

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 6, 1950

FIVE CENTS

GENERAL TARAS CHUPRINKA

Commander of Ukraine Underground Killed in Battle with Stalin's Troops

By V. FELIX

WEST GERMANY, October — Couriers who have recently arrived here from the Ukraine have brought official confirmation by the underground Ukrainian Liberation Council of the death of Lieutenant General Taras Chuprinka, the military leader of the Ukrainian resistance movement in Russia.

The partisan leader was killed in battle with Russian police forces on March 5, in Bilohorshka, near Lvov. He had been the general secretary of the Ukrainian Liberation Council and commander in chief of the Ukrainian People's Army (UPA).

Latest advices indicate that the work of the UPA is going on as before, despite the loss of the man who had been the organizer and leader of the widespread underground movement which fights the Stalinist regime behind the Iron Curtain for the independence of the Ukraine and the other peoples oppressed by Moscow, for the revolutionary overthrow of the Stalinist dictatorship in those countries and for the construction of a classless democratic society based on the socialization of industry and workers' control of production.

General Chuprinka was commander in chief of the UPA from the very beginning of its organization. During 1942 to 1944, he led the fight against the Nazi-German invaders of the Ukraine. Later in 1944, when the Russian army reoccupied the country, he skillfully reorganized the underground network to function under new conditions.

Up to then, for over a score of years of its existence, the terrorist police regime of Stalin, unprecedented in the history of the world, had met no organized resistance of the masses inside Russia and had always successfully destroyed even the embryonic beginnings of such resistance. The organizational skill of General Chuprinka and the heroism of his comrades has now forever destroyed the myth of the omnipotence of the Kremlin's secret police (MVD and MGB, or GPU). The underground organization was successfully built, and continues to exist and fight today despite the death of its chief, with eight years of experience behind it in the practical work of carrying on such a struggle. The creation of this organization is the main contribution of Taras Chuprinka, a great revolutionist.

General Chuprinka—his real name was Roman Shukhevich—was only 43 years old at his death. The whole of his life was devoted to the revolution—and sacrificed to it. The Stalinists have long hunted him.

The GPU liquidated his whole family. His father died en route to banishment in Siberia. His mother was sentenced to ten years imprisonment in a concentration camp. So was his wife. His elder brother and sister, who were in the resistance movement, were murdered.

His son, 16 years old, was kidnaped and sent to a special institution for homeless children for "re-education." When he escaped and was recaptured, his police "educators" caused the name of his father and his prison number to be tattooed on his hands, in order to avoid another successful attempt. General Chuprinka's daughter was also kidnaped and consigned to a "party magnate" in Russia, for "re-education" too. Her fate is unknown.

The soldiers of the UPA and the members of the movement have always kept faith with their leader and commander. One little episode from the year 1947 will illustrate that.

Chuprinka, together with a small unit of UPA men, had been suddenly surprised and surrounded by a police detachment while in an underground bunker. There was no way of escape for them. One of the UPA soldiers went out toward the Russians and announced to them that he was General Chuprinka. This was the fond prize they were hunting for; they ran to get him.

But as soon as they came near, the soldier opened up against them with a machine gun. It was a short fight; he succeeded in dispersing them before being killed; but it was enough to save the life of the commander. More than one such episode took place.

Now Stalin's police have finally succeeded in killing General Chuprinka and are no doubt secretly gloating—secretly, because their press and radio never dares to mention the existence of the underground. But in spite of that, everyone in the resistance as well as among the people knows that the ideas of the new Liberation Revolution, for which Taras Chuprinka gave his life, cannot be killed by the rotten regime and its police forces, and that its ideas will triumph in final victory.

"THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV":

Victor Serge Tops the Field

... page 7

Johnson and the SWP:
The End of an Experience

... page 6

At a CP Meeting in Paris

... page 3

Contrast with Korea: UN Mum On Tibet Invasion

By ABEL BAKER

The invasion of Tibet by the Chinese Stalinist government has been confirmed by India's representative in Lhasa, though much information about the attack may not be known for weeks because of the remoteness of that country and its primitive communications. Chinese Stalinism has undoubtedly launched its military campaign to bring this last "Chinese" area on the continent of Asia under its rule.

It is interesting to contrast the response to this flagrant violation of Tibet's independence, this overt and blatant aggression against a peaceful people, with the response to the invasion of Korea. Apparently this time there is no one to call the UN Security Council into session on several hours' notice to order a cease-fire. Acheson has not yet delivered any decisive policy speeches, nor has Truman ordered that the U. S. army be made available for immediate reinforcement of the troops of the Dalai Lama. Nor is it likely that any great stir will be raised in the UN or Washington or any other Western capital.

The reason for the West's tranquility in the face of this particular extension of Stalinism is only too evident. No Western power has any strategic interest in the trans-Himalayan tableland or its three million nomads. Tibet is not a test of political or military strength for either of the two world giants. After all, the maximum popular knowledge and interest in this country was achieved with the James Hilton novel and movie about Shangri-la ("Lost Horizon").

And in spite of the pretext of the Mao Tse-tung government that Tibet is coming under control of Wall Street, it is reliably reported that the most energetic American in Lhasa is a radio amateur who has set up radio communication from the Tibetan capital to some of the frontier mountain cities of India.

STALINISTS HAVE NO VALID CLAIM TO TIBET

That the U. S. and Russia do not meet in a tug of war over the body of Tibet is a fortuitous circumstance which does not obviate the reality of this latest extension of Stalinism by military means. It is no less aggression and no less a catastrophe for the national independence of the Tibetans. It is simply less expedient for the great powers and therefore it is of no interest to them that this particular nation comes under the Iron Heel.

Certainly the Chinese claim to Tibet is infinitely more tenuous than its claim to Formosa, which the U. S. Seventh Fleet is protecting with its guns, or than the claim of Kim Il Sung to all Korea. Tibet is clearly non-Chinese.

Its people are ethnically indigenous to their own areas, so far as anyone knows with certainty. The language is distinct from Chinese, as is its culture and tradition. Tibet has a long history of independence; on several occasions during the long centuries of Chinese continental expansion, it has successfully repulsed various

(Turn to last page)

CP'ers Expulsion Confronts UAW with Witchhunt Issue

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Oct. 30—The top leadership of the United Auto Workers (UAW) has squarely before it the crucial question of civil rights and union rights of Stalinists in a manner which makes evasion rather difficult if not impossible.

Flint Buick Local 599, at a membership meeting attended by 500, voted by more than two-thirds majority to expel Barry Blassingame, for alleged "Communist activities," according to Clifford Rock, local president.

It is the first case on record in the UAW-CIO where a local union member has been expelled on those charges. Blassingame may appeal the decision to the international union executive board, and then to the convention which is scheduled for April 1951.

Meanwhile, the question of Blassingame's employment at Buick is also an acute problem, for the UAW has a union-shop agreement at General Motors. This particular case is of special importance because it involves so clearly every issue of civil rights and union rights.

This individual was the man run out of the plant, fired by the com-

pany and then reinstated at the insistence of the UAW leadership which directed the local union to file a grievance, and also told the membership that if the man was guilty of any charges, they should be filed under UAW procedure and that a trial be held.

According to the local union president, the following three charges were made and were proved to the satisfaction of a seven-man trial board:

(1) "His actions . . . in making statements in regard to United States participation in the Korean war precipitating a disturbance in which he was expelled from the plant on August 4."

(2) "That he is an active Com-

munist and that alone is sufficient to prove conduct unbecoming a union member."

(3) "That over a long period of time he passed out Communist literature in the plant, including the Daily Worker."

Unless there are other charges, which we doubt, Blassingame clearly is being expelled for his beliefs. No charges that he violated union rules or decisions of a fundamental character are made against him. His case is based on his political ideas, which are Stalinist.

The provision of the union constitution under which his trial was held is a vague clause, "conduct unbecoming a union mem-

ber," which may be interpreted any way by any regime. Suppose, for example, that a UAW member in Ohio joined a "Re-elect Taft Committee." Would he be expelled? Many UAW members would answer yes!

Any breakdowns on the three charges listed against Blassingame show how anti-civil-liberties they are, how unjustifiable they are in terms of any real concept of union democracy.

He did not participate in the wildest strike against himself. He did not break the sacred GM contract. (The misled workers who succumbed to a chauvinistic fervor in August were "guilty"

(Continued on page 3)

Ohio and Philly: Labor Tails the Democrats

"Beat Taft"— But with Whom?

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND, Oct. 29—The Taft-Ferguson battle for Ohio's U. S. senator should properly be labeled "the fight to unseat Taft." The senator from Ohio has been built up as "Mr. Republican" all over the country, and certainly to millions of working people he typifies reaction. His sponsorship of the Taft-Hartley Act, his record of voting, and his many speeches, all single him out for everything that the working class is against.

This election appeared to be an excellent opportunity for the labor movement to unite its forces and present the electorate with a real labor alternative to "Mr. Reaction." The unions succeeded in joining forces. The United Labor League of Ohio was formed, consisting of the CIO's Political Action Committee, the AFL's League for Political Education, the United Mine Workers District 6, and the railroad brotherhoods.

It was in the selection of a candidate that the labor forces failed to meet the challenge. They had no candidate of their own, and agreed in advance to back the winner of the Democratic primary nominations.

In this manner they were presented with Joe Ferguson, state auditor and machine politician unknown for any qualifications other than absolute loyalty to the Democratic Party machine, Ohio's counterpart to Tammany Hall and its brothers in every part of the country.

A good way to gauge the "labor side" of the campaign is to take a look at the piece of election literature which has gained most fame. It is a comic-book style pamphlet called "The Taft Story" and is issued by the United Labor League, sixteen pages long. The first 10 pages attack Taft on his record, hitting him for his stand on housing, taxes, war preparation, isolationism, veterans, rent and price control, etc. The last six pages plug Ferguson.

It is interesting to note that the United Labor League failed to make an endorsement for governor, rejecting Democrat Lausche and Republican Ebricht. For PAC this is the second consecutive election in which they have had no candidate for governor. How many times more does this have to happen before they decide to run an independent candidate of their own?

It is interesting to note that the United Labor League failed to make an endorsement for governor, rejecting Democrat Lausche and Republican Ebricht. For PAC this is the second consecutive election in which they have had no candidate for governor. How many times more does this have to happen before they decide to run an independent candidate of their own?

Washington U. Chancellor Moves Down The U. C. Road with Proposed Purge

By JAMES JAIRUS

ST. LOUIS, Oct. 24—Today in Student Life, the student newspaper at Washington University, Chancellor Compton announced the beginning of a witch-hunt at the university. In wielding the red herding the Chancellor promised the student body that "WU abhors Communism . . . (but) the communist probe will not be a witch-hunt or a purge." Past actions of the administrators leave no doubt in the minds of the progressive students on campus that the "probe" will indeed be nothing but the vilest sort of witchhunt AND purge.

The alleged reason for beginning this campaign now is that WU was mentioned in passing in an article in this week's Saturday Evening Post (Oct. 21) entitled "UCLA's Red Cell: Case History of College Communism." In this article, probably the most naive analysis of Stalinism on American campuses ever published, the only mention

Available: BOUND VOLUMES of Labor Action 1945 to 1948 \$3.00 a volume Order from: Labor Action Book Service 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

This is all they can find to say for their candidate: he came from a poor family, worked for a living, went to school, got a civil-service job, and ran for office five times before making state auditor. Since 1936 he has held that job. Also he has a wife and 8 children. Further, since winning the nomination (and since the unions have helped in writing his speeches) he has been for anything that labor or anyone else wants.

That about tells the Ferguson story. He has one asset and no more: he is running against Taft. But to socialists, the effort to palm off a political hack devoid of any ideas as a progressive and dynamic fighter for labor is ridiculous. Between Taft and Ferguson, no choice can be made. It is well to applaud the merging of union forces in this campaign but the failure to select an independent labor candidate is a blow to a genuine labor political movement.

Taft is well aware of the strength of the unions, and he has been making a whirlwind campaign, hitting every possible community in the state. Perhaps he has trouble scaring up listeners, because he has specialized in speaking to captive audiences. He speaks most frequently to children in the schools, or workers inside the factories, especially unorganized plants. Just about every daily newspaper in the state is supporting him, and some big-shot Democrats have promised their aid.

One of Taft's main arguments is that the Ferguson campaign has been taken over by the CIO-PAC, and that this organization was started by the Communists and still uses Communist tactics. The Republicans have even rummaged up a few labor supporters and are making the most of them, although their number is small indeed.

It is interesting to note that the United Labor League failed to make an endorsement for governor, rejecting Democrat Lausche and Republican Ebricht. For PAC this is the second consecutive election in which they have had no candidate for governor. How many times more does this have to happen before they decide to run an independent candidate of their own?

ADA, Tied to the Dem. Machine, Runs Characterless Campaign

By CARL CRAIG

PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 27—In a campaign which may be characterized as mediocre for the failure of both major parties to grapple with the real issues of the day, the straight Democratic ticket has won the endorsement of both the CIO and the AFL in Philadelphia as well as in the entire state of Pennsylvania.

The two main issues of the campaign as seen by the Democratic and Republican Parties revolve around graft in Philadelphia and responsibility for the Korean situation. Richardson Dilworth, the Democratic candidate for governor who also is the city treasurer, states that if re-elected he will clean up the city.

It is clearly implied of course that only the Republicans are guilty of accepting bribes and of other malpractices. Magistrate Ralph F. Knox, a Democrat in office less than ten months, shattered this

myth when he was recently held for court for embezzlement, malfeasance, non-feasance, misdemeanors in office, and a few other items. So far as the international situation is concerned, the Republicans were on the offensive when the Stalinists had their early victories. When the tide turned and the United States forces took the offensive, spokesmen for the Democratic Party identified themselves with the victorious American combat troops. It goes without saying that not one word was uttered by either party on whether Rhee's politics leaves anything to be desired.

A sideline of the campaign are the super-American activities of Judge Michael A. Musmanno, candidate for lieutenant governor on the Democratic ticket. Hailed by labor as "its man," he follows a routine of visiting local Commu-

nist Party headquarters requesting copies of the U. S. Constitution. After each visit, a statement is issued by the judge in which he feigns amazement and indignation that the local headquarters has not been shut down by the "proper authorities," who of course always happen to be Republicans.

The Americans for Democratic Action in Philadelphia can in no way be distinguished from the Democratic machine. The titular head of the Democratic Party, Richardson Dilworth, is a member of ADA. At present one cannot find any sentiment for independent political action from this quarter.

The failure of labor and progressive organizations to organize an independent slate which could have paved the way for the organization of a labor party only permits one course of action for union militants and socialists to follow in this election. This course is to cast a socialist protest vote. The Socialist candidates appearing on the ballot are those of the Socialist Party, Industrial Government (Socialist Labor Party), and the Militant Workers (Socialist Workers Party).

OHIO LABOR NOTES

Two Wildcats and a Letter

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND, Oct. 29—Two wildcat strikes have attracted considerable attention in this city. The first one was at White Sewing Machine Company, where members of Local 721 of the CIO electrical union (IUE) walked off the job to protest the firing of a union steward. Also involved was the failure of the company to act on an accumulation of issues presented by the union.

The other "wildcat" involved the 4000 workers at General Motors Parma Chevrolet plant, organized into Local 1005 of the United Auto Workers (CIO). While GM plants in general are not the easiest

places in which to work, this new plant has a particularly bad reputation. Working conditions are terrible, and the union has been preparing to take a strike vote on the one issue permitted under the five-year GM contract — production standards, more commonly called speedup.

The strike vote was set for Thursday, October 26. The previous Monday, the local union put out a leaflet whose unusually strong language showed its deep resentment of the company's unbearable policies. It was issued to announce the taking of the strike vote, and contained the following open letter, which we quote in full.

"AN OPEN LETTER TO MANAGEMENT FROM OUR PRESIDENT"

"Big Shots of Chevrolet-Cleveland: 'There has been some mention in our leaflets about some unscrupulous foremen and a few remarks about inquisitive patrolmen. For your information there are some supervisors who are disgusted with your 'sweat blood out of the workers' policy and there are those amongst plant protection who have requested of me to organize them into a union because they've got a score to settle with you. So you see, even those near you resent your greed, your insane drive for dollars, and honor and glory at the table of the slave masters. 'And you intend to deal with the union as if it were a fly in a room, annoying perhaps, but nothing really to be concerned with. You had better have another thing coming. You're either going to talk turkey, or we're going to close your gates and really make you sweat! 'I know now you have no intention to deal with us in good faith. Saturday, you became very snotty in dealing with one of our shop committee. You hurled paragraph No. 117 at him and told him there was a slowdown and to get back to his department and stop this alleged slowdown, or suffer disciplinary action, even to the extent of being fired. You said that Monday the entire committee would be called in and likewise informed, and if they didn't perform as stooges of yours and do as told, they would be disciplined even to the extent of being fired. 'Don't waste your insulting breath. Furthermore, if any officer of this union is disciplined or fired,

the responsibility for any walkout rests on your shoulders!

"I intend to carry out the mandate given me by the workers and I will carry it out to the best of my ability. Although the committee has to bargain with you under the contract, personally I consider you nothing but common criminals!

George Sweda, President Local No. 1005, UAW-CIO"

MEN BACK HIM UP

The sentiments contained in this letter were provoked by the miserable working conditions and by management's obvious contempt for collective bargaining procedures. However, it would seem that putting these ideas down in black and white while dealing with an employer as big and tough as General Motors was untactical. The local management responded all too quickly, suspending Sweda "for an indefinite period, while making further investigation."

The union in turn called the men out in protest, and they stayed out for the rest of the week with no retreat on either side. Johnstone of the UAW's GM department and O'Malley, director of UAW Region 2, tried hard to get the men back to work. At one time they talked a membership meeting of about 800 into going back, but a picket line was maintained and no one would go through it.

It wasn't until Friday night that the local leadership urged the return to work, and then the lines were withdrawn and production resumed. No progress was made on Sweda's case, but it will have to go through regular grievance channels. Sweda's chances of escaping further discipline or possibly dismissal may be slim.

In the meantime, the regular strike vote on the speedup issue was taken as scheduled. Over half the plant force balloted, and of these 89 per cent favored strike action. With this large vote, and with the past week's experience to prove their ability to close the plant, the union is in a position to make some gains in the fight against speedup.

Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL!

Issue in UAW —

(Continued from page 1)

Charge No. 2 sounds as if it were taken literally from the Spanish inquisition against heresy: "That he is an active Communist and that alone is sufficient to prove conduct unbecoming a union member."

As for charge No. 3, the question which the UAW officials have to answer is whether freedom of the press applies to the Daily Worker. Why doesn't he have the right to pass out CP literature?

UAW members opposed to Stalinism AND to witchhunting will oppose this move.

Stellato Purge Boomerangs in Ford Local 600

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Oct. 29—Two important events of recent weeks in the United Auto Workers (CIO) are causing considerable comment within its political circles, and deserve greater publicity than has been accorded them.

As the final results of the election of delegates to the all-important Ford Local 600 general council are being announced, it is quite clear that Carl Stellato, local union president, is a very disappointed man in his hopes that the witchhunt technique and trials he

instituted would smash his opposition.

Quite the contrary. At the moment it appears that Stellato supporters have won 93 seats, and his opposition a similar number. With luck Stellato will be able to squeeze a tiny majority out of the 217-member council. In the two elections being held today, it is 50-50 that Stellato's enemies will win a majority of the delegates, and he may well find himself with a minority.

The fact is that Stellato has suffered a major defeat in these elections, since a two-thirds majority of the general council is required to approve any decision of the trial board, which is hearing charges against five pro-Stalinist officials.

Not only did Stellato's campaign boomerang against him—it antagonized many workers with no sympathy for the Stalinists—but it also enabled the Stalinists to make an important comeback in Ford Local 600.

Over at Ford Local 400, where Al Musilli, union president, tried the same stunt against opponents, a membership meeting recently (by almost unanimous vote) rejected Musilli's bid to follow Stellato's footsteps and remove all officials who wouldn't sign a loyalty oath.

Perhaps Stellato will be consoled by the gift that the other presidents of Ford locals gave him recently at a testimonial dinner. It was a \$1,100 television set. More than likely, the testi-

monial dinner and the gift had some influence in the election of delegates to the general council. We doubt if the ranks felt more inclined toward Stellato when they heard about the fancy TV set.

BULLETIN

Late reports indicate that Carl Stellato, Ford Local 600 president, lost control of the all-powerful general council of the local when his opposition won the last remaining elections for delegates, and Stellato's group will be a minority on the council.

Since the council must pass on the report of the trial committee, now hearing charges against five minor officials of the local union, it seems likely that the trial technique has really boomeranged on Stellato.

It's Not the Wages

The building-trades unions are not responsible for skyrocketing costs in building materials and houses, said President Gray of the AFL's building-trades department. The fact is, he pointed out, that union wage rates in the industry have gone up only 4 per cent over a year ago, and their productivity has gone up even more than that. Thus, he argued, the cost of labor for building has actually gone down "per unit of production" while the prices of houses went up.

AMA President Boasts of Tie-up with Big Business

The million-dollar propaganda campaign of the American Medical Association is on in full blast, and there are perhaps few in the big-city centers who have not yet heard its silky lies. The "Doctors' Trust" is gaining for compulsory health insurance, which it denounces as "creeping socialism."

Its ads and radio plugs are designed to stand on the shoulders of the current "anti-red" hysteria and persuade the people that a government-enforced health program would sell the country down the river to Stalin. They do not mention that their only reason for opposing the idea is that it would cut in on the fat fees charged by doctors.

Not that the AMA is the real spokesman of the doctors' interests. As the railroad unions' paper Labor put it: "Who does run the AMA? First, a small group of medical politicians who make a fat living by telling doctors someone is trying to harm them and their profession. Second, medical businessmen — a comparatively few specialist doctors who charge fantastic fees and want to protect their monopoly."

The heads of the AMA lie-factory openly boast of their tie-in with all branches of big business, including utilities, banks, insurance combines and others. This month, in the association's official journal, President Elmer L. Henderson, listed a vast number of business outfits which will do

tie-in advertising, simultaneously with the AMA's own barrage in 11,000 daily and weekly newspapers. Henderson was unconstrained in his jubilation at the way in which big business has lined up in support. The response, he said, "has been gratifying beyond expectations."

"More than 100 individual banks have indicated they will advertise," he crowed. Many large utilities also—the Iowa Power Company will run the same ads in 40 cities and towns; the Wisconsin Power and Light Company will "cover its entire area with advertising," and the Kansas City Power and Light Company will publish half-page ads.

Just about the entire insurance industry, coast to coast, will "co-operate," he wrote. "Insurance companies and agents all over the country are placing space orders in the press."

The anti-health doctors are also getting the cooperation of the venal press in mobilizing community merchants for the push. "The Des Moines Register and Tribune, for example," said Henderson, "boasts it will sell more tie-in advertising than any paper in the country. The Boston Post, St. Louis papers, the Detroit Free Press, Detroit News, Toledo Blade and many others are working to make this campaign an impressive success."

At a CP Meeting in Paris

French Stalinists Still Attract Working-Class Following but Not on the Offensive

By HENRY JUDD

PARIS, October—A meeting of the Communist Party in Paris, one of the world strongholds of the party, and one in the United States are two rather different stories!

We recently ran the risk (Americans of any political shade not being particularly welcome) of attending the opening rally of the fall-winter political season, under the auspices of French Stalinism. The Big Three of the Party—Maurice Thorez, Duclos and Marty—were scheduled to speak at the Velodrome d'Hiver, Paris' largest indoor stadium, but le grand Maurice, who is evidently seriously ill, was unable to appear.

He is under the care of a Russian heart specialist flown from Moscow. This evident lack of faith in French medicine probably disturbed the party comrades more than Yugoslavia, but Duclos turned it aside by explaining that it was a matter of a "joint consultation" with his French medical comrades! In any event, dressed as "un-American" as is possible, we went to the gathering of 30,000 Parisian Stalinists.

ATTRACT WORKERS

The first and most striking observation of the evening was the fact that here was an audience consisting almost exclusively of workers; the well-known "prole of Paris" coming from the surrounding districts of the city. The contrast between this audience and an assembly of American Stalinists, for example, was obvious enough. Except for a considerable scattering of students, here were workers from all the industries which surround Paris or which center in the city—railroad and subway workers; metal and auto workers from Renault, etc., a characteristically lively crowd of Parisians, animated and energetically talking. Few middle class people seemed to be present.

groups of the Garde Mobile were hidden away in nearby side streets. The party organizes and disciplines its own meetings.

Everyone filed quietly into the hall (no charge), past two rows of party militants who sharply looked all of us over. We negotiated this without any difficulty and were quickly inside the hall into that strange Stalinist world.

HIERARCHY

It was an old, poorly lit hall which does not lend itself well to colorful displays. In the lobby, a fantastic assortment of Stalinist literature was on display. A complete ideological world in itself, with everything from party-line novels (Louis Aragon and his wife) to Stalinist pseudo-science and philosophy! Women's magazines, students' magazines, youth papers—it is doubtful if any subject or any question was not covered here! Even popular movie stars, favoring crypto-Stalinist tags and comic gags for the children were available. The hawkers of this assortment were aggressive enough; for protection and a "passport" we bought a movie mag—at least the pictures were harmless enough.

In the hall itself, a kind of hierarchical arrangement existed. The two balconies were for the "masses," those who entered without any charge. They could sit on wooden tiers without any separation between places. On the main floor, containing individual chairs, entry was for the privileged, by card only. No doubt, functionaries of the party, organizers, intellectuals, etc., could come here. Finally, on the large platform were rows of empty chairs for the big-shots of the party—national committee members, the speakers of the evening, etc. It was all rather a preview of the Stalinist order.

The themes of the evening were contained in slogan streamers surrounding an idealized portrait of Thorez: Down with the proposed 18 months military training period! Long live peace! etc. The concrete theme of the

evening was the demand for liberation of one Henri Martin, a young Stalinist soldier arrested for opposing the war in Indo-China (he received a 5-year sentence the next day). The hall quickly filled up, but the audience lacked enthusiasm and seemed to have little anticipation for the coming events.

CACHIN

At a given moment, headed by that white-haired eternal scoundrel, Marcel Cachin, whose Stalinism seems to have antedated even that of Stalin, the party leaders appeared on the platform from somewhere in the rear of the hall. Everyone rose to their feet, cheering and shouting, and then we heard that rhythmic stamping of the feet which is so typical of a French audience and rather impressive at first hearing. In an old, quavering but still highly audible voice, Cachin opened the meeting with effusive, Stalin-like homage to the sick leader, "our dear friend Maurice" who, ill from his tireless work for peace, was nonetheless with us in spirit.

The announcement that a Russian heart specialist was taking care of "our comrade" met the approval of all, and a resolution was unanimously adopted (one abstention) calling for his rapid recovery and return to the struggle. A curious fact: not a single flag was on display in the hall and, indicating the completely oppositional position in which the party now finds itself, the Marsaillaise was not sung. Only a rather tame International was sung during the evening.

The first speaker of the evening was André Marty, who concentrated on the subject of Indo-China. To our surprise, he turned out to be rather a boring speaker without much oratorical talent. Long-windedness, endless repetition and vulgarly marked his speech. There is little point in re-peating here his typical Stalinist use of half-truths, distortions, etc. It is the same monotonous line the world over.

More important is the fact that it all seemed only for the record, and that no concrete action of any type was proposed. There is no doubt of one thing—at present, despite its impressive ability to mobilize people, the party is impotent to act and the lack of enthusiastic response by the audience indicated their recognition of this. A torrent of words, angry phrases, threats, etc., but no real power behind the torrent, at the moment.

DUCLOS

Marty went on for what seemed an endless time, and the audience became quite restless. He finally concluded and Duclos, acting party head, was the speaker. Here was a first-rate orator—impressive, loud voice, dramatic manner, etc. He knew how to rouse an audience with his demagogic, and particularly with his remarks about the Socialist leaders, who behave so miserably in their coalition government. But again, it tended to fall flat since it was all negative and denunciatory.

We might say, however, that no American Stalinist would dare to utter such remarks regarding the American government as, for example, suggesting that French soldiers in Indo-China desert to the side of Ho Chi Minh, etc.! The radical phrasology bears a superficial resemblance to the famous "Third Period" days, at least in terms of its abusive tone, loudness and volume.

During Duclos' speech many began to leave, and we drifted out. The call of the local bistros was not hard to resist for many, and we sympathized with them. It was more a routine dress rehearsal of Stalinism's influence than a display of strength and power. We wondered, as we left: How can one explain that most difficult of all questions—the continued adherence of the world's most individualist people to the world's most conformist and routinized ideology? A most complex question which has only been partly answered as yet.

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

The BEST recent book on the labor movement— "The UAW and Walter Reuther" by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick \$3.00 Random House Order from: Labor Action Book Service 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER! Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky The Permanent Revolution \$3.50 The Lesson of Spain .25 Marxism in the U. S. .25 The New Course .150 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.

Subscribers — Attention! Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed. 14-45 If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue. RENEW NOW!

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.

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!

YOU and SCIENCE

CYBERNETICS AND HUMAN PROGRESS

By CARL DARTON

The recent account in LABOR ACTION of the New York press interview with Dr. Norbert Wiener inspired us to turn to his new book, *The Human Use of Human Beings* (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1950, \$3). The sub-title, *Cybernetics and Society*, indicates that it is a book of wide scope. The preface explains that the work attempts to be a non-technical treatment of Dr. Wiener's "new point of view with respect to communication and its importance both in the machine and the living organism," with emphasis on "the not inconsiderable social consequences of my point of view." There is a tendency to ramble but this is held within satisfactory balance by the author's prospects in the introductory chapter and an adequate index.

Norbert Wiener is professor of mathematics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In this capacity he has been occupied many years with the theoretical aspects of communications engineering—a field rich with inventions of highly specialized machines for automatic control. This study of the effective messages of control has been christened "cybernetics" by the author.

"It is the thesis of this book that society can only be understood through a study of the messages and the communications facilities which belong to it, and that in the future the developing of these messages and communication facilities, messages between man and machines, between machine and man, and between machine and machine, are destined to play an ever increasing part." Thus the complicated learning processes of the human race are viewed as lying, partly at least, within the field of invention of the engineer.

One cannot adequately summarize here his exposition on the study of man and of the machine as communication organisms. The reader who is interested in an account of some of the most advanced engineering discoveries and their impact both on the productivity level and on theories of knowledge should go to the book itself.

Dr. Wiener has been in the news spotlight recently with his comments about such social problems as technological unemployment and opposition to war. In this current book there are many well-placed words concerning social issues of the day and their relationship to science.

If a Scientist Can Be Bought Once . . .

On the folly of the secrecy program, he says that: "The dissemination of any scientific secret whatever is merely a matter of time, that in this game, a decade is a long time and that in the long run, there is no distinction between arming ourselves and arming our enemies. Thus each terrifying discovery merely increases our subjection to the need of making a new discovery. This is bound to go on and on, until the entire intellectual potential of the land is diverted from any possible constructive application of the manifold needs of the race old and new."

Apparently drawing a parallel from the post-war distribution of German scientists between the American and Russian war efforts, the author has an interesting slant on the loyalty pledges. "The loyalty to humanity which can be subverted by a skillful distribution of administrative sugar plums will be followed by a loyalty to official superiors lasting just so long as we have the bigger sugar plums to distribute. The day may well come when it [the loyalty pledge] constitutes the biggest potential threat to our security. In that moment in which some other power, be it Fascist or Communist, is in position to offer greater rewards, our good friends who have rushed to our defense per accounts rendered will equally rush to our subjection and annihilation.

This viewpoint is to some extent a vulgarization since it places the voluntary prostitution of science to destructive tasks purely on the basis of personal bribery, but Wiener is certainly correct in noting that "a conscience that can be bought once can be bought twice" despite the most rigid of loyalty oaths.

Dr. Wiener sees three "voices of rigidity" on the world scene: the Roman Catholic Church, the Communist Party, and the developing political censorship here in the United States. However his faith in the aims and methods of science enable him to say in conclusion: "Let us hope that it is still possible to reverse the tide of the moment and to create a future America in which man can live and grow and be a human being in the fullest and richest sense of the word." It is our hope—and determination too—that scientists and socialists can create a society that will make a human use of human beings.

Reading from Left to Right

MORE EARNINGS THAN EVER. (*Business Week*, October 28.)

The sedate businessmen's magazine gets almost lyrical about it:

"Profits for 1950 are racing for a new record.

"Six months ago, the talk was of beating 1949. Now the talk is of beating 1948, the best earnings year in history. . . .

"It's the third quarter that did it. . . . [third-quarter earnings after taxes estimated] at an annual rate of \$23.2 billion. That's better than any other quarter business has ever turned in—even in 1948. It puts this third quarter 35 per cent ahead of last year's, even after allowing for the higher tax rate of 42 per cent that went into effect this year.

"The remarkable thing about the 1950 quarterly reports just coming in is their unanimity. Usually, even when business is roaring up, there are a lot of laggards. This time the bandwagon is cram-full. . . .

"The foundations for the boom were solidly laid in the first two quarters. Korea did the rest. Not that defense orders have begun to show in the books as volume as yet. But the certainty that they were coming sent industry and consumers alike on a buying tear.

"Pick an industry—almost any industry. . . . Almost everywhere you look, the gains are astronomical—and you don't need a telescope to see them. Farm machinery, chemicals, food industries, appliances—they're all up. Reynolds Metals may have taken the cake; its net shot up some 8,540 per cent."

Business Week puts a "but" after all this, a "fly in the ointment": the "danger" of Congress passing a stiff excess-profits tax.

The magazine is doubtful, also, of how much of the melon will go to stockholders as dividends, in view of the possibilities of plant expansion.

WORLD POLITICS

New Issue of "Vpered" on Problems of the Struggle Against Stalin

We are in receipt of a new issue of the organ published by the Ukrainian anti-Stalinist resistance movement, *Vpered* [Forward], No. 3, 1950. It is published in Germany in the Ukrainian language; there is also a summary page in English.

One of the articles in this issue was translated and published in LABOR ACTION for October 9, "In the Mirror of Stalin's Parliament," by Vs. Felix.

The main article is by Hornovy, on "Our Position on Relations with the Russian People." Inside the Ukrainian revolutionary resistance, Hornovy is the main theoretical writer of the Marxist current. His article was originally printed illegally inside the Russian Ukraine in June of last year. The main ideas of this article are important in view of the fact that there is a more nationalist current in its ranks also.

The Ukrainian people, says Hornovy, bear no hatred toward the Russian people; on the contrary, they fight the Russian imperialists in order to win freedom for the Russian people also.

The destruction of the Russian system of exploitation, he argues, is the most just and most progressive solution of the national question, and not a step backward toward an outdated past. The struggle for the separation of the Ukraine from the monolithic state of Moscow is not a step against the Russian people, as the Russian imperialists claim. The Russian people do not need the Ukraine; only the Russian imperialists need it.

With numerous arguments taken from present economic relations between Russia and the Ukraine, Hornovy proves that the overthrow of the Kremlin's oppression lies in the hands of the Russian people themselves. By struggling for our independence, he writes, we fight as revolutionists for the creation of the best possible political, economic and cultural collaboration with all peoples, especially with our biggest neighbor, Russia.

The "Freie Tribune" Against Korean War

The preparatory commission for the formation of a new socialist party in Germany, stated its position on the war in Korea in its issue of September 23. The position taken by the *Freie Tribune* is of special interest in view of the fact that the group behind it has recently left the Stalinist movement in Germany. Its organ has shown a strong pro-Titoist line and has therefore been hailed in the warmest terms by the *Militant* in this country. It is to be doubted whether the *Militant* will also greet as warmly the position of the *Freie Tribune* on the Korean war, the most important sections of which we reproduce below.

"In all the expressions of our position on Korea we have always placed in the foreground the fact that the Korean people are the victims of all the events which have taken place up till now. . . . We pointed to the fact that the Koreans were not masters of their own fate. The North Korean government, which has certainly carried out a number of progressive measures such as land reform and social legislation, was completely under the influence of the Soviet government. Every one of its steps could only be taken with the specific agreement and permission of the Kremlin. . . .

The article then goes on to describe the Rhee regime as the representative of the reactionary large landowners. It states that this government has succeeded in alienating the sympathy of the whole nation, and would have been completely wiped out long ago but for the aid and support given it by the United States government.

AGAINST BOTH EXPLOITERS

"The sympathies of the masses," the article continues, "accompanied the rapid initial successes of the North Korean army. There were certainly reasons for this. The North Korean regime was able, due to the more skillful foreign policy of the Soviet Union, to give the appearance abroad of fighting for the interests of Korea. But one must not overlook the fact that this North Korean regime was nothing but a puppet in the hands of the Politburo. We have indicated what the consequences would be for Korea of a victory for the Soviet interests. At the same time, we have warned that if the Politburo's experiment in Korea failed, the Korean people would be sacrificed in the same way as the Spanish people, the Greeks, and many others before them. . . .

"If the struggle of the Koreans had not been controlled by the Kremlin, we would have given it our complete sympathy. As things actually are in Korea, however, the fruits of a victory of the Moscow-beholden North Korean regime would not have fallen into the hands of those who had actually fought and won the battle for liberation. The only role which was assigned to Korea was to secure the southern flank of the Soviet Union in the Pacific.

"The victory of the South Korean government is a great misfortune for the Korean people. We can be certain, however, that the landowner government of Rhee will not be able to win the sympathy of the Korean people in the future. One day the Korean nation will also solve its historical problem: to liberate itself from both the foreign and native oppressors."

THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—15 Why and How Stalinism Fights Bureaucracy

By HAL DRAPER

The Tito regime's "struggle against bureaucratism" is the best example for explaining both what is common to Stalinism in Yugoslavia today and what is different from present-day Stalinism. It is the former which is basic and the latter which illustrates how Titoism needs to adapt the system of Stalinism to its own current conditions.

The key to the first is the problem of bureaucratism as a basic contradiction of the Stalinist system. The key to the second is the newness of Belgrade's break with Moscow; the exposed and precarious position in which this left the regime; the fact that the entire country and people are still quivering from the impact of the rupture and cannot be whipped into quiescence overnight; and most immediately, the economic poverty of the country in which this independent national-Stalinism is seeking to establish itself. In connection with this last aspect, the present economic crisis due to drought and crop failure has exaggerated all of Tito's problems with respect to this question and all others.

First we discuss the basic problem of Stalinist bureaucratism.

Their Denunciations Are Sincere!

The Yugoslav press and propaganda, especially for the last year, has been full of denunciations of bureaucracy and bureaucratism. These speeches and articles are pointed to by the socialist pro-Titoists with enthusiasm as another one of those "proofs" that Titoism is "breaking" with Stalinism. For does not Stalinism represent bureaucratism, and if the Titoists denounce bureaucratism, are they not by that token breaking with a basic Stalinist phenomenon?

Here, for example, is a typical passage behind this proof—one from the much-lauded speech by Tito to the National Assembly on June 27—with a typical denunciation of—

" . . . the terrible evil which bears the name of bureaucracy. It is a disease which is inherited from bourgeois society with ease and incredible rapidity and which is particularly dangerous during the transitional period, for, stretching out its tentacles into all fields of social life, it impedes them and checks their development. Bureaucratism counts as one of the worst enemies of socialism, precisely because it takes root imperceptibly in all spheres of social activity, because at the beginning one is not even aware of it. It would be erroneous to believe that bureaucratism has not begun to take root also in our country. Among us too it gets into the various institutions, into the state apparatus and into the economy, but we are aware of it, and that is why we have taken a series of measures in order to combat it." [My italics. The "series of measures" taken will be discussed as the next subject in this series.]

Quotations of this import can be multiplied indefinitely. There is only one difficulty in accepting such orations as in themselves evidence of a break with Stalinist bureaucratism; and it is very hard to believe that the pro-Titoists who point to them with pride do not know what that difficulty is.

It is the fact that equally violent denunciations of bureaucracy and bureaucratism are the stock in trade of speeches and articles in the whole Russian satellite zone and indeed in Russia itself!

This is so well known that I need devote no space to prove it, but rather explain the reasons for it. It is only entertaining to mention that the above fact is indeed a life-saver for that department of Russian "culture" which has perhaps the hardest row to hoe—the Russian "humorists." What can a humorist make fun of, in that sad land? And so: "Soviet humor has only two themes—Western capitalists and Soviet bureaucrats" [East Europe, April 13].

So the Moscow-Stalinists are unreserved in their condemnation of bureaucratism too, and very vocal about it. "Ah, but that's merely demagoguery on their part—the Titoists are sincere about it!"

Not at all! Both are perfectly "sincere" about such condemnation of bureaucratism, the Russian and Russian-dominated regimes no less than the Yugoslav. Not only sincere but vitally concerned.

Stalin: 'We Need a Whip—'

Bureaucratism, as a symptom, is an inherent accompaniment of and derives from a basic contradiction of the Stalinist system of totalitarian "planned" economy—bureaucratically planned and bureaucratically imposed—which inevitably and continually snarls up and gangrenes every part of the economy. Kravchenko's book *I Chose Freedom* is most interesting precisely for the closeup it affords of how this takes place, described from the author's vantage point as a factory manager at one time.

It flows from the totalitarian pattern of the society, exacerbated by Russian technical backwardness (Yugoslav technique is even more backward) but inherent in rule-from-the-top-down. The little bureaucrats toward the bottom of the hierarchy ape their superiors in their contacts with the masses. They blame their own mistakes on their inferiors while the job fouls up, for Authority cannot be questioned from below. Quality production is sacrificed to meeting the Plan, which is the test of success on top. The bureaucratic jobs tend to pile up beyond even the wishes of the top bureaucracy, increasing the cost of the unproductive state machine. The top bureaucracy seeks to crack down on the bureaucrats below—by setting up more agencies of

totalitarian control. The process, which I seek only to suggest here, is a self-expanding one, only temporarily broken by drives "against bureaucratism."

Trotsky pointed to this characteristic of Stalinism with keen insight, exactly in connection with puncturing the illusion that such "anti-bureaucratic" drives by the top bureaucracy have something to do with democratization. He was writing of the new "Stalin constitution" of 1936 and its secret ballot.

"In a country where the lava of revolution has not yet cooled, privileges burn those who possess them as a stolen gold watch burns an amateur thief. . . . Stalin is compelled from time to time to take the side of 'the people' against the bureaucracy—of course, with its tacit consent. He finds it useful to resort to the secret ballot in order at least partially to purge the state apparatus of the corruptions which are devouring it. . . .

"We have not a few institutions," he [Stalin] told Roy Howard, 'which work badly. . . . The secret ballot in the Soviet Union will be a whip in the hands of the population against badly working organs of power.' A remarkable confession! After the bureaucracy has created a socialist society with its own hands, it feels the need—of a whip! That is one of the motives of the constitutional reform." [The Revolution Betrayed, pages 270-1.]

A remarkable confession by Stalin indeed—and a most illuminating one on the tug of forces within the Stalinist structure. The top bureaucracy, while remaining fully within the framework of totalitarianism, seeks to use the people down below as a whip against the lower echelons of the bureaucracy itself!

The pro-Titoists—who glow over the "series of measures" against bureaucratism taken by the Belgrade regime and which we still have to discuss by themselves—do not understand one iota of all this. Yet the need for "A WHIP IN THE HANDS OF THE POPULATION" is a thousand times more necessary for Tito in Yugoslavia than it was for Stalin in 1936, as we shall see.

What They Mean by Bureaucratism

There is another thing for the pro-Titoists to understand about the Stalinist denunciation of bureaucratism. What exactly is this bureaucratism which is being condemned?

We condemn the bureaucratism of the Stalinist system, and the Stalinists also condemn the bureaucratism which arises in their own system; but we and they are not talking about the same thing.

Here again, Trotsky knew all about the Stalinist "fight against bureaucratism":

"In Soviet political literature you often meet with accusations of 'bureaucratism' as a bad custom of thought or method of work. (The accusation is always directed from above downward and is a method of self-defense on the part of the upper circles.) But what you cannot meet anywhere is an investigation of the bureaucracy as a ruling stratum—its numbers and structure, its flesh and blood, its privileges and appetites, and the share of the national income which it swallows up. Nevertheless it exists. And the fact that it so carefully conceals its social physiognomy proves that it possesses the specific consciousness of a ruling 'class' which, however, is still far from confident of its right to rule." [Ibid., page 135.]

The "bureaucratism" which the Stalinist bureaucrats denounce (sincerely) is an inevitable characteristic of their totalitarian system at the point where it comes into contact with the daily life of the people. The top bureaucracy which rules the state has no need that its subordinate officials in the offices dealing with the people be rude, arbitrary, unreasonable and callous in their day-to-day dealings with the citizens; they would like to have intelligent and flexible administrative bureaucrats with imagination and initiative to carry out their decrees, not rigid automatons, provided that these are also and sufficiently obedient and mindless in their service to the tops. They do not get this incompatible assortment of tailored qualities.

The office bureaucrat who hands out papers and documents for this-and-that did not get there because he was filled with charity, kindness and love for people, and behaves accordingly; the people are antagonized and grumble—quite unnecessarily, from the viewpoint of the top bureaucrat whose job is to give the people more serious reason to grumble. The factory manager must not antagonize his workers to the point where resentment interferes with production, but he must drive them to the limit to fulfill the Plan. No wonder "exposures" of "bureaucratic" behavior are so common in the Stalinist world, and so permanent.

By "bureaucratism," the Stalinists mean such "bad" attitudes, "customs of thought," "methods of work," disregard for people's feelings, rigidity, etc., in the dealings of the lower echelons of the bureaucracy with the people. They do not mean the bureaucracy which is the heart and soul of the regime not only from the top down, but beginning at the top.

As Tito put it in a speech: "What does bureaucracy mean in a country? It has no regard for the feelings of the people. It is a faceless mask to the people. It explains everything by decrees. It does not look into the life and soul of the people, but imposes what it considers correct." [Yugoslav Newsletter, March 10.]

So, since bureaucratism does "everything by decrees," the Tito-Stalinist bureaucracy will wipe out bureaucratism—by passing more decrees, to put "a whip in the hands of the population."

(Next week: the specific features of Titoist anti-bureaucracy.)

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 _____

City _____ Zone _____

State _____ Tel. _____

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

Only \$2.00 a Year

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 14, No. 45 November 6, 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, 1879.

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.

Just received from the bindery—

1948 BOUND VOLUMES of LABOR ACTION and The NEW INTERNATIONAL

Labor Action: bound in heavy cardboard covers. \$3.00
New International: attractively bound in red cloth, with index. \$4.00

Combination offer: both for \$6.00

Cash orders only. Make out checks to:

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, New York

The Socialist Youth League of BERKELEY

AUTUMN CLASS in MARXIST SOCIALISM

Thursday evenings at 8 p.m.
466 Tenth Street, Room 218
(Half block west of Broadway), OAKLAND

Session 4 . . . Nov. 9: State and Revolution
Session 5 . . . Nov. 16: Marxism and Anthropology
Session 6 . . . Nov. 30: Religion and Capitalism
Session 7 . . . Dec. 7: The Evolution of Stalinism

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of L.A. Our policy is to publish letter of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

The End of an Experience

By MAX SHACHTMAN

One of the most important measuring rods in politics is: What did we expect and what did we get? Trotsky often applied it to the politics of the old Communist Party and he was right. It is likewise applicable to the politics of all classes and of all organizations that take themselves seriously.

It is valid in two senses. First: How far did events confirm or refute an analysis that was made? Second: How much did results justify or condemn a policy that was followed? Unless this key question is asked and answered periodically, it is impossible to check on an analysis or a policy, let alone make the necessary corrections.

More than three years ago, a group of members led by J. R. Johnson left our organization—the then Workers Party, now the Independent Socialist League—and joined the Socialist Workers Party. It was at the end of a period in which the two parties had engaged in discussions aimed at uniting them into one. The discussions proved abortive, unity proved impossible. What the SWP leaders were really interested in was to split the Johnsonites away from the Workers Party.

This was confirmed by the Johnsonites, who wrote on July 5, 1947, that they "refused to split from the WP because the suggestion was accompanied by a clear indication that such a split would be but a preliminary to a definitive declaration of the unfitness of the WP for membership in the SWP."

Why, then, did these same Johnsonites, in the same document, under the same date, nevertheless announce their split from the WP and affiliation with the SWP? Because, in weighing the two organizations, they found the SWP to be the party that all genuine Marxists and genuine revolutionists must support with all their strength. For the Workers Party, in which they had abundantly used the unrestricted right to voice their particular views, their statement had only the harshest characterization.

What They Said—
For themselves, they condemned their participation in the work of founding the Workers Party in 1940. In contrast, they lavished the highest praise they could find in their vocabulary for the SWP which they were joining. Since the politics of one day makes sense (or, so often, nonsense) only in the light of the day before, it will help to recollect what they said about the SWP in July 1947:

"The SWP by 1947 has been able to demonstrate far more clearly than in 1940 that it represents a proletarian as opposed to a petty-bourgeois tendency. It has justified its claim in 1940 that it is the inheritor and continuator of the traditions, principles and policies of Leninism-Trotskyism as against the petty-bourgeois opportunism and unprincipled revisionism of the WP. For, more than in 1940, it is possible to say, and easy for informed persons to demonstrate, that in 1940 the historical and political right of the split was on the side of the SWP. There can be no greater misconception of the American movement than to equivocate in the slightest degree as to the contrast between the determined struggle of the SWP to maintain the principles of Bolshevism in contrast to the political and organizational degeneration of the WP."

Any criticism that might follow this lyrical laudation could not but be trivial and that is all it was. So, having spurned the appeal to split from the WP only in order to end by splitting from it, the Johnsonites entered the SWP.

But they were not entering the new party as captives, or mere hard workers: "Good intentions and adjurations to hard work are not sufficient," they wrote in the same document, under the same date. "Political differentiation is a Bolshevik necessity. Thus, political differences will not be hidden behind silence or futile discussions about 'bureaucratic collectivism' and 'bureaucratic jungle' and 'deceptions' and 'misunderstandings.' What is required are clearcut political issues, the discussion of which could only result in benefit to all concerned, education of the International, and, if necessary, a definitive separation of American Bolshevism from all other tendencies."

After the Long Silence

What followed? Just as the spurned appeal for split was followed by a split, so the spurned idea that political differences can be hidden by silence was followed by silence. For three impressive years there was not a peep out of the Johnson group. Not because there was a lack of "clear-cut political issues" during those last three years. Something else was lacking, which courtesy prevents us from naming.

In any case, the long silence has now been broken. "Good intentions and adjurations to hard work" have indeed proved, again, to be insufficient, and "political differentiation" has proved, at least for a "Bolshevik necessity" for the Johnsonites, at least for a few audacious weeks. They have at last spoken up, in a long document submitted for the discussion now going on in the SWP, which they did not, of course, initiate.

The discussion is, formally, concerned with the "Yugoslav question." As is known, the world congress of the Fourth International, which concluded its sessions right on the eve of the sensational Stalin-Tito break, solemnly designated the Tito regime as a reactionary, capitalist, totalitarian police state. The outbreak of the conflict between Tito and Stalin threw the Fourth International, and with it the SWP, into hopeless and ludicrous confusion.

Both are trying to emerge from it with a straight face, by announcing the belated discovery that the Titoists years ago carried out a socialist revolution—not less—and that the designation of Yugoslavia as a totalitarian capitalist police state really ought to be amended somewhat to read "progressive, democratic workers'

state"—not less! Bolder souls go further and announce the additional discovery that all the Stalinist states in Europe and Asia are likewise "workers' states," the product of a socialist revolution which was evidently carried out so cleverly and subtly by the Stalinists that the official Trotskyists, who freely admit they are the vanguard of the world revolution, never even noticed it at the time.

You would think that the kind of discussion that would follow upon such noteworthy discoveries is clearly established. How does it happen that Stalinism, hitherto characterized as counter-revolutionary and a sturdy prop of capitalism, nevertheless carried out a socialist revolution in a dozen different countries, including such important ones as Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia and such a decisive one as China?

And even more to the point, if Stalinism does, and therefore can, carry out the socialist revolution at least to the point of establishing workers' states—somehow imperfect ones, to be sure—for about one-third of the population of the globe, what basis remains for the existence of an independent anti-Stalinist socialist party or International?

That is not the kind of discussion that is going on in the Fourth International or the SWP. It is hard to believe, but true. The Cannonites are debating, instead, only two questions which would normally excite only the most elaborate yawns:

While it is ABC that Yugoslavia is a workers' state, can the same thing be said about Poland and other Stalinist satellites even though the social regimes are identical in every respect? And secondly, while it is ABC that this, that or the other Stalinist country is a workers' state, can we say exactly when the revolution occurred in that country—Monday at noon, or Wednesday at dusk, or Saturday at midnight?

This sort of discussion is too much for the Johnsonites. Hence, their own document.

—And What They Found

We can leave aside, here, any consideration of Johnson's theory that Stalinism is state-capitalism. We have dealt with it before and will deal with it again. Much more interesting is the result obtained from Johnson's document when it applies the measuring rod of "what did we expect and what did we get?"

His document is a criticism of the official position of the Fourth International and the SWP on Russia and Stalinism, and the criticism is positively annihilating, not because Johnson's own position is so right but because the other is so utterly and irretrievably wrong. Of overwhelming political importance is the essential question he raises:

Since it is now the official Trotskyist position that the new Stalinist states in Europe and Asia are, like Russia, workers' states (of one sort or another) which cannot have been established except by proletarian revolution (of one sort or another), and since these revolutionary and workers' states are headed by Stalinism, what remains of the basic Trotskyist theory that Stalinism is counter-revolutionary, and what remains as the political justification for the existence of an independent Trotskyist movement?

This question he hammers home in a dozen different ways, as we ourselves have hammered it home in our press for a long time. It is safe to predict that his success in getting an answer will be no greater than ours: the "official" Trotskyists will never answer the question; they cannot answer it. It is safer to discuss whether the Stalinist-"proletarian revolution" in Poland took place on Tuesday at dawn or Friday at twilight.

Does Johnson himself answer the question? In part; in large part; in any case, SUFFICIENTLY TO REFUTE WHAT-TERINGLY WHAT HE WROTE ABOUT THE SWP THREE YEARS AGO. What he said then, we have already seen, and it shows what he expected. Now let us see what he got. He is speaking now about the same SWP which he once praised for its "determined struggle . . . to maintain the principles of Bolshevism," for having "justified its claim in 1940 that it is the inheritor and continuator of the traditions, principles and policies of Leninism-Trotskyism." And here is what he says today about the inheritor, the continuator and its determined struggle.

After Three Years

After describing and denouncing the position of the head of the Fourth International, he writes: "To this pro-Stalinist, liquidationist tendency, now months old, there is no resistance. Under the impact of the events of 1940-50 the theory of the Fourth International is in chaos." And further: "The chief spokesman of the Fourth International has called into question the validity of Marxism for our epoch."

The language is a little strong, but not bad. In 1947, the principles, traditions and policies of Leninism-Trotskyism-Bolshevism are like granite in the Fourth International, and so they have been since 1940. In 1950, Marxism is called into question by the head of the International who advocates nothing less than a pro-Stalinist, liquidationist course that meets with no resistance, and the result is chaos!

But this chaos is not due to the "chief spokesman" alone. Johnson digs deeper. "Our position is that the chaos in the International is due to the fact that Trotsky's method of analysis and system of ideas are wrong, and that the chaos in the International will continue to grow until a new system is substituted for the present one." The disagreement does not appear to be trivial.

"The first, the basic, the indispensable task of a revolutionary International is to define correctly the working-class organization it proposes to overthrow." (Johnson is referring to Stalinism, of course.) "In this task the failure of orthodox Trotskyism is complete." The "determined struggle of the SWP to maintain the principles of Bolshevism," as Johnson wrote three years ago, does not appear to have been very fruitful, if it pro-

duced a failure—a complete failure—to discharge the first, the basic, the indispensable task. Call it what you will, this is not a very high recommendation for a determined struggle for the principles of Bolshevism carried on by the inheritors and continuators.

At least, we are entitled to know when the inheritors stopped continuing the struggle—Tuesday at daybreak or Sunday at nightfall?

"The Fourth International," we now read from the pen which wrote otherwise three years ago, "cannot escape this decision: if the destruction of private property and the repudiation of national defense are revolutionary, then Stalinism is revolutionary and there is no historical need for a Fourth International." Which is quite right, but not only today; it was just as right when we said it three years ago while Johnson was saying rather different things.

Johnson regrets it, regrets it very much, "but we shall have to show that the theories of the Fourth International have fortified the theories of Stalinism. The true significance of Pablo is that he has brought this that was implicit in the theories of the Fourth International out into the open." This is news, it appears, and regrettable news, for in 1947, we persist in recalling, the only thing that was explicit or implicit was "the determined struggle" by the inheritors who are now "fortifying the theories" of—of what? of Bolshevism? not "the theories of Stalinism."

Sunk Without a Trace

And to make it simpler and clearer, these Stalinist theories were implicit in the position of the SWP as early as 1947, and earlier, when Johnson was impelled to join it because "there can be no greater misconception of the American movement than to equivocate in the slightest degree" about the Cannonite struggle for the principles of Bolshevism, Leninism and Trotskyism. One thing is dead certain: there was indeed a misconception, and it was great enough.

What about the party itself? "The history of Trotskyist theory of the party, however, reinforces Stalinism in spite of all its criticisms."

What about the party's methodology? "What is the methodology of orthodox Trotskyism? It is to be judged by its results. It has never recognized the necessity for an analysis of the present stage of world economy. . . . The subjectivity of the Trotskyist analysis of Stalinism is rooted in the unreflected premise that the Stalinists are social-patriotic collaborators of their own bourgeoisie. . . . The Fourth International is unable in objective materialist terms to find the reasons for its own existence. . . . The inability to analyze Stalinism in the light of Leninist analysis of the present stage of capitalism cripples orthodox Trotskyism at every turn. . . . Orthodox Trotskyism is unable because of its conception of state-property and its subjective analysis of the coming war to make the simplest distinctions between the counter-revolutionary Third International and the revolutionary Fourth International. . . . Orthodox Trotskyism can merely call for a revolution in Russia. Its theory affords no objective basis for it, none. . . . Orthodox Trotskyism, on this fundamental question [the whole colonial question] of its own past, here as elsewhere, is unable to solve one of the problems raised."

It requires no small effort to remember that Johnson is applying these thick-soled, iron-shod, needle-spiked remarks to the very same party which—how long ago was it?—he could not stay out of because not the slightest degree of equivocation could be permitted about its determined struggle to uphold the principles, traditions and policies which, today, are sunk without having left so much as a visible oil-slick. But it is worth while making the effort.

Back to the Silence

Of the chief spokesman of the Fourth International, Johnson writes that he repudiates Lenin's *State and Revolution*—"proposing instead that proletarian politics be guided for centuries by the barbarous degradation in Russia and in the buffer states of Eastern Europe. It is the end of any philosophic method and the most serious of all theories of retrogression. In this mentality can be seen the germs which in maturity make the complete Stalinist—absolute hostility to capitalism as we have known it but a resigned acceptance that Marx's and Lenin's ideas of proletarian power are Utopian. No more deadly deviation has ever appeared in our movement." That's at the end of Johnson's 79-page document. On the first page, we note, is the charge that "to this pro-Stalinist, liquidationist tendency, now months old, there is no resistance," either in the Fourth International or in the SWP.

Therefore? Therefore, concludes Johnson, now that he has broken his silence by a document, he promises to retire into silence again, presumably to continue heeding the "adjurations to hard work."

Jacob toiled in the fields in silence for fourteen years, but at the end of the first seven he at least got Leah and after another seven, Rachel. After three years, Johnson got the right to a document. How much longer he will toil in silence, he knows better than others. But this one document marks the end of an experience.

It is the end of an experience regardless of Johnson's perspectives.

Three years ago he said to his public: This is the SWP, the party of Marxism, of proletarian revolution, of internationalism, of principle, of Bolshevism, unequivocal, justified and confirmed.

Three years later he says to his public: This is the SWP, a complete failure in discharging its first, basic, indispensable task; a movement in a state of growing chaos; the fortifier of the theories of Stalinism; pro-Stalinist and liquidationist; incapable of the simplest distinctions between revolution and counter-revolution; incapable

(Continued bottom of next page)

"The Case of Comrade Tulayev"

Victor Serge's Novel of Life in Stalin's Russia Tops the Field

By MARY BELL

"Among the masterpieces of world literature . . . a beautiful work of art . . . of the highest distinction . . . the unbridled and eloquent rage of a Dostoevsky"—these are among the encomiums applied by various critics to the recently published novel by Victor Serge, *The Case of Comrade Tulayev* (Translated by Willard R. Trask. Doubleday, N. Y., 1950, \$3).

Written in 1940-42, first published in France in 1948, and now translated and published in English, Serge's novel is written out of a lifetime of political participation in the revolutionary movement and many years spent in Russia, including its Stalinist concentration camps.

This novel is one example of a whole genre of literature that has sprung from the most important and pervasive theme of modern life: totalitarianism. One might construct a sub-category out of the literature of the trial, which would include with Serge those writers like Koestler and Kafka who have dealt with this modern phenomenon in varying fictional forms. We add that Serge's novel is in our opinion the most acute in its fine feel for the creation of political personalities and situations, more gracefully written than many of the other works on the same theme, broader in its picture of the protean nature of principals and principles involved in Russian trials and of life itself.

We are not at all sure that the critical accolades are not in some measure, at least, in proportion to the current international political situation. How would Serge's novel have been greeted if it had been published at the time it was written, eight years ago when we were being exposed (as one commentator noted) to *Mission to Moscow*, the film tailored to the exigencies of the political situation of that time and to the taste of the ex-ambassador to Moscow? Koestler's *Darkness at Noon*, to be sure, did appear—on the heels of the Stalin-Hitler pact.

In Serge's book the disclaimer preceding the story, "Any attempt to establish a precise connection between characters or episodes in this book and known historical personages and events would . . . be without justification," is half truth, half irony. The story belongs in the realm of fiction, its characters and situations are the creation of an artist's imagination, but in the case of Serge it is an imagination informed with a lifetime of intimate knowledge and experience.

Politics and Vision

It was a lifetime fired with socialist idealism. It is his political integrity as well as his artistic integrity which would not permit him to create Koestler's *Rubashov*, for instance, that amalgam of "old Bolshevism" and Stalinist capitulation. For Koestler turned away from socialism, while Serge remained an "incurable."

This does not mean to apply a political yardstick to judge a work of fiction. But it does certainly mean that a writer's vision of life, his experience and knowledge have a definite bearing on what he writes. As a matter of fact, Koestler's political ideas have a more direct influence on the form, content and "moral" of his writing than do those of Serge, who held throughout his life to a socialist vision which would be exorcised as "dogma" by the former.

"For several weeks Kostia had been thinking about buying a pair of shoes."

Thus Serge's novel opens. It might be the opening sentence in any Russian novel of the past 300 years. This mundane beginning is filled with emotional impact as the ensuing events place Kostia in the Russia of the period of the "transition to socialism": the time of trials, terror, purges and forcibly collectivized peasants.

Kostia's friend, Romachkin, is a clerk in the Moscow Clothing Trust, who finds through his figures he is cutting wages and who worries about justice. The scene with the doctor whom he consults in the neuropsychiatric clinic is one of many examples of purest irony. "Reflexes excellent, nothing to worry about, citizen. Sex life?" "Not much, only occasionally," answers Romachkin. "I recommend intercourse twice a month," said the doctor drily. "As to the idea of justice, don't let it worry you. It is a positive social idea resulting from the sublimation of the primitive ego and the suppression of individualistic instincts; it is called upon to play a great role in the period of transition to socialism. . . . Macha, call in the next patient."

In the Great Market Romachkin buys the Colt which makes him think of "just men," which is, however, used by Kostia, the worker, to kill Tulayev on terrorist impulse—Tulayev of the Central Committee, Tulayev

End of an Experience

(Continued from page 6)

able of analyzing Stalinism; incapable of solving a single problem of importance; with leaders who challenge Marxism and Leninism as a Utopia, advance the most serious of all theories of retrogression and propose to be guided by the most barbarous degradation of modern times, and yet meet with no resistance in the movement; with a method of analysis and a system of ideas that is wrong from start to finish; and without the ability so much as to find the need for its own existence.

We were told by the Johnsonites three years ago what they expected and, if we may say so, we know more or less what they would get. Now they know it too and the source is authentic. If you learn late, it is better than not learning at all, provided you have really learned.

of the mass deportations in the Vorogon district and the university purges.

Thus is set in motion the necessity for the preparation of the trial—suspicions, interrogations, pursuit of plotters, pursuers turned pursued, checking of those whose antecedents might make them suspect, opening and reviewing of dossiers: ". . . swarming, proliferating, overflowing, all-conquering dossiers. . . the Sailors' Club case, the Red Triangle Factory case, the Academy of Sciences case, the Former Revolutionary Prisoners case, the Leninist Youth case, the Geologic Committee case, the Free Masons case, the matter of homosexuality in the Fleet. . . ."

Captives of the System

The solution to the case of Comrade Tulayev involves many types who stand in varying relations to the regime. There is the Chief himself, Serge's projection of Stalin; those who have acquiesced in various ways with various rationalizations; and the uncompromising Old Bolshevik, Ryzhik.

There is Erchov, the High Commissar for Security, a man of many predecessors, who begins the hunt for the slayers of Tulayev and soon becomes one of the hunted. Surrounded by experts in the art of manufacturing trials and assassins, the compilers and sorters of dossiers, he is a victim of sheer bureaucratic cannibalism.

In the first meeting with the Chief, the first question from the latter, asked in cold rage, is: "The plot?" Erchov thinks the crime might have been committed by an individual. The Chief's retort: "Very efficient, your isolated individual. Remarkably well organized!"

The portrait of Stalin conforms closely to what is actually known about him, his ruthlessness, his contempt for intellectuals and artists. Excellently conveyed is the pinpoint of geniality in the midst of bureaucratic paranoia. Serge shows him not only as a symbol but as a human being—pinioned on the apex of his deadly system. "I pity you, Yossif," his old friend Kondratiev says, "you are the most threatened, the most captive of us all. . . ."

One feels, as the successive scenes with the Chief unfold, why there must be a plot. The novel is ingeniously contrived to show this, for in the situation given either Kostia or Romachkin could have shot someone, anyone. Who the someone was, aside from being a person who represented oppression, was inconsequential. The gun was pointed against the regime, and against the Chief himself as its archetype. And thus also, since the shooting represented disaffection, we are presented with a "collective crime," "collective guilt" and hence the need for "collective punishment." From his bureaucratic perch, the Chief is right. That is why a formula for the trial is sought for by the prosecutors and leaders: a formula that will provide the necessary show for the public. It is thought that a good case would include a Trotskyist, a genuine spy, even one to deny all guilt and to be found falsely accused.

High Commissar Erchov finds his face excised from a group newspaper photo and knows that his days are numbered. He soon takes an enforced rest with his mistress, Valia, one of the perquisites of office which he loses along with it when he is arrested on his return.

The Rublev Type

Another type is Kiril Rublev, a former Old Bolshevik, who has accommodated himself to the regime by means of an elaborate, intellectualized rationale, yet who is exiled to a library—for he has once been an Old Bolshevik. Serge has him say: "Rather than settle which of us is right and which wrong, we prefer to be wrong together because in that way we are stronger for the proletariat. . . ." "We say: To hell with my and me, to hell with self, to hell with truth, if the Party can be strong." His wife Dora sets him doubting by asking, "What Party?" He realizes confessions have been extorted through torture, that some confess to save their skins.

In Rublev's iron circle of imaginings Serge makes understandable in human terms what secures the loyalty of some of the Russian Stalinists. Rublev visualizes a Bukharin or a Piatakov in the dock, suddenly rising to expose his lying comrades, the lies of the prosecutor, the judges, the Central Committee and the Political Bureau. He sees the effect in the jubilation in the capitalist world and the capitalist press. "Read all about it—the Moscow Scandal, the Bolshevik Sink, The Chief Denounced by His Victims."

No, Rublev thinks, it is better to settle it among ourselves. Rublev is the idealistic Party man who had "lived his whole life for the Party, sick and degraded though it may be, our Party." But there is his past, he is guilty of "thoughtcrimes," and he is accused of plotting to assassinate Tulayev.

Another fine portrait appears of Makeyev, the Georgian peasant of dull beginnings ("What boredom, what loneliness, what a desire to smash someone in the face!"), unliked by girls, who becomes a bureaucrat, "CC of CP(b) of the RSFSR." In him, a minor Genghis Khan with four telephones, the "I" and "We" of the party are identified. In him the Tatar derivations are personified. Serge writes: "If by some miracle the weapon of past centuries, a bow, had been placed in his hands, he could have used it as skillfully as the divers unknown tribes whom that soil had nourished, who had died upon it and been absorbed into it." In a local parade, there appear 137 of Makeyev's portraits. There is a Makeyev Day Nursery. But Tulayev had been Makeyev's superior, and since he had rejoiced at Tulayev's murder and been denounced by a long-suffering wife, the connection between him and the plot against Tulayev is easily established.

In both Makeyev and Rublev are revealed another motive for support of the bureaucracy, the worship of indus-

trialization. In Makeyev's life, it is the identification of himself with having personally been responsible for building. In Rublev's, it is a theoretical mirroring of the effects of Diogenes, Magnificor, Kirovsk. Rublev reasons that the creation of these tens of millions of proletarians will automatically rescue Russia from its barbarism.

Kondratiev, member of the CC and political commissar during the Spanish Civil War, is a friend from the Chief's past, a man full of early ideals who supply bent to the regime, with some pang of conscience. The Chief asks Kondratiev for a truthful report on Spain, complaining that he lives on an "edifice of lies." But it is all a trap. The Chief already knew everything he wanted to know. Kondratiev recites the sad history, the inferior planes, the heroism of the anarchists. The Chief cannot see that the planes have anything to do with the liquidation of the Aviation Center's best engineers—they "confessed" their sabotage. Kondratiev boldly defends his softness toward Trotskyists in Spain, goes so far as to ask Stalin's intervention.

They Who Did Not Confess

From this rash moment on, Kondratiev knows that his dossier is making the rounds. He decides to rebel. He makes it known that when accused, he will yell, he doesn't care where, by himself or underground. He even speaks his mind openly at a meeting of a tank battalion that has been having too many suicides—this is such an inconceivable thing, that many of his listeners believe the line has been changed from on high.

The chief calls him in. "So you are a traitor too?" "I am not a traitor either," replies Kondratiev. "And you must know it." The only one to have spoken openly, Kondratiev is merely banished to the East Siberian Gulag Trust.

The plot's formula calls for a Trotskyist. The dossier of the genuine revolutionist, Ryzhik, who has not yet recanted or compromised with the regime and yet has miraculously survived, is found suitable. He has been living on "The Brink of Nothing," the usual Siberian wasteland, where his clock was the first such instrument seen by his hosts. "Criminals! Drinkers of proletarian blood! Thermidorians!" he could howl his protest, only to the frozen winds—

Ryzhik is guarded by an apparatus cipher who carries the yellow secret service envelope sewn up in his tunic containing orders to shoot Ryzhik if the need arises. The guard knows that Ryzhik is pure; but then, if socialism is to be built in one country, he is a danger. When the guard asks him what he shall write about Ryzhik in his report, the latter answers with his magnificently rebellious spirit: "Write them that I . . . on the bureaucratic counter-revolution."

On his trip back to civilization for complicity in the Tulayev case, the security policeman reads in the yellow papers, "state criminal." Ryzhik tells him: "That means Old Bolshevik, faithful to Lenin's work."

Ryzhik will not confess. The death of this old man from self-imposed hunger cheats the regime of an important element in the trial, and only Erchov, Rublev, and Makeyev confess. His suicide, the prototype of unnumbered others, is the measure of the regime. But his suicide cannot be allowed to have simply happened. Someone must be held responsible — Zryeryeva, the neurotic GPU agent who had not "handled" him well, and who will be devoured by the regime.

Serge, by getting inside Russian life, does not merely show us the pity and the tragedy. He removes a little, more of the mystery surrounding the question, "Why did they confess?" The understanding that grows upon one is greater than that produced by many social, economic and political pamphlets. His is an instructive art.

"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.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own labor and socialist library. . . . Write for free book list.

And remember: we also supply books of ALL publishers. Get ALL your books from

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Why Hiawatha Was a Red

Or: How Hollywood Didn't Know the Half of It!

[Condensed from the "Industrial Worker" of October 6, the following takes off on the fact that a movie version of Longfellow's "Hiawatha" was recently stopped in production through fear that its message might be considered "subversive" today—especially its emphasis on Hiawatha's role as a peacemaker. "J. Gumshoe Longnose," whose by-line appears on it, cracked the covers of the children's classic to discover that Longfellow was even more subversive than first reports indicated.]

An examination of the *Song of Hiawatha* clearly shows it is subversive. While it is commonly considered American in inspiration, literary experts have shown that it is entirely un-American, since its general pattern, its rhythm, and its treatment of legends, are all borrowed from a Finnish poem, *Kalevala*. Subversiveness among Finnish people has long been notorious.

The poem intertwines un-American ideas about peace and communal ownership, and even criticism of Free Enterprise, in various insidious ways.

MANITOU FOR UNION

Early in the poem the following words are put into the mouth of Gitche Manitou the Mighty, the Supreme Being in Indian belief. Note its combination of various subversive ideas: communal ownership of resources, peace propaganda, and even a bid for union support. Consider this insidious passage.

"O my children! My poor children! I have given you lands to hunt in, I have given you streams to fish in, I have given you bear and bison, I have given you roe and reindeer, I have given you brant and beaver, Filled the marshes full of wild-fowl, Filled the rivers full of fishes; Why then are you not contented? Why then will you hunt each other? I am weary of your quagrels, Weary of your wars and bloodshed, Weary of your prayers for vengeance, Of your wranglings and dissensions: All your strength is in your union,

All your danger is in discord; Therefore be at peace henceforward, And as brothers live together."

This poem has frequently been given innocent American children to read. Consider the danger of their becoming indoctrinated with the idea that the resources of this continent were intended for either people generally, or for the Indians from whom we have taken it.

The poem credits the hero Hiawatha with the discovery of the chief foodstuff of the Indians, maize or corn, and speaks—

"Of his wrestling and his triumph Of his new gift to the nations Which should be their food forever."

Another highly un-American passage occurs in a canto describing how Hiawatha defeated and despoiled the evil magician Megissogwon, and ends with these lines:

"All the trophies of the battle, He divided with his people, Shared it equally among them."

This is an insidious equalitarian philosophy.

OBVIOUSLY SUBVERSIVE

The entire indication is that though Hiawatha made corn available to the Indians by great vision and personal sacrifice, it was given by him free to all. No enterprising business man would have done this. It is entirely un-American.

If the poem is to be rescued at all, this and similar passages should be rewritten by competent authorities, such as the Economics Department of Notre Dame, or the editors of *Reader's Digest*, so that Hiawatha becomes the

first great capitalist by his discovery of corn. This, of course, would require an entirely different sequence for the rest of the poem.

Not only are the cornfields described as common property with the indication that the corn is shared by all, even by the old men who did nothing about the corn, but there is a further subversive influence in the description of the gaiety with which the work was done.

SETS BAD EXAMPLE

Let any management man concerned with factory discipline consider this description of the corn-husking:

"In uninterrupted silence Looked they at the gamesome labor

Of the young men and the women: Listened to their noisy talking, To their laughter and their singing, Heard them chattering like magpies,

Heard them laughing like the blue-boys, Heard them singing like the robins.

And when'er some lucky maiden Found a maize ear red as blood is, 'Nushka!' cried they all together 'Nushka! you shall have a sweet-heart!

You shall have a handsome husband!"

Ask any efficiency expert whether this is the way that work should be done, and he will assure you such a description of work is as subversive as it is possible ever for literature to become.

Another insidious theme, much favored by subversives, is that all social institutions are transitory. Consider these lines:

"Lo! how all things fade and perish! From the memories of the old men Pass away the great traditions."

This is basic Marxism, and not to be tolerated.

The one instance in the entire long poem where anything like Free Enterprise appears, is the story of Pau-Puk-Keewis, who by a little gaming, not unlike the stock-brokerage business, did acquire all the valuables of the members of the tribe while Hiawatha is away. This could have created a situation where Pau-Puk-Keewis could have put these people to work, and started the wheels of Progress grinding. Instead this Primitive Accumulation is treated with Marxist disdain, and Pau-Puk-Keewis hunted down ignominiously, and his possessions confiscated without compensation. More revolutionary doctrine could not be imagined.

PAGE PEGLER

Clearly this long poem of over 190 pages in the edition your agent has studied, is completely un-American. Yet it is one of the things commonly given innocent young Americans to read by people who do not know subversiveness when they see it. These evil doctrines can be found in almost all books, even in the Mother Goose rhymes.

After serious study of the subject, I respectfully beg to report that the only means to keep books safe for the American way is to destroy them all, and have a new literature written. For this I would suggest that nothing be published except it be written by a committee consisting of Westbrook Pegler, Andrew May and J. Parnell Thomas.

Not in the Headlines

Hunger, D. C.

From the nation's capital at the beginning of October appeared a report by Welfare Director Gerard Shea which told of children lacking food and clothing, "with parents who seem unable to feel concerned about it." The number of needy children is increasing in Washington, said Shea.

Obit

George Seldes' weekly sheet, *In Fact*, has folded up, it announced in its last issue on October 2.

Reason given is finances, fall in subscriptions, higher printing costs, etc.

In Fact specialized in exposing the distortions and suppression of the people's interests by the press of the country as well as fascist organizations and various instances of corruption. This job, it did, however, with a heavy pro-Stalinist slant. More recently, Seldes became an enthusiastic pro-Titoist, like many other fellow travelers. It can be surmised that this latter fact has something to do with the demise, since Seldes writes:

"In 1948 when I interviewed Tito (after also interviewing the Communist head of Hungary, Rakosi) and the next year when I published *The People Don't Know*, the few [sic] Communists who were subscribers to *In Fact* canceled their subscriptions."

Although Seldes' paper was widely pushed by Stalinists all over the country since 1940 when it was founded, his Titoist heresy could not be forgiven by them even though he also whitewashed the satellite states under the Kremlin with as full a brush.

Contrast with Korea --

(Continued from page 1)

imperial troops. The religion of Lamaism, a sect of Buddhism, is derived from India rather than China. Its closest co-religionists are the Mongols. When Mongolia and Sinkiang fell into Mao's hands, he tried to organize the Lamaist monks as part of his political preparation for the conquest of Tibet.

In 1907 the British, trying to develop a tertiary interest in Tibet as a buffer against Russian and Chinese expansion into India, offered the then Peking government a treaty recognizing Chinese suzerainty but clearly making Chinese control nominal and not actual. China never signed this treaty. Nevertheless the real setup became that desired by the British, since they were in a position to enforce their predominance.

DAGGER AIMED AT INDIA

But no more than the Chinese before them did the British become real masters of Tibet; the country did not become a colony. At the end of the Second World War Lhasa became the scene of diplomatic intrigues between Chiang Kai-shek and the British, with Chiang finally losing out there as elsewhere when his candidate for Dalai Lama was bypassed by the Tibetan theocratic council. With the British departure from India in August 1947 the strategic interest in Tibet passed to India.

And that is why the invasion has caused great anxiety in Delhi while it has caused little more than a ripple in Washington. The contrast is striking, in this connection too. Washington was most bitter about Nehru's reluctance simply to follow its line in Korea. Today it shows a remarkable lack of interest in India's needs.

Yet this is a matter that can-

not be ignored. While Tibet is Shangri-la to America, it is of considerable importance to India's northern frontier. A common border between India and Chinese Stalinism alters the balance of relations in that impassable region.

So long as Tibet retained its autonomy Indian military security was so much greater. Without Tibet, India's Himalayan frontier is exposed except for the princedoms of Nepal and Sikkim. Now Stalinism will be able to organize intrigues among the numerous tribes and principalities of Trans-Himalaya, posing a variety of threats to India.

India will undoubtedly increase its military forces in this zone, diverting resources from more constructive purposes. The entire policy of Nehru toward Peiping will come up for revision and questioning; and while it is doubtful if Nehru will have to surrender the foreign minister's portfolio over the issue, it will be an issue. India's policy toward Stalinist China may be altered radically.

THEY BRING NO FREEDOM

Mao has shown complete disregard for India's interests and commitments. Mao ordered the invasion while Lhasa's emissaries were on Indian soil, where they could negotiate with Peiping on a basis of relative equality. Nehru in the meantime had his eyes fixed on the diplomatic negotiations, although not too hopefully. Military conquest knocks the premises for India's policy into a cocked hat.

But isn't Tibet a reactionary state? It is that, but even more, it is an anachronistic one. Its Lamaist monk-aristocracy is a substantial portion of the male population, living completely parasitically off the sorry prod-

uce of the nomads. The people are miserably poor even by Asian standards. Nomad life is an incredible hardship. The days of Tibetan glory have been over for some 12 centuries and very little has been altered since.

The theocracy is absolutist. The monasteries are the real land-owning class. Tibet needs a new life, a new dynamic. Military conquest cannot achieve this any more than could Mussolini's conquest of slave-ridden Ethiopia. Stalinist tyranny will not release the Tibetan people to a new age of national flowering, though it may undermine the established theocracy.

Chinese aims in Tibet have nothing to do with the social emancipation of the Tibetans. Their conquest is an expression of "Greater Hanism," the traditional impetus of Chinese continental expansion.

It may also be linked in an immediate sense with Korea and Formosa. The defeat in Korea, in which Peiping had invested so much manpower and even more political prestige, is a bitter pill. Failure to launch the Formosan adventure, in spite of unremitting bluster, also requires a diversion. The Tibetan invasion has long been prepared, planned and announced by Peiping. But the timing, on the heels of the Korean collapse, seems more than coincidental. It is a diversion for which India, along with the Tibetans, will pay.

Whatever Peiping's motives, the claim of Chinese Stalinism to respect for the diverse nationalities of Central Asia is exposed as hypocrisy. Its decision to march on Tibet reveals it—to the Asian peoples among others—as a ruthless exponent of Chinese nationalist expansion at the expense of weaker peoples.

By LEON TROTSKY
Marxism in the United States
35 Cents Order from
Independent Socialist Press
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Next —
A Labor Party!
by Jack Ranger
A Hard-Hitting, Meaty
Presentation of the Need
for an
Independent Labor Party
25 cents Order from:
Labor Action Book Service
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION
The Independent Socialist Weekly
4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription: NEW RENEWAL
 Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)
ADDRESS APT.....
CITY ZONE STATE

Bill me Payment encl. (stamps, currency or postal note)