as a result of the Histadrut election; little or no campaigning in the Yiddish language; and the question of "activism" against the border Arab states.

The Achdut Avoda-Left Poale Zion, the moderately pro-Stalinist split-off from the pro-Stalinist Mapam, emerged from the election with 10 deputies again as in the Histadrut election, topping the official Mapam (Hashomer Hatzair) which got 8 or 9. The gain for Achdut Avoda is attributed to the fact that it benefited from the anti-government protest vote and that it stressed militant and "activist" fighting against the Arabs.

## THREAT FROM RIGHT

Emphasis on the "activist" issue as explanation for the results of the election receives strong support from the surprising gains made by the Cherut party.

This party was formed from the ranks of the revisionists and followers of the Irgun. Its leader is Menachem Beigun, commander of the Irgun. It has a bellicose irredentist program for taking all of Palestine and Transjordan, and of course it advocates a "strong" policy on border attacks. In addition, Cherut has a social policy that tries to combine worship of the middle class and capitalism with demands for the workers.

Cherut is now the second largest party in the Knesset, having increased its representation from 8 deputies to 16. The gains of Cherut come from the fact that it was the most vigorous opposition to the government on all questions, as any reading of the Knesset debates will show.

Mapai accuses Achdut Avoda of aiding the victory of Cherut by stressing the "activist" issue. An Achdut Avoda leader who was a former commander of the Palmach (shock troops in the Israeli-Arab war), Yigal Alon, conducted a terrific campaign for militarism and for "teaching" the Arab states at any opportunity that they dare not touch Israel. Mapai argues: the "leftist" Yigal Alon helped the extreme rightist Beigun since those converted to "activism" naturally turn to its pure exponents in the form of

extreme nationalism rather than in the hybrid form of Achdut Avoda.

The fact of the matter is that Mapai also played its cards on "activism." For the campaign it recalled Ben-Gurion, its best known "activist," and let it be known that he would be the new prime minister. Ben-Gurion set the tone for the campaign by combining peace talk with "activist" practice, i.e., the hero of Kibya carried through the attack on Gaza.

While there is no doubt that increased sentiment for "activism" is shown in the election results, too much emphasis should not be placed on this issue, but rather where it rightly belongs—on the dissatisfaction of the Israeli population with existing economic conditions and their protest.

The only governmental parties to make gains were the religious parties, the Hapoel Hamisrachi and Misrachi. They obtained 12 deputies, a gain of two. The anti-governmental religious parties Agudat Israel and Poale Agudat Israel won six deputies in place of five.

Their greatest gain came from the vote of the religious immigrants from the Oriental and Arab countries. Had there been a United Religious Bloc of all religious parties they probably would have made even greater gains. The struggle for the political allegiance of the new immigrants is erally just beginning.

A gain was also made by the Progressive Party (liberal General Zionists), from four to five.

## COALITION BROKEN

The Communist Party (which is distinct from the pro-Stalinist but also pro-Zionist Mapam) had elected five deputies to the old Knesset. In the course of the life of this body, it increased its fraction to seven when Dr. Moshe Sneh and Adolf Berman joined it in a split-off from Mapam. In the present election, the CP again elected only five deputies but increased its popular vote somewhat.

The political physiognomy of the new

Knesset is such that about 10 parties are represented and no two parties have a majority. This makes the old coalition policy more difficult and gives the smaller parties more importance.

If Mapai should again try to form the core of the government, as its policy indicates it will, it has fewer choices. It will now more than ever be dependent on the religious parties. Together with the Mapai's 40, the Progressive Party's 6 and the religious bloc's 18 make up a total of 64, which is a majority of four. But this is too shaky a majority to govern.

There are reports that Ben-Gurion would like to add the 10-11 deputies of the Achdut Avoda group to this coalition provided they do not object to a "defense pact with the U.S." Moshe Sharett is reported to be adamant against such a coalition. But the development in relations between Mapai and Achdut will be one of the most interesting things to watch in Israeli politics.

## PARLIAMENTARY CRISIS

There would seem to be many difficulties in re-establishing the old coalition of Mapai and General Zionists plus the small parties. The bitterness of the campaign may rule out such a coalition. The General Zionists would profit by remaining in opposition.

There is always the possibility, mathematically speaking, of forming a purely labor government of Mapai (40), Achdut Avoda (10), Mapam (8), with the aid of Hapoel Hamisrachi and Poale Agudat Israel. This may require some concessions on religious questions, though in this connection it would be easier to deal with these two religious groups than with the other religious groups.

Such a coalition, as an all-labor government, would not have to compromise on social and economic questions; but its real difficulty comes on foreign policy. The extreme pro-Stalinist position of Mapam and the pro-American position of Mapai would rule it out, except on the unlikely possibility that one or the other side would submit to majority rule.

There is also always the possibility that Ben-Gurion may form a caretaker government, and try for a stricter election law to reduce the number of parties in a new election.

## PENNSYLVANIA

# State Taxes Are Hot Issues

By GERRY McDERMOTT

American workers take more of a beating today at the hands of state governments than they do from the federal government. Events in the state capitals are less dramatic than events in Washington, but precisely because state politics is obscure, a great deal of dirty work is done there. Because the labor movement has no party of its own, labor finds it virtually impossible to keep track of what is going on in the 48 capitals, and when the labor movement does find out, it has no real machinery for doing anything about it.

The reactionaries are fully aware of the advantage they have in the state capitals, and this is a big reason behind the "states-rights" philosophy of the Dixiecrats and of the Eisenhower administration.

The red-hot state-tax problem in Pennsylvania illustrates the problems of labor in the state government field.

Pennsylvania badly needs new tax revenues. A series of Republican big business administrations have neglected care for the aged, the mentally ill, the unemployed, handicapped children, and so on, for years. Now, revenue must be provided to meet these needs.

Taxes on corporations are out of the question in Pennsylvania. The state is presently becoming a "depressed area" with industries moving south and unemployment the highest in the nation. It is felt on all sides that corporation taxes would simply drive more industry out of the state to the low-tax South.

The most progressive answer to the tax problem would be an income tax, graduated according to ability to pay. But the big-business-written state constitution forbids this, and amending the constitution would take years of sustained effort.

The Republicans propose to raise the necessary revenue by quadrupling the present 1% sales tax, a measure which would, of course, strike hardest at the poor, who spend almost all of their income and therefore would have almost all of their income taxed. The wealthy,

who save and invest most of their income, would get off easily.

The current Democratic administration of Governor George Leader has proposed a classified income tax. This tax would try to get around the constitutional ban on a graduated income tax by setting a different tax rate on different types of income. Thus, while wages would be taxed at one per cent, capital gains would be taxed at five per cent, and so on.

Any new tax program is unpopular, and this one is no exception. Big business, which prefers a sales tax, attacks the Lead tax program as a wage tax, which it is not.

## LABOR-STATESMANSHIP

The labor movement, on the other hand, fearing a sales tax, is supporting the Leader tax program. As a matter of fact, the cynical and astute politicians of the Democratic Party are making it appear that it is solely labor which wants the tax. The daily press is delighted to go along with this game, so that if the tax passes, labor will bear the onus in the eyes of much of the population.

It will be the Democrats who spend the money, however, who will get the patronage and get the credit for the measures financed by the new taxes. This is the fruit of the "labor statesmanship" which ties the unions to the Democratic Party.

An interesting side issue has been the support of the Communist Party of Pennsylvania for the Democratic tax program. Just as the Stalinist-dominated unions are now crawling back to the CIO and AFL, so the Stalinists politically are crawling back to the Democratic Party.

It must be hard for Stalinist leaders like Steve Nelson and James Dolsen, who were convicted under the Smith Act by a Democratic administration, to sing the praises of that party now. But then everyone knows that they do not think for themselves. Their "soft" policy in Pennsylvania politics is dictated by the needs of Russian foreign policy.

At last available!

The **SECOND** volume  
of  
**Leon Trotsky's**  
**THE FIRST**  
**FIVE YEARS**  
**OF THE**  
**COMMUNIST**  
**INTERNATIONAL**

384 pages.....Paper covers

Only \$2.50

All orders must be accompanied  
by payment.

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

NOTE: The first volume is still  
available too, of course . . . also  
for \$2.50.

ON THE HOME FRONT

# Landy Case: The Real Pathos

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

As if to underscore the meaning of the Watts report which was presented to the Defense Department last week (and which is commented on in *Challenge* on page 5 of this issue), the navy withheld the granting of a commission to Eugene W. Landy, second-ranking student at Kings Point, on grounds of his association with his mother. The Watts report had detailed all of the various relationships, of kin and law, that could make a man a "subversive." The government obliged the next day with the Landy case, giving a somewhat hollow ring to Army Secretary Brucker's statement: "I think the system we have now is working well."

The facts in the Landy case are now familiar, having been widely publicized in the press. It would be easy enough to write it off as another farce in a grimly farcical security system. But it is more than that.

For the Kafkaesque conclusion of this incident is that the victim himself has accepted the government criteria, lock-stock-and-barrel. This gives the case a quality of pathos and emphasizes the human loss which the Workers Defense League could only treat tangentially in the Watts report.

Landy was second in his class—the DAR still intends to give him an award for that. But his mother had been a member of the Communist Party. She had quit in 1947, but still continued to receive the *Daily Worker*. In a statement typical of his entire defense, Landy reported that his mother "rarely ever looks at" the *Daily Worker* which she receives.

## DAMNING DEFENSE

Shortly before graduation, Landy was interviewed by Naval Intelligence agents. He remarked: "Right from the first the Intelligence agents seemed to accept the fact that I am, and always have been, very conservative in my political views. . . . Their questions were all about my mother, about her political associations, the

## THE STOOLPIGEON RECRUITING SYSTEM

The House Un-American Committee has added its bit to the Landy case by proposing to Mrs. Landy that she stool-pigeon on her ex-associates in the CP in order to help clear her son.

The committee's investigator, a Mrs. Scotti, invited Mrs. Landy to testify before the inquisitors. "We want you to do your patriotic duty. Your government is calling you," she told the Kings Pointer's mother.

"I got furious with her," related Mrs. Landy, "when she said it would be better for my boy if I told about all my former Communist activities to the committee. I told her that my activities were insignificant and that some of the people with whom I was associated are dead and that others are just retired and leading conservative lives just like me. Then she said, 'Let us be the judge? I told her I didn't want to ruin other people's lives. Besides, how will it affect my boy?' (N. Y. Post, Aug. 10.)

Added Mrs. Landy: "They want to barter my soul for my son's commission."

## 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.

newspapers she reads, and so on."

This point leads to what is the center of the Landy story. As reported in the *New York Times*, Landy's mother said of her son:

**"He has been a loyal American. He gave me an ultimatum—to quit or he would leave home; to choose between him and the party—and I chose him. He reformed me and yet he is suffering for it. I wish they'd punish me instead of him. I'd rather go to jail than have him suffer."**

## LONDON LETTER

# BLP Branches Prepare for the Conference

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, Aug. 4—Although it is yet another nine or ten weeks before the delegates to the Labor Party Annual Conference assemble in the Winter Gardens of the coastal holiday resort of Margate, signs of activity are already in evidence.

For some weeks the advertisement columns of the Labor press have contained notices extolling the virtues of this or that particular hotel. The advertisements range from the modest guest house, which offers bedrooms facing the sea with hot and cold water in every room for a modest fifteen shillings a day, to the more illustrious hotel on the Eastern Esplanade which boasts of its "excellent table," is licensed to sell liquor and has a lift service to all floors, at the cost of thirty shillings a day.

But, irrespective of the differences in the quality of their off-conference hours habitat, the delegates will at least be discussing a common agenda during the conference sessions. The resolutions on this agenda were released to the press this morning by the party headquarters at Transport House.

There are a large number of resolutions—418 to be precise—and they cover practically every subject under the sun—and quite a few under the moon!

The resolutions are grouped under various headings and although this is rather an arbitrary process, and one which sometimes leads to rows at the composing committees which are held a day or two before conference proper begins, it gives a rough indication of the general temper of the local parties.

The largest number of resolutions fall under the rather vague heading of "Future Policy" and there are 52 of them. It is sad to note that many of them are as vague as the heading itself.

They nearly all, in one way or another, demand a change in the policy of the party, and they nearly all demand a socialist policy—in fact they specify many kinds of socialist policy. "A full-blooded socialist policy" is demanded by the Blyden Labor Party whilst the Wandsworth Central party want "a pure socialist policy." Other adjectives used by the local parties to designate the particular type of socialist policy which they wish to see adopted are: *genuine, real, better, new, militant, vigorous, fighting, and dynamic.*

## "NOT ENOUGH"

All of these are doubtless admirable objectives but the real tragedy is that very few of the local parties have specified exactly what they mean and even fewer have stated precise ways in which their ideal policy should be formulated.

Many of them, it is true, indicate that they are discontented with the current policy and want, in particular, an extension of public ownership and a keener fight against the Tories. Unfortunately they fail to develop the theme, and as a consequence a great number of the resolutions are purely negative.

But, negative or not, there is no doubting the sentiments behind the resolutions. As inadequate and poorly framed as they are, they indicate the strong feel-

**They're all with him at the Academy. They know he's without blemish."**

This tragedy would be enough in its own right. Add to it the complication of the navy denying a commission on the basis of Landy's association, and it is compounded. But perhaps the most incredible thing is the line of defense: for it is always implied that *if* Landy had not threatened to leave home over a political issue, *if* his mother were still in the Party, *if* she actually read the copy of the *Daily Worker* which she receives, *then* it might be legitimate for the navy to act as they have.

## FANTASTIC LOGIC

In other words, the accused has, more or less, accepted the premises

of the accusers, that a relationship with a "subversive" mother makes a man subversive. He disagrees only with the empirical judgments involved: his mother is no longer subversive, and anyway his filial association with her was based on anti-Communism.

The logic of the situation is a fantastic one. And all the more fantastic is the fact that the press (which has come to Landy's defense) also takes this line and implies the basic premise.

The terrible thing about the Landy case—and this within a bourgeois concept of civil liberties—is not that a mistake has been made. That's bad enough, and typical enough, but it isn't the heart of the case. The terrible thing is that both sides, including the accused, has in practice accepted the government's assumption that it is "subversive" to associate with a person's own parents if they are suspect.

service; this year it is the other way around.

This seems an indication that the Stalinist influence on resolutions is less this year than ever; for the British Stalinists are in favor of conscription in Britain and confine themselves to demanding a reduction of 12 months in the length of service.

A few weeks before the Labor Party Conference the *Daily Worker*, the newspaper of the British CP, is holding a conference to which it invites all local Labor Parties in order that a "common policy of action" may be discussed. It will be interesting to see how the Stalinists handle this particular situation. Not that it will make very much difference because indications are that only the usual fellow-travelers, Stalinoids, starry-eyed political infants and loud-mouthed imbeciles will attend the *Daily Worker* priming session, and they long ceased to count for very much in the Labor Party.

## LACKING ELEMENT

A dozen or so resolutions appear on the order paper dealing with the nationalized industries, and they nearly all follow the same broad pattern. Compensation to ex-owners is rejected and some form of workers' control or participation in management is demanded.

Unfortunately this section also displays a grave weakness and none of the resolutions attempts to expound a policy for the development of industrial democracy. This is a feature which has been the subject of frequent comment in previous articles from London and is one which seems determined to persist. It is not because of any lack of awareness, for most of the forward-thinking party members realize that development is needed in the nationalized industries. What is lacking is any coherently expressed thoughts on the subject. This is clearly demonstrated in the resolutions.

A sprinkling of resolutions deal with the Parliamentary Labor Party, and administer criticism of its passive attitude in the House of Commons during the past few years. Says Hornchurch Labor Party: "Our defeat in the general election was partly due to the lack of energetic opposition to the Tory government shown by the Parliamentary Labor Party in the House of Commons." Because of this it urges the Parliamentary Party to carry on vigorous and continuous opposition to the government which will instill Labor supporters with a sense of enthusiasm and fighting spirit.

This brief review would not be complete without a mention of the resolution from the Ebbw Vale Labor Party, Aneurin Bevan's constituency. One would expect from here a resolution which fairly sizzled the paper on which it was printed and which singed the eyebrows of the party leadership.

Such expectations are shattered when one reads that Ebbw Vale deplors that the Tory government has not built a bridge over the Severn River and calls upon the Parliamentary Labor Party to put pressure on the government to achieve this objective. As they say in Wales: "Indeed to goodness"—which is an exclamation of surprise defying translation in printable English.

ing of dissatisfaction apparent in the party at the present moment.

This is quite clearly, and humorously, expressed in the resolution standing in the name of Morecambe and Lonsdale Constituency party. It reads: "This Conference believes that 'Labor Reformism' has reached the end of its usefulness as a basis for political action; that the basic economic injustices of capitalist society remain untouched, and in many cases are more blatant than ever, and that the situation facing the party and our society calls for a more militant approach in the political and industrial fields. Full employment and a decent funeral are not enough."

Under other headings on the agenda the resolutions tend to become more positive and more detailed, although the general trend is still toward vague opposition to current policies.

The hydrogen bomb attracts resolutions from about two dozen local parties, and by far the greater majority of them express opposition to the line adopted by the party leadership in supporting the Tory government's policy of manufacturing the H-bomb in Britain. Some 18 of the resolutions say with complete determination that the Labor Party should not sanction the manufacture or use of the bomb by Britain. The remainder make various pleas for the party to try to secure international agreement on the banning of the H- and A-bombs.

## AGAINST CONSCRIPTION

The growing interest in Britain in automation is reflected by the 19 resolutions which appear under the heading "Automation and Nuclear Developments in Industry." This is the first time that this subject has appeared on a Labor Party agenda.

Many of these resolutions demand that, in view of the consequences of automation, the Labor Party should extend its plans for nationalization of industry. One even demands that the party "adopt a policy of complete nationalization and control of industry." Nearly all of them advance the view that the Labor movement should campaign for a shorter working-week, higher wages, longer holidays, and similar improvements.

The resolutions on military service present an extremely interesting fare this year. They are 22 in number and are all critical of the present party policy of support for the now ruling 2-year period of national service.

What makes for particular interest is the fact that no less than 15 of the resolutions demand the complete abolition of conscription. This is a startling increase on previous years when usually it was only the odd one or two resolutions which demanded complete abolition while the remainder advocated a cut in the length of

# PRO & CON: DISCUSSION

## A Pro-Stalinist Comes to the Defense Of Simone de Beauvoir's Novel

To the Editor:

A year ago a book was published in France that was one of the greatest literary and political events to take place in the life of the intelligentsia in recent years. Although, as has been announced, it will be some months before a translation of *Les Mandarins* appears in America, the prevailing climate of hysterical vigilantism has ensured that sniping shots were fired before the book reached this country. For, in the view of some circles, the *Mandarin*, like the French liner "Liberté," is anticipated to carry a crew of undesirables. Hence the preliminary tracer, dum-dum, and high expostulatory express bullets which are fired by the guardians of our insularism. Indeed, the intensity of their fire would lead us to imagine that, instead of a cargo of ideas, a shipload of Red Army soldiers was about to disembark on these shores.

The authoress of *Les Mandarins*, Simone de Beauvoir, is one of the few writers who have prevented French literature from alienating itself from reality in the post-war years. A doctor in philosophy, and the author of novels, plays, and essays, she took part in the anti-Nazi underground resistance during the Second World War, and has since been in the very center of Parisian political and philosophical activity. She is best known to Americans through *America Day by Day*—a book which, although hardly more than an informal diary, nevertheless contains valuable insights into American life as seen in terms of the European intelligentsia of the left.

Although it may be assumed that the majority of the readers of LABOR ACTION have not read the book, they have already been presented with a set of views concerning it by Mr. Giacometti, in an article entitled "Simone de Beauvoir's Road to Stalinism" which appeared in the issue of June 6. It will therefore be profitable and proper to examine this book in function of what Mr. Giacometti has already said about it.

### "BIG BUSINESS VIEWPOINT"

That the task of denouncing *Les Mandarins* has fallen to Mr. Giacometti does not detract from the fact that—even before the appearance of the translation—one view and one view alone has been presented to the American public. At first it might seem ironical that Mr. Giacometti, a European supporter of the left, should join in the reactionary chorus, thus identifying himself with the viewpoint of big business and those who gain their livelihood by advancing, in various forms, the theses that big business would have the public accept. But in fact this contradiction is not atypical of those whose adherence to the left remains traditionalist rather than dialectical in character. It is therefore important to examine Mr. Giacometti's errors in the interpretation of the book, for his misconceptions reveal a paradoxical conservatism which is averse to facing up to the contemporary political situation in the world.

Mr. Giacometti states that the publication of *Les Mandarins* in France was a political rather than a literary event.

He should be sufficiently familiar with the contemporary European atmosphere to know that the two are so inextricably commingled that the idea of separating them in this way seems absurd; the book is neither political nor literary, but both together.

He further states that the story concerns "a group of left wing intellectuals" in post-war Paris. This is misleading. The group of intellectuals, at the time the story opens, was politically representative, and not left-wing—otherwise there would have been no necessity for the book's being written. Nor do the members of this group all become left-wing. Lambert, the young journalist, turns eventually to the right; Volange, the "ex-collabo," stays there; Sciascine is in the pay of the State Department. Mr. Giacometti would have done more justice to *Les Mandarins* if he had told LABOR ACTION readers that the book, instead of being the "story of some left-wing intellectuals," portrays the moral and therefore political repolarization, as it took place on the personal level, from the time of the defeat of Hitler's armies down to the mid-fifties. The point is that whereas at the time of the Liberation all were fighting for Freedom versus Nazism—a question which needed no discussion—after the defeat of Nazism it became a question of further crystallization—freedom for whom and for what. The characters in the book seek ethical principles in the name of which they are to deal with the conflicting realities of the contemporary world.

Nor should we rigidly identify, as did many literal-minded critics, Anne with the authoress, Sartre with Dubreuil, and so on. For while there is a degree of artistic truth in this identification, closely held to it becomes a naive allegory and a false parallel. For example, Dubreuil writes a book illustrating the uselessness of literature, whereas Sartre did exactly the contrary in *Qu'est ce que la Littérature?* There have even been insinuations that Miss de Beauvoir is manipulating facts to her advantage by saying that it was the fictional *L'Espoir* which first released details of the Russian camps, instead of David Rousset in *Le Figaro*. The point of this "manipulation" is plainly to face the protagonists with the crux of the problem which the Left then faced, thus dramatizing it for the reader. The only alternative to this approach would have been to write a shallow fictionalized account of the period in which the characters, organizations, and newspapers are all relabeled with pseudonyms so that the resulting book could be passed off as "fiction."

### THE "MORAL PLANE"

One is completely staggered, however, to read Mr. Giacometti's assertion that Miss de Beauvoir has "reversed herself in spectacular fashion, declares her readiness to defend every falsehood in the services of a powerful tyranny, and strikingly reveals her political ignorance"—since she does nothing of the kind.

To begin with she does not deny the reality of the labor camps in Russia, nor does she imply that a doubting attitude should be held today towards their existence. Furthermore the Communist characters in the book are either presented schematically (therefore as faithful mouthpieces of the party) or even, as in the case of Lenoir, ridiculed.

Regarding the labor camps, Simone de Beauvoir is not "defending falsehood" at all. Instead she shows Dubreuil and Henri faced with a moral problem—that of publishing materials that, at least for them, have nothing that is adequately verified, and which, moreover, if published, will appreciably advance the cause of reaction. Thus Miss de Beauvoir does not so much "defend" the policy of labor camps as attempt to show how this Russian problem is understood by the left-wing French intelligentsia—as part of the policy of a growing socialist nation faced with economic and organizational difficulties. She also shows how, on the universal moral plane, the existence of these labor camps is dwarfed by the threat of nuclear warfare. Thus while readers of Mr. Giacometti might be led to believe that Simone de Beauvoir has endorsed lies which attempt to

conceal labor camps, she does nothing of the kind, and shows no tendency to hide any truth however unpleasant or embarrassing. Her conclusion is that in a choice between a life which includes labor camps and a life which includes nuclear war, the former is preferable, and doubly preferable when into the balance are thrown the millions of exploited workers to whom a capitalist future offers no hope.

Mr. Giacometti, however, having damned *Les Mandarins* with unreflected comment, instead of exerting himself to substantiate his statements, eases his muscles by hiring a donkey in the shape of an anonymous reviewer from the *Libérateur* to carry his burden to the end. Here again hostility is the hallmark. The reviewer speaks, for example, of the protagonists' "impulse to escape responsibility." This simply is not true. The majority of the characters accept their responsibilities to the limit. If the book portrays "hesitations" and moral conflicts it is precisely because the characters seek their way to assume such responsibility as will realistically advance the cause of the working class within the present configuration of forces. If there had been no sense of responsibility the book would not have been written. Even Anne is saved from suicide by her sense of responsibility. "I have no right," she says.

### THE INDELIBLE STAMP

The charge is further made by the *Libérateur* incognito that the "mandarins of the Left are strange people. They never meet workers, and not a single wage-earner appears in the novel. These progressive intellectuals are not even in touch with organizers of working-class origin." This is a childish quibble, since both the lives and writings of Simone de Beauvoir and of Sartre bear indelibly the stamp of close association with the working class, and the fact that *Les Mandarins* does not concentrate upon this aspect is not a valid argument. The point here is that the fundamental premise of capital versus labor is assumed from the outset, and does not therefore stand in the necessity of being proved again in these pages. One does not ne-

cessarily have to describe the evils of exploitation on a plantation to write a play about the moral dilemma of being for or against the abolition of slavery. Although the workers are not specifically described, since *Les Mandarins* is a book about French intellectuals, their presence is nevertheless felt throughout. "The little lights along the Tagus, you can't describe them when you know that they light up a starving city," as Henri says. It is also plain that both Henri and Dubreuil get the greatest pleasure when the workers read them. "The next day I shall not see workers buying my paper," says Henri in distress when he considers publishing articles on the labor camps.

"All the heroes of Simone de Beauvoir's novel live in a state of constant anxiety wondering what the Communist leadership will think of every initiative they take." This interpretation also betrays an unfair bias. Henri and Dubreuil are not concerned with what Lachaume or the Communist Party leadership think. They are concerned with the relationship between the working class in France and an existing worker's republic—Soviet Russia. It is not therefore a matter of what the French Communist Party says. More precisely they are concerned with the fate of a French proletariat endangered by the reactionary maneuvers of the State Department.

Much more space would be required to deal with Mr. Giacometti and his helpmate than may be demanded here, but one might perhaps take up the *Libérateur* reviewer's conclusion which is that "*Les Mandarins* is little help for the building of a proletarian, socialist, and independent New Left." *Les Mandarins* is largely devoted to explaining why in the present configuration of forces in France there is no possibility of a "New Left," and how the whole concept of a "New Left" is a dangerous illusion, a utopian dream which can only lead to the victory of reaction.

An article, such as that of Mr. Giacometti, does great harm to the labor cause by presenting in a distorted light to the American reader the ripening of contemporary political reality in Europe.

EDWARD SCOTT

## Reply: The Mandarin's View of Politics

A peculiarity of Mr. Scott's criticism is this: It is quite clear that he agrees that Simone de Beauvoir has taken the road of apologetics for Stalinism, for this is precisely the political merit of the book for him. Yet he manages to sound as if to report this fact, which I highlighted, is to misrepresent her.

Stylistically, he achieves this effect by relabeling Stalinism "the ripening of contemporary political reality," and relabeling his own pro-Stalinism as "facing up to the contemporary political situation in the world" and "dialectical" adherence to the "Left," by which he means that "workers republic" of the Russian totalitarians.

Mr. Scott's methods resemble his politics at a few other points too (to take some minor but illustrative matters up first). For example, he quotes me as writing that the book was "a political rather than a literary event," which would imply that it was no literary event at all; whereas I had written "more a political than a literary event"—which perhaps may still arouse his disagreement but should not arouse reasonable strictures about "separating" the two aspects. Indeed, I was merely stressing that I wished to deal principally with the book's political aspect, as distinguished from its literary and psychological qualities, which are great. Since Mr. Scott also devotes himself to the political angle, I fail to see the relevance of his comment.

Unfortunately, Mr. Scott's criticism is not altogether political. He leads in fact with the familiar Stalinist method of charging that I am "identifying [myself] with the viewpoint of big business" and the "reactionary chorus"—by "denouncing *Les Mandarins*." This is as obnoxious as it is dishonest. What he means, of course, is that any left-wing opponent of Russian Stalinism must be systematically vilified as an "agent of reaction" in accord with the Moscow Trial prescription for book reviewers. Surely this shows Mr. Scott is qualified to defend de Beauvoir against the charge of "defending falsehood"....

But in view of Mr. Scott's amalgam of "big-business viewpoint" with any

criticism of *Les Mandarins*, I must point out that *Les Mandarins* got a rave notice from Emile Henriot, a conservative critic from the French Academy, writing in *Le Monde*, a paper of big business if there ever was one. The militantly reactionary organization *Paix et Liberté* also praised the book in its radio program. I do not mean to suggest, however, that Mr. Scott shares Henriot's or J. P. David's political opinions. The enemies of our enemies are not necessarily our friends....

### TO TELL THE TRUTH

This is also why it is important that the "revelations" about Russian slave labor should not have appeared in "L'Espoir" but in *Le Figaro Littéraire*. The political meaning of Rousset's exposure would have been different had it taken place within the context of an independent, revolutionary policy, instead of in the pages of a reactionary paper. The truth can only further the cause of the working-class—but, even more important, the full truth should be told at all times. While the Stalinists and their camp-followers are in a position to tell true facts about capitalism, *Le Figaro Littéraire*, *Preuves* or Sciascine (who defends State Department policy but is not "in its pay") are in a position to tell true facts about Stalinism. On the other hand, only independent socialists are able to tell the full truth about both, without being anybody's agents or in anybody's pay.

The group of individuals portrayed in *Les Mandarins* is fortunately not representative of the whole left-wing intelligentsia in France, nor was it so in 1945. It is the staff of *Les Temps Modernes* and, in part, of *Combat*. It is true that these groups were not as homogeneous then as they are now. The committee of *Les Temps Modernes* included at the time conservatives like Raymond Aron, now a frequent contributor to *Preuves*, or Albert Ollivier, who joined the Gaullist movement. Among the contributors, there were David Rousset, Richard Wright, Arthur Koestler, Albert Camus.

(Turn to last page)



**LABOR ACTION**

August 15, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 33

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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

# Young Socialist CHALLENGE

August 15, 1955

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

## Watts Report Reveals Military Reaching Out to Impose Controls on All Youth

By EDWARD HILL

"A careful study of the Army Military Personnel Security program and its application to inducted men makes it difficult to avoid the conclusion that the ideal draftee is an only child of spontaneous generation who, despite a hermit childhood, has miraculously acquired the ability to read and write English but has never made use of these useful skills."

This is the opening statement of the introduction to *The Draftee and Internal Security*, a two-volume monograph by Rowland Watts, national secretary of the Workers Defense League. On the basis of solid documentation drawn from one hundred and ten cases of army discharges, Watts has written a first-rate analysis of a little-known aspect of the witch-hunt. The importance of his work for the socialist youth movement is obvious.

The development which Watts reports is relatively new. In its most extreme form, it probably dates from the Peress case and the army's hysterical reaction to it. In March of 1954, Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens told the Senate Armed Forces Committee:

"The traditional policy of the army has been that the discharge given should reflect the service rendered. . . . I recently changed it in one aspect and directed that where a man is discharged from the service because he is found to be disloyal or subversive, his separation within the limits of the law should be under other than honorable conditions, regardless of the actual character of the service rendered." (Emphasis added.)

### ARMY'S SYSTEM

In concrete terms, this change in policy has resulted in granting the army "political and social control over every young man subject to the Selective Service Law from the dawn of his mature understanding until he approaches thirty."

This, of course, follows as a result of the conscription policy,

which places young men under military obligation, through the reserves, for a period which is sometimes as long as ten years. Throughout this time, the army has the right to brand a man for actions taken prior to entry into service, in some cases actions which require the army not to allow the inductee to serve in a normal fashion!

In working out this fantastic policy, the army has set up a system of investigation, accusation and clearance which is almost totally devoid of any rights for the accused. The rule here is the anonymous witness, the omniscient board, the secret hearing.

When a young man enters the army, either as a draftee or a volunteer, he is required to sign a Loyalty Certificate which is primarily based upon "membership in, affiliation with, or sympathetic association with" organizations listed by the attorney general. In many cases, it has been pointed out to army boards that none of the organizations on that list have had a hearing, that the list is explicitly for the purpose of determining employability in government jobs (and is not even mandatory in those cases), but this has made little difference.

### WHAT FOLLOWS THE "FLAG"

In point of actual fact, it would even be a step forward if the army would confine itself merely to the anti-libertarianism of the list. Some of the charges that have been made go so far beyond the undemocratic criteria and intent of the list that one might look back at Tom Clark as a consistent democrat.

• Once a charge is placed against a man, he is "flagged," i.e., he cannot be promoted, moved out if the military district, assigned to normal tasks, or discharged. In some cases, individuals have spent their entire twenty-four months in the service under these conditions.

• After the "flagging," the accused is investigated. Occasionally, he will be cleared at this level. However, he is given no notification of this fact other than that

he is now open to assignment to some regular military job.

• If he is not cleared by the investigation, the inductee is served with a Letter of Allegations of Derogatory Information and he may request a hearing. These will be described a little later.

• If he fails clearance at the hearing, he may file additional information with the Army Review Board—although neither he nor his counsel may appear before it! Again, there is no notification of clearance other than assignment to normal military training.

• If the accused is not cleared by the Army Review Board, this fact may be kept from him for his twenty-four months of service. He will then receive either an "Undesirable Discharge" or a "General Discharge under Honorable Conditions," the latter if there is some "doubt" about him.

• He may now appeal to the Army Discharge Review Board. This board is not part of the security program and therefore has no criteria to guide its determination.

• Assuming, as is usually the case, that the Army Discharge Review Board does not clear him, the inductee has his last chance: an appeal to the Board for the Correction of Military Records. At this level, his opportunity for a reversal rests on technical or mechanical error.

• Finally, he may appeal to the secretary of the Army and the secretary of Defense. There is no probability of reversal unless some "startlingly significant new evidence" is introduced.

### LABYRINTHINE WAYS

The allegations which must be fought in this labyrinth are probably broader than any in the various loyalty and security programs. To begin with, there is membership, affiliation or sympathetic association (attended meetings, subscribed to paper, etc.) with listed organizations. Then there is membership, etc., with organizations cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the California Committee on Un-American Activities (the Tenney Committee), or "anonymously cited" organizations.

The signing of petitions, reading of certain literature (the accused was "an ardent reader of Marx and Engels"; the accused "carried Russian publications to college classes"), writing of articles, writing of letters to subversives, keeping of addresses ("listed in your notebook the names of eight individuals all of whom have subversive backgrounds") are all considered relevant criteria.

One other brand of accusations should be given special consideration: this is guilt by consanguinity, or, in some cases, by legal relationship. Association with a grandmother, with a grandfather, eleven cases of association with a mother and three with step-mothers, ten with fathers, five with brothers, two with sisters, eight with wives, and one each with a mother-in-law, a father-in-law, a sister-in-law and a brother-in-law, are recorded in Watts' report.

### DANGERS OF LITERACY

These accusations must be answered in a hearing. The hearing itself is secret. Formerly, a "Confidential File," the G-2 report on the accused, was kept secret. Now a summary may be requested, although in some cases this has become a play-act formality of no benefit to the "Individual Concerned" (the army's Kafkaesque little term for its victim).

During the hearing, questions are not confined to the allegations. The entire G-2 file must be rebutted, though the accused and his counsel can only infer the nature of these charges from the questions which are asked.

One tendency which Watts reports in this hearing is a fear on the army's part

of books, reading and writing. Witnesses are repeatedly asked, "Does he read?" "What books does he read?"

In one case, an "Individual Concerned" who had evidently called himself an intellectual was asked, "What do you mean an intellectual? Does that mean you question our present way of living and our present government? Is that what you mean by an intellectual? In other words, you don't accept for face value. Is that what you mean?"

The consequences of this nightmare experience are terribly real. Watts writes:

"This 'branding' is not a theoretical thing. A man with an 'Undesirable' discharge from the army has little hope of getting an industrial job or any other job with a productive future. Even a 'General Discharge under honorable conditions' creates insurmountable obstacles in many fields. The man with no discharge at all, pending 'determination,' is in a never-never-land of employment hopelessness. Seven jobs in three months is one fantastic fact."

### A BOW TO WDL

Perhaps the most important aspect of this problem, one which Watts emphasizes, is the extent of social control which this system grants to the army. In the present situation it means, as Watts pointed out, that the American male is accountable to the military for his actions, associations and relatives from the time he is born until the time he is thirty years of age.

Developing quietly and with little attention, this program is probably the most potentially totalitarian of all the witchhunt apparatuses.

We are all deeply indebted—as we have often been—to Rowland Watts and the Workers Defense League, and to the Fund for the Republic whose grant-in-aid made it possible for Watts to make the study. The relation between this aspect of the WDL's work and the present case which it is conducting for the ISL against the attorney general's list (without which the army program could not exist) re-emphasizes the importance of support to the League in the fight which it is conducting on all fronts of the witchhunt.

Last sessions  
in the N. Y. YSL class  
**THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF SOCIALISM**  
WEDNESDAY EVE'S at 8:15

(6) Aug. 17  
Democratic Socialism and the Future

All sessions will be held on consecutive Wednesday evenings at 273 Madison Street, Apt. 3A (Lower East Side), New York. Take D train to E. Broadway sta.

**YSL CLASS • NEW YORK**  
**THE NEXT SESSION**  
**IN THE CLASS**  
**Perspective on**  
**History & Revolution**  
TUESDAYS at 8 p.m.  
**IS**  
Aug. 16—GORDON HASKELL  
Revolution in Asia—I  
Aug. 23—GORDON HASKELL  
Revolution in Asia—II  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

**ATTEND THE YSL SUMMER CAMP—SEPT. 6-11**  
**Socialist Education—Recreation—Comradeship**  
At Genoa City, Wisc. Fill out and send in the blank below.

YSL — c/o Meier  
5426 S. Maryland  
Chicago 15, Ill.

I would like to register now for the YSL camp.  
 \$5 deposit enclosed.  Please bill me for \$5 deposit.  
 I may attend the camp; please send me brochure.  
 (Make checks payable to D. Meier or Young Socialist League.)

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

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

Registration for one  for couple

## Exploring the Parallel Between Two Movements

# ZIONISM and STALINISM

By HAL DRAPER

Perhaps it could have happened only in England.

England is the country where even Stalinist intellectuals sometimes write with a freshness and independence never seen in any other country's party-liners or fellow-travelers. Whatever it is in the English tradition of independent thinking that breeds a relative nonconformity even in monolithized movements, the same thing is true of the English Zionists.

The official organ of the British Zionists, *Jewish Observer & Middle East Review*, is edited by Jon Kimche; and in the past too it has sometimes carried material which would not have been touched by its American counterparts with a ten-foot pole. Yet it was still startling when in its May 13 number this Zionist organ published an article which set out to draw a parallel between the Zionist movement and ideology and—Stalinism.

The parallels between the two movements have often impressed themselves upon anti-Zionists, including the present writer; and as far as we are concerned, most sharply with respect to the question of attitude toward critics and opponents. No other movement that pretends to be democratic is as similar to the Stalinists in its frequent readiness to vilify the mildest critic, and to do so with a Stalinist-type formula: Where, for the Stalinist, his opponent is semi-automatically an "agent of fascism" or "agent of reaction," for the fanatical Zionist his critic is semi-automatically an "anti-Semite." (One of the latest of the phantasmagorical smear campaigns in the American Zionist press has been against Arnold Toynbee, as nothing less than an "anti-Semite," because of the viewpoint he expresses on the Israel-Arab conflict in a concluding volume of his *Study of History*.)

But this sort of thing is not at all what Michael Lewis is thinking and writing about. He is concerned precisely with the politics of Zionism, and most particularly with a parallel which goes like this: In Stalinism there is the problem of the relations between the world Communist Parties and the state apparatus of Russia; in Zionism too there is the problem of relations between a state, Israel, and the world Jewish communities.

The finding of neat parallels, in history past or current, can be a very tricky and self-deceptive pastime; but let us see how far Lewis has pushed his parallel and what he has turned up.

### Heart of the Parallel

His starting subject is "What's Happened to Zionist Ideology?" The underlying problem is one we have discussed at various times in these pages: Does Zionism have any role outside Israel, now that its state exists, other than to funnel all the "exiled" people back to their promised land as immigrants?

This suggests the first parallel to Lewis. "In some ways, despite obvious differences, world Zionism has reached a similar impasse to world Communism." It's the "negation of the negation": as communism is realized in practise, the need for communist parties naturally withers; and as Zionism is realized in practise (i.e., insofar as all Jews return to Israel), the need disappears for Zionist parties, organization, activity and theory.

At first glance, to one who is reading very rapidly, this may appear like a neat parallel, but a moment's thought shows an oversight by the parallelizer which will reveal much.

When communism is "realized in practise" in Russia (to follow Lewis' parallel), does the need for the communist parties in the rest of the world tend to disappear?

Lewis is obviously completely unaware that this question even exists in the terms of his parallel. Throughout, he slurs over the difference between the "realization" of the program and its "realization" in one country, in which latter case the need for militant parties in the other countries is not less but if anything greater.

This, of course, would completely destroy his neat parallel. For by the terms of its ideology, the Zionism of Israel—unlike genuine Marxist socialism or communism—looks to victory only in one country.

Implicitly, therefore, the communism with which Lewis is working his parallel is the national-chauvinistic "Communism" of Stalin's theory of socialism-in-one-country. The movement with which Zionism is put in parallel is not, and cannot be, an internationalist communist (Marxist socialism) but only Stalinism.

Before we see where this leads us, let us note that Lewis shows in passing throughout his article that he naively accepts Stalinism in this sense. Of the "realization" of Communism "in practise," and the consequent "end [of] the need for the class struggle, for Communist ideology, and therefore for Communist and other parties," he says:

"With the rise of the Soviet Union, and now of Communist China and Eastern Europe, that stage is at least theoretically many decades nearer."

He uses more than once the typical Stalinist apologetic phrase about the inevitable difference "between partial achievement [in Russia] and the ideal goal," with its subsumed notion that the disconcerting blemishes which one might find in the Russian system are temporary imperfections incident to transition toward the ideal.

In fact, as he goes along in the article he even explicitly mentions "the building of socialism in one country" as something which Russia was "forced" to retreat into, by disappointment over the failure of revolution in Germany. "The distortions of the original ideals of Russian Communism can be traced from this point," he explains, and it is clear that for him these regrettable "distortions" were necessary and unavoidable (Stalin's "realism").

### The Border-Guard Role

What, now, Lewis is doing in his article is paralleling present Zionist difficulties to these "distortions," i.e., to the Stalinist transformation of the revolution into national-chauvinist lines.

Thus for Stalin, the Communist Parties did indeed have to disappear as *communist parties*; they had to be transformed into border guards for the national state of the new Russian bureaucratic ruling class—parties which continued to speak in internationalist terms but which functioned decisively only in terms of "What is best for the immediate national interests of the Russian fatherland?"

But this is exactly the function which Lewis (and many other Zionists) see for the Zionist groups of the diaspora now—to do for Israel what the Stalinist parties do for Russia, most particularly, to mobilize political support for the Israeli government's aims. (Of course, the function of financial support is a special Zionist form of this role.) If Israel is attacked by an Arab force, the Zionists and their fellow travelers must make an international scandal of it; if Israel massacres an Arab village, the Zionists must cover up, and denounce any critics as anti-Semites; etc.

This "border guard" function for the world Zionist movement is, of course, explicitly verbalized by most Zionists, and by Lewis also, although they also try to think up domestic reasons for Zionist existence. The results here are sad, including futile talk about the Zionist movements finding a home-grown function by pretending to be community activity groups. Lewis' article does not go in for this, though he winds up with a hopeful sentence about "Zionism will succeed only to the extent that it answers the needs of the different sections of world Jewry, and not only of the state of Israel." How this devoutly-wished-for consummation is to be achieved by Zionism-in-one-country is not disclosed, since Lewis' article ends right there.

### Two-Stage-Consolation

Lewis' identification of Zionism with precisely the *nationalist-chauvinism* of Stalinism is further set down in words as he writes:

"What conclusions can be deduced from this situation [conflict of interest between Israel and non-Israeli Jews], particularly in terms of contemporary Zionist ideology? The most obvious is that Zionism can only be realized in stages, and not as an uninterrupted process."

Since the whole article is cast in the form of the analogy with Stalinism, by "uninterrupted process" Lewis is of course thinking of the world-revolutionary perspective ("Permanent Revolution") which was counterposed to Stalin's nationalist counter-revolution.

The Stalinist theory of "stages" which is behind his words is this: In the first stage, the Russian state (in which The Revolution is deposited as in a safety-deposit vault, or like the caterpillar in the cocoon) grows and grows and grows, on its own nationalist-state basis, until the day when it has become so strong that (second stage) by its own sheer power it spreads The Revolution further. Indeed, we have seen Lewis' own reference to this second-stage revolution in Eastern Europe and China.

We know that what actually came out of the cocoon of Stalinism-in-one-country was not the butterfly of socialism but the slugworm of a new bureaucratic despotism which is as anti-socialist and anti-labor as it is anti-capitalist. But all this is quite alien to Lewis' thinking. He is trying to suggest that Zionism, because it is so like Stalinism, can perhaps also solve the WORLD Jewish problem in safe "second stage," but only after a first stage (the present one) in which the slogan is "Everything for Israel." This functions as a justification—a consolation—for the imperfections of the present stage.

But even within the framework of the Stalinist analogy this is plain silly. Stalinism can be spread to all countries, or be imposed on them, for it is now a type of social system, albeit one which has developed out of a nationalistically degenerated revolution against capi-

talism. But it is simply meaningless to think of "spreading" Zionism outside of Israel in any sense. The "realization of the program" of Zionism is the reverse of a spreading; it is the notorious "Ingathering of the Exiles." The consistent Zionist program for solving the problem of world Jewry is to abolish any world Jewry.

Lewis in one passage notes the difference with regard to direction ("concentrates inward" versus "spreads outward") but does not link it up with his later musings about "stages."

Here then, we have a Zionist writer who, frankly in a quandry about the impasse of his movement, turns to a sympathetic parallel with Stalinism in an effort to see a way out. He is disturbed by what the Zionist reality has turned out to be, and he reminds himself that he should not take this disturbance too seriously, or at least any more seriously than a good Stalinist should take his qualms over the contradiction between "partial achievement" and "ideal" in the Russian reality. His practise in swallowing and rationalizing the crimes of Stalinism serve him in good stead to digest the peccadillos of Zionism.

This pattern can be seen at many points. Right after the train of thought above-noted about the "distortions" which Russia was "forced" into by socialism-in-one-country, he appends his parallel for Zionism:

"Israel, faced with Arab encirclement, and a threatened 'second round,' needs the victory of the Zionism of *aliyah* [immigration to Israel] in countries like England and the United States; but she, too, may find her original ideals and aims distorted by a lack of response and readiness on the part of Western Zionism."

Here (unrelated to the rest of the parallel, for these are just musings) the analogy of "world revolution" becomes, for Zionism, "the victory of the Zionism of *aliyah*" outside Israel. But this "victory," as we have already seen, points exclusively to the liquidation of world Jewry and not to any solution which "answers the needs of the different sections of world Jewry, and not only of the state of Israel."

Within his analogy—like all other Zionists who cannot steel themselves to accept the consistent program of "Ingathering of the Exiles"—Lewis is intellectually shuttling between lip-service to *aliyah* and efforts to establish some different kind of relationship between the State and the Movement.

### Common Ground

Yet, although his specific parallelisms break down again and again—and have to break down, since the example of Stalinism does not really offer any solution to the impasse of Zionism, which is *sui generis*—what Lewis has done is fix attention willy-nilly not on a tricky set of parallels but on a certain portion of common ground between Zionism and Stalinism.

It is a ground which is common not only to these two movements and ideologies but to others; that is true; but it is still a useful thing to highlight quite apart from "parallels."

This common ground is national-chauvinism, in the sense we have explained.

There are few things which are better guaranteed to make a Zionist boil with indignation than such a diagnosis. For the typical Zionist of the diaspora not only thinks of himself as an internationalist but is very proud of it. He is rightly scornful of the narrow bourgeois nationalism of anti-Zionists of the type represented by the American Council for Judaism. In fact, in the article by Michael Lewis under discussion here, it is "the international character of both movements" which, he says, produces the parallels he plays with.

This "internationalism" of the Zionist has a kernel of truth. The consistent American Zionist, for example, does not see politics through the nationalist lens of American (capitalist) interests, ideas and folk mythology about foreign affairs. He tends to see all politics through a different national (and nationalist) lens, the Israeli. The fact that his thinking is not tied down to, or primarily conditioned by, the nationalism of the country in which he lives, but by another country, is the basis of what he likes to think of as "internationalism."

It is obvious that the American Stalinists are just as "internationalist" in this sense, insofar as they are good Russian chauvinists (displaced geographically).

### The Exo-Nationalist Link

In this sense, too, it is correct that (as Lewis wrote) it is "the international [but not internationalist] character of both movements" which produces the parallels, such as they are. There are not many cases in the world where groups of people in many scattered countries have adopted politics which depend on an extra-national "lens" of the type we have described in.

In the case of Stalinism, we know the source of the appeal, and it is a political one. There is an extra-national "lens" effect in the case of world Catholicism, in part. There is one other appeal which has brought about this "lens" effect. It is racism. There was a quite small and embryonic example of it in the "displaced nationalism" of pro-Nazi Germans throughout the world for a period in the '30s. Yet this is hardly comparable to the "displaced nationalism" of the Zionist sector of Jewry, so great is the difference quantitatively. It is only in movements of an "international character" that this displaced nationalism can occur as a large-scale phenomenon.

Hence, although the common ground of Zionism and Stalinism is national-chauvinism, it is more specifically the displaced national-chauvinism, or—if we need to invent a technical term—the exogenous nationalism, of an internationally distributed group. This sums up what makes possible the finding of intriguing parallels between a totalitarian-political movement like Stalinism and a racist-political movement like Zionism.

# To the Attorney General: An Appeal For a Fair Hearing

As reported in LABOR ACTION last week, the Department of Justice hearing on the "subversive" listing of the Independent Socialist League was recessed on August 3 while an appeal for a fair hearing was laid before Attorney General Brownell. ISL counsels Joseph L. Rauh Jr. and Isaac Groner had moved to disqualify the hearing examiner who had been appointed by the Department, E. M. Morrissey, in a telegram to the attorney general. The attorney general replied by proposing that the case against Morrissey be put into an affidavit and submitted to him, with the government attorneys given time to reply.

Following is the text of the affidavit now submitted by counsels Rauh and Groner on behalf of the ISL, in pursuance of the case for a fair hearing; to it also is appended a Memorandum on the affidavit by the same counsels.

We wish to emphasize one point made in the document itself. What is involved here is not merely some personal question involving an examiner named Morrissey. What is involved is the issue of whether the government wishes to give the minimum essentials of a fair hearing on the list. If the attorney general does not, then it will be up to the courts to pass on this aspect of the government blacklist system as well as on the substance of the ISL case.

We publish these documents in line with our aim to present publicly as far as possible a full record of the whole case of the ISL vs. the Subversive List. Two textual points: (1) The "R" numbers with which the text is sprinkled refer to pages in the official record. (2) The term "the organizations" refers to the fact that the hearing includes in one package not only the case of the ISL but also the listing of the ISL's predecessor, the Workers Party and its youth group the Socialist Youth League.

Joseph L. Rauh Jr., and Isaac N. Groner on oath depose and say,

That they are counsel of record for the designated organizations in the above-entitled proceeding.

That, while affiants have no reason for questioning the honor and integrity of Edward M. Morrissey who is presently assigned as the examiner in the above-entitled proceeding, they are convinced that the said examiner (i) has a fixed opinion that the organizations have been and are properly designated by the Attorney General and (ii) has such a fixed, personal bias and personal prejudice in favor of the government and against the organizations, that affiants would be recreant in their duty to insure for their clients a fair and impartial hearing if they did not respectfully request the Attorney General to disqualify the examiner from any further connection with this hearing, all on the basis of the facts and reasons hereinafter stated:

## ROUTINE RIGHTS REFUSED

(1) The examiner has refused to accord to the organizations even the most routine and formal requirements of an orderly hearing.

(a) The examiner has refused to read into the record his letter of designation as an examiner. Counsel's routine request that this be done was followed by a hostile denial, as follows:

"Mr. Rauh: Mr. Examiner, we would like you to read the full letter of designation as Examiner into the record, if you don't mind.

"Mr. Morrissey: I have made a statement for the purpose of the record relative to my designation as Hearing Examiner in this particular case. I think it is complete and a part of the record. That request will be denied" (R. 294).

(b) Counsel for the organizations, thus denied the elementary right to have the full letter of designation read into the record, quite naturally pursued the subject and sought to place on the record any conversations which the examiner had had with representatives of the Department of Justice. The examiner at first "declined to discuss it [the conversations] with the counsel for the organizations" (R. 295); then, after counsel moved to disqualify the examiner, the latter stated sharply: "Before I rule on your motion, let the record show that at no time or under any circumstances have I ever consulted with any official of the Department of Justice relative to this hearing. Now your motion to disqualify the Examiner will be denied" (R. 298). In an effort to clarify the record as to the scope of this denial, counsel for the organizations immediately asked whether the examiner had had "any conversations with the Department of Justice" about the examiner sitting in this matter; the examiner stated that "I have my answer for the record" (R. 298). At the present time, therefore, the record shows a denial that the examiner "consulted" "relative to this hearing," but no denial of discussions with the Department about the examiner's participation

in the hearing, or discussions concerning the examiner's general views on the Attorney General's list, radicalism, etc., or discussions concerning the Attorney General's general approach to hearings under these rules, the legal results hoped to be achieved, the kind of evidence to be taken and records to be made, the treatment of organizations' counsel and other matters which might convey the Department's viewpoint but not be consultation "relative to this hearing."

(c) Regardless of the question whether there is anything in the letter of designation or in any conversations with the Department of Justice which would indicate favor toward the government or hostility toward the organizations, the fact that the examiner was unwilling to clarify these matters on the record is itself evidence of hostility to the organizations.

(d) In addition, the examiner refused the simple request of counsel for the organizations to clarify the rules under which the hearing was proceeding, as follows:

"Mr. Rauh: I am asking you this question, which can be answered very simply, Mr. Examiner. In a case of conflict between the Administrative Procedure Act and the rules of the Attorney General for these hearings which will govern?"

"Mr. Morrissey: Well, that will be decided when we are confronted with that situation" (R. 123).

## "SUBSERVIENT"

(2) At the very outset of the formal hearing, the examiner ruled spontaneously and subserviently exactly as the Government counsel requested him to do (R. 14-15, 16, 18, 19-20, 23-24, 25, 55, 57, 59, 107).

(3) The examiner has shown absolute unawareness of the fundamentals of a fair hearing. He stated, "I frankly don't know what you mean by standards, Mr. Groner" (R. 30-31). When this was explained many times over as "some idea of what communist means for the purpose of ultimate determination in this proceeding" (R. 31) and "what definitions or means the Attorney General will use in order to make his decision" (R. 45), and after counsel for the organizations repeatedly made the point that the Statement of Grounds was not the equivalent of standards because the standards were required to evaluate the grounds and the proof in reaching a decision (R. 54-55, 57-58, 101-106), the examiner simply parroted the Department of Justice line (R. 43-44, 52, 55, 56-57, 100-101, 106, 134-135) that the standards are clear because of the statement of grounds (R. 109-110, 167, 169-170).

(4) The examiner has refused to indicate any standards whatever by which he will judge the organizations, thus making a fair hearing impossible (R. 109-110, 128, 131, 133, 167, 169-170).

(5) The examiner has ruled against the organizations automatically and without consideration of the issues involved.

(a) The major issue in this proceeding

is the meaning of the word "COMMUNIST" and whether big "C" or little "c" is intended. If the word "COMMUNIST" means an organization directly or indirectly connected with the Communist Party, it is undisputed that the designated organizations are not "COMMUNIST" since their opposition to Communist Party, Communist International and Soviet Russia are well known and admitted even by the government. If the word "COMMUNIST" means a group of believers in a society based upon common ownership of the means of production and distribution aiming at establishing the principle from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs, then the organizations proudly plead guilty and no hearing is required on the facts. The examiner overruled repeated efforts (R. 31, 128, 131, 133, 167, 169-170) by the organizations to require the government or the examiner to state which, if either, of the above meanings of word "COMMUNIST" would be applied at the hearing and, if neither of these, what the meaning of word "COMMUNIST" for purposes of this hearing actually was. After overruling every effort by the organizations seeking to clarify the meaning of the word "COMMUNIST" (R. 109-110, 128, 131, 133, 167, 169-170), all predicated on thorough explanations of the difference between big "C" and small "c" organizations (R. 31-43, 45-47, 48-49, 50-52, 124-127, 130-131), the examiner asked counsel for the organizations what the difference between small "c" organization and a large "C" organization actually was: "will you explain to me the difference between the small 'c' and the large 'C' (R. 153); "I am asking as not to be facetious or anything else if you can define for me, I would appreciate it, the difference between the small 'c' and the large 'C'" (R. 154). In other words the record demonstrates conclusively that the examiner ruled against the organizations several times on the crucial issue in the proceeding without understanding or trying to understand the basic issue being raised by the organizations.

(b) Counsel for the organizations moved to dismiss five of the grounds because they charged action which the organizations would or might take after coming to power (R. 84). Counsel pointed out that the charges "are on their face statements of the end society which we might hope to put into effect if these organizations ever gain power. They do not on their face purport to recite what the means are of gaining power" (R. 84). Counsel for the government failed to respond to this point, yet the examiner, without giving any reason, denied these motions (R. 110). In other words, the examiner sustained charges forbidding the advocacy of democratic socialism in America without argument on this point by the government or giving a reason himself.

## BIASED RULINGS

(6) The examiner has shown a lack of minimum substantive knowledge of the field required for independent and impartial rulings (R. 47, 115, 153-154).

(7) The examiner has denied motions of the organizations on the ground that the views of both parties "have been fully explained and argued and are a part of the record" (R. 167; 179). When counsel asked for a definition of the word "COMMUNIST," the examiner said, "my ruling on that is that it is already in the record from both sides" (R. 169) and "as far as I am concerned, I have made my statement for the record and it may stand" (R. 133). These refusals to make responsive rulings (see also R. 238) are certainly not unbiased reasons for denying motions by the organizations.

(8) When counsel for the organizations pointed out that defining standards was duty of government and that the government, not the organizations, should state the difference between small "c" and large "C" organizations (R. 154-155), the examiner stated to counsel for the organizations: "If you don't desire to do it, I am going to request the De-

partment to do it, because I would like to know" (R. 154). Yet the examiner never did require the Department to do so.

(9) The examiner did not require Department counsel to specify the language or the place in the Executive Order where the standards were recited, although government counsel stated flatly, "The standard is set forth in the Executive Order" (R. 52), and counsel for the organizations repeatedly requested the reading of the particular language (R. 52, 53, 55, 56).

## "ABDICATED"

(10) Counsel for the organizations quite naturally sought to determine whether the charges against them of advocacy of overthrow of the government by force or violence would be judged in light of the clear-and-present-danger test (R. 134). The examiner abdicated his role as examiner and left the matter entirely to the government, as follows:

"Mr. Rauh: . . . Now, we are being charged with advocating the overthrow of the government by force and violence. I would like the examiner or the government or somebody to tell me whether there is any time limit on this force and violence or whether advocacy of this in some future era many centuries off is to be proscribed? In other words, is this hearing guided by the clear-and-present-danger [test] or is it not?"

"Mr. Morrissey: Well, now, you pose that question to the examiner, and I am not going to answer it. If the Department sees fit to answer it, they may so do.

"Mr. Alderman: The Department made its position for the record in connection with the hearings last week on the motions" (R. 134).

(11) Counsel for the organizations, also quite naturally sought to determine the purpose of the Attorney General's list, since this purpose should be relevant to any standards which may ultimately be utilized in judging whether the organizations were properly listed. The examiner denied this request, too, without giving a reason:

"Mr. Rauh: . . . I would like someone, I don't know who, in the opposition or the Examiner, to state the purpose of the list.

"Mr. Waterman: I object to that question, Mr. Hearing-Examiner.

"Mr. Morrissey: The objection will be sustained" (R. 136).

## "HOSTILE"

(12) The examiner is allowing the Department to proceed without explaining the theory of its case. The examiner overruled the organizations' motion to require the government to make an opening statement setting forth its theory of the case (R. 292). The organizations are thus being forced to proceed with a hearing, not only without knowing what standards the examiner and the Attorney General may ultimately apply, but without even knowing what the theory of the government's case actually is.

(13) The examiner has made hostile remarks to counsel for the organizations. For example, he has stated, "I am not going to sit here . . . and let you people expound your political views for the purpose of this record" (R. 129). He has accused counsel of seeking "To indirectly do what I ruled against your doing directly" (R. 197), when all that counsel was trying to do was to explain an objection to the admission of evidence. He has implied case cited may be "false" (R. 23-24, 27). He has admitted evidence without even hearing our objections (R. 184). Probably the best statement of examiner's views is the following: "Let's let the Department proceed as they see fit" (R. 203).

(14) The examiner repeated several times that counsel for the organizations had agreed to certain matters that the record shows they never agreed to (R. 212, 213, 256).

/s/ JOSEPH L. RAUH JR.

/s/ ISAAC N. GRONER

## MEMORANDUM

Counsel for the organizations do not deem it necessary to submit a detailed memorandum of law to the Attorney General on the subject of prejudice and bias. The government memoranda in the case of the attempted disqualification of Judge Luther W. Youngdahl contain all the relevant decisions and there would be no useful purpose in repeating the citations and quotations here.

We desire, however, to make the following four brief observations:

(1) The Attorney General apparently shares the view of counsel for the organizations that the facts set forth in our telegram of July 26, 1955 state a prima facie case for disqualification of

[Turn to last page]

# PRO and CON: DISCUSSION

(Continued from page 4)

*Les Mandarins* also portrays a variety of people.

The important fact is that, after describing a series of purges, polarizations, etc., Simone de Beauvoir takes sides with a small group whose ideas, problems and conflicts resemble closely the ideas, problems and conflicts of the present staff of the review. Specifically, their ethical principles have led them to deal with the conflicting realities of the contemporary world by supporting Stalinism to the hilt. Their views, which are also Simone de Beauvoir's, are the political "message" of the book, that is, precisely what I set out to criticize.

## THE MANDARIN'S PITY

Mr. Scott further says that "the lives and writings of Simone de Beauvoir and of Sartre bear indelibly the stamp of close association with the working class." Why? Because the "fundamental premise of capital versus labor is assumed from the outset," and because Perron and Dubreuilh want their paper to be read by workers. It is obvious that Mr. Scott has much the same idea as Dubreuilh and Simone de Beauvoir as to what "association with the working class" means. It does not mean to harbor good intentions toward the working class, to be for the underdog or to pity the starving people of Lisbon. It means personal, militant association over a period of time with workers in trade unions or in working-class parties. Such contact alone can provide the knowledge of what workers think and feel. That Perron's vacation is spoiled by the knowledge that people in Lisbon are starving is all to his credit but does not testify to "close association with the working class."

The same is true for Debreuilh and Anne, as it is for Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir, who have never seen working-class life and activity except from afar. While it is true that this is a book about intellectuals, these intellectuals are particularly remote from reality and confined in Paris provincialism. What is present throughout the novel is not the workers but the mandarin's ideas about workers.

Their ignorance about these matters lead Miss de Beauvoir's mandarins to manipulate abstractions instead of participating in real organizations and movements with real people. Only bourgeois intellectuals are faced with the anguishing problem of communicating with that strange and remote sphinx that the worker is in their eyes.

## ALIAS THE CP

Instead, Dubreuilh, Sartre, etc. substitute the CP for an actual working-class, considering the CP to hold a monopoly on working-class representation. This at a time when the proportion of workers in the CP is steadily diminishing, when its membership has fallen from 1 million in 1945 to 500,000 in 1954, when 25 per cent of its wage-earning members do not belong to the unions existing in their field, when the majority of French wage-earners abstain in the elections, when the CGT is no longer able to call important strikes but only to contain them.

Worse yet: to them the working-class is not even the workers in the CP (whom they do not know), but specifically CP hacks like Lachaume (whom they know). This attitude of reverence for the Stalinist "apparatchnik" on the part of the important intellectual is nothing new for the mandarins. It appears in Sartre's *Les Mains Sales* and throughout *Les Chemins de la Liberté*. If their concern is with "the fate of the French proletariat endangered by the reactionary manoeuvres of the State Department," there is no evidence that they see the problem otherwise than from the patronizing heights of their literary eminence, and through the glasses of Stalinist mythology of the most vulgar kind.

At no time did I (or my comrade from *Le Libérateur*) state that Simone de Beauvoir denies the existence of Russian slave-labor camps. What I am saying, is that she justifies their existence within the framework of Stalinism (perhaps reluctantly, perhaps with anguish), in the name of an ideology which necessarily has not the remotest connection with Marxism or socialism. This same justification holds for the Moscow Trials, for the assassination of tens of thousands of revolutionary militants in Europe and Asia, for the extermination of several small nations, etc. Little matter. Blood under the bridge, as Merleau-Ponty said in *Humanisme de Terreur* or, as Mr. Scott so delicately puts it,

the "economic and social difficulties of a growing socialist nation."

Mr. Scott justifies the slave-labor camps in the same way. I therefore again fail to see the relevance of his criticism, since the main point of my review was precisely that Miss de Beauvoir had become an apologist of Stalinism. Mr. Scott seems to think this is all to the good. It would have been simpler to say from the beginning that he agrees with her and not with me.

## NONE SO BLIND

The lack of understanding or even of interest in the social nature of Stalinist Russia and of the Stalinist movement, drives the mandarins to ignore fundamental facts which should determine their political choice. They ignore the fact that there has been a counter-revolution in Russia, which has replaced a workers' republic with a new society of exploitation; they ignore that in the course of this counter-revolution, the Communist International was transformed from an instrument of revolution into an instrument of imperialist policy; they ignore the drives in Stalinist imperialism that contributed to give rise to the threat of nuclear warfare, as they ignore the millions of exploited workers in the Stalinist countries, to whom a Stalinist future offers no more hope than capitalism does to workers in France and elsewhere. More immediately, it leads them to ignore the existence of Russian H-bombs, which are even now infecting the Japanese atmosphere from the north, just as American H-bombs are infecting it from the south. In so doing, they make their small, reactionary contribution to the apology of imperialism and exploitation, and to the polarization of the world into two military blocs that endanger the future of mankind. Is this responsible political behavior? Not by socialist or Marxist standards.

The alternatives of the mandarins are artificial: the bourgeois intellectual is either condemned to compromise with bourgeois society, as Perron does, to be a hack for the State Department, like Scriassine, or to be a hack for the Stalinists, as Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir are preparing to be while holding their noses. The choice of being with the exploited and oppressed of both camps is one which they might fleetingly flirt with (around 1947), but one which their whole lives, outlook and environment prevents them

from permanently adopting. They do not understand class struggles; they only perceive the proletariat as a docile herd of oxen led by the nose by one bureaucrat or another.

Because it does not fit in with this view of society, Simone de Beauvoir has systematically ignored in her book the independent, revolutionary socialist position. The remarkable fact about this, of course, is that revolutionary socialist elements played a decisive role in the RDR, that Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir supported them, that they were engaged in constant discussions with Trotskyist organizations, that they were called names in return by the Stalinist press. What was the position of these people? What is it now? Not a word about it in the book. For the same reasons, no doubt, that Daniel Guérin's article was not included in the special issue of *Les Temps Modernes* on the Left, and that Claude Lefort was not asked to contribute.

## KOESTLER'S COUNTERPART

The symmetrical view is offered in Koestler's *Age of Longing*, a book which may fairly be said to represent Scriassine's views. It deals with comparable people at about the same time. From the literary point of view, *Les Mandarins* is incomparably more important. From the political point of view, it is fully as bad. Both books express the political confusion of people who have not seen their way clear of the ideologies of exploitation and barbarism that dominate the world of our intellectuals.

In conclusion, I wish to stress that I do not question Simone de Beauvoir's motives, but her way of thinking, which is related to her social position. I believe her to be as sincere as she was when she supported the RDR, and I believe that she is still as attracted to justice as she was when she wrote *Le Deuxième Sexe*. I do not believe that she is altogether happy in her present condition as a Stalinist auxiliary, even knowing as little as she does about Stalinism. For one thing, she knows the Stalinists: a Kanapa, a Servin, a Casanova, a Billoux. . . . Otherwise, as Mr. Scott suggests, there would have been no necessity for the book being written.

She has eyes to see, but chooses to keep them shut. It is all the more important for us to uncover the reasons for this strange disorder.

ANDRE GIACOMETTI

# To Attorney General — —

(Continued from page 7)

the examiner. Otherwise, there would have been no point in the Attorney General suggesting that counsel file this affidavit. We cannot believe the Attorney General would put counsel to the effort and expense of preparing this affidavit if a prima facie case had not been made out in the telegram.

(2) In the case of Judge Youngdahl, the Department of Justice filed an affidavit indicating that the judge had a fixed opinion on the question of guilt or innocence. There is no doubt in our minds that Mr. Morrissey has a fixed determination to justify the Attorney General's listing—a clear equivalent of a fixed opinion on guilt or innocence. We cannot believe the Department of Justice will apply one standard in trying to disqualify a distinguished federal judge and another standard for its own agents and examiners. Actually, the case for disqualification here is many times as strong as that supporting the government's efforts to disqualify Judge Youngdahl. Here there is a withholding of the formal designation of the examiner and apparently of conversations with the government. Here there is clear evidence of hostility toward the organizations and their counsel. Here there is deliberate concealment of the standards of judgment. Here there is a fixed opinion on guilt. If citing alleged irrelevant material was proof of bias in the Youngdahl case, how much more direct evidence of bias is there here.

(3) The United States government established, at the very inception of the loyalty-security program in 1947, the policy, that "Advocacy of whatever change in the form of government or the economic system of the United States or both, however far-reaching such change may be, is not disloyalty unless that advocacy is coupled with the advocacy or approval either singly or in concert with others of the use of unconstitutional means to effect such change." This policy

flows from 165 years of the Bill of Rights and of judicial decisions implementing the fundamental principles of American democracy. The examiner has reversed this history by allowing charges based on advocacy of a particular end society to stand in this proceeding. The Attorney General must either act himself at this time or be deemed to condone the unconstitutional and undemocratic principle that the government may restrict speech favoring far-reaching changes in our economic and political system.

## THE LARGER ISSUE

(4) What is at stake here is not only the examiner's personal bias and prejudice, but also the fundamental question of the type of hearing to be accorded the organizations (see particularly our telegram, R. 124-127). If all the Attorney General means when he states publicly that he will grant hearings to designated organizations is that the government will put into a record all the material it considers relevant and then the organizations can do likewise, all without standards of judgment, clear charges, rules of relevancy, etc., then there can be no fair hearing whether or not the examiner is disqualified. We have no doubt that if this is the type of hearing the Attorney General is offering the organizations, the courts will again reverse the Department of Justice as they have in virtually all cases to date involving the Attorney General's list. If, however, a really fair hearing is to be offered, the time has come to start over—to designate a new examiner, to direct the Department of Justice representatives to set forth standards of judgment and clear charges, and generally to create an atmosphere for this hearing that will meet the expectations of fair-minded Americans.

Respectfully submitted,  
/s/ JOSEPH L. RAUH JR.  
/s/ ISAAC N. GRONER

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

## Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.  
 I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

LA DRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

## 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

ZONE STATE

CITY