

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 16, 1956

FIVE CENTS

THE ZIONIST MIND: 'By the Dollar and the Gun'

... page 6

KENYA TRADE-UNION LEADER CHARGES: Labor, Not Mau Mau, Is the Victim Now

... page 3

BRITAIN: STRUGGLES AHEAD IN '56

... page 3

FARM BARONS VERSUS LABOR

... page 2

Kutcher Wins, VA Backs Down on Pension

By BERNARD CRAMER

James Kutcher, the "legless veteran" whom the Veterans Administration tried to deprive of his war disability pension, won a notable victory—for himself and for civil liberties—when the VA hearing committee decided on the 8th that he is to retain his \$329 monthly compensation check.

The significance of the victory was increased by the fact that it can be ascribed to the preceding successful fight to force an open hearing, instead of a secret star-chamber proceeding.

Said Kutcher after the announcement: "I think it was the publicity that made them retreat in their position. We had probably won two-thirds of the battle once we got them to agree to an open hearing. I think now the court ought to rule favorably on my plea to get my job back and the government ought to stop trying to evict me from my house."

This last sentence refers to the first two "Kutcher cases" in the government's heinous record of persecution against the veteran, whose mere membership in the Socialist Workers Party has made him the butt of an unparalleled series of witchhunting attacks.

The VA first retreated on the pension assault when the N. Y. Post splashed the story across the news. Support came from many directions, notably Sen. Ke-fauver. The bureaucrats began by restoring Kutcher's pension pending the hearing, and then, under continued pres-

JUSTIN GROSSMAN vs. the ARMY

For another notable victory against the government witchhunt, turn to last page for story on the Grossman Case.

sure, broke down and granted an open hearing.

No clearer demonstration has ever been made of the fact that the secrecy of the witchhunting hearings is a necessary feature of a system which cannot face the light of day.

This victory will be of great significance for Kutcher's attorneys, Joseph L. Rauh and John Silard, in pressing for justice in the first and basic "Kutcher case." This is the fight against the VA's 1948 firing of Kutcher from his job as a filing clerk in its Newark office. New steps in this case are expected soon.

But while the VA backdown is a victory to be hailed, it is important to note that, in the course of making the decision itself, the VA committee, under Peyton Moss, reiterated and justified and insisted on the very police-state principles under which the persecution had been launched.

First and foremost, the charges against Kutcher had equated the holding of political views critical of the U. S. government (or even advocating or "causing" strikes in wartime) with

(Turn to last page)

Eisenhower's Message: A Little of Nothing For Everybody

By GORDON HASKELL

President Eisenhower's State of the Union message was about what we have come to expect in these times from this man and his advisers. While it lacked any bold program for the future, it amply filled the vacuum with optimistic observations, homely truisms and the like.

Politically, the most significant aspect of the message is that it reveals the campaign strategy of the Republicans for 1956, and makes it clear that if the present prosperity hangs on till the fall, the Republicans are going to make a real fight of this election, whether or not Eisenhower is their candidate.

Widespread editorial comment has described Eisenhower's message as leaning strongly toward the Fair Deal. This is as much a commentary on the weak and watery brew that Fair-Dealism had become by the end of Truman's tenure in the White House as it is on Eisenhower's program.

In the domestic sphere Eisenhower proposed to do an absolute minimum to keep up the welfare measures now in operation, and to expand them ever so slightly and mildly. What he did not do

was to propose the dismantling of any of the "welfare state" programs now in operation, or to open the doors to any further rich men's tax cuts, or give-away plans of national resources.

And it is precisely this tiny "leftward" wiggle, if one can exaggerate it to that extent, which puts the Democrats in a most embarrassing position. Their policy during three years of Eisenhower rule has been to take a position (a reclining one, to be sure) on exactly the lines to which Eisenhower has now moved.

They have been for a little more of this and a bit more of that than their Republican colleagues. Their struggles with the White House have been more over the names they have been called than over serious policy issues. And now, what little they had to differentiate them

(Turn to last page)

This Strikebreaking Drive Threatens the Whole Union Movement It's All Labor's Battle at Westinghouse

By GERRY McDERMOTT

Pittsburgh, Jan. 8

All the storm signals are flying in the thirteen-week IUE strike against Westinghouse Corporation. It is high time for the new united labor movement to come to the aid of the strikers with more than money and sympathy.

As the strike enters its fourth month (its sixth month for about a fourth of the strikers who are members of Local 601 in East Pittsburgh), the situation clearly calls for sympathetic support, protest demonstrations, mass picket lines, auto cavalcades, etc., on the part of the rest of the labor movement.

Here is the picture:

(1) Westinghouse's arrogant management has not moved one inch from the dictatorial position it took at the start of the strike last October.

In January, as in last October, it simply demands that the union accept a contract which would slash to ribbons union pay and working conditions.

(2) In Westinghouse plants across the country, the classic Mohawk Valley formula of strikebreaking is being dusted off and

applied. For the first time since World War II, a major corporation has kept open in a strike.

Each day, at Columbus, O., at Mansfield, O., and at Sharon, Pa., the company announces that "so many more people have returned to work" and that "so many carloads of products were shipped." Actually, it is doubtful if 5 per cent of the work force has returned nationally; the point is that the company is trying it.

(3) At Mansfield, O., decertification proceedings have been be-

gun under the Taft-Hartley Act.

At East Pittsburgh, the "Westinghouse Employees Forum" is trying, so far unsuccessfully, to spark a back-to-work movement and to collect signatures for an NLRB election to decertify the IUE. Supposedly made up of striking members, the Westinghouse Employees Forum nevertheless has money for high-priced lawyers and expensive newspaper ads. They didn't win the money on a quiz show.

(4) At Sharon, Pa., and other plants, strike leaders have received notice that they have been fired.

(5) Also at Sharon, Pa., floodlights have been installed around the plant; movie cameramen inside the fence take pictures of pickets; hidden microphones attached to 24-hour-a-day tape-recorders are scattered just inside the fence. At East Pittsburgh, floodlights and loud-speakers are being installed.

(6) The company continues its barrage of newspaper ads, radio announcements, letters to homes, and foremen's visits to homes.

Needless to say, the daily press in strike towns has kept up a continual barrage of misrepresentation, distortion, and calumny against the strikers. It attempts to panic people back to work. It attempts to convince the public that a handful of union bosses and hotheads are keeping ordinary people from working. It has not a word—not a word—of criticism for management.

COMPANY TERMS

This is despite the fact that government officials high and low have called on the company to arbitrate. The union agrees; the company arrogantly refuses.

The mayors of a number of cities have called for arbitration; the governors of three states have called for arbitration; the chief of the federal mediation and conciliation service, representing the federal government, has called for a fact-finding board; ten "friends of labor" senators have called for an investigation.

The company refuses; its terms are: Surrender!

(Continued on page 2)

Automation: Behind The Westinghouse Fight

By GERRY McDERMOTT

The larger issue in the Westinghouse strike is automation. It is a problem which all industrial workers will face tomorrow. As is often the case with economic change, the effects of this new industrial revolution have come to human consciousness only slowly and painfully.

When the strike against the Westinghouse chain first began as a local strike by Local 601 of the East Pittsburgh plant, the issue which set it off was a new and unprecedented company program of time-studying day workers—crane operators, hookers, material handlers, sweepers, store-room employees, and the like. Time-studies have been used traditionally to set piecework rates for production workers; how can you set piecework rates for a crane operator?

At East Pittsburgh, one fourth of the employees have already been laid off; no one is working with less than 13 years seniority. The workers concluded that more layoffs were in store, and demanded that the company bargain with the union before continuing the study.

The company refused and the strike began. Since then, it has spread to the Westinghouse chain. Other issues are involved, but this is the main one.

The newspapers and the public had a hard time understanding the grievance, and probably still do not understand it.

The company claimed that it was merely exercising its right to manage, to run the plant efficiently. The union denied that, for its part, it was interfering with efficiency; it merely demanded a voice in the unprecedented study. The public was puzzled.

Westinghouse is forced to time-study non-production workers for a very simple reason—with automation in full swing in the electrical industry, there soon won't be any production workers! This is one of the things that the new industrial revolution will mean to labor relations.

All of the old rules about pay, performance, job classifications and the like are being torn up. Production is entering a

no-man's land (both figuratively and literally!) where these problems will have to be worked out anew.

For management, this raises awesome problems. With intricate and expensive automation equipment, the cost of depreciation is terrifying. But it cannot be avoided. The only places where corners can be cut are with labor. With only a few workers, that means that they must be speeded up and time-studied to fantastic lengths.

In an article in the December *Fortune* (the trade paper of American industrial capitalism) devoted to General Electric, this question is posed, but not answered. "Depreciation, rather than labor, will be the big cost," writes *Fortune*, "in the highly automatic plant of the future—and depreciation can't be 'laid off.' What happens then . . .?"

Another article in the same issue is devoted to the Westinghouse strike, and gives a partial answer. Westinghouse has discovered that already, today, over 50 per cent of its payroll goes to non-production workers. Therefore, in the constant drive to cut cost, it began to time-study these people.

Other plants have been doing the same—Ford, DuPont, railroads, and others. There is already a management consultant firm which specializes in it—John L. Schwab and Company.

The explosion at Westinghouse was touched off because management would not agree to bargaining or arbitration over the results of such studies. Since the vast bulk of jobs will be day-work type jobs in the future, for the union to agree that the company had the unbridled "right to manage" in these areas would be to give up any say at all about working conditions and pay.

And yet, as the investment in automation-type capital goods becomes heavier and heavier, management will try, more and more, to employ their terrifically expensive machines in a dictatorial way.

All unionists must realize that what the Westinghouse workers face today, they will face in the near future. They had better be ready for it.

Westinghouse Battle —

(Continued from page 1)

If the union had refused all these dignitaries the newspapers would scream; when the company refuses, they say nothing.

And, by the way, having made their little "gesture," the "friends of labor" in office—the Senator Humphreys and Senator Douglasses, the Mayor Lawrence and the Governor Harrimans aren't much help.

In the final analysis, labor must win its own battles with its own strength.

Because the labor movement cannot afford a Kohler or Perfect Circle on the scale of Westinghouse, the pressure is building up for the rest of the union movement to go into action to give the strikers massive support.

They would encourage the embattled strikers.

They would serve notice on Westinghouse that the labor movement is not going to be broken.

They would move other employers to put a little quiet pressure on Westinghouse to settle.

They would serve notice on other employers that the course taken by Westinghouse was an unwise one.

NEED A PROD

Why hasn't Meany or Reuther called for such action, or even threatened it? We suspect that it is because they are still trying to appear, in the afterglow of the unity convention, as "labor statesmen" who don't "believe" in the class struggle.

This difficulty of the "labor statesmen" could be considerably relieved if militants in the locals put the heat on for the launching of such measures; if they called on the whole national labor movement to take up the question of dealing with Westinghouse as it required; if the labor movement considered the possibility of a national boycott; if they put on the agenda the problem of what to do, of course without violating Taft-Hartley, about all the other workers in the nation who are working on Westinghouse products while this strike is going on.

There are probably a number of reasons why Westinghouse management has taken the stand it does. It became accustomed, with the old UE, and especially during the war, of getting about what it wanted. The Stalinist-run UE talked militant but gave in when the chips were down, because it was a weak union.

The IUE has made its mistakes, too. Not too many years ago, Carey invited Westinghouse's president, Gwylim Price, to speak to an IUE convention. Price was introduced in glowing terms. No wonder Price got the idea he was dealing with a company union!

No doubt management watched Kohler and Perfect Circle closely and concluded that unions weren't as tough as they had believed. Westinghouse workers—and Carey too—are teaching them now that they are wrong.

The company was probably also encouraged to get tough by earlier victories over the IUE in Westinghouse. In its early days, in the fight with the UE, the IUE attracted many conservative and company-minded workers who wanted to get rid of the "reds." So long as this type of worker held office in the IUE, the company got away with plenty.

Now the IUE has found a whole new strata of local leaders and is receiving militant leadership from the international as well. The company is surprised.

Within the corporation, several factors are at work. President Price and Vice-President Blazier have apparently staked their executive careers on being able to break the strike. They will probably be fired after the strike is over, but in the meantime they are following their policy to the bitter end, hoping against hope that they will win.

But looming over these temporary issues is the question of automation. This is discussed in a separate article in this issue. But it makes the issues in the Westinghouse strike of importance to every worker in modern industry. The sooner the entire labor movement realizes it, the better.

'DOWN ON THE FARM'—II
What Every City-Slicker Should Know . . .

FARM BARONS vs. LABOR

The big farm lobby is spearheaded by the American Farm Bureau Federation, a powerful organization controlled by the big farmers, although its membership includes many small farmers. The lobby includes the special crop and industry associations, and works closely with the National Association of Manufacturers and the W. S. Chamber of Commerce. It is well-financed and effective.

One of the lobby's most important activities is the prevention of legislation which would extend to farmers and farm workers the benefits of social welfare legislation.

The right of farm labor to organize and bargain collectively is not recognized by law, nor does machinery exist to settle labor disputes in agriculture. Farm workers have yet to be admitted to the welfare state. There is no minimum wage, no limitation on hours, no unemployment insurance for them. The only welfare legislation which includes farm workers is a recently enacted amendment including them in old age and survivors insurance benefits.

But the big farm lobby does not confine itself to agricultural matters. In opposing the enactment or extension of social welfare legislation, it plays the field.

The lobby originally opposed the minimum wage and recently helped to prevent it from going higher than \$1; it opposed extension of social security to farmers and farm workers; it opposed adequate appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration; it opposed national health insurance. But the lobby does more than oppose. There was one piece of legislation it supported heartily—the Taft-Hartley Act.

Part of the ideology of the big farm lobby is the familiar one of chopping everything up into little pieces and handing this mush over to the states for action "on the local level." And well might they advocate this position, for the lobby is the most important influence in the legislatures of most of the agricultural states.

In eighteen states, the big farm lobby has taken the leadership in sponsoring "Right-to-Work" legislation. The recent Wisconsin law prohibiting the use of union funds in political campaigns was sponsored by the Farm Bureau Federation. The lobby is also the dominant influence in the Farm Placement Service of the Department of Labor in the states.

NIGHTMARE ECONOMY

Suppose for a moment that the workers at General Motors had no union and that the rest of industry was virtually unorganized. Suppose that GM had a practically unlimited supply of foreign workers for whom it contracted through the government in whatever numbers and whenever needed. Suppose that the right to organize and bargain collectively was not guaranteed by law, that there was no social security, no minimum wage, no unemployment insurance, no workmen's compensation.

Suppose further that the employers were efficiently organized to obtain a cheap labor supply and to fight the organization of unions, and had the support of chambers of commerce, utilities and financial institutions. Suppose that, in addition to all this, illegal workers kept coming across the border from Canada and furnished the employers with a ready supply of cheap, helpless and frightened labor.

If this were the state of affairs in Detroit, not only would the auto workers be poor and helpless, but our whole economy would be a nightmare in which the great corporations ruled everyone and the

From the pamphlet "Down on the Farm: The Plight of Agricultural Labor," published by the LID and National Sharecroppers Fund, 112 East 19 Street, N. Y. C., 25 cents.

working population lived like peons.

Yet change the industrial corporation to an agricultural one, Detroit to California, and Canada to Mexico, and you have an accurate picture of the world in which agricultural labor lives. Is it any wonder that many farm workers have left agriculture in disgust and turned to the cities for employment?

Over two million wage workers were employed on American farms in 1950 for at least 25 days a year. Over a million were full-time farm laborers. Nearly 400,000 worked on large scale corporation-type farms.

Somewhat less than a million seasonal or migratory workers were employed for at least 25 days on farm jobs. About a third of them were American citizens of varying races and national backgrounds; a third, foreign nationals brought to the United States under contract; another third illegal workers from Mexico, known as "wetbacks" from their practice of swimming across the Rio Grande to get into the United States. The number of illegals can only be a rough guess; some estimates put their number as high as a million.

SWEATSHOP IN THE FIELDS

The average wage rate paid on the farm in 1954 was 88 cents an hour, according to the Department of Agriculture. In the southern states, the average was 53 cents an hour; in the Pacific coast states, \$1.07 an hour. The wage rate in some southern states was as low as 30 cents an hour.

The agricultural work day consists of slightly more than nine hours, six days a week. However, in many areas, especially in the south, a day's work goes from "sun to sun," or from "can to can't"—when you can see the sun in the morning until you can't see it any more in the evening.

Farm labor productivity has risen steadily. Farm output per-man-hour is now almost twice as great as the pre-World War II average, and over a fifth higher than in 1947-49. In 1953, one worker produced farm products for himself and 17 other people.

Wages of farm workers have not even held their own compared to industrial wages. The ratio of farm workers' wages to those of factory workers reached its high point in 1946, when hourly farm wages were 48 per cent of industrial wages. By 1954, it had declined to 37 per cent.

This seems strange at a time of nearly full employment. Lack of union organization and protective legislation are part of the explanation. But another crucial factor is the employment on the farms of foreign contract workers and illegal immigrants.

REWARD FOR VIRTUE

In the N. Y. Times' Jan. 5 survey of the economic picture in the Western Hemisphere, the article on Guatemala underlines some of the results of the made-in-America overthrow of the Arbenz regime which installed the present dictator Castillo Armas.

For one thing, it seems that the "confidence of native business men" is returning now that "labor-management strife has been eliminated" by the United Fruit dictator.

American businessmen's "confidence" has been helped too. To favor foreign investors, last January, "the government exempted interests, dividends and profits from foreign investments from the local profits tax when the investor lives abroad."

"Another hopeful sign is the oil picture." Under the new oil law, 29 firms, "most of them U. S. concerns," have put in for exploratory rights.

"The principal reason" for the expected economic activity in the country "is U. S. economic aid." For this fiscal year Guatemala is getting \$15 million from Washington, plus another \$8 million for the Guatemala section of the Pan-American highway. It pays to toe the mark for Uncle Sam.

SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

20 - 3

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!

LONDON LETTER

Britain: Struggles Ahead in '56

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Jan. 1

With jaundiced eyes the politicians and journalists in Britain have been shaking off the remnants of the New Year and Christmas festivities and surveying the prospects for the coming year. By all accounts they aren't very pleased with what confronts them.

Looming large on the horizon is the threat of a troublesome period for the bosses of industry. Many big trade unions, including the Engineers, Miners and Railroad workers, are making endeavors to push their members' wages up somewhere nearer the levels of the continually climbing prices. Their efforts have been spurred by the budget introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer last autumn which is having the effect of further pushing up prices.

On the latest rough-and-ready tally the pay claims now outstanding between employers and unions will cost the bosses some \$1410 million a year on top of the current wage bill. This is no small beer in anybody's language and—perhaps more important from the bosses' point of view—the trade unions show every indication that they are going to dig their heels in for a sizable slice of the sum which they have demanded.

In recent years it has become customary for union leaders to make demands for fairly large pay increases without any real intention of fighting for their realization; they have been more in the nature of gestures to the militants in their own ranks rather than serious attempts to cut into the profits of industry.

But the days when trade-union leaders could play such a game now seem fast running out. The average union member has become much wider awake to the full effect of the government's policies and can see the shareholders being handed largesse while he is being asked—or forced—to tighten his belt.

The signs of a new and tougher policy from the trade unions have appeared in most unlikely places.

Just before Christmas the mammoth right-wing Transport and General Workers Union issued a statement which caused much fluttering in the dovecotes of the government and employers. The statement said that the TGWU was not prepared to accept increasing productivity as the sole reason for asking for extra pay—and that it intended to see that its members got a fair slice of whatever was available whether productivity was increasing or not.

Such a statement has not been forthcoming from the TGWU for many, many years and it caused the British Employers Confederation to issue a counter-statement which trotted out the old story about wages, prices and inflationary spirals.

SHAKE-UP IN KEY UNION

The employers' discomfort is further increased by the fact that the TGWU is at this moment undergoing a change of leadership—which always leads to a general sharpening up of tempo by the contestants for top honors in an endeavor to gain maximum support from the rank and file. The change is necessary because Jock Tiffin, the general secretary of the union, died just after Christmas.

Tiffin had held the post for only a few months following the death of Arthur Deakin at a May Day rally last year. In actual fact he carried out his duties only up till September, when he went in the hospital where he stayed until his death.

His work as secretary has been performed by Frank Cousins, the assistant general secretary, who fought with him for the top job in the ballot last year. Cousins is by no means a revolutionary, but he is much further over to the left than was Tiffin or Deakin before him.

Now the reins have passed, temporarily, into Cousins' hands and many of the Tory pressmen have been speculating on the outcome.

If past practice is anything to go by, Cousins will be elected in the national ballot of TGWU members which is to take place within the next few months. Which means that the TGWU—1,300,000 strong and the largest union in Britain—could move over several degrees to the left. Such a move would upset the whole balance of power within the British trade-union movement and could lead to all sorts of complications for the right wing.

Already some members of the Trades Union Congress top brass have been heard to complain that the TGWU isn't what it was when Deakin was alive; and the right-wing General and Municipal

Workers Union hurriedly rushed out a statement which tried to emulate the stronger line of the TGWU. This was necessary because the two unions overlap to some extent, and if the TGWU pushes a tougher line which pays off in the form of bigger wage packets the GMWU might lose some members to it as a consequence.

Thus, with big pay claims filed and awaiting prompt attention, and with the traditional line-up of power within the trade union movement liable to be upset, the employers are viewing the coming year with some apprehension.

THE VELVET GLOVE

The government starts the new year with a changed team, Sir Anthony Eden having decided to do a little switching around in order to give his henchmen a change of scenery. None of the changes has been startling but one or two observers have pointed to the fact that a couple of the changes seem to indicate that the government will be taking a tougher line during the next twelve months.

Main reasons for this belief revolve around the appointment of a new chancellor of the Exchequer and a new minister of Labor. New boy at the Treasury is Harold Macmillan while Iain Macleod now sits in the minister of Labor's chair.

Macmillan, it is said, is much more willing than the old chancellor, Rab Butler, to go the whole way with the desires of big business and it is being forecast that his budgets will tighten the screw on the workers much more than did Butler's.

Already big business is dishing out its orders to Macmillan. Last week *The Economist*, which makes a hobby of telling the Tories what to do, told Macmillan how he should set about curing the British economy of its ills.

Everybody, said *The Economist*, knows the reason for the upsets to the economy: over-full-employment. The "tonic" industry needs is a tightening of the credit squeeze until unemployment is pushed up. A possible figure, according to this theoretical journal of the right, is three per cent of the total labor force—about 700,000 men and roughly three times the current average level. It's Macmillan's job, as chancellor, to set the machinery in motion which will achieve the objective set by *The Economist*.

While Macmillan is cracking down on the workers in the Treasury, Macleod is expected to do the strong-arm stuff at the Ministry of Labor. His predecessor, Sir Walter Monckton, was one of the

quiet boys of politics; with his charm and smooth table-talk he was looked upon as almost a neutralist in the conflict between capital and labor. But not so Macleod.

He is one of the bright boys of the Tory Party Central Office—one of the "theoreticians" of the bourgeoisie. His appointment as minister of Labor seems to indicate that the Tories have decided to fill this tricky office with a man who can crack the whip when the occasion demands.

A "nice guy" like Monckton is fine as a minister of Labor while the trade unions are passive and acting in a "responsible" fashion toward the employers; but when the trade unions show signs of becoming more militant and acting responsibly toward their members, then Monckton gets kicked out and Macleod comes storming in ready for the rough-house.

PRESSURES ON BEVAN

The expected conflict on the industrial front is bound to have repercussions in political circles—both within Parliament and without—and the big question-mark of the coming year is how the Labor Party, particularly its parliamentary section, will make out.

The long-drawn-out wrangle over the leadership of the Parliamentary Labor Party has now been settled and Hugh Gaitskell is firmly installed in the chair; but there are still many other important points involving lower ranks of leadership still outstanding.

One of the first jobs of the Parliamentary Labor Party when it meets at the end of January after the Christmas recess is the election of a deputy leader to replace Herbert Morrison, who threw his hand in after being beaten into last place in the ballot for the leader's job.

Who will be standing for election is not yet known. Middle-of-the-roader Jim Griffiths seems certain to stand if nominated, as does right-of-center Alf Robens. Aneurin Bevan has not made public his intentions and indications are that he has not yet made up his mind.

At the moment opinions among the Bevanites are divided on the matter. One section is urging Bevan to refuse nomination while another section is pressing him with equal force to stand. Thus Bevan at the moment is being subjected to a considerable amount of lobbying from various angles. It seems very much as though a majority of Bevanites in the parliamentary party don't want him to stand while a strong section of Bevanites outside of Parliament do want him to stand.

Various positions of leadership in the national party will also be up in the air this year. The position of party treasurer, for an instance, has been captured by Gaitskell in the past two years in a straight fight with Bevan. With Gaitskell now party leader, speculation is rife as to what will happen about this position.

Gaitskell could maintain a dual role, but it would be most unusual. On the other hand, if he resigns past practice

has it that the job automatically goes to the next in line in the last ballot, and Bevan was the only other name on the ballot paper.

Whether the right wing will allow Bevan to step so easily into this job remains to be seen when the National Executive meets at the end of the month for its usual meeting at which it is expected to consider the situation.

But dog-fights over leadership positions apart, the big query in everybody's mind is what role the Labor Party will play during the coming year.

The rank and file is now in better fighting trim than it has been for some years. It has cast off a great deal of its apathy—not because it now more readily accepts the existing right-wing policies but because it is keenly aware that the Tories are opening a big attack. And the rank and file, particularly of the left, know that it will be easy for them to swing the party line over toward the left in face of a Tory attack and a general sharpening of the class struggle.

LOCAL VOTES COMING

One of the big fights which will occupy the Labor rank and file during this year will be in the localities on the question of rents.

As outlined in other London Letters, the Tories have constructed policies which will hit tenants hard and push up rents all-round. The spearhead of their attack is concentrated on the local councils; and this year the whole of London goes to the polls to elect its councillors for the 28 metropolitan boroughs for their three-year term of office.

In addition the councils outside of London will be electing the one-third of their members who retire annually. The year 1956, therefore, will see local council elections occurring on a scale which happens once only every three years, and the elections are expected to be much livelier than usual.

Normally the Labor Party leadership likes to keep these local elections very much "local"; the broadening of the issues to include national measures is very much discouraged. This year, however, it will prove impossible to do this, for the central Tory government is playing havoc with local council affairs by the financial policies which it has imposed upon them.

Thus the local elections will probably be much broader and the left of the local parties is busy trying to make them as broad as possible in order to generate a popular demonstration against the Tory government.

A general summing up of the coming year in Britain is that it will be one of increasing activity on both the industrial and political fronts. The temper of the workers is rising and, if the Labor Party plays its cards correctly, it can be turned effectively against the government.

In such a situation the Labor left can expect to benefit so long as it keeps piling on the pressure and devotes its main energies to formulating a consistent left-wing policy, pushing it within the party and at the same time hammering the Tories like a blacksmith making horse-shoes on piecemeal.

If such predictions are fulfilled, then next New Year's Day will look as different as this one does from its predecessor—but in a different direction.

Kenya Trade-Union Leader Charges: Labor, Not Mau Mau, Is the Victim Now

By DOUGLAS ROGERS

One of the most frankly revealing reports to come out of Kenya has just been sent to the British T.U.C. and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

It makes clear that the Mau Mau emergency has been deliberately exploited in an attempt to smash the young African trade union movement.

The report has been submitted by the Kenya Federation of Labor (the African "TUC") and is signed by its young, dynamic general secretary, Tom Mboya.

Says the report: "It has been almost impossible to do any constructive trade-union work, in view of the constant arrests of trade-union leaders. Many trade-union officials were arrested and detained on the allegation that they had connections with subversive activities. None of them, however, were tried in a court, although the Kenya Federation has more than once appealed to the government that these leaders be brought to trial."

Twenty-nine trade-union leaders ar-

rested in April this year have not, so far as is known, even been brought before screening teams.

Two of these arrested trade-union leaders had just returned from a trade-union course in Britain, before which they had been thoroughly screened and given a clearance by Kenya Police special branch. Three others had been screened and cleared only a few weeks before their arrest. Another had, after inquiry, just been granted a passport to visit the Gold Coast for trade-union study.

Obviously, no charges could be sustained against them—and none have, been brought. Yet they stay in jail.

So many trade-union leaders have been arrested that some unions have had to close down temporarily.

The report goes on to reveal the staggering injustices committed in the name of the Emergency in Kenya.

Wives and families of arrested men are taken back to African reserves.

Jobs of Africans taken in for screening are immediately filled and their houses

allocated to other tenants. If released, they join the army of homeless unemployed.

Thousands of African workers compulsorily moved from the "White Highlands" into the already overcrowded reserves found no homes, no land, no relatives. Some had been away from the reserves for 30 years: the little they owned was in the Highlands.

"The only alternative they had," says the Kenya Federation of Labor, "was to run into the forest and join hands with the terrorists. Many of them for lack of food used violence to obtain it."

In the Eastleigh area of Nairobi, about 6,000 African workers were rendered homeless—and many jobless—in one day. Despite protests by the Federation, the government made no attempt to provide homes.

Instead, Africans found sleeping in relatives' homes were liable to arrest and imprisonment.

Under the Emergency Regulations, workers have to carry a green card known as

(Continued from page 3)

BOOKS AND IDEAS

T. CLIFF: STALINIST RUSSIA

A Marxist Study on the Nature of Stalinist Society

STALINIST RUSSIA, A Marxist Analysis, by Tony Cliff.—M. Kidron, London, 1955, 275 pages, \$2.00.

By HAL DRAPER

Tony Cliff's work is not one of those over-plentiful books on Russia which merely set out to describe, cuss out, or philosophize about the horrors of Stalinism. It is a serious and valuable study, from a Marxist viewpoint, of the Stalinist social system and the nature of the Russian state.

The author—long a leading Trotskyist in England and now associated with the left Labor Socialist Review—believes that the best theoretical description of the Stalinist system is "bureaucratic state-capitalism," and we will have to say a word about his handling of this state-capitalist theory; but his political conclusions are very close to, if not identical with, those of Independent Socialism.

Apart from its point of view, however, Cliff's Stalinist Russia does a preliminary job in its first two (long) chapters which is alone worth the price of the book.

These two chapters present an analytical description of the social and political conditions of Stalinism, virtually constituting a handbook on "Why Stalinism is not socialism." And this is done by marshaling a vast amount of factual material based almost entirely on official Russian Stalinist sources, laws, publications, etc.

The first chapter does this job on the socio-economic relations of the Stalinist system, including: the destruction of workers' control, role of the "trade unions," the wage system, legal restrictions on the worker, draconic punishments for lateness or other offenses, position of women in industry, slave labor, depression of the standard of living and subordination of consumers goods production, the productivity of labor under Stalinism, expropriation of the peasantry, the turnover tax, the atrocities of the criminal law, the advance of inequality and salary differentiations, etc.

And finally in this chapter Cliff presents an excellent discussion of the unplannedness of this "planned economy," stemming from the built-in dislocations of bureaucratic mismanagement.

In Chapter II, "State and Party in Stalinist Russia," Cliff has equally authoritative summaries of the Russian reality on the structure of the armed forces, the role of the "soviet" organs of government, the rigging of the elections, the monolithism of the party, etc.

OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS

All of this material is fully documented as to sources. In the course of taking up many of these questions, Cliff counterposes the Stalinist reality to the Russia of Lenin and Trotsky, making clear the gulf between the Stalinist counter-revolution and the Bolshevik state which this counter-revolution destroyed.

Socialists have long looked forward to a contribution of this sort. An approach to it—and a useful one—was a section entitled "Soviet Myth and Reality" in one of Arthur Koestler's books (an otherwise vapid collection of essays whose title, *The Yogi and the Commissar*, has become better known than any of its contents). There was a report some years ago, I remember, that this section was going to be expanded to book-size by Koestler and Dwight Macdonald, but nothing seems to have come of it, if it was true. In any case, Cliff's two chapters represents the best accomplishment of this task to date, for its size.

Much of the material in the subsequent sections of Cliff's book, dealing with the nature of the system, is devoted to refuting the view that Russia is a "workers' state" or "socialist state." An excellent chapter, which appears as an appendix, deals directly with "An Examination of Trotsky's Definition of Russia as a Degenerated Workers' State." It is a very effective attack on this theory, which has led to the present extreme degeneration of both wings of the "orthodox Trotskyist" movement and its Fourth International.

In a couple of other chapters (III and IV) Cliff discusses a great deal of material which would be a necessary part of any Marxist discussion of the nature of Stalinism. These take up some general considerations about "workers' states"

and then "The Material Heritage of Pre-October [Revolution] Society" in Russia. It is the next three chapters which attempt to present the theory of "state-capitalism" as applied to Russia.

Of course, as our readers know, this theory is quite mistaken in our opinion; but since this is not the place to polemicize against it, it is more important to note what kind of "state-capitalist" theory is this one of Cliff's. For there are all kinds of people who have applied this label of state-capitalism to Russia, with quite different political and theoretical meanings; just as, for that matter, the same is true for our own label of bureaucratic-collectivism.

We have often pointed out that the "state-capitalist" theory sometimes shades into versions which make it virtually identical with our own. This tends to happen where the "state-capitalism" which is seen in Russia is analyzed as being so basically different from "private" capitalism that it tends to take on the characteristics of a new social system, which is not the same as any other existing system, and which is labeled a hyphenated-capitalism only as a matter of terminological taste.

Cliff's analysis does not begin this way, but it tends to wind up so. To begin with, he makes a brave attempt to subsume the Russian Stalinist "capitalist" system within the same (Marxist) economic categories as the old capitalism. With him, as with all others who have attempted this feat, it boils down to stripping capitalism of all essential attributes which do not fit into the Stalinist picture; and, as with all others, the first of these attributes to go is capitalist profit as the motor of the system.

POLITICAL STRENGTH

But he moves from this type of analysis to something else, which becomes increasingly important for his analysis till it governs his political conclusions.

This is: heavy stress on the importance of the differences between the two different "state-capitalisms" which he finds himself discussing. One state-capitalism is that which is "an organic, gradual continuation of the development of capitalism"; the other is the "state-capitalism which rose gradually on the ruins of a workers' revolution."

At the point where he makes this distinction explicit, he also reveals the Achilles' heel of his whole theory:

"Historical continuity in the case of state-capitalism which evolves from monopoly capitalism [the first type] is shown in the existence of private property (bonds). Historical continuity in the case of state-capitalism which evolves from a workers' state that degenerated and died, is shown in the non-existence of private property."

The italics are Cliff's, and his answer to this question of historical continuity is vital for him, for it is the same as asking: What is the systemic common ground between capitalism and this "state-capitalism" of his, which did not and cannot arise from capitalism? When he answers "non-existence of private property," the game is up, I think; for obviously this "non-existence" shows only that the old capitalism has not been resuscitated and says nothing at all about the positive question of what it is that has grown up on the ruins of the workers' state.

However, I cite this to show how Cliff's analysis moves over to the more fruitful question of the gulf between the capitalist world and the Stalinist "state-capitalist" system, and it seems to me that it would be easy to show that every one of his political, and even social, conclusions flows from his analysis of the differences between the two systems, and not at all from his (to me) labored exposition of the "capitalist" nature of Stalinism.

So in the final two chapters, where Cliff takes up "The Imperialist Expansion of Russia" and "The Class Struggle in Russia," the sharp point of his analysis is directed against any conceptions of the "progressiveness" of Stalinism and toward a revolutionary opposition to the whole system.

Cliff's political standpoint is that of the Third Camp and makes no compromise with any illusions about Stalinism. This is its political strength.

Without any doubt, the book belongs in every socialist's library.

Reading from Left to Right

ECONOMIC MYTHS ON INCOME DISTRIBUTION

By GODFREY DENIS

Although the *Nation* since its editorial reshuffle is at least as mushheaded about Stalinism as before, it still carries from time to time excellent individual articles, usually to be sure, on issues which are safe from the viewpoint of the editors. This means that its articles on the American camp are generally usable by socialists.

In the January 7 issue William Williams, assistant professor of history at the U. of Oregon, does a yeoman job on the current economic myths—more specifically on the myth (accepted as pure gospel by most liberals) that all income brackets except the very rich have dramatically increased their absolute and relative income during the past decade and a half.

In order to handle the question properly, Williams asks several questions. The relevant ones are: "(1) Does the distribution of real income and actual economic and political power bear out the assumption that American society has been leveled upward? (2) What have been the moral, social and political costs of the economic changes which have occurred?"

His answers are based on the post-war census statistics, Herman Miller's *Income of the American People*, and the recent congressional hearings on low-income groups. To be sure, the statistics in question are only partially adequate since they deal almost exclusively with earned income, i.e., wages and salaries excluding total income which would include rents, dividends and interest. Nevertheless, the picture of the American income structure is good enough for the purposes involved.

The statistics are clearest up to 1951. According to Miller, for example, in 1950 half the income recipients got less than \$2000 a year, and over 20 per cent of the income earners got less than \$1000. This in an economy swollen by war spending during the Korean war in addition to the "normal" pump-priming of the war economy.

Miller also points out that while the median income jumped between 1944 and 1950 from \$1800 to \$3000 a year, "when actual dollar amounts are adjusted for price changes, there appears to have been no increase in the average family's real income since 1944. On the contrary the figures indicate a slight decrease in the purchasing power of the average family during the period after World War II."

THREE EXPEDIENTS

In order to maintain a modest standard of living the heads of families had to resort to a number of expedients. For one thing almost a million farmers left the farms to go to the cities between 1940 and 1951. (Incidentally more than one third of the farmers in 1951—a good year—received the major part of their cash income from other sources, and only three-fifths of the farm families derived more than half of their income from land.)

For another thing, the number of working women doubled between 1940 and 1950; the social cost of having the wife work in a family with small children will probably be reaped in the next decade's juvenile-delinquent statistics. Besides, in 1951, 67.2 per cent of the women earned less than \$2000 a year; as Williams puts it, "labor under such circumstances does not necessarily produce a sense—let alone the reality—of emancipation for the women."

The third expedient has been, of course, to go into debt. The full statistics here are not available but it is an accepted fact that the major part of the working population is heavily in debt.

Let us now examine briefly the structure of income distribution. In 1951, for example, the bottom 20 per cent of the population got 2.5 per cent of the national income; the top fifth received 47.7 per cent. Compared with the previous decade's figure for the top fifth of 49.1 per cent, it is obvious that we are hardly

dealing with a revolutionary redistribution of income and power.

To make the picture clearer, the very top of the income pyramid in 1951—the top 2 per cent that earned more than \$10,000 a year—earned 12 per cent of the national income; compared with the 2.5 per cent of the bottom 20 per cent. That is, the basic inequality has been affected hardly at all, despite all the reams of paper written about the Vital Center in America.

RUNNING HARD . . .

The congressional reports yield masses of data. Two of the more interesting points:

One investigation concludes that a family with incomes of less than \$2000 a year in 1953 and 1954 were poorer, both in an absolute and relative sense, relative to other income groups, than in 1948. Another adds that in terms of real income the number of families with incomes under \$2000 was about the same in 1953-54 as in 1948. Progress;

When we see something like the median-income figure for families, it is interesting to take it apart. Williams does this more than adequately.

The latest median income figure for families is \$4200. However, families having four children or more average \$3949; those with five, \$3155; those with six or more, \$3252. That is, low-income families carry a disproportionate burden of the cost of rearing the nation's children.

While precise data on the number of working wives with children are not available, a local study in Madison, Wisconsin, gives a fair indication of the trend. Forty per cent of Madison's married women with children under 18 are working, an increase of 25 per cent since 1950.

The figures involved substantiate Williams' image of the American economy, the image from *Alice in Wonderland*: an economy running very hard to stay right where it is.

He concludes: "Let us assume that the real income of the American people has increased between 10 and 12 per cent since the end of World War II (a generous estimate). The cost of this economic gain in terms of the damage to the character and the texture of American life has been high, for it is due largely to an economy primed by the cold war.

"Prosperity at such a price may not lead to bankruptcy in the narrow economic sense but it is likely to destroy the moral and intellectual integrity of society and bring about its physical devastation in a nuclear war."

WATTS TO ACLU

Rowland Watts, national secretary of the Workers Defense League, has been appointed staff counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union, it was announced this week. He replaces Herbert Monte Levy.

Among Watts' many and outstanding activities for civil liberties, *LA* readers may remember particularly his recent report on army "security" witchhunting of draftees, his vital role in pushing the ISL's case against the "subversive list," and the Shachtman passport case, and his investigations into Louisiana anti-labor violence and Florida peonage.



LABOR ACTION

January 16, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 3

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

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.

Marking a New Retreat by Student Liberalism—

SDA Leadership Goes In for Expulsions

By S. L.

For the first time in its history, Students for Democratic Action (SDA) is in the process of expelling members. In November of 1955, the National Board of SDA passed a by-law to its Constitution "enabling" expulsion of the few SDA members who belong to the Young Socialist League—this, to be accomplished without trial or any semblance of due process.

This move was the culmination of a series of events which have wracked both SDA and its parent group, Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), the leading political organization of American liberalism; consequently this significant step, which indicates the tortured nature of present liberal politics, cannot be understood without some background information.

As *Challenge* has pointed out in the past, the liberal movement is caught on the horns of a dilemma.

Over the past few years, ADA has developed an illusion of being a power in the Democratic Party. It is distinguished from the rest of that party by its close alliance with the trade-union movement, its stand for civil liberties and civil rights, and its limited but important democratic criticisms of American foreign policy. Yet, because of its immersion in *Realpolitik* and its illusion of power, it supports a party led in Congress by Southern reactionaries dedicated to Jim Crow, and led in general by people responsible for the federal "loyalty program," the Subversive List, the Smith Act prosecutions, opposition to colonial independence, etc.

In order to be secure in its power fantasy, it has to dilute, and retreat on, the content of its pro-democratic program; if it were to try to carry out its program or carry its ideas on democracy to their logical conclusion, it would have to break with the reaction it supports and participate in the formation of a labor party.

LINE OF DRIFT

By and large, its leadership is moving in the first direction, although certainly not as fast as most of its congressional adherents (Humphrey, etc.). In the rank and file of ADA, especially in the SDA, there has been a growing reaction against the drift toward the right.

Therefore, when the necessity for re-evaluation and internal debate is paramount, and when the slight lessening of tensions on the civil-liberties front should encourage an all-out attack against the witchhunt which has been institutionalized into the fabric of American life, we find instead that organized liberalism is curbing its pro-democratic positions and constricting itself in such a fashion as to prevent internal dissent and differing ideas from developing.

In fulfilling this pattern, ADA a few years ago retreated from its position in favor of the right of Communist Party members to teach. In taking a position in favor of the elimination of teachers on the grounds of undesirable political association, it also sought to prevent its

student affiliate, SDA, from exercising its previous right to an autonomous position in the area of academic freedom.

The students, retaining their position in favor of complete rights for teachers, refused at first to give up their right to publicly state their program in this area—one so vital in itself as well as to their political existence on campus.

The ADA leaders, in what has become their normal bureaucratic fashion, threatened the youth with disaffiliation. Two main currents of thought developed in the SDA.

The first, led by the national leadership, favored giving in to the ADA and in effect denied the importance of the political position involved.

CAPITULATION

The left-wing current, on the other hand, maintained that denying CP members the right to teach was an important indication of ADA's flight to "respectability."

It pointed out that the new ADA position retreated on a basic touchstone of civil-libertarian politics, the rights of Stalinists, and accepted the thesis of categoric "guilt" of every Stalinist. Acceptance of this position leads to sanctioning witchhunting investigations to discover CP members. It would therefore lead ADA to further retreats.

The acceptance of the position has already, along with other developments, vitiated to a good degree ADA's position on the Fifth Amendment.

The left wing led a fight for autonomy and for educating people on the deep implications of ADA's retreat on civil liberties. At the same time it opposed SDA's disaffiliation from ADA, speaking out against the few SDAers who immediately demanded that SDA break ties with ADA, and denouncing the threats of the ADA right wing to cast SDA off if it did not knuckle under.

The SDA leadership capitulated and became the ADA instrument for quelling dissent in the youth. In doing this, it revealed more plainly than ever that its belief in real democracy was rhetorical, or at best, not operative in situations where it was faced by dissent and opposition in its own bailiwick.

BUREAUCRATIC MOVES

The most important repressive act conducted by them against the SDA left wing was the move for the expulsion of the handful of SDA members who belong to the YSL.

The question involved is not that YSLers have any absolute or eternal right to membership in SDA. The real reason for the expulsion was the fact that two YSLers were in the leadership of the "minority" tendency in SDA which opposed capitulation to ADA.

Their politics and their membership in the YSL were open and well known for years before any attempt to expel them was made. It was only when they joined with other SDAers to fight on questions, enumerated before, that the attempt was made, not so much as an attack on the YSL as an attempt to destroy and/or cow the "minority."

The first step of the SDA leadership took place at a summer National Executive Committee meeting when a committee was set up to investigate the question of SDA-YSL cooperation in areas of agreement. Such cooperation had taken place sporadically and locally.

The obvious motivation was not the cooperation, but the internal SDA situation, and therefore the YSLers present

supported an amendment to include in the motion that a study be made of the question of YSL-SDA dual membership. Since this was clearly the issue and since there were vicious rumors being circulated containing unfounded assertions of a personal as well as a political nature, let the facts be examined! But this was rejected by the maker of the motion, Ron Wertheim (former national chairman), and consequently rejected by the Executive Committee.

On November 26, the Cooperation Study Committee reported to the National Board. The latter accepted its proposals, which severely constricted any joint SDA-YSL action, although the report stated that it was unable to find anything undemocratic about the YSL. (See *Challenge*, Dec. 12.) Immediately afterward Ron Wertheim presented in mimeographed form, an additional motion which was described by its supporters as a by-law enabling expulsion of the YSLers from SDA.

The by-law stated that YSLers were doctrinaire revolutionary socialists who had been guilty of "disruption and factionalism" in SDA, and consequently were no longer to be permitted in SDA.

NO TRIAL

The YSLers, as well as other SDAers present, attacked the motion as an attempt to kill the minority, and further that it eliminated a fair trial since the only point that had to be proven at the trial (provided for in expulsion cases by the SDA Constitution) was membership in YSL, which is already known and open. This would be only a mockery, for the enabling clause had eliminated the necessity for proof of the charges by stating them ("disruption and factionalism") as bold fact. Therefore, trial for "acts committed" was impossible.

The motion passed after the deletion of the section on "disruption and factionalism," but with the intent and result remaining. However, there was not even a mock trial forthcoming, for shortly after, two YSLers were not permitted to renew their membership (previously a formality) and two others received notices from the National Office that their memberships were "terminated."

At the end of December, the New York Region of SDA held its convention. The left-wing resolution presented to it states that the board motion should be reconsidered; that its real motive was to destroy dissent in the organization; that the constitutional provisions for fair trial were eliminated.

This motion never came to a vote, for a more "moderate" motion was enacted first. The convention passed a protest to the National Board which avoided the real questions of the enabling by-law and right of dissent, but called for a trial

under the by-law (as we have said before—a mock trial) and criticized the national chairman for terminating the memberships in question without the aforesaid "due process."

THE DEMOCRATS!

However, this recommendation was not even formally proposed as a motion to the next National Board meeting, nor even allowed in its minutes. That body kicked the question of what to do around like a radioactive football. After a plea for chapter autonomy, it was finally decided that the various chapters should be notified about the original enabling by-law to see if they had YSL members. They are then to hold their mock trial. However, should a chapter refuse to expel a YSLer, the National Board will then expel the chapter. *And this is called chapter autonomy!*

Incidentally, that the chapter proceedings would be quick and easy was expected by many supporters of the action because, as they explained, the YSLers are "ethical people" who openly admit their YSL membership.

A sizable number of SDAers who take democracy seriously are now planning to campaign inside the organization for minority rights and for reversal of the by-law. If SDA wants its program for civil liberties and democracy to be taken as something more serious than hollow rhetoric, it must reverse its hypocritical attack on internal democracy. We, in combination with all genuine civil-libertarians, want a strong democratic liberal organization on the nation's campuses.

In short, we hope that an angry SDA membership will reverse its leaders' vicious attack on even the most rudimentary and basic rights of dissent.

THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

in the series of special pamphlet-issues of *Labor Action*

10 cents each

No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism

No. 2—Independent Socialism and War

No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis

No. 4—Socialism and Democracy

No. 5—What Is Stalinism?

No. 6—Socialism and the Working Class

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

SECOND SESSION OF

Max Shachtman's Class
on the Theory of
BUREAUCRATIC
COLLECTIVISM

Tues., Jan. 17 at 8:15 p.m.

"WORKERS STATE" AND
"STATE-CAPITALISM"

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

THE ZIONIST MIND: 'By the Dollar and the Gun'

To the Editor:

Mr. Draper's article in the Nov. 14 issue requires an answer. The Israeli-Arab problem that exists is not soluble by the approach of Mr. Draper. His plan would have one effect, the end of the state of Israel.

I briefly discussed Israel and Zionism with a member of the YSL. He said that one of the things wrong with Zionism is that it sidetracks people from the real job they can do. His attitude comes from a philosophy which concerns itself with the power of the working class but not with the current and historical sufferings and hopes of Jews as Jews. In the first place, Jews have their unique problems; in the second place, man does not exist only as worker or capitalist but as part of a tradition which he may reasonably value. A. D. Gordos, Katznelson and the other dreamers of pioneering in Palestine did more for people, history and socialism than Trotsky, Axelrod and the rest of the non-chauvinistic Jewish radicals.

The attitude of many of the Independent Socialists is determined by their antipathy toward Jews who seek a unique Jewish answer to the Jewish problem. They have never believed there should be an Israel, and so the survival of Israel is not important to them.

I do not know if Mr. Draper shares this attitude on the basic question of unique Jewish action. His readers may agree with what he says because they have this attitude. Before I turn to the specific points of the article, I have showed some of the motives which readers may bring to the current phase of the question.

There is a typification of Israel as "a provocative Israeli regime operating on a Zionist-chauvinist policy." The key word here is "provocative." I am reminded of the Thurber fable which tells of the anger of the fox at the noise the rabbit makes in pounding its hind legs on the earth when running. The existence of Israel is provocative to the Arab states and all provocation would end were Israel to declare itself non-existent. Any policy of Israel claiming the right to exist is provocative. If Israel has some right to exist, it can't be criticized for having provocative policy.

The real meaning of provocation is very similar to the meaning of "legitimate grievances" which Mr. Draper says the Arabs have and which Israel should eliminate. The basic grievance the Arabs have is that Israel exists, and demagoguery on this point has been whipping the Arabs into a frenzy. The other grievances, primarily the Arab refugee question, are of only doubtful legitimacy, as I will later show. Israel has consistently expressed its willingness to discuss these grievances with the Arabs, who have just as consistently refused to negotiate. If action by Israel is all that is required it is difficult to see why the Arabs will not discuss the steps which would make proper action possible. Refusal to negotiate is a possible indication that action on these relatively insignificant and easily soluble problems would have no effect on the basic grievance of the Arab states.

'MAGNANIMOUS'

Israel's grievances relating to the freedom of the Suez and the treatment of Jews in Arab countries are more clearly legitimate than the Arab grievances. Yet no concession is made on these problems. A nation cannot perform gratuitously magnanimous acts with no concern for its own just demands and security.

Mr. Draper considers the "massive retaliation" policy by Israel a part of its provocation. The border settlements of Israel are faced with the problem of constant incursions of Arabs who steal and destroy. When a Negev farmer wants to water his fields at night he takes with him a Sten gun or Belgian rifle in order to fight off thieves. The incidents in which a few sheep are taken, a few pipes blown up, a few men killed receive a line or two in the Times. At the end of a month or year many hours have been lost and many families have lost brothers, fathers, mothers.

"Massive retaliation" means an act by a band of Israelis against some Arab objective in order to frighten the Arabs into a bit more quiet on the frontiers. I

do not see that it would be a better solution for Israel to sit by and watch pipe, sheep, man endlessly destroyed.

The question of the use of force is also related to the question of provocation; that Israel's response is typical of the policy which led to the cul-de-sac is also related.

Had Israel not possessed force and used force in 1948 it would not now exist. The policy of force has therefore led to the cul-de-sac of existence. Can there now be existence without force? Mr. Draper does not believe that an explosion can be prevented by piling up armaments on both sides. One side once exploded; it constantly repeats that it intends to explode; yet, if this side continues to build up armaments and Israel does not, there will be no explosion when the Arabs are superior.

NEEDS 'BIG BROTHER'

Mr. Draper alludes to the ridiculous demand of Israel for parity with 40 million Arabs. Then he ridicules Israel's attempts to obtain the protection of a "big brother," the U. S. Israel is wrong to seek to rival combined Arab strength and is wrong to seek an ally which would balance a seemingly inevitable Arab preponderance. There is absolutely no indication that Israel could survive without force of its own or of an ally. Ben-Gurion has repeatedly expressed a desire to meet with the Arabs and have peace and advancement in the Middle East. The policy of force and of alliance is the attempt of Israel to survive long enough to see the day when the Arab states will agree to peace and progress in the Middle East.

Even if, as Draper says, the U. S. might trade off Israel (as it did in 1948), the country will be able to make its own attempt, or to seek help in other quarters.

The Middle East is composed of pawns, yet the pawns are men, and each man is looking out for himself. If only the Arabs would wake to the possibility, the pawns could work together against the players and change the game.

Israel is at fault because it does not make concessions on "the vexed problem of the Arab refugees and similar sore

points." Its terms are "far from being identical with the demands of justice and democratic politics."

The Arab refugees fled because they believed in those who wished to destroy Israel. The war was not begun by Israel. A state of 600,000 absorbed 750,000 empty-handed immigrants; a tremendous area inhabited by 40 million cannot absorb 900,000 refugees.

I can't see why the aggressors are not responsible for the refugees. I can't see why it would be unjust for Arab to settle among Arab in a shift of population. I can't see why it would be just for a small state which has so large a number of as yet received but unabsorbed refugees of its own to be expected to undertake a new burden both economically and of security. I can't see Israel's responsibility at all in view of the above. Yet Israel has offered to negotiate, and has stated a willingness to aid in the resettlement of the refugees. The clamor over the refugees comes only in deference to the claims of the Arab states. It is easy to see why *Life* magazine brushes aside history and morality in discussing the Arab refugees, but I can't see why Mr. Draper places so much emphasis on Israel's generous position as being unjust. (It might be undemocratic not to give the Arabs the chance to return to their former homes; but it is reasonable to ask people to move from one place to another if the cause of peace and justice is served. And, though the justice is clear in this matter, I am not certain that it is undemocratic not to let return those who ran away out of sympathy with the enemy.)

Mr. Draper considers Israel's Zionist policy a hindrance in achieving peace in the Middle East. Israel has stated that any Jew has a right to come to Israel. Thus far the application of this policy has been to areas in which the Jews have lived in precarious and degrading positions (Asia and Africa) and areas in which they suffered because they were Jews and wished to get away (Europe). If it is reasonable to have sympathy for oppressed and homeless people and people finally finding a home, it is reasonable to extend it to those who have come to Israel. Nor do I see why any Jew

should not be able to become Israeli if he wishes. Thus far only a trickle of American Jews have gone to Israel. The five million here are not a problem to the population pressure of the small state.

There would be a problem if the Russian Jews were allowed to leave and wished to go to Israel. We do not face it now; but if Israel were confronted with the problem it is conceivable that the magnificent job of 1948 through 1952 could be repeated with the aid of American Jews and within the present boundaries of Israel.

Zionism is a problem in the area not because of its nature but because it is a complaint of the Arabs. Similarly, Israel is "arrogant and insolent" to the Arabs only in the substance of its policy which I have tried to show is merely dedicated to survival and preservation. These two aims are arrogant and insolent to the Arabs. It is difficult to understand why Mr. Draper is satisfied that Israel is at fault merely because there is an Arab complaint.

ON CHAUVINISM

Chauvinism may mean blind enthusiasm for military glory or zealous and belligerent patriotism. I don't think Mr. Draper could show that Israel is guilty of the first. As to the second, Israel's patriots are zealous and they will fight to ensure its survival. Warlike natures can't be criticized but on the question of what is being fought for. The word "chauvinism" is a short-cut emotionally charged expression for saying that you don't go along with the patriotism of someone.

Israel has not been treating its Arabs with complete equality. This is a criticism to be weighed; it scarcely is so serious as to warrant any international conflict. The Arabs have not accepted in their own states even the obligations which the Israelis have undertaken toward their minorities. Yet Israel refrains from a justifiable reciprocity. If Israeli pressure on domestic Arabs would relieve the conditions of Jews in Arab countries, the cause of justice would be served.

I think that if Mr. Draper would reconsider his arguments in the face of the actualities of the Israeli struggle for existence and Arab objections thereto he would: (1) If Jewish, sell Israel bonds or at least buy them, and give to the UJA [United Jewish Appeal]. (2) If non-Jewish, urge Jewish socialists to work for the survival of Israel. In either case, urge the U. S. to help Israel with substance.

Until a day which Israel constantly works for and awaits, Israel lives by the dollar and the gun, and not by the word.

NATHAN DODELL

REPLY

The Zionist Mind: 'Blood'-Politics and Chauvinism

To comment on some parts of Mr. Dodell's revealing letter may be, I'm afraid, like gilding the lily.

LA readers will not soon see again a document which exhibits the chauvinism of the Zionist mind so candidly, so naively, so matter-of-factly—in other words, which so neatly illustrates so many of the things we have said about Zionism.

I am not merely referring to Mr. Dodell's agreement that Zionists are Jewish chauvinists, to be distinguished from "the non-chauvinistic Jewish radicals," and that this Zionist chauvinism can be defined for short as "belligerent patriotism," a definition which does not say everything but will do.

I am also referring to such things as his firm assumption that Jews must "seek a unique Jewish answer to the Jewish problem," that this must be done by "Jews as Jews," etc.

Encouraged by Mr. Dodell's uninhibited ability to look squarely at his own chauvinism, I suggest to him: *Translate this into German.*

See what happens when you begin talking about *German* answers to be given by *Germans* as *Germans* (of course, chauvinist ones).

By the way, it was not Hitler who invented the notion of "thinking with your German blood," but it was the German chauvinist tradition among other things which nourished Nazism.

HOW 'UNIQUE'?

And what, one may ask, would constitute a unique Arab solution to the Arab problem in the Middle East, to be thought up by "Arabs as Arabs"? Could it possibly coincide, magically, with the "unique Jewish answer"? and if not, what side should be taken in this struggle of chauvinisms by the unique Brit-

ish-as-British? And does Mr. Dodell complain if John Foster Dulles also approaches the problem as a chauvinistic American-as-American, i.e., as an imperialist?

Or is Mr. Dodell of the opinion that only Jews have a moral license to seek a "unique" chauvinistic answer for Jews-as-Jews, whereas international morality and justice are to be urged on all others as a non-nationalistic standard of conduct for the good of their own souls?

Good socialists and good democrats, who are internationalists, have always fought the similars of the "German blood" ideologists, the 150-percent Americans, the Moslem Jihad fanatics; and the "non-chauvinistic Jewish radicals" whom Mr. Dodell doesn't like have always been in the forefront in fighting the Jewish counterparts of these chauvinisms.

Mr. Dodell is clearly a reasonable person who tries to think things through; but has he thought through his assumption about "blood"-politics?

For example, take his off-hand reference to the fact that Israel has "unabsorbed refugees of its own" to take care of, and so can't be burdened with Arab refugees, who are clearly not "its own" but someone else's—aliens (it appears) who are being pushed onto it by incomprehensible "Arab complaints"...

But hundreds of thousands of these Arab refugees are human beings whose families and ancestors have lived in the land for a multitude of generations more than David Ben-Gurion even knows the names of his ancestors. What makes them aliens in their own land—the authority of the Bible? the Zionists' ambitions? their mistake in bearing the wrong "blood"?

Or look at the unpleasant depths of chauvinism laid bare in Mr. Dodell's

final two recommendations for action. It does not occur to him, it would seem, that, if Israel deserves support, it deserves support by non-Jews as well as Jews.

Here, of course, Mr. Dodell is unwittingly caricaturing Zionist politics, or reflecting its essence, but not speaking for it. So steeped is he in "blood"-politics that, to him, it even takes Jewish "blood" to merit being asked to support Israel.

Readers who may smile at this "slip" of Mr. Dodell's should understand its source. To the consistent Zionist, the Jew is and always will be an alien in any land of the Diaspora, just as the anti-Semites claim. Few Zionists will, like Mr. Dodell, push this to the bitter conclusion that, if the (Zionist) Jew must always be alien to the gentile, then the gentile must always feel alien from any Jewish interest. But Mr. Dodell seems to be a man, as we have noted, who tries to think things through.

HE CAN'T SEE . . .

Mr. Dodell, therefore, finds it impossible to see the Arab as a human being who has just as many rights as the Jew. He makes no bones about what he can't "see": "I can't see why it would be unjust for Arab to settle among Arab in a shift of population," he says, with such disarming naiveté that you have to think for a moment before you remember—that, after all, no anti-Semite has ever been able to "see" why Jews should object to being confined to living "among Jews," that is, in the Ghetto.

For some reason that Mr. Dodell's Zionist-poisoned mind cannot grasp, the Palestinian Arabs who have lived in the land for generations object to being ousted from their possessions, their land grabbed by the Zionist government, and they and their families condemned to a

(Continued on next page)

Kenya Trade Union Leader — —

(Continued on page 7)

a "History of Employment." Earlier this year the Nairobi district commissioner cancelled many of these passes—some in respect of workers who had lived in Nairobi for 20 to 30 years.

The Federation says that it has done everything possible locally, by representations to the minister of Labor and the government, but nothing has been done. Now it believes that only pressure of public opinion outside Kenya can bring relief.

[Next is listed a 9-point program of the labor federation for expansion of trade-union activity and organization. —Ed.]

Of industrial conditions the report says: "The present wages are so low that they can hardly support the needs

of a worker and his family, let alone enable him to save for his old age. Many African workers work until they are too old to be of use in industry, and yet by that time they have nothing on which to live when they are no longer useful as employees."

Of African housing: "The practice at the moment of housing workers on a bed space system does not permit family life. . . . Until wages are high enough to enable workers to pay rents for proper housing, a government subsidy will be necessary."

Of the Emergency: "If the present policy of the government is pursued further the result will be more bitterness and hatred, more chaos and worse violence on a larger scale."

—Tribune (London)

The Zionist Mind — —

(Continued from page 6)

hopeless existence in the refugee camps—in some cases, locked out just on the other side of the line from their own farms, where they would be "infiltrators."

No doubt these Arabs should be grateful that they are not being exterminated in gas chambers; this cannot be doubted. But while world Jewry, perhaps the most tragic victim of hate and bestial genocide that the world has ever seen, can point to more brutal oppression from its enemies than any which Zionism inflicts on its own Arab victims, still it is hard for near a million people to distinguish carefully between being murdered and being starved to death or to misery.

THE SAHIB IS OBJECTIVE

Mr. Dodell may fail to "see" why they should be so subjective about it; he blandly remarks that to grab "their former homes" from these Arabs "might be undemocratic," "but it is reasonable to ask people to move from one place to another if the cause of peace and justice is served."

This is the noble objectivity of the colonialist *sahib* about the regrettable inconveniences inflicted on the lower-races-without-the-law.

This is the lordly objectivity of the South African white-supremacist who knows exactly what serves the cause of his "peace and justice"; and why should the Africans murmur if they are "asked" to move from their homes in order to ensure tranquility for the whites? Why should they raise a "clamor"? How can they fail to appreciate the *sahibs'* "gratuitously magnanimous acts" (to quote Dodell)?

The Arab population in Palestine was caught between the two sides in the Israeli-Arab war. Both sides were re-

sponsible for the flight that took place. The Arab side of this responsibility is obvious. The Zionist side was provided by such things as the bloody massacre at Deir Yassin, the Zionists' "Lidice." This, in turn, was only the most extreme example of the effort which they made to utilize the Arab war to make Palestine "Arabenrein."

Even Arabs who supported Israel in the war against the Arab states have been expropriated from their land, as a front-page dispatch in the N. Y. Times once revealed to a scandalized world.

Does this bother Mr. Dodell's *sahib*-objectivity about peace and justice? Not at all. As we have seen, "it is reasonable" to dispossess a people if it serves the Zionists' "peace and justice."

MIDDLE EAST GHETTO

As for the rest of the problem, Mr. Dodell does not seriously discuss the points actually made in the articles which he purports to discuss; and nobody would guess from his letter alone what it was we wrote.

We wrote from the point of view of how to ensure the "survival of Israel" and the Jewish people in that land. Only in our program, which Mr. Dodell does not really discuss, this survival requires an entirely different policy from that pursued by the Zionist-chauvinist government of Israel.

We wrote from the point of view of how to unite the Jewish and Arab peoples against the demagogic, feudal-reactionary and aggressive policies of the Arab rulers. Mr. Dodell need not bother to cover up the sins of the Zionists by louder cries against the sins of the Arab leaders.

We wrote from the point of view of how to put an end to the mutual and circular process of retaliation whereby each side bleeds the other.

But we also pointed out what the whole world knows: that it is the Zionist government of Israel which has been responsible for systematically raising the "ante" in this round of retaliation—from Deir Yassin to Kibya to Gaza to the Syrian shore.

And this shame and dishonor which the Ben-Gurion regime bears is redoubled in our eyes because, unlike the Arab feudalists or reactionary military men like Nasser, it is the Ben-Gurions and Sharets who claim to be "socialist," who pretend to be "more advanced," more "civilized," than the Arabs whom they look down upon.

Mr. Dodell's—and the Zionists'—point of view, however, is described with damning conciseness in the letter's last sentence: "Israel lives by the dollar and the gun, and not by the word."

That is, Israel lives as a satellite of Washington; Israel lives by militarizing itself; it has no political program ("word") by which to appeal to the Arab peoples against its would-be aggressors.

Israel lives as an armed ghetto in a Middle East which will increasingly be driven to hostility against it by its own policies as the representative of the dollar and gun.

The Jews of Israel have left their European ghettos to erect the largest ghetto in the world, with state boundaries around it.

The Jews of Israel have escaped the burning ground of Europe in order to enflame their "own" part of the world.

This is what Zionism will mean for the "survival of Israel."

We are seeing another act in the tragedy of the Jewish people, and only a socialist-internationalist policy can avert it. This is "the word," not the dollar and the gun.

HAL DRAPER

Mboya Presents Trade-Union Program

"Trade-union leaders and officials are the special target of H. M. Security Forces. They are arrested without trial; detained for an unspecified period. Africans are reluctant to come forward and fill their places, since they know what the future holds."

This was said by Tom Mboya, secretary of the Kenya Federation of Labor, at a meeting organized by the Movement for Colonial Freedom [in London]. . . .

"We interfere in politics," he said, "that is—we are told—our crime."

The charge of interfering in politics had been brought against the Kenya Federation of Labor because of a resolution submitted by them to the International Federation of Trade Unions at its meeting in Vienna in May [1955].

At the meeting they had demanded, and were still demanding, the following measures:

"1. *Forced Labor*: We ask that the International Labor Office investigate the existence or otherwise of forced labor in Kenya. This Federation believes that when some thousands are forcibly removed from their homes, forcibly detained by the central government without pay—or with very little money in lieu of salary—that is in fact forced labor.

"2. *Government Handling of the Emergency*: We do not approve of collective punishment, mass arrests, detention without trial: these things increase bitterness against Europeans in general. Villagers who have refused to report crimes have done so because they have lost faith in the justice of those in authority; collective punishment is no cure.

"3. *Representation*: We demand adequate representation for Africans on all ministerial, legislative, and municipal councils. Where joint consultative councils exist, workers' representatives should be appointed by the workers, and not by the government.

"4. *Screening Machinery*: We demand that people be put on trial, or released. During 'Operation Anvil' some 27,000 Africans were arrested, including 37 trade-union leaders. In response to pressure the government granted a rescreening—by a new method which included question and investigation—for these leaders; 17 were then released. We say that the cases of all who were screened at that time should be reviewed.

"5. *Land*: We ask that the White Highlands be opened to the peoples of all races, with just safeguards and that immigration—both from Asia and Europe—be temporarily stopped. At the moment the government has allocated £110,000 for land development, and

STALINIST SPORTS

Articles appearing recently in the Communist Party press of Hungary indicate that the party leadership is seriously perturbed by the failure of party organizations to keep a tight enough grip over sport and entertainment. . . .

An article in the newspaper *Szabad Nep* of September 14 notes with alarm that "rightist views have spread in the field of sport, the role of the party has been weakened . . . and the false and bourgeois slogan of 'sport without politics' has spread." Unearthing what it terms "an even more serious mistake," the newspaper discovers "that the ideological-political education of our athletes has been neglected. . . . The dangerous views of nationalism and cosmopolitanism have spread on a large scale in some sport organizations."

Trainers have been appointed, the newspaper notes, "exclusively on the basis of whether they were sport experts." Conceding that "an expert knowledge is required in sports," the newspaper insists that "in addition reliability, a knowledge of party policy and a capacity to train youth are equally necessary." . . .

. . . Addressing a conference of Communist youth officials and sports experts recently, the secretary of the Budapest Communist Youth Organization told his audience (according to the newspaper *Szabad Ifjusag* of November 5) that they had been too easy-going and non-political in their attitude toward sport, for instance, by accepting as trainers former army officers of the pre-war regime.

"We must observe more strictly," he said, "the Marxist-Leninist doctrine that sports are not an aim in themselves, but an important means of Communist education of youth."

Noting what he called "disturbing symptoms" in some sport clubs, he added that "not one single political lecture had been given in the Red Banner Club," and warned the Communist Youth organization that it would have to radically change its attitude toward sport.

—ICFTU Spotlight

£330,000 for the encouragement of European settlement.

"6. *Color Bar*: We ask that racial segregation in regard to schools and medical services be stopped. If we accept the principle of a multi-racial society it should apply everywhere. Free compulsory education for all African children is our aim.

"Land distribution and parity of representation; these are our minimum aims," he concluded. "Procrastination in regard to these two things will lead to more violence, more trouble and more instability. . . ."

—Peace News (London)

W. BARRETT'S HAIR IS RAISED BY KOESTLER

The unwillingness or inability of so many otherwise knowledgeable people to open their eyes to the chauvinist essence of Zionism was strikingly exhibited a few weeks ago, when the following two items occurred in the same issue of the N. Y. Times Book Review section (Dec. 4) in separate articles.

On one page William Barrett, an editor of *Partisan Review*, reviewed Arthur Koestler's *The Trail of the Dinosaur*. As is well known, Koestler is pro-Zionist. Barrett writes with something like shock:

"The second section [of the book] is by far the weakest, containing . . . one hair-raising discussion of Judaism, the plain and simple point of which is that the Jews should either give up their religion or go to Israel. Since the Jew is defined by his religion, Koestler argues, and since this religion is separatist, ergo the Jew should physically separate himself from the community in which he is bound to be an alien. It seems odd that Koestler has not stopped to observe that this is one of the stock-in-trade arguments of professional anti-Semitism."

What is really odd is that Barrett seems to be totally ignorant of the fact that world Zionism, led by Israeli Zionism, insists precisely on this "stock-in-trade" conception that the Jew is necessarily alien in all communities except his "own," and that all Jews must therefore be "in-gathered" to Israel, liquidating the Diaspora. (The well-fed American Zionists are the main holdouts against this consistent Zionism.) It is not necessarily tied up with Koestler's view on the relation between the Jewry and Judaism as a religion.

Barrett's hair is raised to encounter

this notion in Koestler, because he associates it only with the anti-Semites. But in this respect Zionism and anti-Semitism have always been bisymmetric phenomena.

This is pointed up by a book review a few pages further in the same issue. The book is *The Secret Roads: The "Illegal" Migration of a People 1938-48*, by the leading British Zionists Jon and David Kimche.

The reviewer Homer Bigart mentions some of the material in this "fascinating tale" of the Jewish exodus under the whip of Nazi exterminationist terror. He notes:

"Some of the methods employed were fantastic. Agents of the Mossad Committee for Illegal Immigration made bargains with the Gestapo in the last Thirties to spur the exodus of 'surplus' Jews and help make the Reich 'Judenfrei.'"

This was also brought out in the recent Israeli scandal over the Kastner case, involving the sordid tale of a leading Zionist agent in Eastern Europe who was charged with collaborating closely with the Nazis in herding a mass of Jews into the Nazi maw in order to achieve the emigration of a certain number to Palestine.

The point is that the common ground between the consistent Zionists and the anti-Semites is precisely the aim of making the Diaspora "Judenfrei," though from quite different motives. Consistent Zionists have even given voice, at rare moments of frankness, to the hope that anti-Semitism should increase in order to drive to Israel the Jews who now dwell in the "illusion" that they can integrate themselves among the *Goyim*. H. D.

Socialism in One Country

LA for Dec. 19 published the statement of the Asian Socialist Conference proposing a peaceful solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict. They were plainly balanced and fair, however much anyone might differ with one or another plank.

In contrast, a statement by the secretary of the Socialist International on "International Socialism and the Israeli-Arab Conflict" illustrates why the socialists of the ex-colonial world look on this assemblage of mainly European social-democrats with such justified suspicion.

Julius Braunthal's statement has virtually nothing to say other than euphoric words of praise for the "socialist state" of Israel (no less!) and a summing up of the issues in the conflict as "a war between feudal reaction and democratic Socialism."

Not accidentally, Braunthal throws in the reminder: "It should be remembered that the Socialist Party of Israel, Mapai, is the only socialist party in the Middle East affiliated to the Socialist International." It is likely to remain so, regardless of how the Arab socialist movement develops.

Braunthal's statement literally presents the Israelis as building Socialism in One Country. This is the one thing it keeps repeating. Israel is "a Socialist State growing up in the Middle East"; Israel is a "Socialist commonwealth" in the midst of the Arab states; it is "Socialist Israel," "the only Socialist oasis in the Middle East," etc. There is not a word about Zionism or the anti-socialist Arab policy of this "socialist" paragon.

Grossman Case: Draftee Wins First Round in Court

By SAM ADAMS

Just before the year 1955 ended, Judge Oliver J. Carter, sitting in the federal court in San Francisco, granted a restraining order to Private Justin Grossman to halt the army from giving him an undesirable discharge. This highly significant action has enhanced the struggle against the discriminatory army regulations dealing with soldiers who admit past political activities not popular in official circles, or membership in organizations proscribed by the attorney general.

Grossman's case is a simple one. Upon his induction into the army about a year ago, he filled out the army's loyalty questionnaire, stating that prior to induction he had been a member of the Socialist Youth League, the Workers Party before its dissolution, and the Independent Socialist League. Grossman also informed the army that he had been a member of the Youth Socialist League (which is not on any "list" whatever).

On the basis of the information supplied by Private Grossman, the army instituted an investigation of its own on February 8 of last year, which lasted until May 23. With its enormous resources, brilliant detective work, and the assistance of all those governmental bodies engaged in this work, the army finally came up with—charges that he had been a member of the Socialist Youth League, the Workers Party, the Independent Socialist League and the Young Socialist League prior to induction.

Another charge against Grossman was that among his personal references was one Paul Jacobs, a "former communist." Jacobs, as a matter of fact, was for many years a well-known CIO functionary who helped lead and organize the struggle against the Stalinist stranglehold of large sections of the labor movement on the Coast.

With bureaucratic formality, the army presented the charges as above summarized to Grossman and provided him with two alternatives: (a) accept an undesirable discharge; or (b) a hearing at which he would have the opportunity to deny the charges against him.

HEISLER'S DEFENSE

The alternatives were, quite obviously, unacceptable to Justin Grossman. He certainly would not accept an undesirable discharge, disagreeing sharply with

the existing loyalty program and not only its criteria; and he could not accept a hearing to "deny charges" based upon his own voluntary information. Grossman thereupon obtained as legal counsel Francis Heisler, the prominent labor attorney of Chicago and California and a National Board member of the Workers Defense League.

Heisler proceeded to prepare a different kind of defense. Past experience with the army has shown that it was prone to issue undesirable discharges which permanently stigmatize soldiers, even before hearings, and particularly when it had the slightest suspicion that a soldier was preparing a legal defense against charges.

Heisler thereupon went into the federal court in San Francisco to ask for a restraining order to prevent the army from suddenly handing Grossman an undesirable discharge, as it had already done in other cases on the West Coast.

In the hearing before Judge Carter, the Chief Assistant U. S. Attorney, Lynn Gillard, opposed the motion of Heisler on the ground that Grossman still had available to him appeals in the army. To which Judge Carter replied:

"I'd be inclined to agree with you, but what is to prevent the army from giving him a quickie discharge? The army has done that, you know, once it gets wind of legal action."

The San Francisco *Examiner* pointed out that the judge was referring "to Private Rodger St. Helen and others who were given undesirable discharges while their attorneys were attempting to obtain court orders."

This wasn't all. In court, Grossman denied the validity of the army case, showing that the ISL, WP and SYL were the most consistent anti-Stalinist organizations in the country and in no way subversive. He and his counsel cited the efforts of the ISL to obtain a hearing from the attorney general for a period of 8 years, which, when finally granted, was adjourned last August and has not been resumed since.

The army, through the U. S. attorney, is, of course, pressing for a reversal of the judge's decision. A hearing has been set for January 13, for the army to show cause why Grossman should be given a discharge other than honorable based on his rating of excellent, and why the restraining order should be made permanent.

Kutcher Wins Pension Case—

(Continued from page 11)

"rendering assistance" to an enemy state, and therefore, in effect, equivalent to treason. Although the stated charge against Kutcher was this one of "rendering assistance" and "aid and comfort" to another country, the specifications quoted from a faceless informer's report showed Kutcher doing nothing but criticizing this government. (This is aside from the fact that Kutcher denied making the statements quoted, some of which were in wild non-socialist language.)

Yet the VA committee's letter of findings said:

"...in order to support a forfeiture [of pension], it must be established beyond a reasonable doubt that the veteran did knowingly and intentionally render assistance to an enemy of the U. S. While it is the opinion of this committee that the utterances alleged to have been made by the veteran in July 1950 and the summer of 1951, if established beyond a reasonable doubt, would constitute a violation of the forfeiture statute, the committee determined that all the available evidence does not measure up to this quantum of proof."

This statement is even worse, if anything, than the original enunciation of the principle, since this time Moss throws in the words "knowingly and intentionally."

JOB CASE NEXT

On another point the committee also stuck by its "principled" guns for witch-hunting purposes. It conceded, in its decision, that no veteran in this country has ever forfeited his pension except after first being found guilty in a court of law; but it insisted that this was not necessary.

"Under the statute and the regulations a forfeiture may be administratively de-

termined upon satisfactory evidence," it wrote.

The next act may involve Kutcher Case No. 1, the job fight, in the shape of a hearing before the federal Court of Appeals.

When this case got to the Supreme Court, the decision went against the government to this extent: it stated that Kutcher could not be fired simply on grounds of SWP membership; his personal responsibility had to be shown. Thus the case went back to the district court to start its way up again. Since the district court found Kutcher's dismissal justified on the new grounds, the Court of Appeals is the next step.

The pension case, Kutcher Case No. 3 was also fought on the grounds of Kutcher's "personal responsibility," and to this extent the defeat of the witch-hunters provides a hopeful augury. But the government prosecution has plenty of room to maneuver in the differences between the two cases.

A Marxist Classic
Rosa Luxemburg's
The Accumulation
of Capital

Yale Univ. Press\$5

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

Eisenhower's Message

(Continued from page 11)

is in danger of being "stolen" from them.

Of course, we are still a long way from the elections, and all kinds of things may happen before then. The Republican Party still contains within it the bulk of the most reactionary and conservative economic agitators and practitioners in the country. Even though Eisenhower appears almost as if he were in a conspiracy with the Democratic leadership to keep the present power relations intact at the fall elections, an administration loaded with businessmen and a party loaded with unreconstructed Hooverites can easily throw the election to the Democrats anyway.

If the present boom continues to run through November, there are two areas, inside the borders of the U. S., which can give the administration in power real trouble and in which a sizable shift in the vote from the Republican to the Democratic column could be decisive. That is the farm vote and the vote of a significant segment of the population, both Negro and white, to whom the government's handling of the civil-rights issue is vital, especially at a time when no other issues appear too pressing.

As far as the farm program is concerned, it is too early to say now just what will be passed, who will line up how, and how it will work out electorally. It is clear that the "free economy" advocates in the administration have lost out to those who recognize that, however nice such a notion may be in theory and in the propaganda of the Chamber of Commerce, it is not politically practicable as far as the farmers are concerned.

In the one important sector of the American economy in which many small producers still maintain a footing, only a vast program of state control and subsidy can prevent the open and public economic extermination of the small people and their replacement by a handful of agricultural monopolies.

SPECIAL THEORY

The contradiction between Eisenhower's theories and the political necessities in agriculture are so glaring that a special theory or explanation had to be invented, to account for it both to reluctant Republicans and to school-children who, if left to themselves, might ask too many questions about it.

Eisenhower included an exposition of this theory in his State of the Union Message:

"In successful prosecution of the war, the nation called for the utmost effort of its farmers. Their response was superb, their contribution unsurpassed. Farmers are not now to be blamed for the mountainous, price-depressing surpluses produced in response to wartime policies and laws that were too long continued. War markets are not the markets of peacetime. Failure to recognize that basic fact by a timely adjustment of wartime legislation brought its inevitable result in peacetime—surpluses, lower prices and lower incomes for our farmers."

It is not the natural workings of capitalism at all, you see. There was the war, and then there were the Democrats who failed to "adjust" wartime legislation in time. But then how does one explain the farm depression of the '20s, and the catastrophe in the '30s? Well, there was another war, you see, and...

In any event, a group in the Republican Party has seen enough light to convince it that whatever may have been said about the New Deal farm programs of the '30s, a little subsidized non-production is inevitable. Hence their adoption of the "soil bank" proposal, which is another variant of the old hated programs to prevent agricultural overproduction.

In a supplementary farm message, Eisenhower spelled out his program to pay farmers for producing smaller crops. Forty million acres, 11 1/2 per cent of all crop land, are to be—not plowed-under, like the cotton and little pigs of the New Deals AAA, but unplowed-under.

In the field of foreign policy, Eisenhower's message limited itself almost exclusively to general verbiage, coming out foursquare for international justice, peace, dynamic flexibility, the pursuit of happiness, fair solutions for tragic disputes, etc.

Claimed as "major gains" in this field were the developments in precisely the three areas (Germany, SEATO, Baghdad Pact) where the U. S. position has been steadily "deteriorating," as is now openly admitted by virtually all commentators in the U. S. from right to left.

In the explosive field of civil rights, Eisenhower came out with just about the minimum with which to embarrass the Democrats without committing the Republicans to anything.

His proposal for a bipartisan commission to investigate "allegations" that "in some localities" "Negro citizens are being deprived of their right to vote and are likewise being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures" is actually an insult to the Negro people and to every real supporter of equality. A president, who is sworn to defend the Constitution, at a time when it is being openly and boastfully and arrogantly violated in thousands of towns and cities, hundreds of counties and a dozen states, proposes not to do anything but to appoint a commission to look into the matter.

CHEAP TRICK

Insult though this proposal be, from the point of view of capitalist party politics it is not altogether without guile. Since Eisenhower proposes that the commission be bipartisan, it means that the Southern Democrats who dominate Congress would have to agree to set it up in the first place, and then would have to decide what Democrats should sit on it.

What Eisenhower's advisers hope for, no doubt, is that instead of a commission to investigate, what will really be created is a first-class brawl inside the Democratic Party. At the same time, sensitive Southern racists can easily understand that Eisenhower's proposal is not exactly a home-thrust against them.

GOP calculations may well prove correct. The only question is whether another attempt to play cheap-jack politics with the vital interests of the Negro people will produce the same results in this year of 1956 as in the past: simply to shift support of significant sections of them from one party to the other. There is that in the mood displayed around the Till murder which makes it appear that it is at least possible that such a brazen trick will simply magnify and speed up tendencies for Negroes to seek brand new political alliances.

Every State of the Union message is a partisan propaganda document, and in election years they tend to be more rather than less so. This one is a pretty true reflection of the party in whose leader's name it was read. It starts with a paean of praise to the war-economy boom, that crowning achievement of capitalist civilization. It ends with a cheap political trick at the expense of the most exploited section of the population.

A New Collection!
MARX AND ENGELS
ON BRITAIN

Contains the whole of Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England* in addition to dozens of their articles and letters. 538 pages—fully indexed—hard-cover—fine binding—but only \$2.50! All orders must be accompanied by payment.

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

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

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

Please enter my subscription:

1 year at \$2. New

6 months at \$1. Renewal

Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE