

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 9, 1950

FIVE CENTS

**The UAW and the 'Communist Purge' In the Labor Movement**

... page 2

**Israel: Political Changes Loom**

... page 3

**Morocco and the Atlantic Pact**

... page 6

**'No Balm in the Liberal Gilead'**

... page 2

## Liberal Party Backs Dem Slate But Ranks Uneasy over Deals

By PETER WHITNEY

The election campaign in New York is in full swing. Charges and counter-charges have already been hurled and, if nothing else, much interesting dirt promised to be uncovered during the campaign.

The key positions involved are: for state governor—incumbent Thomas E. Dewey against Democrats Walter Lynch; for senator—incumbent Herbert H. Lehman vs. Republican Joe Hanley; and in a special election for mayor—Democrat Ferdinand Pecora against Republican Edward Corsi, with Acting Mayor Vincent Impellitteri also in the running although without the blessings of his Democratic Party.

The three major Democratic candidates have also been endorsed by the Liberal Party, and this endorsement is a faithful reflection of the position of the leadership of that party: support Fair Deal Democrats wherever possible. They remain firmly wedded to the Democratic Party, despite rumblings in the ranks against this policy and despite the contradictions of their position.

The Liberal Party leaders continue to use the strength and support of their substantial trade-union base in behalf of a Democratic Party which they have described as "poisoned by the Southern racist group, and in the North, largely dominated by corrupt power-hungry machines." David Dubinsky of the Ladies Garment Workers Union and Alex Rose of the Hatters Union are no doubt intimately acquainted with the corrupt power-hungry machine of Tammany Hall, since their endorsements in this election were arrived at after long conferences with said machine.

### REVERSE ON TAMMANY

Just last year the Liberal Party carried on a slash-bang campaign against corruption, graft, gangsterism, racketeering, and general evil generated by the New York Democratic mob with their front, William O'Dwyer. The Liberals backed Republican Newbold Morris who pledged himself to clean up the Augean stables. But Morris didn't win; so a year later the Liberals find themselves in the strange position of bedfellow with the very forces they howled against last year.

Of course, the Liberals try to palm off their candidates as genuine, honest-to-the-core progressives whose heart and soul belong to the labor movement. What then are they doing in a party poisoned by racism and dominated by corrupt machines? And as one delegate neatly put it at the state convention of the Liberal Party: Can a candidate acceptable to the five county bosses of New York be the right candidate for us? How can we attack Tammany Hall one year and support it the next?

The rationalization offered by the party leaders is that they "compelled" the Democratic Party to take the Liberal Party's choices. State Chairman Adolph A. Berle tried to answer the objections raised at the Young Liberals' convention by stating: "This year was the time to make our weight felt by compelling the

Democratic Party to take our man as well as to profess our principles."

What reason or use will there be for a Liberal Party if it can so reform the Democratic Party as to profess (no less!) the Liberal principles — "a bold constructive program that thoroughly meets the needs of the people"? And how can the Liberal Party justify its organizational independence when it calls upon the

(Turn to last page)

### N. Y. C. Registration

Monday to Friday, Oct. 9-13:  
5 p.m.-10:30 p.m.

Saturday, October 14:  
7 a.m.-10:30 p.m.

at your local election-district polling place

You must register in order to vote

Stalinism Has Been Defeated by Arms But Second Stage Opens over 38th Parallel—

## U. S. Plan for Korea Won't Raise Its Stock in Asia

By MAX SHACHTMAN

The war in Korea has entered its second stage, as is obvious. What is not so obvious is that the new stage is far from the last one.

It is interesting to see how the change in the stage of the war is recognized by the two powers who are responsible for the war and in whose interests the war has been fought from the very start, namely, the United States and Russia.

When the war began with the invasion of South Korea by Stalin's marionettes in the North, it caught the puppet regime of Syngman Rhee by surprise that was shared by its patron, the United States government. The latter's representatives in the United Nations, supported by all their allies, professed horror over the invasion in the most indignant terms and called upon both sides to cease fire and to re-establish as sacrosanct the division of the country at the 38th parallel which Stalin and Roosevelt had so arbitrarily used to cut that unfortunate land in two.

The cease-fire request was addressed, of course, to the North Korean Stalinists who were so effectively enforcing their own cease-fire order upon Rhee's fleeing forces. The Russians, to whom the appeal was really addressed, turned a deaf ear to it. Being self-styled diplomats of the highest moral purpose and principle, they saw no reason to instruct their puppets to stop firing bullets which were so effectively reaching their target, or to remember that the 38th parallel was a line they had established and which was not to be crossed.

Now the fortunes of war have changed. Vyshinsky suddenly recalls that not only is there nothing wrong with a cease-fire order but that it is, in fact, an excellent way of bringing peace to Korea. And that, likewise, the 38th parallel is so excellent a line of demarcation between the two sides that they should each retire to their respective positions behind it in order to bring about peace. His bullets are not so effective now as are the American.

But that is the very reason why Washington's Austin finds that a cease-fire order has its limits, and that while the crossing of the 38th parallel from the North is a monstrosity that imperils the security and peace of Korea and the world as a whole, its crossing from the South is natural, proper and essential, and indispensable to wiping it out altogether.

The New York Times now finds that the division was never anything but a "monstrosity" which "was always purely artificial, it was never recognized by the Koreans themselves or by the United Nations, and should not be recognized now." Which shows how high moral purpose is sustained by a supple memory. We were led to believe by the United Nations' reports in the New York Times of only three months ago that, under the leadership of Austin, the UN not only "recognized" the division but called upon the Stalinists to continue recognizing it as a guarantee of peace in Korea. Either the reports of the UN Sessions in the New York Times were falsified through and through, or else its editors suffer from the familiar disease of political amnesia.

### RUSSIA LOST—U. S. GAINED NOTHING

Much more important, however, is the other respect in which the United States is showing its recognition of the second stage in the war.

Rhee's troops are already well into Stalinist territory. But not the American forces. And unless Rhee's divisions start taking the same humiliating beating from the Stalinist army that they took when the war started, it is not likely that American forces, at least of any size, will be sent across the 38th parallel. Why not? Certainly not because it runs against the grain of American foreign policy to send its armed forces into foreign countries, for it is in foreign countries all over the world, and notably in South Korea, that the bulk

(Turn to last page)

## In the Mirror of Stalin's Parliament . . .

An Analysis of the Composition of Moscow's Supreme Council: the Bureaucracy Rules

By Vs. FELIX

On June 12 of this year, the first session of the newly elected Supreme Council of the USSR met in a magnificent hall of the Kremlin.

In that hall hangs a mirror half as wide as the wall itself. During the history of the Kremlin that mirror has seen a great many faces, faces of the powerful inhabitants of the Kremlin: the czars and noblemen, the landowners and industrial magnates, the generals and clergymen. Then the years of the great October Revolution passed by like a storm. The power of the reactionary Kremlin was destroyed by the glorious proletarian revolution. The years of reaction came on. . . .

### And whom does the Kremlin's mirror see in the Hall of Power today?

The general election to the Supreme Council took place on March 12, 1950. We are not at all interested in the process of election itself, that is, how it was put over. Surely, the nature of Stalinist "democracy" is known all over the world. We will mention only that according to Pravda 300,000 votes were cast against the Stalin party list but the rest—99.99 per cent—were for it. That is only a bluff, as usual.

For instance, Pravda never mentioned that, in the 1946 election in

(Continued on page 7)

### Deputies to the Supreme Council (Social Composition)

Deputies	No.	%
Politburo & Central Comm. members of Communist Parties	112	8.5
Members of government; ministers	151	11.5
Party committee secretaries	209	15.9
Secret police top officials (MVD & MGB)	24	1.8
Army (generals & top officers)	30	2.3
State administrative apparatus	121	9.2
Managers of industrial enterprises	104	7.8
Top officials of trade unions	24	1.8
Intelligentsia (scientists, writers, teachers, &c.)	224	17.0
Presidents of collective farms	135	10.3
Brigadiers of collective farms	16	1.2
Ordinary collective farmers	5	0.4
Brigadiers of industrial enterprises	76	5.8
Ordinary workers	85	6.5
TOTAL	1316	100.0

# Will UAW Stand Up Against Trend in Labor To Import 'Communist Purge' into Unions?

By BEN HALL

The recently enacted McCarran bill raises vital questions about the defense of political liberties. The labor movement, sad to relate, has carefully avoided any discussion of the role of its liberal friends in putting over the new law or in suggesting imitations and substitutions. Its silence in this respect is "understandable"; for it would hardly be possible to explain how the liberal Democrats collapsed and then announce the usual all-out campaign for their re-election without striking a jarring note. In the interests of electing a Democratic Congress in 1950 it would be best to forget the needs of democracy.

The labor movement opposed the enactment of the new bill and called for a presidential veto but ignored its basic, reactionary content. Union critics skirt about the fringes of the new legislation, rejecting details while accepting main features, fusing about flecks and spots while overlooking spreading stains on democracy.

The crux of the matter is: Shall men be penalized for their political affiliations? Shall they be herded into concentration camps not as felons guilty of criminal acts but as dissidents "guilty" of expressing political convictions?

As might be expected, the same winds begin to blow through the unions, poisoning the already enfeebled structure of union democracy. Shall a man have the right to express his political convictions without fear of being fired from his job or expelled, from his union? The most elementary dictates of democratic procedures, the most basic principles of free discussion, would give us a speedy reply. Not many years ago, any union militant would answer unhesitatingly in defense of such fundamental liberties.

Now, however, anyone can hack away at civil liberties so long as he inveighs against "spies" and "saboteurs." It becomes legitimate to stop the expression of opinions because it is illegal to throw bombs. One man or group of men can be penalized for what they say in public because it is illegal for other men to copy confidential documents in secret. The public is to be enlisted in a wide campaign to unmask grippers, who might be communists, who might be Communist Party members, who might be spies.

## BUREAUCRATIC METHOD

In such an atmosphere, the unions take up the "Communist problem." Let us have not made it clear enough, we repeat: We are not discussing the fate of spies, saboteurs, secret agents or any of the real or Hollywood-manufactured cloak-and-dagger characters in the paid or unpaid service of espionage bureaus. We are discussing the rights of those thousands of workers who have been deluded into following the Communist Party and of those tens of thousands of others who are honestly, though mistakenly, sympathetic to the expressed aims of the Communist Party as they themselves interpret and understand them.

Bureaucratic officials in many unions have "settled" this question a long time ago. Their most humdrum, normal procedures provide for the expulsion of all critics, the ramming of a gag down the throats of any opponent. Expulsions, beatings, rigged elections and phony meetings are the answer to all the ordinary problems of day-to-day internal union life. Some, like Joe Curran of the National Maritime Union, are quite skillful at this sort of thing, having practiced it during long years of cooperation with the Communist Party.

Naturally, in such unions there is no question of "how to deal with communists." In disposing of the problem, the bureaucrat disposes of the rights of his membership. Inside the union he continues a cozy existence undisturbed by nagging critical voices. Outside the union the Communist Party is able to pose as the victimized champion of democracy.

But other unions have a long, splendid democratic tradition, chief among them the United Automobile Workers (CIO) which has won its respected and out-

question of Stalinism by application of these formal provisions. Such a proposal would have helped the CP rally support and sympathy. In untrammeled discussion, without overhanging threats of expulsion, the Stalinists went down to smashing defeat.

## THEY'RE NOT CLEAR

The action of the Local 600 Council goes far beyond the unenforced UAW constitutional provision which applied only to members of the Communist Party (and Nazis). The Ford resolution will victimize not only Communists and CP sympathizers but also a militant who refuses to sign such affidavits because he finds them abhorrent on principle. In the same way, the Taft-Hartley Law penalizes John L. Lewis, a non-signer, as well as known CPers.

In several incidents in various parts of the country, members of the UAW have thrown out of the plant workers who were accused of "communist" activity. The top union leadership has carried on a campaign against such "lynch law." But it is not quite clear whether it is disturbed more by the undemocratic nature of these actions or by their unruly, uncontrolled character.

"People who disregard the legal rights, even of Communists, and who resort to lynch law, may be anti-Communist but they are not on the side the UAW is committed to," writes *Ammunition*, the official magazine of the union. This would seem like a clear defense of the rights of CPers. But

it says in another place: "Where you are really concerned about someone you honestly believe to be a Communist, it's not your job to take the law into your own hands. In that case, notify the FBI. The FBI knows better than you what to do."

But if a worker is "guilty" only of his CP views, why should he be singled out for FBI investigation? *Ammunition* gives ammunition to those who would victimize workers for their opinions.

Those who think we are being harsh may say: "After all, *Ammunition* is only suggesting an investigation. If the man is a Communist but not a saboteur, the FBI will only watch him but it won't have him fired." We need comment on this objection only to point out that it flows from an acceptance of an omnipresent secret police and at the same time expresses a utopian faith in the fairness of an uncontrolled and uncontrollable group of undercover agents.

## FLINT CASE

In Flint, a man accused of being a CPer was actually thrown off his job by UAW members of Local 599. The officers of the local and of the international interceded and did their best to convince the men responsible for the act that they were wrong. Don't take the law into your own hands, said these officers, utilize the regular grievance procedures of the UAW. In praising the actions of the UAW representatives, the *Weekly Review* of the Flint CIO Council says that "The stand taken by the UAW officials

was correct and in keeping with the best traditions of trade-unionism... but it was definitely unpopular."

That it was unpopular, is undoubtedly true. Nevertheless, the UAW officers have not yet taken a clear stand. They rest their case not on the right of a union member to voice his political views, even if a CPer, but on his right to a trial under the union procedures. The responsible UAW officials may have felt that public opinion in the victimized worker's department was running so high that a diplomatic dodge was necessary. Even if that were so, the fact remains that the UAW has not yet expressed itself clearly on the whole question.

The Executive Board of Local 599 has adopted a resolution for presentation to the next UAW convention providing for the "expulsion of any person known to be active in a subversive movement or found guilty of advocating, aiding or abetting in activities detrimental to the welfare of our country or our union." This sad piece of political stupidity is before the union. And even if it were not placed on the agenda by Local 599, others would do so. The Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, and its paper the *Wage Earner*, is casting about to float new ventures inside the UAW.

Yes, it may be difficult; it may prove to be unpopular in some circles. All the more reason to begin a hard-hitting educational program inside the UAW on the real meaning of democratic rights.

## TEN FAIR DEAL SENATORS TALK ABOUT CHANGING McCARRAN BILL

# "There's No Balm in the Liberal Gilead"

By MARY BELL

Congress is adjourned, the freshets of campaign oratory herald the election-year flood and the criminal division of the Attorney General's office is hiring the most loyal of the loyal to put into effect the bill which is the heritage of the 81st—the "Communist-control bill."

Ten Democrats, those who upheld the president's veto, serve notice that they will urge repeal or drastic amendment of the control bill when Congress returns in "the calmer, post-election atmosphere." They couple this statement with a vigorous warning that in opposing the bill, "loyal and liberal-minded Americans" should not help Communists or Communist organizations "in their hypocritical attacks" on the law. They hint at a "positive, effective security program" if the law is not repealed.

We need not be comforted. There is no balm in the liberal Gilead. These are the Humphreys, Douglasses and Kilgores who first thought up the concentrationary scheme to counter the McCarran registration proposal, then voted for the combined legislation, the compromise bill containing detention-registration. Only after Truman's hasty veto which permitted a straining Congress to leave for its fall electioneering campaign, did most of these liberal gentlemen vote nay.

## ME-TOOISM

It was not even as though the country hadn't had any procedure for the handling of "subversives." Truman could rest confident, as could Humphrey-Douglas-Kilgore, in the application of the attorney general's list, compiled at Truman's own behest when he began his "loyalty" program which ushered in the current hysteria in 1947. They could rest confident that the government's security police, the FBI, were all too well equip-

ped in espionage, terror, police measures and all kinds of legal and illegal procedures, to handle whatever threat might arise. But far from content with leaving "well enough" (which was ill enough) alone and far from even questioning the authoritarian and unappealable attorney general's list, the liberals te] in with and contributed to the general hysteria on this question. They demonstrated that they could play the game of me-tooism, too.

It is this same liberal wing which betrays such concern about a "progressive" foreign policy, about combating Stalinist propaganda on the international scene with something more than armed force, voting funds for the "Voice of America," mobilizing a "Truth" campaign, etc. They would like to demonstrate to the slaves of Russian-dominated nations that the United States is by comparison a democratic country. How? By democratically-run concentration camps?

## MORE COPS NEEDED

What better ammunition can the Agit-Prop department of the Politbureau devise to combat liberal pretensions than the facts of the Communist-control bill?

Two new letter boards are to be staffed, the Subversive Activities Control Board—five men; and the Detention Review Board—nine men. The first will concern itself with "Communist and Communist Party front registration"; the second will rule on detention camps under "the concentration-camp" (says the October 1 New York Times without batting an eye) provisions of the law. The attorney general foresees a new division in the criminal department which will create "hundreds" of new jobs.

An ironic sidelight on the new legislation is the fact that the attorney general's list won't do for

the new SACB. No sir, the brain-trusters of the new law considered that list subject to attack on the grounds of—ingratitude of civil liberties! The attorney general's list, requested by Truman, was compiled from data furnished by the FBI which, arbitrarily and without appeal, labeled organizations, now about 150 in number, as "subversive." The gentlemen of the 81st Congress knew this procedure was criticized as being a violation of free speech and constitutional rights, even though the lower courts have thus far held up this right.

But this new law, vetoed by the president for its infringement of civil rights among other more practical considerations, provides for appeal. That right is to be respected in the administration of the registration of "Communist" and "Communist front" organizations. The attorney general must take his FBI data to the president's SACB with a petition to list groups as "subversive." A special hearing will then be held before the board or a board examiner at which the defendant may appear with counsel who can cross-examine the government's witnesses. Then a finding of subversive may be taken to the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia and eventually to the Supreme Court. Only after the high court has ruled in favor of the government can the defendant be compelled to obey the law or face criminal prosecution.

## TERMS OF BILL

Yes, constitutional procedures and safeguards can and are to be observed—to bring about what Truman described as "thought control!" Thus far, the sections of the law made public which define "subversives" would apply only to genuinely Stalinist organizations. Among the many criteria for the

determination of a "Communist-action" or "Communist-front" group, the following is typical: "(2) The extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government..."

Thus, on the surface and so far as the letter of the law is concerned, it would exclude independent radical and socialist organizations such as the Independent Socialist League and others that are now on the attorney general's "subversive list."

Despite our passionate, long and principled opposition to any form of Stalinism, and our considered definition of it as a new totalitarian formation, we can draw little satisfaction from the fact that the present law concentrates exclusively on it. This is not the way to fight Stalinism. It is a diminution of civil rights. It signifies a totalitarian trend within the democratic capitalist society of the United States. It strengthens Stalinism on a world scale. The same measure and methods will be found effective against other, non-Stalinist opponents of the government. And especially, given the low ebb of the Communist Party in the United States, the action resembles the use of a tank to crush a mouse.

Whatever the difficulties in applying the law, however drawn-out the legislative battles, whatever reversal the liberals try to effect in a "calmer" period if such we can envisage, the damage has been done. It can only be overcome by the outright repeal of the measure and the lifting of the attorney general's list as well.

Get your L.A. every week!  
Subscribe at \$2 a year!

# Political Changes Loom in Israel

## Businessmen Press for Concessions, Split Possible in the Mapam

By AL FINDLEY

For the first time since the establishment of the state of Israel, the Jewish bourgeoisie has begun a serious political offensive with the hope of gaining governmental power.

As steppingstones on their road to power they hope to use the economic difficulties of a poor country, which was never self-sufficient even before partition and whose economy is now carrying the additional burdens of large-scale immigration, a disproportionately large burden of armaments and is hampered by the cutting of normal trade between "industrial" Israel and the surrounding Arab Palestine.

A few weeks ago the Ministry of Supply introduced rationing of clothing in line with the Mapai (Labor Party) policy of austerity. The bourgeoisie met this by declaring a nation-wide strike of shopkeepers. In the Knesset (parliament) the demand was raised by all bourgeois groups for the lifting of controls and a return to "free enterprise" by all bourgeois groups from the Heguth (Irgun) Party to the bourgeois parties which are in the government coalition with the Mapai. The impossibility of a free economy in a country where imports exceed exports by the ratio of eight to one does not bother the bourgeoisie. Free trade would enable them to raise prices and reap enormous profits.

The American Jewish bourgeoisie has joined the fight. A large minority led by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver is pressing for a resolution by the American Zionist Organization demanding that the Israeli government change its present economic policy.

Most writers believe that if an election were held now the conservative General Zionists in Israel would come out greatly strengthened. There is, however, no evidence to support this belief. All by-elections have returned the same proportions as the previous national election.

## Concessions to Capital

What seems more logical to this writer is that the religious bloc would gain, primarily as a result of the large influx of predominantly religious Jews from Asia and Africa. The question still remains whether the religious labor parties or the religious bourgeois parties would get these new votes.

The Mapai, which controls the government and which has grown substantially—it now has 70,000 members—is meeting the "threat" in a number of ways.

On the economic side it has made sizable concessions to capital. It passed a law giving many privileges to foreign capital and it has promised to modify the rationing program to meet some of the demands of the merchants. It has adopted the line of proposing plans for the increased production and productivity of labor and it lays the blame for lack of progress on "sabotage" by the manufacturers.

Politically the Mapai is hoping for two things.

It is attempting to unify the Israeli trade-union movement by detaching the religious labor groups from the bourgeoisie and getting these groups to join the Histadruth (the General Federation of Jewish Labor in Israel).

The largest single religious trade-union group and Zionist political party is the Hapoel Hamizrochi. The "Lamisneh" faction of Hapoel Hamizrochi favors entry into the Histadruth and is on the road to a majority in that organization. One union, the teachers' union of the Hapoel Hamizrochi, has already voted to unite with the Histadruth organization of teachers.

The Hapoel Hamizrochi has succeeded in forming a united organization with the non-Zionist religious labor organization, the Poale Agudath Israel. If the Hapoel Hamizrochi breaks away from its bourgeois mentors and joins the Histadruth, it will probably carry the Poale Agudath Israel with it. The success of such a unification will not only weaken the bourgeois bloc but will also proportionately reduce the specific weight of the Mapam (pro-Stalinist labor group) within the Histadruth.

## Mapam Divided on Stalinism

The Mapai also hopes for the expected split in the pro-Stalinist Mapam. The Mapam—whose name means United Labor Party—was originally formed by the unification of three groups: the Hashomer Hatzair, the Left Poale Zion and the Achduth Avodah, a left-wing splittoff from the Mapai. These were later joined by a fourth group, the expelled Premering wing of the Communist Party.

Mapam has not been experiencing the growth it expected as a result of the burdens of the austerity program and the miseries of the new immigrants. It has suffered as a result of the anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish policies of Russia and the satellite countries. Mapam seems, however, to have held its own and has even won some elections within the Histadruth.

For the past year the Mapam has been driven more and more down the road to Stalinism. The lead in this drive has been the Israeli leadership of Hashomer Hatzair, aided by

the unprincipled politician Moshe Zvev, the former head of Haganah. On all questions from Korea to Titoism and the Stockholm "peace" petition, Mapam has taken a 100 per cent Stalinist line. It has made its Stalinist foreign policy the main and decisive issue of policy. It turned down entry into either a coalition cabinet or into a Mapai-Mapam government primarily on the ground that Mapai would not go along with support of "peace moves of the Soviet Union."

The leaders of Hashomer Hatzair have been turning more and more toward Stalinism ideologically in addition to supporting Russian foreign policy. In a May Day article entitled "We and Communism," Rifting calls on the Mapam to become a "communist party." He goes the whole hog and justifies even the lack of democracy in the Stalinist parties.

## Hashomer Goes Whole Hog

The rationale for Mapam's need to become a "communist party" is as follows. Stalinism is now the only force for socialism, according to Rifting. The social-democrats are excluded by their reformism and their support of the imperialist war. The Independent Labor Party of England is disintegrating. The so-called "left-wing" socialist parties like Nenni's in Italy are not independent ideological tendencies but anterooms to Stalinism. The Trotskyists hardly exist, Rifting adds. Therefore, he concludes, Mapam must become a "communist"—i.e., Stalinist—party.

While he points to the crimes of the social-democrats, he completely ignores any crimes of the Stalinists and above all completely ignores the crucial question that if there is no anti-war Third Camp now there is a need to create one. Surely a "pioneer" cannot ignore such a vital point!

The Hashomer Hatzair, with its separate organization and tight discipline, is in a position to dominate the Mapam, since it casts a solid vote despite any differences within its own ranks.

The extreme policy of extreme pro-Stalinism has caused friction with the other important section of Mapam, the Achduth Avodah. The latter's leaders include Israel Gallilee, former commander of Palmach, and Tobenkin, ideologist of the Kibbutz (collective) movement. While Achduth Avodah goes along with support of Russia, they object to the emphasis placed on foreign policy. They place their emphasis on domestic issues. They put greater emphasis on the Zionist aspect of their ideology and support entry into a Mapai-Mapam government if given concessions on internal issues.

The Jewish press has been talking about the possibilities of a split in Mapam. In the Kibbutzim (collectives), Mapai and Mapam are engaged in political discussions. Lately the component units of Mapam have been voting separately within the Histadruth, the Hashomer Hatzair supporting CP motions and the rest of Mapam abstaining. According to one report, the latter abstained even on the Stockholm "peace" petition, crucial as it is to the Stalinists.

## The "Neutrality" Question

Nobody can say whether or not the split will finally take place. If it does, there will be considerable realignment—ideological, party and governmental—in Israel. While there is no immediate hope for the emergence of a real Third Camp position, opposed both to Western capitalism and to Russian imperialism, the event would surely strengthen the advocates of "neutrality."

All parties in Israel are officially in favor of neutrality in the struggle between the Western and Russian blocs. Mapam and the Stern group have twisted neutrality to mean support of Russia and its satellites, which, they claim, is not a "bloc" but leaders of a progressive movement. The bourgeois parties do the same for the Western bloc. The government, however, on the whole, carried out a fairly strict policy of neutrality up to the Korean war.

On Korea the Israeli government—like Nehru, also an advocate of "neutrality"—supported the U. S. Like Nehru also, the Israeli government then proclaimed that its policy was not one of "neutrality" but of independence from prior commitment to either bloc. Israeli is free to act, said the government, with one bloc on one occasion and with the other bloc on the other occasion, depending on the merits of the issue.

The decision to support the U. S. in Korea was so unpopular at first with the rank and file even of Mapai that a spokesman issued the ridiculous statement that the Russians would not be offended but would understand that Israel had to act the way it did. But later the Mapai leaders came out strongly for the pro-U. S. turn and carried on a long campaign for their policy.

The fact that the Arab states did not go along with the U. S. gave their policy the aura of a "smart move" to obtain arms and economic aid from the U. S. These two factors seem to have obtained a limited if reluctant support to the government policy of supporting the U. S. on Korea.

## Stalinists Meet A Setback In UAW Local

By JOE HAUSER

The Stalinist-controlled administration of Fisher Body Local 45, United Auto Workers (CIO), received one of its rare defeats last week.

As reported previously, there was quite a stir in the local over the issue of freedom of the press, with Bert Foster, financial secretary, insisting on the printing of his article on the Korean situation in the union paper, the Eye Opener, and Leo Fenster, editor and board member, refusing to print it. Foster took his fight to the executive board of the local, much to the embarrassment of the Stalinists, and received the backing of a large majority there, including most of the CP followers.

At the same board meeting, a policy committee consisting of the officers and a few board members was set up for the paper. Also a motion was passed continuing Fenster as editor, with Foster making this motion.

It was rather surprising, therefore, to find at a membership meeting about ten days later that Foster brought in a motion to reject that part of the board minutes continuing Fenster as editor, thereby completely reversing his position on this matter. His reason for this change was Fenster's stalling around on printing the next issue which was to contain the disputed Foster article.

In presenting this motion, Foster also brought up the general narrow factional manner in which Fenster used his position as editor, a condition which has existed for many years previous to this. After almost two and a half hours of debate the vote was taken, 65 to 40, to remove Fenster as editor; and another motion was passed for the policy committee to select a temporary editor.

Actually, the anti-Stalinists received only a moral victory on the issue of the running of the paper, for so long as the present administration is in power there can be no great change in editorial policy. Perhaps the most important result will be that the Stalinists may force Foster out of their more-or-less on-off collaboration. On several occasions previously Foster had split with the party-liners over specific issues, but he always made his peace with them later. This time the CP may not be so forgiving, and while Foster may not be the ideal type of union leader, he certainly would be a help to the present almost leaderless opposition.

## UAW STRIKE

The strike of the United Mine Workers Local 12231 (District 50) against the Diamond Alkali Company in Fairport, was ended after 67 days, with the union winning 10 cents an hour direct wage increase, and another nickel in 1951 and 1952, in a three-year contract. Also included were the cost-of-living bonus clause, increased hospitalization and insurance benefits, and added holiday and vacation privileges. Pension plan will be at \$110, including social security.

Several weeks ago the strike was completely stalemated when two AFL unions challenged the UMW as bargaining representative. The NLRB conducted an election, with the UMW off the ballot due to its non-compliance with the Taft-Hartley Law. The results were AFL Chemical Workers 546, AFL Teamsters 50, and "no union" 1565. The UMW had asked its members to vote "no union." With this election out of the way, Local 12231 was able to push the strike to its conclusion. While not all its demands were won, the union can be satisfied that it won substantial improvements despite difficult circumstances.

# The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name ..... Address ..... State ..... Tel. .... City ..... Zone .....

# Youth Student Corner

## THE LYL CASE AT BROOKLYN COLLEGE

By ROBERT LAWRENCE

The U. S.-Russian imperialist conflict in Korea is having important ramifications on college campuses throughout the country. The drive for unanimity of viewpoint is being accelerated, and consequently the right of student groups to present views divergent from those of State Department officialdom is being destroyed.

The arbitrary suspension of the Labor Youth League of Brooklyn College by F. W. Maroney, dean of students, is the latest chapter in the series of case studies in "campus hysteria." The LYL is the current youth adjunct of the Communist Party.

On June 14, 1950, at the close of the spring semester the Labor Youth League was approved by the Student Governing Council and the Faculty-Student Committee on Student Activities at the school. In accordance with the constitution of the college the LYL was recognized as a legitimate campus organization.

However, before the commencement of the current term, i.e., before the LYL had held a single meeting on the Brooklyn College campus, it was arbitrarily suspended by the dean of students—"in view of the United Nations war in Korea and the world situation in general." The dean, in the anti-democratic fashion of many contemporary "liberals," vetoed the June 14 ruling of the committees responsible for recognizing campus clubs.

In establishing the criterion of conformity as the basis for recognition, the college administration has scrapped its former policy of recognizing all Stalinist clubs that openly declare their relationship to the Communist Party (a demand which was reactionary in the first place). In its place it has established an even more authoritarian rule.

In suspending the LYL from campus, the college administration has not attempted to obscure the fact that this is only the beginning of a campaign to suppress all groups critical of U. S. imperialism. Professor Herbert Stroup, chairman of the Faculty-Student Committee on Student Activities, in a statement issued to the college newspaper, proclaimed that "he would ask the FSCSA, at its meeting on October 2, to initiate a full-scale re-examination of the college's policy (toward college groups)..."

He blithely added: "the college's stand will affect other groups as well as the LYL."

### "This Is Not Russia, Dean Maroney"

The reaction of the unorganized student body to administration policy is, in general, good. Students with little or no political sophistication understand the anti-democratic nature of the Maroney action.

Among most organized political campus clubs, however, there is a serious lack of capable leadership. It is to be hoped that the liberal groups—Students for Democratic Action, Young Liberals, Student League for Industrial Democracy—will show what it takes to present and sustain an opposition to administration policy. Moreover, the Sidney Hook version of campus democracy is gaining adherents in liberal ranks and campus; and although Hook's thesis is, as yet, accepted by only a few it will undoubtedly gain more disciples as the world situation becomes more critical.

Chief opposition to the suspension of the LYL comes from the E. V. Debs Society on the campus. The Debs Society, which maintains a Third Camp position on the war, distributed a very effective leaflet on the suspension, two days after the beginning of the semester. The leaflet, entitled "This Is Not Russia, Dean Maroney," pointed out the unprincipled nature of the administration's action in utilizing Stalinist techniques to combat Stalinism.

Presenting the positive view that "students have the right to organize clubs to present their political views, however unpopular these views may be," the Debs Society assumed the leadership in uniting non-Stalinist organizations and students in a coordinating group which will fight the administration's action. This coordinating group hopes to invite a well-known speaker to the college to speak on civil liberties on the national campus in conjunction with a student rally against the suspension.

Although the perspective for revoking the administration policy is not bright, the campaign can still be immensely fruitful in terms of acquainting the student body with the necessary connection between increasing U. S.-Russian imperialist rivalry and the suppression of academic freedom on the college campus.

### NOT IN THE HEADLINES...

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, minority groups, national and world politics—\$2 a year.

LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly Vol. 14, No. 41 October 9, 1950 Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. GENERAL EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES: 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: IRonsides 6-5117. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874. Editor: HAL DRAPER Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

# Reading from Left to Right

HOW THEY PUT OVER THE FRANCO LOAN, by W. V. Shannon and D. Cater (The Reporter, August 29)

The "they" in the title points to Franco's ambassador-at-large in this country, Lequerica, and his right-hand American, Charles P. Clark, organizers of the Franco lobby, and their retinue of trained congressmen. Clark, it seems, decided that the outbreak of the Korean war was Der Tag—the time to strike for the long-prepared aim of opening the Washington money bags to the Spanish fascist dictator. He reckoned right.

Acheson and the State Department had already conceded half the battle. The authors refer to "the vague position of the State Department—a position which provided no bulwark, moral or strategic, against which a senator might brace himself..." Last April, Dean Acheson conceded that economic aid to Spain would not be objectionable... In contrast to the weakness of the State Department's position, the Department of Defense has carried on a purposeful campaign, of its own "in favor of the Franco bill.

This, write Shannon and Cater, was more important than the switches by individual senators, but they report that Franco's man Clark regarded as the "turning point" the pro-Franco-loan

change of heart by Senator Claude Pepper, the "liberal."

Senator Claude Pepper of Florida, who has stood many times in the spotlight at Madison Square Garden to thunder lusty opposition to Franco, voted for the amendment (the Franco loan)... First, as an advocate in the past of a loan to Russia, he felt that he had to be consistent, even though he disliked the Spanish government equally. Second, he felt that the times were now so serious that "we can't afford to be too particular about our friends."

"One prominent Democratic senator, who had opposed aid to Franco in the past, looked up wearily from his desk. This isn't something we're proud of. We don't feel like sending up rockets to tell the people back home. But there isn't much time left and we've fumbled the ball on two counts. We've got no answer to the Communist-inspired Stockholm "Peace" Appeal which is gathering millions of signatures, and we've got no answer to the Russian-trained troops which are ready to sweep across the continent. I had hoped we could wait to get rid of that guy Franco but there simply isn't time."

All of which could be an epitaph on the grave of liberalism.

# WORLD POLITICS

## BRITISH ILP LEADER PRESENTS THE THIRD-CAMP POSITION

The following statement is by the national chairman of England's Independent Labor Party, John McNair, in The Socialist Leader of September 9.

By JOHN MCNAIR

The news which we are receiving every day from the Far East proves that the military operations which are taking place are of the utmost gravity. It is because we are conscious of the tragedy which is now being unrolled before our eyes that we call once again on the workers of Britain to examine the facts as they really are.

The working-class movement of Europe and of the world is, roughly speaking, divided between capitalist America and Stalinist Russia. In this country the majority of the working-class support the United States as being the "lesser evil."

It is a strange tragedy that the European working-class movement has gone through discomfiture defeat time after time during the last generation, precisely because in both the two great wars it supported the "lesser evil."

It is not quite clear that in the two world wars the victory of the "lesser evil" did not lead either to peace or to working-class emancipation? We have seen in our lifetime the growth of the forces of oppression, the frustration of the genuine socialist movement and the development of totalitarianism, and in some cases, of sheer barbarism, which was unknown to our fathers. This has been the historic result of supporting the "lesser evil."

A further point which is worthy of careful consideration is the fact that the world menace of Stalinism received a tremendous impetus as a result of the support for the "lesser evil" which was given during the second world war. The present power of Stalinism has grown out of the Allied victory in the Second World War. We therefore state categorically that the victory of the UN forces headed by the United States will not end capitalism, it will not end imperialist exploitation and it will not bring peace to the world.

### STALINISM'S APPEAL

The natural response of our readers will be that if we are not prepared to support the United States, we must therefore support Stalinist Russia. Nothing could be further from the truth. We consider that Stalinism has resulted in the complete suppression of genuine democracy and freedom, not only in the USSR itself but in all the satellite states dominated by their puppet governments. We know perfectly well that the voice of international, revolutionary socialism has been stifled in these countries.

But we are aware of something else: the tolling millions of the East having suffered from age-long oppression are turning toward Stalinism. This is not because of any inherent virtue of Stalinism, it is due to the fact that Stalinism promises to these tolling millions economic freedom from the shackles of foreign exploitation and from their own feudal lords. The tendency of these millions is therefore to fly from the evils which they know, embracing the promises which are indeed supplemented by acts, which are given to them without realizing what the final result will be.

We therefore say that a military victory of the forces of monopoly capitalism will no more bring peace and happiness to the world now than they did after World Wars No. 1 and No. 2. We

The British Political Scene Is Portrayed Each Week in— THE SOCIALIST LEADER Britain's Foremost Weekly Yearly subscription: \$3.00 Shorter periods pro rata Order from: Socialist Leader 318 Regents Park Road Finchley, London, N.3, England

They Need Your Help! Local New York of the ISL sends food and clothing packages to needy workers in Europe. You can help! Send your aid—especially clothing for school-age children—to the New York ISL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11.

## THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—II

# The Nature of the Yugoslav Elections

By HAL DRAPER

The character of Tito's elections is of a piece with his People's Front (explained last week). The last national election in Yugoslavia took place this past March and offers itself as an example.

Elections in the Stalinist states are fakes as far as democracy is concerned. This is well known but among many ill-informed anti-Stalinists this is understood only in the bourgeois tradition of election-stealing: ballot-stuffing à la Chicago gangsters or Tammany, or falsifying the count, or violation of the secrecy of the ballot at the polls.

Anyone who thinks this is the main reason why Stalinist elections are mockeries does not even begin to understand totalitarianism. In another connection we have already mentioned the comments by Trotsky and Victor Serge on the secret ballot in Russia—and in Hitler Germany, where the secrecy of the ballot was also not formally violated.

The whole point was summed up by Serge: "What remains of the October Revolution if every worker who permits himself to make a demand or express a critical judgment is subject to imprisonment? Oh, after that you can establish as many secret ballots as you please!" All that needs to be added is the Hobson's choice of the one-party list and the ideological and physical terror (the threat is all that is necessary, in ordinary cases) which forms the actual context of the sheep-herding to the polls.

Thus the "democratic ritual" of Stalinist elections becomes the totalitarian plebiscite. As Trotsky put it, discussing Stalinist "Bonapartism":

"As history testifies, Bonapartism gets along admirably with a universal, and even a secret, ballot. The democratic ritual of Bonapartism is the plebiscite. From time to time, the question is presented to the citizens: for or against the leader? And the voter feels the barrel of a revolver between his shoulders." [Revolution Betrayed, p. 278.]

### Plebiscite and Demonstration

The Yugoslav election of last March was openly presented to the people not as an election (except formally) but as a plebiscite. With laudable frankness Tito called it so himself.

In an interview with a group of Paris newspapermen, the marshal declared that "without forcing the truth one could consider these elections as a kind of plebiscite." [Le Figaro, March 28.] Or, as Franc-Tireur quoted him on the same day, "it is indeed a kind of plebiscite, as they were able to interpret it abroad, or at least a referendum."

But this election was not even presented as a plebiscite for or against the regime. Tito had a more sure-fire angle. It was insistently drummed into the people that they had to vote for or against the Cominform. As Djilas put it in his main election address, there was no question of who was going to be elected. As Tito put it at his main election address at Drvar, the people had to state "whether they are for a progressive socialist Yugoslavia or for a dependent country."

As a "democratic election," the show put on in March does not even merit serious consideration. As a plebiscite on pro-Cominformism, the performance could take on some meaning. Insofar as the vote had this meaning, there are few observers who can deny that the overwhelming majority of the Yugoslav people are anti-Cominform, anti-Kremlin—whether that majority is Tito's announced 92 per cent or not. But the utter fatuity of the pro-Titoist socialists is precisely evidenced by their glowing accounts of the affair as an evidence of Titoist democracy, with accounts of the secrecy of the ballot, etc. One can read the same sort of stuff in any fellow traveler's account of elections in Stalinist Europe (cf. Konni Zilliacus' latest book).

But the totalitarian mind does not think in terms of majorities, even majorities in a simon-pure plebiscite such as was staged by the Titoists. It demands a nation which is a monolithic block. Its shibboleth of success is unanimity. Any deviation from unanimity is evidence of hostile class elements, traitors, degenerates and saboteurs, and not of the fact that inevitable differences of opinion exist. In a country which is marching from "socialist triumph" to "socialist triumph," it would be difficult to explain how more than a tiny percentage of such anti-social creatures and bourgeois scum could exist—though it is convenient to have a few around as whippingboys.

There is really nobody to elect on election day, but "it is the duty of the People's Front to bring out to the polls all its members and thereby turn these elections into another demonstration of the unity of the Yugoslav peoples..." (So orated Zvonko Brkic, member of the Politburo of the Croatian CP.) Nobody would dream of citing a demonstration organized by totalitarianism as a "proof of democracy," but if the demonstration takes the form of a ballot-dropping festival, a form adopted by the totalitarianism as a bow to custom, there will be people who will insist on being gulls.

(The word "festival" as applied to the Yugoslav election is not a prejudicial term insinuated by us, but the Yugoslavs' own description of election day and the atmosphere they sought to create around it.)

### Creating the Proper Atmosphere

The totalitarian trappings of the March election included the standard advance pledges of unanimous votes. Like this: "By our unanimous vote for the People's Front candidates, we will show for all the world to see that no power can detach us, now or in the future, from our glorious party or from you, our beloved and dear Comrade Tito." This particular specimen was sent by an "election meeting" of army units in the Sarajevo garrison to the Beloved Leader by telegram two weeks before the vote.

The bureaucracy's propaganda hammers away at what is expected of the voters, with the "—or else" scarcely having to be added: "This impressive number of voters [10 million] will on March 26 show that they are one with the state and party leadership headed by Marshal Tito." And so on.

There is another concrete aspect of the Stalinists' electoral procedure which we have often pointed out as against the Stalinist boast of "free and secret elections." This concerns the way in which the candidates are actually named—which is, of course, not on election day but at the formal nomination meetings. In Russia these nominations, which are actually the only elections of any kind, take place by open vote, held before the watchful eyes of Beria's men. There is no "secret ballot" at this point.

And how is it in Yugoslavia? We should like to see some informa-

tion—who go into such a flurry of detail on the mechanics of the election on this point from our Titoist propagandists or pro-Titoist apologetic Yugoslav vote on election day, how rubber balls are used instead of ballots, how the election officials are careful to see that there is a "no-list" urn as well as a government-list urn, and other such meaningless tripe. If we ask for information, it is because we have seen only one mention of the question in the course of reading a ton of articles, and this mention would seem to indicate that the Yugoslav nominations are held in the Russian manner.

It appears in a pamphlet which is distributed by the Yugoslav Information Center in New York, a report of a group of U. S. professional fellow travelers headed by Prof. Jerome Davis who visited Eastern Europe on a quick trip, in the interests of "peace." The character of this report is sufficiently indicated at the moment by the fact that it gives a glowing whitewash on the state of democracy in every one of the Russian satellites, as well as Yugoslavia. Its section on Yugoslavia mentions in passing: "The People's Front prepares the list of candidates for election to the People's Assembly. Usually a conference is held where a proposed list is read. Sometimes the conference deletes a few names and substitutes others." (My italics.)

### Another "First Step" to Democracy

But if a man works hard at closing his eyes to reality, he can usually succeed in duping himself. Our pro-Titoist socialists even convinced themselves (temporarily, apparently) that the Yugoslav leaders had taken "first steps" toward democratic elections, among other "first steps." The Tito regime threw out a couple of pieces of sucker bait for such fish, but the Fourth International Trotskyists did not bite hard until the "new electoral law" came along last February.

This law provided that an "independent" candidate could stand for the Tito parliament by getting 100 signatures in his constituency to a nomination petition. The Times correspondent in Belgrade, Handler, wrote about "the abolition of the single-list system" and the Cannonite Militant applauded. They were too, too anxious to be hoodwinked, however, and joy was shortlived.

In the first place, on the very face of it, the "right" to run for parliament by convincing 100 brave citizens to sign their names was a right that could be safely exercised in Tito's police state only by a candidate perfectly acceptable to the dictatorship. In fact, one of the reasons given by Kardelj (according to Handler) for the "reform" was the fact that all organized opposition to the regime had disappeared, had been wiped out. There were no opponents of Tito-Stalinism above ground even to dream of taking advantage of the "right."

In the second place, if this new electoral gimmick was to be hailed as a "first step" to democracy, then Yugoslavia's Tito would not have been the only beneficiary. In fact, the Czech Stalinist regime was way ahead of him. In Yugoslavia, as it turned out, no "independent" candidate turned up—not one. And with a regime so earnestly devoted to furthering workers' democracy as Tito's is painted, this could not have been due to fear, could it?

In Czechoslovakia, however, the regime not only passed a law exactly like Tito's but, it seems, it even took on a momentary spark of life. So at least we are told by fellow traveler Zilliacus (now, like so many of his breed, a Tito rooster): "Anyone who could gather a thousand signatures, however, was entitled to stand as an independent candidate. Two attempts were made, one in Prague and one in a small town. In both cases, the candidates were given every facility by the Czech Home Office, including the supply of paper for posters, but were unable to get as many as a thousand signatures." [I Chose Peace, p. 214.]

The whole affair would be a farce if it were not a tragedy. Imagine a Czech or a Yugoslav saving the secret police the trouble of getting up their own list of dissidents by themselves obligingly collecting the names for the Ministry of the Interior!! The premature huzzas of the pro-Titoists for the new electoral law could have come only from types who think a police-state regime is a secondary superstructural characteristic of Stalinism while the important thing is its "nationalization" of economy....

### Kardelj Pulls a Boner

As it turned out, the Tito regime did not go through with the electoral "democratization" even as a façade. According to rumor (in line with my policy of quoting only statements by pro-Titoists, I also pass on only those rumors which are circulated by the pro-Titoists), Rankovich of the UDBA put his foot down in the fear that even a demagogic maneuver might bring complications. As in every bureaucracy, including the Russian, the Club versus the Sop is a constant tactical problem.

Gérard Bloch, assigned by the Fourth Internationalist Trotskyists to do a hack job on our point of view on Titoism in a long article, has nothing to say about all this, in the two embarrassed sentences he devotes to the point. On the electoral democratization, he merely mutters that "Unfortunately Tito has since flatly rejected such a project and this will doubtless provide Draper with another opportunity to denounce totalitarianism at work." Beyond this stupid sally, shame was mute.

It remains to record that, in the first flush of demagogy when the new electoral law was announced, Kardelj let the cat out of the bag. In an article entitled "A New Victory of Socialist Democracy," he wrote:

"There is no doubt that this system better corresponds to our concrete conditions, for it permits the great mass of voters to participate in the designation of the candidates, whereas with the list system, these were in fact decided by a minority of political leaders." [Les Nouvelles Yugoslaves, Feb. 5, My italics.]

Kardelj thought, as he wrote those damning words, that the new law would be available to prove "progress toward workers' democracy." The words are still damning.

(Next week: Is Yugoslavia a Police State?)

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

Only \$2.00 a Year

# Morocco and the Atlantic Pact

## Morocco to France: "We Cannot Be the Ally of Those Who Betrayed Us!"

The important national-resistance movement of Morocco, the Istaqlal Party, which is the leader in the fight against French colonialism, has issued a significant statement flatly repudiating involvement of their country in the North Atlantic Pact or in any alliance with the Western imperialist powers. At one and the same time it is a statement of position, a sketch of the betrayal of promises by French imperialism to Morocco, an exposé of the current police regime imposed by the Paris government, and a documentation of the disillusionment of nationalist hopes in the pledges of the imperialists.

In this period, when so many are announcing that capitalist imperialism has changed its spots, the Moroccan nationalists also retain some illusions about the character of the Second World War in a section of their statement (which is somewhat condensed for publication here), but these illusions, whatever they are, evidently do not extend to their own tasks. "We feel we have been betrayed," they write. "We cannot be the ally of those who have betrayed us," they say in effect.

The statement should be of great interest to socialists as an earnest of the elements out of which a Third Camp against imperialist war will arise.—Ed.

### DECLARATION ON THE ATLANTIC PACT

The Western powers are concerned with including North Africa in the plans for the common defense of the states of the Atlantic Alliance.

In France the Inter-Ministerial Conference held on August 12, 1950 has laid down the conditions under which North Africa would be called to take part in the system of Atlantic defense.

It is clear that the decisions made by the Inter-Ministerial Conference on North Africa have great importance under existing international conditions.

Firstly, and insofar as our country is concerned, these decisions constitute a violation of the international treaties which guarantee Moroccan sovereignty. In fact, the French government has no juridical right to involve Morocco in any coalition without its consent.

The Istaqlal Party has pointed this out many times, and particularly in its note of February 27, 1949, at the time of the negotiations on the Atlantic Pact.

But the essential point, in the present world situation, is a basic problem.

The Moroccan people, who are conducting a bitter struggle against French colonialism, ask themselves to what extent they have benefited from the ideals of liberty and democracy for which they were called to fight in the last two wars.

### After World War I

When the First World War broke out, Morocco was still in the first years of a regime imposed by France under special international circumstances. At the appeal of H. M. Mouley Youssef, Moroccan divisions unreservedly made their contribution to the offensive in Belgium, on the Marne, on the Somme and at Verdun.

In the eyes of the Moroccans, this participation had one meaning: the fraternity in arms had to be translated after the war into a fruitful cooperation based on respect for the sovereignty and institutions of Morocco.

But at the close of hostilities the French authorities of the Protectorate behaved like veritable conquerors toward the Moroccan people. Morocco was not an allied and friendly country but a conquered territory.

Thus the Moroccan government saw itself progressively and methodically stripped of all its prerogatives. A French administration replaced it on all levels, and exercised the power directly, thumbing its nose at the treaties.

The conquest of the land was from the beginning the dominant concern of the French Pro-

tectorate administration. In a few years, more than a million hectares, including the most fertile sections, were grabbed from the Moroccan peasants in different ways and given to some thousands of French colonists.

The Protectorate administration also set itself the task of undermining the moral unity of the country, politically and administratively as well as culturally and judicially. This anti-nationalist job had the aim of artificially splitting into two antagonistic blocs a national community which history, culture and the Mohammedan religion had always united.

The Moroccan people were not slow to understand that the Protectorate regime not only systematically hampered their development but was despoiling the country, at the same time that it ensured almost total control over the country's wealth to the French colony.

While half the country still opposed the French occupation in the South and in the Atlas mountains in an armed resistance which ended only in 1936, the other regions organized to free themselves from the Protectorate's yoke, by different means.

The Rif war, led by the national hero Abdel-Krim, constituted the first act of revolt against French-Spanish oppression.

In 1930 the reaction of the Moroccan people took the form of an organized political movement. The Moroccan Committee of Action set itself the task of denouncing the abuses of the regime to French public opinion. In 1934 this committee performed constructive work and presented the sultan and the French government with a Plan of Reform which proposed to lead Morocco, with the aid of France, toward taking care of its own affairs.

The French administration responded with a series of repressions, imprisonment, jailing of patriots in forced-labor camps, deportation of the principal Moroccan leaders to the Sahara and Equatorial Africa. Some of them were kept in exile for nine years.

But the Moroccan nation had already become certain, after a 20-year experience, that the solution of the Moroccan problem lay in the abrogation of the Protectorate treaty.

### World War II: Ally Betrayed

However, the outbreak of the Second World War, considered as a final defense of liberty and democracy, was to quiet all reverberations of the French policy and lead the whole country to cooperate without reservation in the war effort.

"From this day on," proclaimed Sultan Mohammed V on September 3, 1939, "and until the banner of France and its allies is crowned with glory, we must support it without reserve, without bargaining for the use of our resources and without recoiling from any sacrifice."

Morocco did not abandon this attitude, even after the military reverses in France in 1940.

After the landing of the Allied forces in 1942, our country put its material, human and strategic resources at their disposal. It furnished numerous contingents who contributed to the liberation of Tunisia, Corsica, Italy and France.

The war effort of the Moroccan nation found its justification in that nation's conviction that the Second World War was a war for the liberation of all peoples without exception those who were under colonial domination. The Allies had made that solemn promise in the Atlantic Charter.

It was under such circumstances that the Istaqlal Party, on January 2, 1944, issued a manifesto which pointed to the bankruptcy of the Protectorate regime and proclaimed Morocco's right to independence with territorial integrity.

People's delegations came from every section of Morocco to present their petitions on this occasion to the sultan, testifying to the will of the Moroccan people to take back their liberty and independence.

Read

The NEW INTERNATIONAL

The Protectorate authorities reacted by proceeding to the arrest of the political leaders, including the secretary of the Istaqlal Party; they unloosed the bloodiest repression that Morocco had ever known. Scores of Moroccans were massacred; hundreds were imprisoned, tortured or deported.

During this time the Brazzaville conference made clear that its "reforms" or "new orientation" for French colonial policy eliminated any hope, even any distant hope, for autonomy or self-government.

But our party did not despair of convincing French opinion that cooperation between our two countries did not imply French domination over Morocco. With this aim, on January 2, 1946, it addressed an appeal to the French people. A few months later it sent a delegation to Paris.

But the French government did not decide to make a gesture of understanding. Instead of choosing the road of conciliation, it preferred to maintain and impose its own rule. Instructions to this effect were given to the new French representative in Morocco, General Juin.

### Comparable to Fascism

Since May 1947, the French Protectorate authorities have not stopped strengthening their system of oppression and exploitation to such a point that the police-dictatorship regime which rules the whole country is becoming comparable to the fascist dictatorships in its methods.

At the present time this regime is characterized by the following:

- Direct administration [by the French] which more and more is taking over whatever remains of the French administration on Moroccan sovereignty is creating a state of tension between the *Résidence Générale* and the *Makhzen*.
- The prohibition of exercising the most elementary rights of man by any Moroccan—neither freedom of assembly, freedom of movement, nor trade-union liberty.
- Freedom of expression is notably non-existent as a result of the advance censorship instituted in 1939 and still maintained today. There is no guarantee of individual liberty because of the absence of a penal code and criminal laws.
- The renewal in diverse ways of the policy of expropriation for the benefit of French colonists.
- Tightening of the apparatus of repression: increase in the French police force; institution of "city delegations" and "area controls" which are new networks for police surveillance.
- Persecution and provocation of Moroccan patriots.
- Contempt for the political and social aspirations of the Moroccan people and the policy of giving first priority to the interests of the French colony.

### We Are Not Bound!

It is in such political, economic and social conditions, under such a regime, that the French government intends to keep the Moroccan people "to maintain order and stability." And it is in such a climate of tension that it is proposed to integrate Morocco into the plan of common defense of the states of the Atlantic Alliance.

The Moroccan nation has already fought two wars at the side of France and the Allies. Today, six years after the liberation of France, it feels deeply that its faith and confidence has been betrayed.

Under these conditions, the Istaqlal Party, certain that it is interpreting the feeling of the Moroccan people on the decisions of the Inter-Ministerial Conference to include Morocco in the defense system of the Atlantic Alliance and to maintain the political status quo in North Africa:

- (1) Points out again that the Moroccan people do not consider themselves bound by any obligation underwritten by the French government in its name;
- (2) Reaffirms that the Moroccan people, faithful to the Manifesto of January 2, 1944, has the major and prior concern of its own liberty and independence;

(Continued bottom of next page)

# Mirror of Stalin's Parliament --

(Continued from page 1)

the western regions of the Ukraine, only 10 per cent of the voters cast their ballots for the Stalin list; the election was almost totally boycotted by the population after the propaganda actions of the Ukrainian revolutionary underground movement took place. We have not yet received any information on the results of the election-boycott propaganda of the Ukrainian People's Army (UPA) in March 1950, because of the difficulty of making connections through the Iron Curtain.

This is only one example of the "truth" to be found in Pravda [which means "truth" in Russian—Ed.].

But one can find true statements in Pravda too. And that is just what we are interested in.

In Pravda for March 15 there were published the lists of all the newly elected deputies to the Stalinist parliament. There are 1316 persons altogether. There are 678 deputies in the Council of the Union and 638 in the Council of Nationalities. Pravda presents a short biography of each of them, and from these we can determine the social and national status of all the deputies—that is, we can answer the question: *Whom does the Kremlin's mirror see in the Hall of Power today?*

The picture which results from an analysis of the deputy lists is given in the accompanying box on page 1.

To make the picture clearer, it must be said that deputies to the Supreme Council are selected only from "the best of the best," only the cream of Stalinist society. There is no one who is not an order-bearer, no worker who is not a Stakhanovist, who has not been promoted up from the ranks. This is the real meaning of the categories "ordinary workers" and "ordinary farmers" given in our list, since Pravda says nothing more about their social position.

But even if these categories, as well as the "brigades," are assigned to the working class, the result is the following damning picture of the social composition of the Stalinist parliament: the class of 190 million Russian toilers is represented by 182 deputies or 13.9 per cent, and the class of 8 million Stalinist magnates is represented by 1,134 deputies or 86.1 per cent!

Therefore the conclusion imposes itself: Stalin's parliament is the class parliament which represents the interests of the upper class of Russian society only.

Is there any essential difference between that parliament and the bourgeois parliaments, or the state Duma of czarist Russia, the Congress of the United States, or the Cortes of fascist Spain? . . . An interesting picture results also from an analysis of the Council of Nationalities in the Stalinist parliament. As is known, the USSR is inhabited by 182 nationalities; sixteen of them have their own "independent" republics in the union [SSRs "federated" to form the USSR]. In addition, there are several autonomous republics and regions. The second house of parliament, the Council of Nationalities, presumably exists to represent their interests. It is elected on the basis of parity: every SSR (republic) sends 25 deputies, every autonomous republic 11, every region 5. But from an analysis by nationality of the deputies from the non-Russian republics, the following picture emerges.

### RUSSIAN WATCHDOGS

Among the 25 deputies from each republic, 20 per cent are of Russian nationality. For instance: 5 Russians from the Ukrainian SSR; 4 Russians from the Uzbek SSR; 5 from the Kazakh SSR; 5 from the Lithuanian SSR; 6 from the Latvian SSR; 5 from the Tadjik SSR; 6 from the Kirghiz SSR; etc.

Does this mean that 20 per cent of the population in these republics are already Russians? Then the conclusion must be that there has been a swift tempo in the process of colonization of non-Russian areas of the country by the "superior nation of all the other nations of the USSR" (Stalin)—that is, by Russians.

Who are these Russians who represent the non-Russian nationalities in the parliament? Take the example of the Tadjik SSR. Its deputies to the Council of Nationalities include:

- (1) D. K. VISHNEVSKY, Russian, minister of state security (MGB) of Tadjikistan;
- (2) N. P. PARAMONOV, Russian, secretary of the Kurgan-Tubinsk committee of the Communist

## Morocco —

(Continued from page 6)

(3) Is firmly convinced that strategic considerations must not come before political considerations. Strategic considerations in a given country are also determined by its political, social and economic status.

(4) Declares that the Moroccan people can never consider themselves the ally of those who scorn their right to liberty and independence.

For the General Secretariat of the Istaqlal Party  
Mohammed LYAZIDI

Rabat, Sept. 2, 1950



## Readers Take the Floor . . .

### From England: On Titoism and Pro-Titoism

To the Editor:

I feel that LABOR ACTION's stand on the Tito question has been fundamentally correct. While at the same time quoting the Yugoslav government at great length, you analyze it critically from a socialist point of view. I do not believe, as you do not, that the nature of a Stalinist regime can change overnight.

The Trotskyist reply to one's socialist criticism is that UNLESS we cooperate with Tito he will go into the camp of the capitalists—but by cooperating with us, he is to some extent committing himself to a Marxist (Trotskyist) policy. They also point out that his isolation may force him to adopt socialist measures.

The unhappy truth is, however, that unofficially they have fallen for Tito's government "hook, line and sinker" and he is using them as a free international propaganda organization. Officially, in fact, as we all know, he is having nothing to do with any left-wing democratic organizations, as he is afraid their democracy may contaminate him.

### SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER!

Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

The Permanent Revolution .....	\$3.50
The New Course .....	1.50
Marxism in the U. S. ....	.35
The Lesson of Spain .....	.25
Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay .....	.25
Fascism, What It Is, How to Fight It .....	.15

ALL FOR ONLY \$5.00

Labor Action Book Service  
4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

However, I see no harm in sending "brigades" to Yugoslavia. There never has been any loss in people seeing for themselves. I think that intelligent Marxists should see for themselves.

David ALEXANDER  
London, Sept. 29

We agree with Comrade Alexander that the idea of going to Yugoslavia to "see for oneself" is not only unobjectionable but in itself a good thing. Any comments that would have to be made about the "youth brigades" and the actual propaganda around them would not impugn this point.—Ed.

### ILP Line

To the Editor:

I should like to express my appreciation for the many articles of interest and merit in your excellent paper.

However, I wish to draw your attention to a passage which I feel may lead to misunderstanding. In your issue of August 28, in the article "How the Titoists Defend Totalitarianism," Comrade Hal Draper quotes Will Ballantine writing, as he says, "in the British ILPs Socialist Leader."

"Although Ballantine's remarks appeared in the Socialist Leader, they do not (as readers might be misled into supposing) represent the views of the Independent Labor Party."

I would draw the attention of our American comrades to the following reply to Anarchist criticism of the publication of the articles supporting Tito:

"We do not deny the right of the writer of the 'Freedom' [organ of British Anarchism] article to disapprove of what Ballantine said about Yugoslavia, but we object to his assumption that because we published Ballantine's articles we necessarily agreed with the viewpoint expressed in them. We are not

afraid of free expression, free publication and free discussion." Let not our American friends think that all ILP members have been induced to support Tito's totalitarian regime.

E. G. DAVIES  
Norwich, England, Sept. 19

We can add that in its July 15 issue, the Socialist Leader even more specifically dissociated itself from the views of Comrade Ballantine, in its editor's column "As a Socialist See It." There we read that "it can be said here and now that the editor of the Socialist Leader does not in any way share his [Ballantine's] belief that Yugoslavia is a socialist state," and that "insofar that many of the trappings of Stalinism are evident in Titoism, we do not share any of the current enthusiasm for the latter regime. Tito not only accepts most of the Stalinist version of Marxism, he is apparently an apt pupil of the Soviet regime insofar as it is alleged the jails of Yugoslavia are full of political dissidents. Furthermore it is fairly obvious that the two main features of socialism—freedom and democracy—would be as disastrous to Tito as they would be to Stalin."

In quoting Ballantine, and giving the source of the quotation, I certainly had no intention, of course, of ascribing his views to the ILP. I agree with the editor of the Socialist Leader that he should publish such views as Comrade Ballantine's. LABOR ACTION invites the presentation of such views in its own columns, for discussion, and we have indeed published one such dissenting contribution, the only one received. In our case, in printing such discussion articles, it is our policy to make clear at the same time that they do not represent the views of the paper, in order to avoid the kind of ambiguity which, I gather, arose from the original publication without comment of Ballantine's article in the S. L.

Hal DRAPER

# Washington's Plan for Korea --

(Continued from page 1)

of U. S. combat troops are now to be found.

If Truman and Acheson are reluctant to send American troops across the 38th parallel—and reluctant they undoubtedly are—it is, above all if not entirely, due to the extent to which they recognize that while they have won the first stage of the war in Korea from a military standpoint, they have lost it to Stalin from a political standpoint. Not only in the long run, but right now, the political victory counts for more than the purely military victory, and nowhere is this truer than in Asia. Messrs. Truman, Acheson and Austin want to use the second stage of the war to recoup their political defeat.

The precipitation of the war in Korea may not have endeared Stalinism to the Korean masses; it may have lost the Russians and their tools the support and sympathy of many. But the United States has not gained anything the Russians may have lost. The indescribable destruction of life and wealth in this brief but murderous war, which has devastated the country to the point where General Stratemeyer can announce the end of "strategic bombing," has not brought Washington the blessings of the Korean people. Not even the best American photographer on the scene possesses a camera that has pictured throngs of Koreans cheering the appearance of American or South Korean troops, because the lens has yet to be ground which will take a picture of what is not there. The sight of Rhee, so widely hated by all Koreans, riding back to power on American guns, is only calculated to cool off any relief the people may feel at escaping the yoke of the Stalinist police state.

In the rest of Asia, much the same story can be told. If Stalin has gained little or no support from the masses of that continent as a result of the Korean war, there is no evidence that he has lost any, either. Nevertheless he has gained, if only in the sense that the United States keeps losing ground—what little it had to lose—which means that Stalinist position is relatively stronger.

## The Wedge Is In

American imperialism cannot rid itself of the heritage of distrust and opposition which is so justifiably associated with its name among the Asiatic masses. Its unrelaxed patronage of Rhee, who is detested as a murderous reactionary all over Asia and not in Korea alone, has only deepened this distrust and opposition. Its resumption of patronage over Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, and over the French assassins of the Indo-Chinese people, has only deepened these sentiments still further.

As a result of the first stage of the war, therefore, the Stalinist forces and their standing among the Asiatic peoples remains substantially intact and cohesive. What is more, they appear to have fixed the main responsibility for the destruction of Korea upon the United States, and they have certainly succeeded in driving a wedge between the United States and Great Britain, at least on the Chinese question, and a far deeper and more significant

wedge between the United States and Nehru—and what is much more important—the Indian people as a whole.

Washington is aware of this perturbing fact, if not fully then at least more than ever before. The glistening statesmen who edit the social-democratic *New Leader* either are not aware of the problem at all or are not interested. With that political acumen which distinguishes them from normal (that is, unhysterical) people, they propose, currently, that "MacArthur should be instructed to occupy, as soon as possible, all territory north of the 38th parallel," and demand the maintenance of "U. S. and other UN forces on the Korean peninsula, in their present strength, until the Koreans are strong enough to resist new aggression. Simultaneously, the U. S. might declare that it has no territorial or military designs in Korea."

Washington statesmen are, notoriously, not very intelligent, but then, as has so often been proved, it is not necessary to be intelligent in order to be wiser than the editors of the *New Leader*. A few blows on the head are all that is needed for that, and Washington has felt them. Hence, the new line for the new stage. Hence, the new Korean proposals of Austin in the United Nations.

## Another Election under Rhee?

In the hope of changing the deep conviction in Asia that the United States is following an imperialist policy—which it is following—Washington, hoping that all of Korea can be taken by the South Korean troops alone, is ready to hold the American troops below the 38th parallel. And for the United Nations Commission that is to supervise the elections if and when Rhee conquers North Korea, Washington is prepared to propose non-American members exclusively, mainly representatives of Asian countries. In this way, it hopes, some of the stain will wash off its reputation in the East, and it can begin to catch up with and outstrip Russia in the race for what counts so decisively—political position, political sympathy and support from the masses.

Such is the plan and such is the hope. Whether it can be realized is another story. If Acheson were twice as ingenious as he is, he would not be able to wash spots off a leopard, for they are in the nature of the animal.

Washington's difficulty lies in the fact that in Korea (and in so many other lands), it has *nobody* to rely upon except the Rhee and all they stand for. It cannot—neither bluntly nor delicately—dump this monster of a Rhee out of the window, if only because it would show that its armed intervention to maintain him in power was a barefaced fraud from the beginning. Besides, who would replace Rhee in the political vacuum which Rhee and Washington have created in Korea?

But everyone, above all everyone in Asia, knows that if Rhee conquers the whole country, any election that would follow would be a criminal outrage. Everything in Rhee's record as ruler of South Korea—everything without exception—indicates that where Rhee wins, his armed gangsters, uniformed and un-uniformed, will drive out of

the country every Stalinist, real or suspected, and every genuine democratic opponent, whom they do not assassinate in the street or in his home. An election under such conditions, supervised from abroad or not, will deserve the name to just about the same degree as a Stalinist election.

This is known to every prospective election supervisor who knows Rhee, *what* he stands for and *whom* he stands for. We leave entirely aside the fact that an election is proposed, after Rhee's victory, *only* for North Korea and not for the country as a whole. We leave it aside because it will change nothing fundamentally about the anti-democratic nature of such an election, and because the one that Austin proposes for the country as a whole is to occur only after Rhee has had an opportunity to consolidate his infamous old police regime firmly over the entire nation.

## Impossible Task

This is an additional reason why Washington shies away from proposing that it control the election, or participate significantly in the UN commission which it asks be designated for that purpose. It wants to escape the further odium that would attach to its name in Asia and elsewhere. Its clever statesmen think, however, that if the election is supervised by others, especially if the others are representatives of anti-imperialist or non-imperialist states that have recently fought their way to national sovereignty, like India, that will cover up the Rhee dictatorship and lift the odium attached to its establishment and reinforcement.

That, we are convinced, is where Washington will come a cropper again. The plan is too transparent. There is no likelihood that Nehru's government will cover Rhee with the protective cloak of the good name which India enjoys among all the people of Asia. And if India does not figure prominently in the Supervisory Commission so ingeniously dreamed up by Acheson, the commission won't be worth, to the United States, the paper on which it is appointed.

The brighter the schemes which Acheson conceives for American foreign policy, the surer their doom. He has an impossible task, whether his adversaries or his admirers (including the editors of the *New Leader*) understand that or not. He must present the United States to the peoples of the world, especially of Asia, as a patron and crusader for democracy and popular well-being. Try as he will, he cannot get any additions, let alone any replacements, for those who continue to stand out prominently as the firmest associates and beneficiaries of the American crusade: the Adenauers, the Churchills, the De Gasperis, the Pope, Chiang Kai-shek, Bao Dai, Syngman Rhee, Quirino, Franco, and their like everywhere.

For all the hatred that people feel toward Stalinism, and it is profound and extensive, for all the suspicion and uneasiness felt toward it even by those who sympathize with it to a degree or another—they see in American imperialism no magnetic alternative, no alternative that will resolve the burning social problems which afflict the masses everywhere. Korea is the latest proof of this. More will come.

## "THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of Modern Russia

by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

## MURDER IN MEXICO

### The Assassination of Leon Trotsky

by General Sanchez Salazar  
in collaboration with Julian Gorkin

The story of the assassination of Trotsky written by the ex-Chief of the Secret Service of the Mexican police who was in charge of the investigation.

235 pages \$2.50

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.  
(Orders must be accompanied by payment)

# Liberal Party --

(Continued from page 1)

voters in New York State to vote for Democratic candidates for the minor posts? Will not many a voter conclude: If this Democratic Party is okayed by the Liberals for the major offices, it's the party for me right down the line, and there's no use my fooling around by voting for them on the Liberal line.

Thus, in this election again, the Liberal Party has lost another opportunity to place its independent candidates before the labor and liberal forces of New York. It seeks to corral these elements behind the Democrats, and limits its own role to that of handmaiden and servitor of the Democrats.

In the 1950 elections the Liberal Party reflects all of the backwardness and primitiveness of the labor movement in its groping efforts to function in some effective way on the political field. The very existence of the party means that at least some section of the labor leadership in New York (the ILG and the Hatters plus other unions) finds itself impelled to break with the policy of straight support to the old parties. But they are still tied with a thousand cords to the Democrats, and hence utilize the Liberal Party as the electoral apparatus of their unions to enter into relations with the old-line parties.

## FIGHT OVER KLEIN

Despite its trade-union base the Liberal Party is not a labor party mobilizing workers for genuine independent political action. At best it can be described as a distorted tendency which

may, given a rising tide for a labor party, be pushed into that development.

Within its ranks are elements which more or less consciously push for the party to run independent candidates. It is this healthy sentiment which LABOR ACTION looked to when it urged the Liberals to put up their own candidate for Mayor in 1949:

Within the County Committee, for example, the hottest fight developed over the question of supporting Congressman Arthur Klein (Democrat) from the Lower East Side of New York, as against running an ILG trade-union leader, Raymond Orsini. Klein was endorsed, but only after all the big wheels of the party had been rolled out to subdue the opposition. The vote of the committee, which consists of the local club leaders, was 18 to 13, with 8 abstentions, and there was some interesting speculation on what the vote would have been in a secret ballot.

This sentiment for independent candidates helps to push the party onto the right road. It boiled over at the state convention in the rebellion against endorsement of the Democrat Lynch, and repeated itself in the selection of local club candidates. The Democratic boss of the Bronx, Edward Flynn, has refused to allow his candidates to accept Liberal endorsement, and thus the Liberals are forced to run their own candidates for most posts in that borough. A similar situation prevails in other sections too.

These candidates, running on the Liberal line only, play no important part either in the elec-

tion or in the general tenor of the Liberal campaign; but, with no illusion about their role, or the reasons why they are running independently, we believe that they should get the vote of our readers as an earnest of the direction which should be pressed on the party by its supporters.

During the coming week, October 9 to 14, New York voters must register in order to vote in the November elections. By registering in the Liberal Party, workers can play a part in pushing the Liberal Party onto the labor party road. Such registration enables the voter to have a voice in inner-party developments, without committing him to support of the pro-Democratic line of the party. LABOR ACTION urges its New York readers to register Liberal Party, and to do their share in impelling the party to real independent political action.

## IF YOU ARE—

- For socialist democracy
- Against Stalinism
- Against capitalism

## YOU BELONG WITH THE INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

Write to the ISL  
4 Court Square  
Long Island City 1, N. Y.