

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JULY 2, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**IRAN DEFENDS ITS INDEPENDENCE**

... page 2

**Tito-Yugoslavia: A Discussion**

... pages 6-7

**Alfred Rosmer on 'Co-Determination'**

... page 2

**Portents in France's Election**

... page 3

## "McGRATH RIDES AGAIN"

"But let it be known that Attorney General McGrath has once more told off Tom Jefferson in no uncertain terms.

"For McGrath rides again. Emboldened by the Supreme Court's decision in the Smith Act case, he has now rounded up the Communist 'second team'; the Foley Square Follies will reopen soon . . . And by placing them in court we dignify their ideas and discredit the most magnificent document we own, which is known as the Bill of Rights. . . .

"It is easy to imitate the enemy. But in the long run we believe the citizens of this republic—and free men everywhere—will come to revere Justices Black and Douglas and others like them who refused to join the stampede."

New York Post, June 21

**The People Look Forward to an End of the Killing—**

# IN KOREA: IS IT PEACE?

By MARY BELL

One year and 1½ million casualties after the outbreak of the Korean war comes the cease-fire proposal by Russia's Malik and its cautious reception by the U.S.-UN bloc.

As we go to press on the Wednesday following, no one knows whether this is it or not. Opinions range from the "cautious hope" attributed to the Western European nations to the reservations and skepticism of American officialdom, the latter especially clear in a confidential State Department memo accidentally made public from Tokyo headquarters. Notable exceptions are the fight-to-the-bitter-end fanaticism of Syngman Rhee, the MacArthur clique and the New York Daily News.

What has caused the rising note of hope, of course, is that Malik—in the course of a routine UN radio program—did not set any conditions for discussion of a cease-fire. Through the mouth of Malik, presumably, the prime mover of the Korean war was speaking from the Kremlin. Absent were the usual demands for the restoration of Formosa to Stalinist China, a seat for the latter in the UN, etc. However, since proposals of the Russian government relate to its imperialist aims, everyone is cautious and speculative over this surprise move.

There is much ground for speculation on how closely the Russian and Chinese governments agree; whether this proposal was worked out in common, or whether the seeds of "Titoism," that is, of national-Stalinism, are sprouting in China.

There is some variance in the Russian and Chinese approaches.

(Turn to last page)

As the sparring over a cease-fire in Korea goes on at this writing, only one thing is certain: that the peoples of the world, including the people of this country, fervently hope for and welcome an end to the fighting, an end to the bloody and useless slaughter. No one pretends that it will "solve" anything. Given the kind of war it has been, there has not from the beginning been any possibility of a progressive outcome from the military victory or defeat of either side. But there will be an end to the killing, if only temporarily.

That is why the big question in the minds of the people is significantly "Do they really mean cease-fire?" and not "On what conditions shall weicker for peace?"

No one pretends that it will "solve" anything because a cease-fire is to be welcomed in the same way as any military truce is welcomed in a war of which the peoples have had their bellies full.

Military truce it is. Peace it is not.

Neither the U. S. or Russia can bring peace to Korea, to Asia or to the world. For them, a cease-fire means a breathing spell during which they can maneuver for further advantage, make their deals, whip their war alliances into shape, prepare for the world war. For the peoples of the world it can mean more time to rally their strength and courage to fight against the imperialist blocs and against their looming war.

It is only the organization of the working people against both capitalist and Stalinist imperialism which can prevent world war, it is only their triumph which can mean peace for the world.

## Government Roundup of Stalinists Launches New Police-State Methods

By GORDON HASKELL

The Truman administration seems determined to earn for itself the onerous title: police government, police state. A few weeks ago the Truman-appointed majority of the the Supreme Court declared that the infamous Smith Act does not violate the Bill of Rights. And early on the morning of June 20 FBI agents were knocking on the doors of twenty-one leaders of the Communist Party, bearing with them warrants for their arrest on charges of violations of the Smith Act.

How many people does the Truman administration plan to throw into the penitentiary for the "crime" of allegedly advocating the ideas of "Marxism-Leninism," or on the charge of having conspired to "teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the government of the United States by force and violence"? A hundred? A thousand? Twelve thousand? All these figures have been mentioned as the "targets" of those two great defenders of the American Way of Life, J. Howard McGrath and J. Edgar Hoover.

The arrest of seventeen leaders of the CP (four have so far eluded the FBI dragnet) and the fantastic bail on which they are being held is clearly designed to accomplish one end: to destroy, by police measures, the Stalinist movement in this country as an organized force.

As anyone who has read a single copy of LABOR ACTION knows, we are mortal enemies of the Stalinist movement both here and throughout the world. This has been true for the eleven years of our existence and we consider Stalinism today one of the most dangerous anti-working class and anti-socialist forces in the world.

But we are unalterably opposed to the use of police measures against Stalinism as a political and ideological movement. Stalinism can be defeated politically only by the efforts of the workers and all who love freedom and democracy in political struggle. The moment the policeman enters the political arena and starts "solving" political problems with the nightstick or the jail, he becomes a greater danger to democracy than are the Stalinists themselves.

At least in the United States, the

constituted itself a much greater danger to the civil liberties of all Americans than the Stalinist movement here could ever hope to become.

And in this, the element of irony is not missing! Government leaders by the score have proclaimed that the real way to destroy Stalinism throughout the world is to raise the standard of living of the people to a point at which Stalinism will lose its

(Turn to last page)

truth of the above statement is incontestable. Here the Department of Justice, in seeking to suppress the Communist Party by means of the infamous Smith Act, has clearly

## They Cheered John L. Lewis — To Rebuke Walter P. Reuther

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, June 25—John L. Lewis had a wonderful time among the auto workers here this week, and not the last reason for his pleasure was the knowledge that his visit was so uncomfortable for Walter P. Reuther.

The fact that over 1,500 secondary and plant auto workers' union leaders attended a banquet in Lewis' honor, and a crowd of from 40,000 to 50,000 heard him speak Saturday afternoon may be attributed as much to Reuther's recent blunders as to any inherent popu-

larity that Lewis has in the auto shops.

Just two weeks ago, the UAW-CIO dedicated its new international union headquarters, Solidarity House, and for this occasion a select few were invited by formal card only. While there were some auto workers among the crowd, a mainly middle class, professional-politician and civic-leader gathering was held.

A few auto workers who tried to attend the ceremonies by showing their paid-up union cards were denied admittance. This left a bad taste among many auto

workers and it was talked about in many shops.

The kind of workers' celebration such a dedication ceremony might have been held by Ford Local 600 in celebrating its 10th anniversary. For the ceremonies at which Lewis spoke were truly a working-class rally: auto workers with their wives and kids by the thousands, like the CIO picnics and rallies of old times.

REUTHER BLUNDERED

And in contrast to the leadership theme that permeates all

(Turn to last page)

In New York

TONIGHT

—SATURDAY evening, June 30, to be exact, since that's when you get this issue in the mails—come to the

ISL SUMMER SOCIAL

Dancing, liquids, refreshments and good company  
Labor Action Hall  
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

# The Iranians Defend National Independence

By RICHARD TROY

As events in Iran move rapidly to a decision, the whole dispute has taken on the character of one of the most dramatic and forceful displays of anti-imperialist sentiment in the post-war world.

Iran, as every one knows by now, is an extremely backward country, lacking the most elementary means of maintaining the huge petroleum complex which, it seems, it is actually in the process of taking over as this is written. This fact alone underlines the intensity and popularity of the ever-mounting anti-imperialist feeling there. Despite the quite evident fact that the British may actually withdraw from the oil fields and leave them to disrepair and mismanagement, the people of Iran are pressing forward the process of expropriation.

Every reporter in Iran speaks of the intensity and drive of the anti-British program. But very few seem to accept it at its face value, and treat it as a development of serious political consequence except insofar as it cuts off oil supplies or gives the Stalinists an area in which to propagandize. The least cognizant of all are the British.

To them, and many others, the whole development is "irrational," "emotional," "the workings of a few demagogues," and, although they recognize occasionally that it is associated with a general "awakening" in the entire Middle East, they assume that it will pass once the Iranian people return to normal, see the "futility" of their efforts to guide their own destiny, and remove the fanatic Mossadegh.

### MORRISON: WORDS

From the very start of the dispute the Western world—and in particular the British—have behaved in a manner which betrays an incredibly meager understanding of the huge events so vividly seen in Iran. Herbert Morrison's debut in foreign policy has been a colossal failure, reflecting no credit upon the Labor Party. This is true despite the fact that he expressed, as part of a recent debate in the House of Commons, some relatively enlightened words of caution.

"In some of the speeches," he said, "to which we have listened members have been casting their minds back to the days of imperialism, and perhaps are thinking it is possible to do in this modern period what could be done years ago."

These remarks stimulated some rather discourteous retorts from his Tory opponents, but in truth they were unnecessary, for evidently Morrison does not take his own words too seriously. The policies he has pursued do in fact assume that "it is possible to do in this modern period what could be done years ago," at least to the extent of Britain's weakened status.

### MORRISON: DEEDS

It is Morrison, after all, who is dispatching a top-notch team of international lawyers to the Hague Court to protest the "unilateral" action of the Iranian government in taking over the oil facilities. The British know, of course, that the decision of the Hague Court can have no effect upon Mossadegh's behavior, but they are anxious to have it put on the books that, from the legal point of view, the British have been "wronged."

Anyone with the barest understanding of the mood of the Iranian people can see that this effort will only further intensify their anti-British feelings. Yet the New York Times, evidently approving of the Hague trial, writes: "if Iran has a good case it should not hesitate to present it."

But this misses the point entirely. The Iranian people have, and can have, little respect for the intricate "international law" devised by the big powers; nor do

that the Iranians were not in the least frightened by Morrison's stern lectures on the sanctity of international law. By the time the directors of Anglo-Iranian arrived in Teheran it was already too late. Mossadegh, with enthusiastic support from his people, immediately demanded that the British hand over, as a basis for further negotiation, 75 per cent of the proceeds of the three months which followed the nationalization act of last March. The British, after stalling around a while, refused, and instead offered them 10 million pounds to tide them over until final arrangements.

### ARROGANCE

This naturally did not meet Mossadegh's satisfaction; he reiterated his demand for 75 per cent, and the British, indignant, quit the conference. They left Teheran immediately, stating as they went that they could never come to terms with Iran "so long as Mossadegh is in power." Again the complete inability to recognize the depth of the movement which Mossadegh now represents stands out. For the British were saying, in effect: Get rid of this fanatic, Mossadegh, and then we'll bargain with you.

The British attitude now is one of the most supreme arrogance and contempt:— Let them fry in their own juice. They have created this mess in Iran, let them now work it out. As soon as we withdraw from the fields the vast resources which we have built

will go to ruin. Their country's treasury will dry up. Their seven-year-plan will be completely decimated. . . and, then, they will return to us, on their hands and knees, and beg us to come back and direct them.

Naturally, the British cannot be as blatant as this openly, but such is the essence of their present position. More is at stake than oil and war: the waning prestige of the British Empire.

### CASE OF MEXICO

This is a far cry from the great outrage which U. S. imperialists expressed in 1938 when the Mexican government expropriated their oil properties, but, even if in diminished and more helpless forms, it is in the same tradition. The New York Times, commenting editorially upon this situation recently, reminded its readers of Mexico, noting that Mexican oil production today is not as great as it was in 1921, the peak year. Thus, of course, it is argued that once the imperialist cord is severed the former colonial nation is helpless. The Mexican government reacted indignantly, pointing out that Pemex has produced more oil in its 13 years of operation than was produced in the 13 years prior to the famous expropriation. At any rate, so far as the Mexicans are concerned, the new arrangement is satisfactory.

But that by no means shows that Iran will do as well, for compared to Iran Mexico is an advanced nation. There is no doubt that, if the Iranian oil reserves

are to continue to be tapped, foreign technical help will be required. Last week a group of unemployed German engineers, once in charge of the German-run oil fields in the Balkans, volunteered to direct the oil resources for the Iranian government. In addition, there are the American oil concerns which, although up to now officially neutral in the dispute, may well in the end take up where the British leave off.

The American government, by the way, has offered a 25 million dollar loan to Iran which Teheran at first turned down. The offer was again extended last week, as an admitted attempt to bribe Teheran into more congenial behavior toward the Western powers.

Whatever the outcome of the present crisis, it is quite obvious that whoever is brought in to run the oil operations will have to work under the sovereignty of the Teheran government. The age is rapidly passing when the more "advanced" nations can rule the backward.

Morrison is undoubtedly correct when he denounces Mossadegh's oligarchy for channeling the revenues of his government into the hands of the small aristocracy and not to the sadly dejected Iranian masses. But this same Mossadegh does represent the masses when he himself denounces British rule over southern Iran. The Iranian people themselves will have to deal with the Mossadeghs, and the Mossadeghs will eventually go, but the intense national consciousness which he now represents will not.

# Alfred Rosmer on Co-Determination

[Alfred Rosmer, the veteran French socialist and trade-unionist, recently paid a visit to Germany with the primary purpose of investigating the meaning of the proposals for "co-management" (co-determination, co-control) which the German labor movement had demanded and which have been adopted, in one form, by the Bonn government of Western Germany. The co-management development in Germany is, and above all, should be, of greatest interest to socialists everywhere. We are therefore glad to present the views and impressions on the subject which Comrade Rosmer brought back from Germany, for the interest of our readers. They appear in the current (June) issue of *Revolutions Proletarienne*.—Ed.]

By ALFRED ROSMER

The principal object of my trip . . . was the co-management question. For the French workers, the nationalizations have been a lamentable failure; for the British, a disappointment. It is to be understood that the Germans sought a different "structural reform." But what? Since the question is important, a brief historical sketch will be useful.

The German trade unions were first reconstituted under the tutelage of the occupying powers and for a while were local and regional only. As in the case of production, the working-class upsurge beat down these restrictions one after the other, and finally a central trade-union federation was formed: the *Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund*, which includes 16 industrial and craft unions and numbers more than 5 million members.

It was this trade-union center which, in a manifesto of November 1948, demanded the complete reorganization of industry so as to give the workers an equal share in the control of all enterprises. The demand was supported by a 24-hour strike which had the double effect of publicly showing the strength of the organization and of popularizing the idea of co-management.

Trade-union unity had been achieved from the very beginning in such a way that, although the majority of the trade-union leaders are socialists, there are also Christian-Democrats and non-party people in the unions; the movement holds to its independent

ence from parties and has shown itself capable of defending this independence. Besides, co-management raised no conflicts within the organizations—on the contrary.

The Christian-Democrats approved it. Even the archbishop of Cologne, Cardinal Frings, came out for it in a pamphlet published in the fall of 1949. The Catholics pay close attention to the workers' demands. And the principle of co-management was written into the constitution of one of the German states (*länder*), Westphalia, which unlike the Bonn parliament is governed by a coalition of socialists and Christian-Democrats.

The question took more precise form in March 1950 when the trade-union federation published "Suggestions for a New Order in Industry": equal workers' representation in all the leading bodies of the corporations and formation of economic committees in all enterprises employing more than 20 people.

On March 30 representatives of the trade unions and of the employers' organizations met at Hattenheim-im-Hesse to take up the workers' demand for co-management. Agreement was easily reached for the setting up of a federal economic committee composed of a hundred members, half appointed by the trade unions and half by the employers, and similar committees in each of the German states. The employers also agreed that the workers be represented in the management committees but on the formal condition that their representatives be chosen from among the workers in the enterprise itself, that these representatives must have worked in the enterprise more than 10 years, and that they constitute only 30 per cent of the body.

The trade unions wanted equality and the right for the workers to be represented by unionists not necessarily working in the plant. No agreement was possible; the talks were broken off.

They were resumed in May through the intervention of the

minister of labor, but they did not get further than recognizing the principle. In point of fact, the employers remained strongly hostile to this infringement on their authority, and they showed it as soon as the question arose of returning the Ruhr steel plants to their owners.

### VICTORY

The Inter-Allied High Commission had taken over these plants and had instituted a kind of co-management in them; but this "co-management" was limited to secondary questions since all the important decisions were taken by the High Commission. Still the management did include workers' representatives, appointed by the High Commission itself, and the employers had already indicated that they wished to abolish this when the factories were returned to them.

The trade unions fought back, demanding not only the maintenance of the workers' representatives in the steel plants but also similar representation in the management of the mining enterprises. And they organized a referendum on the question of a strike in case the companies' refusal made it necessary. Ninety-five per cent of the metal workers and 93 per cent of the miners voted for the strike.

It was at this point that the Bonn government intervened and put forward a bill giving the workers equality of representation in the mining and metal industry, for plants employing more than 1000 workers. There was still some resistance from the employers' side but it gave way before the threat of a general strike. And last April 10 the government bill was passed by the parliament.

The management committees of the enterprises consisted of 11 members designated as follows: one by the workers in the plant, one by the non-production employees in the plant, two by the national trade union and a fifth chosen by these four; on the employers' side, four representatives of the stockholders and a fifth

On the whole, then, the elections mark a definite—even sharp—swing to the right, but a swing which was not merely at the expense of the Stalinist movement. De Gaulle got most of his votes from the now exhausted Catholic party, signifying a vast shift in middle-class mentality which now is prepared for "hard" solutions. At the same time, other rightist parties and groups (generally listed as "independent" or "peasant") benefited from this shift so that the center of political gravity, as a whole, moved sharply to the right.

Perhaps an even more significant phenomenon is that, for the first time, a large section of the Stalinist vote (half a million) went over to the de Gaullists. In this, all proportions reserved, a start of that new classic phenomenon of pre-Hitler Germany where great

masses of disillusioned workers found the bridge from Stalinism to fascism not too difficult to cross? It would seem so; de Gaulle's boast that he now has a solid base among the French working class is undeniable. These workers looking for action and who cannot find it in the Stalinist ranks have begun to shift to the general, who offers the perspective of possible power in the future. Whether this tendency will augment depends upon what the new government does (or doesn't do). Nonetheless, we cite it as one of the more obscure, yet most alarming, consequences of the election.

Between de Gaulle and the center parties their is a convenient, wide and easily crossable bridge of classic rightists (Reynaud, Daladier, etc.), so-called "independents," "peasants," etc. The socialists, ready and anxious to resume their participation in the former coalition government, are no longer essential to the formation of a government, as be-

come the same kind of 3-party government will probably be established to begin with, but will it last? And suppose the socialists, even modestly, try to enforce a social program on the new government? Their so-called allies can turn instantly to their right, or even further, and form a government without them. The three former government parties do not have a majority in the new Assembly, as before. They depend on the tolerance of the right, just as the socialists in the coalition will depend on the tolerance of their own rightist allies.

POLITICS IN DECLINE  
Is it necessary to list the extreme dangers represented in such a situation? The entire parliamentary and democratic structure is in danger, sapped by Stalinist, rightist and de Gaullist forces. The weak center has a capitulationist policy, from which the socialists cannot be excluded.

# French Center Sags; Gaullist Threat Grows

By HENRY JUDD

PARIS, June 22 — France has elected its National Assembly which, in theory, is to govern the nation for the next five years. The election produced a number of surprises, some of which are not clearly understood as yet, given the absence of final electoral statistics. One might add, in any case, that electoral statistics as such never explained fully any election, and this is a classic case of that truism.

Not least of the surprises was the large proportion of the 24½ million eligible voters (80 per cent) who actually voted, although an abstentionism of as much as 30 per cent had been widely predicted. It would appear that those who, in a general state of disgust and indifference, had intended to abstain changed their minds at the last moment and, deciding that after all the elections offered some way of expressing their opinion, rushed to the polls.

A further surprise was offered by the manner in which the Socialist Party, deeply committed to all the unpopular deeds of the past government and expected to suffer huge losses, managed to hold its own in the National Assembly, and did not lose too badly in popular vote, despite its incredible behavior politically. This is unquestionably the one note which is even faintly agreeable in an election which produced nothing but discordant sounds and results, insofar as it means not endorsement of the SP's politics but a desire to register a socialist vote without aiding the Stalinists.

If the American press is hailing a "great victory over communism" and rejoicing in the "reliability" of the French people, we cannot imagine a grosser misinterpretation of the facts nor a more absurd case of wish-thinking. The Stalinists, it is true, lost popular votes for the first time in 30 years and indeed this has its significance. Unlike recent elections in Italy, where Stalinism actually registered gains, the French CP lost 546,000 votes, or 10 per cent of its 1946 total vote. These losses were evenly distributed around the country, and not just in the rural areas. In Paris and other proletarian centers, Stalinism has definitely declined.

### DE GAULLE EMERGES

But we must not exaggerate this fact. In the first place, a glance at the statistics will show that the CP remains the first party of France, despite its sharp loss in seats in the Assembly—a phony loss since it was manipulated by the dishonest electoral law. It still has, unfortunately, the overwhelming support of the French working class. And that, we need hardly add, is no small matter. After five years of experience, the French proletariat still retains its faith in the Stalinist party. What a mark of the failure of the socialist and center parties of France!

Further, all parties—without exception—lost to the party of General de Gaulle, the reactionary and militarist party of France. And this, we submit, is the most significant and alarming fact of the entire election. The socialists and center elements are busily consoling themselves over the fact that de Gaulle did not win a majority, but we find this far from convincing. De Gaulle has now emerged as a firm, considerable and aggressive force, organized in all spheres. Few can believe that this party of action will calmly sit back and await the next elections—five years hence! Almost half the voters chose either the totalitarian party of the Stalinists, or the militarist and authoritarian party of de Gaulle; i. e., parties openly committed to destroy the present republic and its precarious democracy. Yet the traditional political leaders tell us they have won a victory!

On the whole, then, the elections mark a definite—even sharp—swing to the right, but a swing which was not merely at the expense of the Stalinist movement. De Gaulle got most of his votes from the now exhausted Catholic party, signifying a vast shift in middle-class mentality which now is prepared for "hard" solutions. At the same time, other rightist parties and groups (generally listed as "independent" or "peasant") benefited from this shift so that the center of political gravity, as a whole, moved sharply to the right.

Perhaps an even more significant phenomenon is that, for the first time, a large section of the Stalinist vote (half a million) went over to the de Gaullists. In this, all proportions reserved, a start of that new classic phenomenon of pre-Hitler Germany where great

masses of disillusioned workers found the bridge from Stalinism to fascism not too difficult to cross? It would seem so; de Gaulle's boast that he now has a solid base among the French working class is undeniable. These workers looking for action and who cannot find it in the Stalinist ranks have begun to shift to the general, who offers the perspective of possible power in the future. Whether this tendency will augment depends upon what the new government does (or doesn't do). Nonetheless, we cite it as one of the more obscure, yet most alarming, consequences of the election.

Between de Gaulle and the center parties their is a convenient, wide and easily crossable bridge of classic rightists (Reynaud, Daladier, etc.), so-called "independents," "peasants," etc. The socialists, ready and anxious to resume their participation in the former coalition government, are no longer essential to the formation of a government, as be-

come the same kind of 3-party government will probably be established to begin with, but will it last? And suppose the socialists, even modestly, try to enforce a social program on the new government? Their so-called allies can turn instantly to their right, or even further, and form a government without them. The three former government parties do not have a majority in the new Assembly, as before. They depend on the tolerance of the right, just as the socialists in the coalition will depend on the tolerance of their own rightist allies.

POLITICS IN DECLINE  
Is it necessary to list the extreme dangers represented in such a situation? The entire parliamentary and democratic structure is in danger, sapped by Stalinist, rightist and de Gaullist forces. The weak center has a capitulationist policy, from which the socialists cannot be excluded.

The truth of the matter is that the elections have marked a further disintegration of French political life, and the perspective is rather toward the eventual formation of some kind of de Gaullist regime based upon anti-democratic and reactionary measures. There seems little that can halt such a development, and it is clear that the Americans at Washington are preparing to make their peace with the general. After all, he is a general, isn't he?

A note should be added about the disaster which overwhelmed all the small groups and tendencies of the left which participated in the elections. Without exception, not only did they fail to elect a single candidate, but received numerically insignificant votes. This includes the so-called Trotskyists, the neutralists of the "Gauche Indépendant," whose best known candidate, Claude Bourdet, received only 8,000 votes and ran almost last in his sector, various pacifist and federalist groups, and Stalinist fellow-travelers. Outside of and apart from the Socialist Party, it is clear that no possible development of independent policies or ideas is possible in France today; all other efforts are obviously artificial and bound to fail.

but the combination between the Radicals and their even more conservative allies will set the tone of the combine. The MRP ended up losing over half its votes and 173 seats in the RPF, and is now the smallest of the six large groups, after having been almost neck and neck with the Stalinists, who won 181 seats, in 1946. The loss of strength by the MRP did not, however, take place just now. It occurred during the period of the organization of de Gaulle's RPF, between 1947 and 1949. As a matter of fact, a good part of those who were carried away by de Gaulle and voted for him in the municipal and senatorial elections at that time have since left him. That is why de Gaulle votes, which had reached 30 per cent of the total a couple of years ago, slipped back to 21 per cent last week.

Footnote from *Wonderland*: The June 11 issue of *The Militant* carries an article on the election campaign of their brother official-Trotskyists, the French PCI. The *Militant* quotes the PCI electoral stand for all but the two districts where there were PCI candidates, as follows: "Workers who follow the Socialist and Communist parties will naturally support the parties of their choice and the French Trotskyists call upon workers to vote for these parties wherever they run independently."

The electoral declaration of the PCI, as published in its organ *La Vérité*, phrased the matter a bit differently. The PCI, being more frank about its desire to be a loyal left-Stalinist opposition, had this to say: "The PCI calls for votes for the workers' party which runs independently, that is in practice for the Communist Party. [Emphasis mine—P. R.] Noting the absence of a real struggle program of the so-called independent French Communist Movement . . . the Political Bureau [of the PCI] puts the workers on guard against its candidates." Doesn't the Militant like the Frank attitude?

### Sidelights on the French Elections

By PAUL ROBERTS

Later returns of the elections to the French Assembly modify only slightly the results published in last week's LABOR ACTION. Settling of certain contested seats brought the de Gaullists a little consolation for falling so far short of the 200 seats they had boasted they would win. In Strasbourg a recount brought victory to de Gaulle's General Pierre Koenig, thus increasing to 8 the number of generals among the RPF deputies (de Gaullists).

It now seems that there will still be a few seats contested when the new Assembly meets in July, but disregarding that possibility the standing now is:  
RPF (de Gaullists) ..... 118  
Socialists ..... 104  
Stalinists ..... 103  
Independent Rightists ..... 98  
Radicals (moderate conservatives) ..... 94  
M.R.P. (Catholic Deputies) ..... 85  
Scattered Overseas Deputies ..... 23  
Still to vote (South Sea Islands) ..... 2

This gives the government parties—the Socialists, Radicals and MRP—283 deputies out of the 627. It now seems very likely that the government will find enough allies among the independent right conservatives to acquire the minimum of 314 votes needed to get an absolute majority in favor of a new government coalition.

In the new government coalition the Socialists will be the largest single group of deputies,

chosen by them. There remains an eleventh, who would necessarily be the arbitrator in case of irreconcilable conflict.

On this point the trade unions agreed to make a concession: in the last analysis it is the stockholders who could designate the arbitrator but they could do so only after a rather complicated procedure whose details we need not go into; this procedure permitted the stockholders to gain time, in any case, but it gave the workers the possibility of carrying on their own agitation, bringing the dispute before all of labor. It is, then, in any case, a big victory.

I must say, however, that among my friends in Frankfurt I did not find as much enthusiasm about it as I had felt from a distance. This co-management (the German word, *Mitbestimmungsrecht*, conveys the right to equality more clearly . . .) is not without risks: permanent contact with the employers, the possibility that the workers' representatives will come to feel more like "bosses" than like defenders of the workers' interests.

These dangers are certainly not illusory but here, as in all trade-union activity, everything depends on the union ranks, the trade-union organization itself, and its ability to maintain control over its representatives. The trade-union leaders are well aware of that. The article in the

metal workers' paper *Metal* which announced the victory is entitled "A Beginning," and the campaign which gained this first success is going to be carried on to extend co-management to other industries one after the other.

Because I was judging by comparison with the French trade-union movement, which is today bogged down in a petty kind of corporatism, perhaps I attributed exceptional importance to this achievement of workers' control—for co-management can be that at least—gained through systematic and steadfast action. For the German trade unions face not only their own employers, they also face the representatives of the American capitalists, who tried to intimidate them by saying that co-management would discourage the investment of the foreign capital which is so necessary for their renaissance industry. Once the law was passed, they likewise took their stand: they had issued their "friendly" warnings only against "extreme and inequitable" measures such as would indisputably alienate private capital, German as well as American.

The New York Times, in an editorial entitled "The New Socialism," also recalled these "warnings"; it explained very clearly the meaning of the reform, including why the German workers had not followed the French and British examples;

then it made its point: if the workers are reasonable, co-management can contribute to social peace and production; otherwise, there will be chaos and bankruptcy; it added, in conclusion, that experience will show to what extent this "new socialism" will have influence and find followers in other parts of the world.

The *Monthly Journal*, organ of the powerful Amalgamated Engineering Union in Britain gave an answer to this question which had been foreshadowed in its April issue. "British trade-unionists," wrote Paul Derrick, "may be impelled to think that if the German workers can get equal representation in the councils of private companies, then British workers should at least be admitted to representation in the councils of the nationalized industries. And it could even happen that the British workers will want to follow the example of their German comrades and demand equal representation in the councils of all companies employing more than 300 people. If the workers were represented in this way, one would doubtless see fewer boards of directors distributing excessive profits to their stockholders.

And the Fabian Society is to publish a pamphlet in which the author, a student of the nationalizations, concludes by asking that henceforth the workers directly choose one third of the directors of all the public enterprises.

Get ALL your books from Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y. We can supply you!

# The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name .....

Address .....

City .....

State .....

Tel. ....

# YOU and SCIENCE

## WHY THE APATHY ON CIVIL DEFENSE?

By CARL DARTON

The publication last summer of *The Effect of Atomic Weapons* was a step in the U. S. government's campaign to make the people atom-bomb-conscious and to build up a home-defense organization. The official announcement called for an adequate atomic defense "as a deterrent to Russia starting the war and using the A-bomb."

*Atomic Weapons* became a national best-seller and its contents were popularized in newspapers and magazines. More and more booklets with plans for local defense committees came out of Washington. School children were drilled to protect themselves against flash burns, and shelter arrows became a familiar part of the street scene. So vivid was the campaign that it was not only children who awoke nightly in a cold sweat when planes passed overhead.

Despite the agreement of all that the threat to the people, cities and industry is severe, the response to the call for civilian defense has been extremely weak. Only this past January, after three years of reports and indecision, the responsibility for carrying out the job was given by Congress to the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

At the same time a program costing over three billion dollars was proposed. But no money was appropriated and the joker is that before any amount can be made available it must be matched by an equal amount from each state or city.

However, it has been apparent from the beginning that the cities and local communities have neither the knowledge nor the money to set up more than token defense measures. Many large American cities are near the bankrupt stage and state legislatures have been loath to tax smaller communities for funds needed in the cities.

Local officials responsible for home defense have been very critical of the federal program. For instance, the mayor of Milwaukee has stated that it is the apparent assumption of the federal government that any military defense of large cities is hopeless and that the CDA is creating a feeling of futility and helplessness. To quote the mayor: "The acceptance of the relative defenselessness of targets . . . appears to be a hard fact which stems from the unwillingness of the people of the democracies to accept the logical consequences of atomic energy."

### Moods Among the People

Indicative of the situation is the fact that, of the 15 million civilian-defense workers estimated to be required, only one half million have volunteered throughout the United States. Purse strings have been tightly held. Through March of this year, New York City, one of the world's prime targets, has appropriated only \$750,000; New Jersey \$8,300; Illinois nothing; and Massachusetts \$150,000.

Several weeks ago a National Conference on Civil Defense was held in Washington. Its purpose was to shake the country out of its apathetic indifference and to bring home to Congress the complaints of state and local governments. To quote the N. Y. Times, "All speakers [including President Truman and Gov. Warren of California] struck a note of urgency. Governor Warren was cheered when he criticized Congress for not making funds available. Nevertheless, there is much doubt about the effectiveness of the conference. Washington observers feel the attitude of Congress stems from 'the apathy of the public.'"

### Why are the people apathetic about civilian defense?

Perhaps some are convinced that there will be no major war and no bombing on American soil. Perhaps a greater number feel that the war is inevitable and that A-bombs will be dropped—and will be dropped on their communities. Some of the latter must simply be convinced that they will be caught in the vast center of the atomic explosion where there is no survival. Scientists assure us that on the perimeter of the explosion many lives can be saved if certain precautions are taken. These assurances have failed to arouse much enthusiasm.

Perhaps also there are those who boycott every activity of the Truman administration. Many are irritated because the government can find billions to bomb Korea but has no money to provide for bomb shelters and vastly expanded disaster facilities at home. Sand buckets and band-aids are ridiculously inadequate.

There are perhaps other factors but this writer believes that the apathy is a manifestation of the people's lack of confidence in present-day society's and the present government's ability to deal with the consequences of the atomic bomb. The A-bomb looms bigger than any group of people—yes, bigger even than all of the society which gave it birth.

Despite the general apathy to civilian defense there is one proposal which has caught the public fancy—the proposal for the dispersal of the cities. Since the proposal has been seriously presented by some social scientists we think it should be given serious thought and analysis by socialists.

Our next column will attempt to grapple with the many and complex aspects and consequences of the demand for decentralization of industries and populations as an effective defense against atomic warfare.

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 27 July 2, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER  
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH  
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

# READING from LEFT to RIGHT

MORALE, by Henry Zentner.—*American Sociological Review*, June.

Professor Zentner discusses the data on the morale of the American soldier in World War II as presented in *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II* by S. A. Stouffer et al., on the basis of questionnaires among the servicemen. Here is some of the raw data from Stouffer:

War aims: the only formulation that met almost complete agreement in the questionnaire was: "Whatever our wishes in the matter, we have to fight now if we are to survive." Only two-thirds of the men agreed to "We are in the war to fight until we can guarantee democratic liberties to all peoples of the world." Only 55 per cent were sure they were not "fighting for the economic interest of American Big Business."

Thirty-six per cent of the men were unable to give a response naming the goals the U. S. was fighting for; 16 per cent more submitted stereotyped single-word answers like "freedom,"

"peace," "democracy," etc. Over one third in a sample had never heard of the Four Freedoms.

Asked the most important qualities a good noncom should have, officers and men differed sharply. Officers rated highest: ability to carry out orders, ability to think for himself. The men rated highest: ability to help and advise the men under him, ability to explain things clearly, ability to gain the personal liking of men under him.

The armed forces Research Branch was unable to follow up "its predictions of a widespread breakdown of morale after the cessation of hostilities" but Zentner believes the scattered available data confirmed the prediction: "The riots and 'mutinies' which broke out in 1946 in all parts of the globe occupied by American troops were, of course, an outright repudiation of army discipline, and 'These data would suggest that the [breakdown in discipline] was all but complete and universal. . . . The behavior of the men had constituted an affront to military order of the highest magnitude. . . ."

# Readers Take the Floor . . .

## FROM ENGLAND: SOME COMMENTS ON THE POLITICAL SCENE

[The following letter from a friend in England, dated March 24, should have been published earlier but it is still very interesting as a sidelight view on the situation in Britain.—Ed.]

To the Editor:

It has been very good indeed to receive the NI and LABOR ACTION, most especially the former as there is no theoretical journal here. Though we may appear to be very silent, in fact, the articles in NI are very carefully read, and, on the whole agreed upon as to their soundness and thoroughness.

As you must know, those of us who incline to a similar point of view as yourselves have no organization of any effectiveness, and many of us are not linked with even the small group which has, I believe, made some attempt at organization. All that we are able to do at present is to make every effort to keep our minds clear on the major issues and take the very few opportunities offered us to clarify discussion in the haphazard way it arises in the LP and ILP gatherings and in personal contacts.

The RCP ["official Trotskyists"] with its *Socialist Outlook* has done much to confuse left-wingers in the LP and now it is well-nigh impossible to know what are the real affiliations of members of their "Socialist Fellowship," so many are CPers, if indeed there are many Trotskyists amongst them.

You will, of course, have a pretty shrewd estimate of the way things are going here from the ordinary press reports. Everybody's main worry is the rapidly rising cost of living. There is really very little popular feeling against the "L" call-up, and a fatalism about the atom bomb. The CP cuts no ice on either issue. At present the CPers' choice of issue—rearmament of Western Germany—is completely ineffective. The CP is, in fact, quite discredited—which, of course, does not make it play less treacherous a role. The Tories are screaming every possible exploitable slogan. One feels the LP could often make very effective

### BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, published June 27:

FERTILITY IN MARRIAGE, by Louis Portnoy and Jules Saltman. Signet, 168 pages, 25 cents.

KNEEL TO THE RISING SUN and Other Stories, by Erskine Caldwell. Signet, 144 pages, 25 cents.

HOW TO KNOW AMERICAN ANTIQUES, by Alice Winchester. Mentor, 292 pages, 35 cents.

answer if it would bother to go to the public.

The scenes in the Commons last week, I think, gave many middle-of-the-roadsers pause for thought. As I write, the ILP is in conference and rumors are current of its burial—I expect unfounded—the corpse will continue to be hawked from Transport House to Friends House and back again. Commonwealth crops up with this ad: "Ex-Commonwealth Reunion Dinner"—"all old members welcome". . . "tickets 6/-."

Everything dismal in the popular mind, however, is expected to give way to light and jollification over Morrison's Festival of Britain. It would be interesting to see an estimate of the cost of this particular circus in terms of the bread and butter. But we shall have to wait some time to see the necessary reports.

The eternal queues are pitiable. To the housewife who has little money, every meal is a problem, the price of every article she has to buy increases little by little. This imposition falls most heavily on working people with children and old people who cannot earn. Rationing by the purse is now established, although, of course, the other kind of rationing still ensures a rather better diet than was ever guaranteed pre-1939.

I would sum it up by saying that the country still feels itself to be in a state of siege. The LP has done well, far better than many people expected, but the seams are coming apart in the structure they have endeavored to create. Fair shares, economic recovery, nationalized industry—but rising cost of living, three years to go toward better living conditions—but with what kind of regime at the end of them? And nowhere a glimmer of hope that a good life will be realized. It was that which people voted for in '45. They begin to see that lasting out the siege will not bring it and nobody points out fresh, hopeful possibilities (except, so help us, the Tories and the CP).

However, writing you an impressionate picture must needs leave all too much unexplained and unaccounted for. There is a

melting-pot appearance to England still, which, when I remember my childhood (just before the war) and the rigidity of class distinctions then, has some good aspects (?), but I feel half the fight has gone out of the working class for the time being, except amongst the miners, who as a group, will never forget nor think of forgiving or softening up. A close study of conditions and attitudes amongst them could be most profitable for anyone wanting to know how we really are faring.

Thank you again for the papers. All good wishes.

M. STEPHENS  
London, March 24

### Suggestion

To the Editor:

The minority resolution at the recent UAW convention pointed out that an independent Labor Party will give American workers a real Fair Deal.

The resolution could have added that a Labor Party will give working people the Best Deal. A good slogan might be, "Organize a Labor Party for the Best Deal possible."

JOHN LOEB

### LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor and Socialist library . . . Send for free book list 114 W. 14 Street, N.Y.C.

### The Handy Way To Subscribe!

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:  
 NEW  RENEWAL  
 6 months at \$1.00  
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

ZONE ..... APT. ....

CITY .....

STATE .....

Bill me.  
 Payment enclosed.

# PRO AND CON: WAR POLICY

## McKINNEY CONTINUES EXPOSITION OF HIS MINORITY VIEWS ON WAR POLICY

By E. R. McKINNEY

This week I want to summarize what I believe about the war and accompanying events. Comrade O'Connor's reply to my last piece is headed: "Defend Democracy? Yes!—Defend U. S. Imperialism? No!" I have not been raising the question of defending anything; only the question of what are the facts, how revolutionary socialists should react to those facts, what should be the content of revolutionary socialist propaganda and how it should be organized for the purpose of advancing the program of revolutionary socialism in the ranks of the masses. I have had nothing to say about bourgeois democracy being a "lesser evil." I said and still hold that bourgeois democracy is the political system of the UN nations and that it is profoundly different from Stalinist or any other totalitarianism.

This is today the outstanding opportunity for reaching the masses with the propaganda of revolutionary socialism, that is, the program of Marxism, of genuine Bolshevism. In the present situation to attempt to reach the masses through their longing for "democracy," as they call it, is comparable to the longing of the Russian masses in the period of World War I for "peace, land and bread." There is one important difference: the masses in the U. S. are politically far ahead of the 1914 Russian masses and their concern with "democracy" is at a higher political level than the "peace, land and bread" interests of the Russian masses.

Comrade O'Connor charges that I err when I say that LABOR ACTION makes Stalinism and bourgeois democracy out to be "equally reactionary twins." But he writes: ". . . both Washington and Moscow pursue basically reactionary policies. . . a victory of either one of them will have reactionary consequences." Now this is a little bit muddy and unclear. Both Washington and Moscow pursue basically reactionary policies; but they do not pursue identically reactionary policies. There are levels and degrees of reaction.

It has been and I presume is still the position of revolutionary socialists (Marxists) that one profound difference between bourgeois democracy and fascism is that under fascism effective organization of the class struggle by labor is all but eliminated. For instance, today in the U. S., which

is certainly dominated by a reactionary ruling class, the Communist Party is still in existence and operating. Its meetings have not been disrupted by a Gestapo and neither have its members been rounded up and sent to slave-labor camps. The *Nation* and *New Republic* are still spluttering from week to week. LABOR ACTION comes out every week, saying whatever it sees fit and unmolested. I cite these really elementary things to show that to say that the U. S. and Russia pursue basically reactionary policies is virtually devoid of meaning. Any exploitive system is reactionary.

We have been taught that any kind of state, even a workers' state, is oppressive. This means that in a certain way it is reactionary. But does that mean that a workers' state, in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for example, is comparable, as reactionary, to the displaced bourgeois state? Comrade O'Connor will, of course, say "no" immediately but Norman Thomas will say that it is more reactionary than the bourgeois democratic state. He is against "all dictatorships," meaning primarily "fascism and bolshevism" since to him bourgeois democracy is not a dictatorship.

I understand thoroughly that the direction of the oppressive workers' state is toward socialist freedom and that the direction of the bourgeois state today is not only not in the direction of socialist freedom but even away from bourgeois democracy. That is, its historical trend today is not, as in the first quarter of the 19th century, in the direction of bourgeois-democratic freedom. But historical trends and epochs have the habit of being rather long-drawn-out. History is not a series of mutations. It is not like some insects, born mature. Neither does an epoch pass away suddenly as with a sort of capitalist heart attack.

There is a subhead on Comrade O'Connor's article: "Neither Camp Defends Democracy." This statement is neither factual nor true. Here again is mystification caused by a very loose use of the English language. (This, of course, is not unusual in political discussion.) Neither camp defends socialist democracy, workers' democracy, that type of democracy which is in the full interest of the masses. But the U. S. UN camp does defend some kind of democracy; the Russian camp

defends no kind of democracy. If this is denied then you take the position that they are "equally reactionary."

The UN camp defends bourgeois democracy. Comrade O'Connor writes: "we do not and will not make the mistake of identifying bourgeois democracy and capitalist imperialism." I take it from this that if Comrade O'Connor can find bourgeois democracy somewhere divorced from imperialism he will support it. He can support Switzerland. Or Norway for example. So far as I know these countries do not go in for capitalist or any other kind of imperialism. But I ask, can this twofangled theory of Comrade O'Connor hold for the U. S.? England? etc., etc. What was the U. S. on that day in 1915 when the marines marched into the Haitian parliament and dissolved this ancient body and took over the whole little country? In just what portion of the life of England was that country bourgeois-democratic but not imperialist?

Comrade O'Connor says: "The fact is that the 'content of democracy' for Asia and even for Europe is not and cannot be a system patterned after the bourgeois-democratic capitalism of the U. S." Why not? In the concrete, right now, what will it be patterned after? I am talking about a real and actual government, not a political abstraction. Nehru could do worse than pattern his proposals for the press on capitalist U. S. He can do precisely what he is doing; getting nearer to Perton, except that he proposes to do it by law so-called. Would it be an improvement in Western Germany for the Allied armies to withdraw and give the Germans a chance to copy, if they see fit, the bourgeois-democratic practices in the U. S.? Or doesn't this make any difference?

Comrade O'Connor writes further concerning Europe and Asia: "democracy" cannot be brought to these peoples in the wake of American armies. It certainly will not be brought to them by Stalinist armies either. That is why we are against both war camps."

There are two things wrong here. First, it is not true that "democracy" cannot follow in the wake of American armies. Do American armies set up fascism or Stalinism? Is that what MacArthur established in Japan or Clay in Germany? Does Comrade O'Connor hold that the coming

Japanese constitution will be a totalitarian constitution? I say that it will be a democratic constitution, that is bourgeois-democratic. I am not very happy at the fact that I do not yet have to oppose totalitarianism, the "garrison state," the "ditte state," yet in the U. S. I am happy because if I were actually faced with this dilemma I would be helpless and the working class would be helpless. They have a BREATHING SPELL. They are not stifled yet. There is a difference and it is irresponsible to underestimate its importance. The latter part of the above quotation again takes the position, implicitly that the two camps are "equally reactionary."

Finally Comrade O'Connor writes: "Comrade McKinney seems to exclude the possibility of the formation of a Third Camp, the possibility that the workers and peasants and colonial peoples can rally themselves to struggle against both war camps. . . . Well for one thing, I was taught, inside and outside the Marxist movement, that the masses do not and cannot organize themselves. They can write in agony, surge and even revolt but they cannot organize themselves. The mass-industry masses did not organize the CIO. They provided the all-important creative surge necessary but the CIO was organized and set up primarily by John L. Lewis and the UMWA. Not only was the NAACP not organized by Negroes but it was not even organized primarily by Negroes at all but by white liberals. I assumed that one thing Lenin taught us was that it was precisely at this point that Bolshevism made one of its major politico-organizational contributions, namely that Bolshevism is the theory and practice of the party leading the masses. Now I discover that even in backward, illiterate and hungry Asia, the masses can lead themselves. There was a man in our movement once who held this notion. According to him the sharecroppers ("peasants" to him) would provide the revolutionary inspiration for the industrial proletariat.

I know of and accept only one "Third Camp"; that is the world masses led by the proletariat with a revolutionary socialist party at its head. That is why the very term "third camp" is a useless addition to the Marxian vocabulary. Not only useless but not unrelated to reformism and a certain kind of frantic opportunism.

As for Comrade Findley's side issue, two remarks are necessary: (1) It's one-sided. It is very true and very important that "many who support Washington do so from progressive reasons." (It was true and important for World Wars I and II also.) Valuable conclusions in approach and educational propaganda flow from this fact. By the same token, however, Findley should keep his eye on the fact that (to paraphrase) "many who support the Stalinists do so from progressive reasons" also. For most of the world, to put it mildly, an equally important fact! All of which is important on how to put forward our Third Camp position, but not on what that position should be.

(2) If we may be so bold as to interpret Findley, he is perhaps suggesting that we should emphasize (not "flaunt") our opposition to the war as compared with stressing the need to defeat Stalinism. This, like its possible obverse, misses one of our main points. This is: the prerequisite for an effective and meaningful socialist line against Stalinism is vigorous (not de-emphasized) opposition to U. S. imperialism and its war policies. This is a shorthand formula for the sake of brevity, but it should serve to recall the idea.

LABOR ACTION's material on the war has been full of discussions of "how to defeat Stalinism," as is the first part of the resolution. It will continue to be, and within the context of our views.—Ed.

### They Need Your Help!

Local New York of the Independent Socialist League has been regularly mailing packages of food and clothing to needy workers in Europe. The relief committee has especially urgent need for clean, wearable clothing for children of school age, particularly in the 12-14 age group. Please bring or send your contributions to the city center of the ISL, at 114 West 14 Street, 3rd floor, New York City.

### Says "We Have to Stress Our Position for the Defeat of Stalinism"

To the Editor:

It seems to me that McKinney and the editors are going around in circles, neither of them coming to grips with each other's position. The major responsibility is, of course, McKinney's.

If I may be so bold as to interpret McKinney's position, it is not support of the war, neither is it opposition to the war. McKinney's position can best be described as "benevolent neutrality" toward the Anglo-American bloc. While he is not ready for us to support the war, he has no objections to

others supporting the war. What's essentially wrong with this position, I will let the editors deal with. For myself I would like to discuss a side issue.

McKinney correctly points out that many who support Washington do so from progressive reasons. It seems to me that our job in the U. S. is not primarily to come into head-on opposition by flaunting the anti-war side of our position. Without giving up our anti-war position we have to stress our program for the defeat of Stalinism. It is true that the majority resolution [i. e., the PC resolution—no minority resolution has been presented, at least as yet—Ed.] gives us the essentials of such a position but the emphasis is still too much on the negative side of our program rather than its positive side. For example: instead of, or rather in addition to, the "Open Letter to Acheson," I would like to see Comrade Shachtman write an equally lengthy and skillful article devoted primarily to "How to Defeat Stalinism."

AI FINDLEY

We're going to pass up Comrade Findley's invitation to deal with the alleged position of "benevolent neutrality" (whatever that means exactly) which he deduces from Comrade McKinney's articles.

25 cents Order from:  
Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

Against the ISL Draft Resolution --

"Titoist Yugoslavia Is Not Stalinist"

By PAUL ROBERTS

The Draft Resolution of the Political Committee on Yugoslavia represents a half step forward. In fact, the first half of the resolution, with one exception, takes satisfactory cognizance for the first time of some of the real aspects of the Tito-led revolt and its consequences.

The exception is: at the end of section 2, there is the implied refusal to support the Yugoslav people's struggle against a Stalinist imperialist invasion if the Western Powers should—for their own reasons—side militarily with Yugoslavia. This is based upon the assumption that Yugoslavia will without fail become an organic part of the Western camp and, of course, upon the basic notion that the regime is and will be an exploiting class regime.

Part I of the PC's resolution, entitled "The Positive Outcome of Titoism," carries the very important, if belated, realization that at least in Western Europe Tito-like movements "tend to move either in the direction of . . . capitulation to the bourgeoisie, or in the direction of the Third Camp." Incidentally, mention should certainly be made of Germany as well as of Italy, since the UAP (Independent Workers Party) is at least as significant as the Magnani-Cucchi group.

What the authors of the resolution cannot yet see is that this has for some time been precisely the dilemma of the Yugoslav Communist Party and regime as well. And all the while that the columns of LABOR ACTION were filled with myopic articles on Yugoslav "Stalinism," on this real earth desperate pressures have been at work pushing Yugoslavia toward integration with the capitalist world.

This brings us to Part II of the draft resolution. Allow me to quote: "All of its origins [emphasis in the original] and the formation of its leading personnel are in Russian and Russian-controlled Stalinism. But its break with Moscow, while still remaining on the basis of the same system, has shown us for the first time a bureaucratic-collectivist state and system setting out [my emphasis—P. R.] to adapt Stalinism to its own national needs, interests and conditions."

These two important sentences show, alas, the two primary weaknesses of the whole approach to the Yugoslav question by the ISL leadership. First of all: a sad ignorance of the origins of the Yugoslav regime.

Last summer this writer tried, in a discussion article, to explode the complete lunacy of the assertion in another article that the Tito regime was installed by the Russians, as the other Eastern European Stalinist governments were. Let us get clear once and for all the fact that the Yugoslav Communists were carried to power not by Russian bayonets but by the mass resistance movement. It should be equally clear that such a road to power would have an effect upon the attitudes of the cadres involved. And the Yugoslav leaders were never too prompt to respond to Russian control.

Breaking with Stalinism

The second weakness which has permeated the PC's approach to the Yugoslav question is that of a sectarian scholasticism bent upon abstracting one or a few aspects of a situation and constructing systems from them. These systems may be built with some formal professional logic, but they show little trace of an effort to achieve a Marxist understanding of the general development of the situation.

Let us grant that the Yugoslav leaders SET OUT merely to adapt Stalinism to Yugoslavia. That is not the question: the question is: are they doing it? The answer is: one by one, with increasing rapidity, they are beginning to fly in the face of every trend of present-day Stalinist development.

One of the cornerstones of the Stalinist state is, of course, the privileged position of the bureaucracy. The Yugoslav decree of October 14, 1950 wiped out the bureaucrats' special privileges of living and eating better than a skilled worker. Many of the bureaucrats grumbled. Some went so far as to appropriate for themselves food stocks under their control; they landed in jail. The proponents of the PC position have passed off the whole Yugoslav campaign against bureaucratism and for democratization and "decentralization" at first as meaningless and now as something due only to adaptation to little Yugoslavia's lack of resources, etc.

Can that be said with justice of the wiping out of entire powerful ministries, which are replaced by technical committees made up of a handful of regional representatives, and the turning out of thousands of bureaucrats who are told to go out and get themselves jobs as workers? And can the comrades pass over in silence the introduction of rules, culled from the Paris Commune, setting a two-year limit on the term of factory directors, who must then return to their benches?

A second key Stalinist tenet is the cult of the leader. The Yugoslavs have bitterly attacked the Stalinist substitution of blind leader worship for Marxist analysis. There is a very noticeable trend away from having ikon-like pictures of Tito all over the place, with all that they signified. This is not based upon the impressions of a befogged Norman Thomas taking a hurried walk down the Terezia Street from Belgrade's Hotel Moskva. Nor upon the uncritical articles that filled the official-Trotskyist press during their short-lived honeymoon with the Titoists, articles along the lines of the classical "Socialist smoke pouring from the factories" pieces of the old Friends of the Soviet Union days, articles whose authors now find themselves attacked by Tito and Kardelj as "in practice incessantly following at the tail of Soviet foreign policy." No, this trend away from hero-worship has been noticed by critical observers, with experience in the revolutionary movements of several countries, and they have noticed it all over Yugoslavia.

And that trend is significant when taken with the hammering away at the bureaucratic degeneration of the Russian state and CP, even though Milovan Djilas has come up with an amateurish theory about Russia being state-

capitalist without having a capitalist class. The Yugoslav press has been filled with attacks on the totalitarian stultification of all thinking by an all-powerful Politburo making everything, including even science and the arts, subservient to it.

Lest you think that their attack applies only to Russian Stalinism, note that on June 3, 1951 the plenum of the Yugoslav Central Committee heard a report by the Yugoslav Central Committee on the degeneration of Djilas on the lessons to be drawn from the degeneration of the Russian CP which, the report said, "is no longer a party of the Marxist type . . . because the basic elements for such a party have been destroyed: freedom of opinion [probably a better translation than that given by the New York Times would be: "the free struggle of ideas"—P. R.] and true democracy within the party based upon such a struggle." Following Djilas' report the plenum voted a procedure quite new in Eastern Europe today. From now on "personal views of party leaders may be challenged or discussed freely in party meetings or in the party press" until the matter is settled by a majority vote of an official party body. Of course it remains to be seen to what extent this will be carried into practice, but today even the concept is significantly alien to the *fischerprinzip* of the Stalinist parties in Russia, in the satellites and all over the world.

The CPY's Direction

A third important aspect of the Stalinist state is its totalitarian police "justice." We have all heard of the frame-up trials in which so-called defense lawyers join in heaping abuse on their supposed charges. LABOR ACTION on June 4 aptly highlighted a cynical statement by Czech Deputy Minister of Justice Herafa, giving a typical Stalinist appraisal of the role of lawyers. Said Herafa: "Today nothing any longer justifies the independent practice of the profession of law." He complained that some lawyers had been under the impression that their job is to "take the part of their clients' interests" and have thus "disturbed the prosecutor and judges in the good [sic] accomplishment of their tasks."

This concept of the defense lawyer as an assistant to the prosecutor is one of the Stalinist concepts which the Yugoslavs have denounced and are trying to combat. The new Yugoslav Criminal Code adopted a few months ago also denounces the Stalinist practices of permitting a prosecutor to prolong indefinitely the pre-trial detention of the accused, of punishing people for their "general attitude" or suspected attitude without having to convict them of a specific offense defined as criminal under the law, and failing to show a spirit of in- and of justice automatically "accepting confessions dependence toward the police." In fact, the Yugoslav press has complained that the profession of defense lawyer became so onerous during what they call "the period in which we slavishly aped the Soviet bureaucracy," that no one wanted to become a defense lawyer any more.

A fourth pillar of Stalinism has been its perversion of trade unions into speed-up agents of the state. Only last week the Central Committee of the Yugoslav unions reminded their militants that their role is supposed to be the defense of the workers' interests even against their own state. This reminder is coupled with a denunciation of the Stalinist role of the unions as straw bosses to get increased production for the managers. Of course even this new advance leaves much to be desired, since there is no claim of the right to strike against their government, but the trend away from the Stalinist conception is clear. This in turn fits in with last year's introduction of factory councils which the Russians first emasculated and then abolished even juridically fifteen years ago.

How can such important differences with the Stalinism of today be called minor local peculiarities? Only by arbitrarily squeezing them down until they lose all relation to their importance. Or better still, and this is the "find" of the PC's resolution, the events in Yugoslavia are "due to precisely such experimentation and improvisation as 'due to the lack of the Tito bureaucracy, as was also true in the hatching of Russian Stalinism.'" There we have it! To show the identity between Titoism and Stalinism our professors compare these Yugoslav developments with the Russia of—when? today? No, that would be too ridiculous. With the Russia of the twenties and early thirties! Yes, the Yugoslavia of 1948 had something in common with the Russia of, say, 1930. In both cases the bureaucracy was unsure of itself, did not have a solid hold on all of society. But if ever international and local pressures pushed two countries in different directions, this was it.

The Russian Stalinists in their "hatching" days were looking for—and bringing into existence—a new ruling class to destroy in its own way the conquests of October, class of the workers' state. To do this they had to find ways to root out every shred of the old revolutionary tradition. That's why they were "experimenting and improvising." The Yugoslavs too are fighting against old conquests and traditions, but not at all the same kind of conquests and traditions. The Yugoslav CP is fighting, on a gradually widening front, against the traditions and conquests of their own bureaucrats of the days when they "slavishly aped the Russians."

Why have the Yugoslav Communists been developing in this direction? Is it to appease or "placate" those for whom, the PC resolution says, "the Cominform break gave rise to (though not decisively motivated by) an upsurge of feelings, hopes, aspirations and illusions"? No, a real Stalinist state, with its own viable class base, could merely "placate the people" at some juncture—but that was precisely the trouble with the Yugoslav bureaucracy. They had not had the long years, the international apparatus, the physical resources of the Russian Stalinists. They were instead quickly deprived of their one solid Stalinist support, Russia, and thrown into the position of needing the working peoples of Yugoslavia not as a placated neutral but as their own base of power.

That is why the Bonapartist bureaucracy of 1948, with many hesitations and vacillations and zigzags, has had to turn toward the working peoples of Yugoslavia instead of being able to afford the luxury of establishing itself as an independent exploiting class.

The PC resolution is deeply disturbed by the possibility of a pro-Yugoslav attitude being used as a bridge to the theory of the "bureaucratic revolution" and to the abandonment of independent Marxist organization in order to become a left-Stalinist tail. That possibility exists, as the writings of Pablo of the 4th International slyly show. On the other hand there are those who use support of Tito as a bridge to support of Western capitalism, like Wallace. Then there are those, like the German UAP, whose support of Tito has led them toward the Third Camp. There is also the fact that on the continent of Europe, the Third Camp groups friendly to the ISL and to its general position, and notably our Spanish comrades of the POUM, have taken a favorable attitude toward the Yugoslavs. Does Comrade Shachtman claim that only Pablo is logical?

The PC resolution notes that "if this road has been possible for the Yugoslav CP, it is possible for any other CP." Or, if one pawn can skip a space on its first move, so can all the other pawns. (At this point I can see Professor Draper nodding his head and saying: "Precisely.") It never even occurs to our professors that Moscow was not able, however much it would have liked to have been, to simply manufacture CPs in series, all identical, all equally bound to Moscow's strings. Fortunately for history perhaps, parties (if they are related to mass movements and are neither simply imported puppets nor little family sects) are not little pieces of wood on a professor's chess board. They can be effected by the mass movements just as they can effect the movements. This is particularly true of the one Communist Party in Europe ready solidly existing exploiting class. This is therefore particularly true of the one Communist Party in Europe which was an intimate part of the one active, revolutionary mass resistance movement on the continent. That is why the Yugoslav regime had an organic link with the masses such as no other East European regime even approached.

What's Fundamental?

That organic link with the Yugoslav masses not only made the break possible—it impelled it. That is why, when the Stalinists purged and liquidated the mayor of Bucharest, a member of their Rumanian Central Committee, he was charged with "having tried to make himself popular." The Stalinists are not professors; they know where danger lies, and they will certainly do everything they can to make new Yugoslavia's impossible in the future. It would be dangerously wrong to base our future line and orientation on the tiny possibility of such an event repeating itself, particularly since, as the 4th International's experience with Yugoslavia shows concretely, any such party which breaks with Stalinism quickly leaves the entire Russian camp in any case. That is why supporters of the Third Camp are actually able to get along with Yugoslav or German or French Titoists better than are the pro-Russian Trotskyists.

The PC's resolution concludes its analysis of the Yugoslav state on a peculiar note. Peculiar, that is, for anyone who supported Lenin and the Bolsheviks, though it would not be peculiar for a Menshevik. Section II concludes by saying that despite any small concessions, the regime will quickly quell all "tendencies to make or demand fundamental changes in the political system (particularly in the CPY's monopoly of politics and in the monolithism of the one-party state)." [My emphasis—P. R.]

Now this writer himself thinks the suppression of all other parties was a mistake by the Bolsheviks, and that mistake made it easier for Stalinism to consolidate itself. This writer does not, however, join with the Mensheviks in equating the Bolsheviks—even when they make such an error—with the Stalinists. Since when do we make the one-party state our criterion in judging the nature of a state? If the authors of that draft resolution wish to revise their whole estimate of the Russian revolution let them do so openly, not by dragging it in the back door!

The PC resolution fears the "rout and confusion" which can come from a pro-Yugoslav analysis. Such rout and confusion can exist, of course. On the other hand, the safest way to avoid confusion is to take off into the ivory tower of sectarianism. We can copy the Manganaro group in Italy with its abstentionist ultra-leftism, the Socialist Labor Party in this country which sticks—come hell or high water—to the program laid down by Daniel DeLeon in the 1890s, or the attitude of the Socialist Workers Party toward the newfangled approach of the big post-war General Motors strike. Then no one will get confused, no one will be in a position to influence the unruly course of events, and the comrades of the ISL Political Committee will peacefully grow beards while the world goes by or crumbles around them.

NOTE: This discussion article is not accompanied by a resolution. That is because the Political Committee's draft resolution was so late in appearing; it finally appeared only in LABOR ACTION of June 18. There was barely the time to write this critique; since there was not the time to write a substitute resolution. The writer cannot be in New York for the convention himself, he urges the delegates, if no other resolution on Yugoslavia is presented, to do the following: Ask the separation of the PC resolution into its two component parts: vote for Part I ("The Positive Outcome of Titoism") and vote to table Part II ("National Stalinism in State Power") for further discussion.—P. R.

For the ISL Draft Resolution --

Tito Regime: Reality versus Whitewash

By HAL DRAPER

Unfortunately for the educational usefulness of Comrade Roberts' discussion, he writes as if the only material we have presented on Titoism was the present resolution on National-Stalinism and Yugoslavia. As it should, this resolution summarizes our political analysis and views on that subject. But few political questions have received as voluminous treatment by us, not only as to analysis and views but as to the facts and evidence which test views. And as a matter of fact, Roberts has read this mass of material. More's the pity that he writes as he does.

(1) WE HATE TO DO THIS . . .

This is especially clear in his first remarks about "half step forward . . . for the first time," etc. The "half step forward" is the resolution's discussion of pro-Titoist splits in Western Europe.

We are loath to dampen Roberts' pleasure in our half-step forward, but this point in the resolution happens to be taken straight out of the final article in my LABOR ACTION series on pro-Titoism. That was over a half year ago (Dec. 11).

The title of this article was, indeed, "The Positive Outcome of Titoism," which (plagiarism upon plagiarism) is used for the first part of the present resolution.

There is only one difference: half a year ago in making the same point, the example I used was the German group (now called the UAP) which Roberts himself refers to. The resolution uses the more recent event in Italy.

(2) DEFENSE

Still more unfortunately, Roberts also finds a step backward: "the implied refusal to support the Yugoslav people's struggle" against Stalinist invasion if the Western powers side with Yugoslavia. That's his language. It is simply amazing.

Yes, from the very beginning we have said that we defend Yugoslavia against Russian invasion as long as this is the war that is being fought. And from the very beginning we have added that this "could quickly become the focus of war between the U. S. bloc and the Stalinist bloc, in which the national Yugoslav element would be swallowed up and subordinated; and in which it would be impossible to defend Yugoslavia without giving support to the overshadowing war of the Western bloc." (That's the resolution's language.)

Does Roberts disagree with this? That would be news to me. Yet he seems to be objecting to it. It is not a question of predicting whether a Russian invasion would or would not touch off the world war. That is a question for either a speculative discussion or a crystal ball, but not for a resolution. It is a question of making clear that we do not propose to support World War III if it formally breaks over the Yugoslav national question, as World War I formally broke out over the Serbian national question.

(3) TOWARD CAPITALISM?

The resolution states that national-Stalinist splits in the stateless CPs, in Western Europe for example, are pushed in the direction either of capitulation to the bourgeoisie or toward Third Camp politics. (This, incidentally, is not intended to exhaust the alternatives, since disintegration as a tendency being another, for one.)

These, Roberts informs us, are also the alternatives ("the dilemma") before the Yugoslav regime—presumably: toward capitalism or toward genuine socialism. We are "myopic" because we "cannot yet see" that "on this real earth" Yugoslavia is being pushed toward "integration with the capitalist world" by the pressures at work.

Coming from the official-Trotskyists, whose article of faith it is that capitalism or socialism are the only possible social systems in the world, we would understand this assertion (there is no argumentation attached). But it comes from Roberts, who looks on Stalinism not only as an ideology but as a new social system.

Is he saying that this new social system can exist only under the aegis of one state, Russia; that it is excluded that it can exist in a state independent of the Kremlin? If it is not I who raise the question; it happens to be the theme of a good part of the resolution. Yet Roberts has no space to take up this question, which strikes at the root of his view of Yugoslavia, and limits himself to the jibe about myopia.

The resolution stresses: the difference in the position of the Tito regime as compared with (say) Magnani-Cucchi is that the former is based on a state power and

the latter is a propaganda group in a hostile society. This simply accounts for the difference in the immediate pressures on, and the immediate alternatives before, the two. Without any doubt, it is possible for Magnani-Cucchi to remain a Stalinist-dissident group at odds with the Kremlin (and remain quite impotent, too, I would add). But Tito, having split from the Kremlin, is not impotent. He has the state power of a totalitarian regime under him.

He has before him the perspective of using his state power to consolidate a regime based on the same social system he was building BEFORE the split, namely, bureaucratic collectivism. It is because a split-off group in a stateless CP does not have this possibility before it that the resolution spotlights the pressures on such a group's members to turn in the direction of the bourgeoisie or the Third Camp.

This is the point as far as the Yugoslav state bureaucracy is concerned. (The resolution sufficiently stresses that the break impelled wide elements in Yugoslavia toward the left.) But the whole point about Roberts-type pro-Titoism is exactly its claims FOR THE TITO RULING BUREAUCRACY. It is the ruling bureaucracy which is painted as pushing for "democratization," "socialist democracy," etc.

(4) ORIGINS

It is, frankly, tiresome to be told once again about how Tito's CP came to power on the basis of a mass resistance movement, and to have this chewed over as irrelevantly as before. We pointed to this indubitable and important fact in the very first article on the break in our press, as an essential part of our explanation why Tito's national-Stalinist revolt was able to be successful while others (like Dimitrov) with similar yearnings got nowhere.

Let me make clear, then, if it is necessary, that the resolution (Par. 6) is at this point concerned with the origins of the Yugoslavs' political and social ideology "and the formation of its leading personnel" "in Russian and Russian-controlled Stalinism." This is the political womb from which they came. If Comrade Roberts will look back at this passage, he will see the reason why this point is made there.

(5) EVIDENCE

Roberts' section on the Tito regime's "struggle against bureaucracy" and other evils need not occupy us long. Roberts, for the most part, merely repeats the bare claims of Yugoslav propaganda which have been taken up in overwhelming detail and at exhaustive length in LABOR ACTION articles, notably our series of articles (all 20 of them) from July 31 to Dec. 11.

Nowhere else have the facts about the Yugoslav regime been examined in such detail. And so, if nothing else, my pride is hurt at Roberts' pretense that he is bringing us news.

For a half year after these articles came to their conclusion, Roberts did not have the time to set LA readers straight. Now, complaining about the rush, he blithely ignores (for lack of space) virtually all the factual material and political analysis that have been presented, and considers it possible to reassert the bare claims as if he had just dropped in yesterday.

One piece of "evidence," however, has to be taken up because it cropped up only the other day in the dispatch of Tito's Walter Duranty (Times correspondent Handler) and Roberts shovels it in without realizing what he is doing. This is the announcement from Bulgaria that the regime "reminded" the trade-union leaders "that their role is supposed to be the defense of the workers' interests even against their own state."

With great restraint, we shall merely remark in passing that Roberts hands us (as always) a speech or decree or announcement or claim by the regime, and then proceeds to talk about the "new advance." Are the Russian satellite states full of such speeches by its leaders about how the trade unions have to protect the interests of the workers? Yes, and "bad" trade-union leaders get purged with monotonous regularity, but from Belgrade a decree is better than a deed. These horrible conditions that are now to be abolished by the "new advance"—can it actually be that they existed up to now? The Titoists denounced anyone who said so, and Comrade Roberts would have followed with head-shaking and awfully cutting remarks about scholastic professors.

"Of course, even this new advance leaves much to be desired, since there is no claim of the right to strike against their government," says Roberts. In point of fact, it was specifically reiterated that there was no right to strike. But you can't have everything, can you now? If you can't have trade unions which have any actual means to defend the workers' interests, at least you have a decree, and it is only myopic-scholastic-sectarian-abstentionist growers of beards who would not be tickled pink.

But this is not the cream of the jest. The uproarious part of it, for those who have that kind of sense of humor, is Roberts' statement that the new advance "fits in with last year's introduction of factory councils. . . ."

That's as it should be, with one giant stride toward democracy after another fitting together until the final edifice is built. . . . The only difficulty is that the new announcement on trade unions knocks the props from under the whole basis on which the factory councils were instituted and is in direct, head-on, blown-in-the-bottle collision with it.

For the functions which the trade-unions are now "reminded" they have to defend are the very functions which were virtually taken away from them and assigned to the factory councils, when the latter were set up with enough ballyhoo to launch a circus.

This disconcerting fact is all there in LA of last Dec. 4. The Belgrade Politika wrote last July that the new workers' council setup "changes essentially the role of the trade unions in the economic tasks and in the protection of the interests of the employees and workers. In the future, it will be the workers themselves who, through their workers' councils and their management committees, will independently solve all questions, taking upon themselves the economic functions and the role which the trade unions held in the solution of these questions." The new functions of the trade unions were declared to be "ideological, political and cultural," etc.

Likewise Tito himself, on July 18 at the National Assembly. Likewise the Central Committee of the trade unions a day later.

Roberts and others were simply bowled over by this great new advance toward democracy. We dealt with it last year on its own basis. Now the NEW great new advance is that the previous great new advance is dumped through a trap door. The function which was to be the REASON FOR EXISTENCE of the workers' councils is, with equal ballyhoo, reassigned back to the trade unions. Roberts has another decree to cheer.

Where this is supposed to leave the workers' councils now, I haven't the vaguest notion at the moment. Maybe they're supposed to be around also to "remind" the trade unions of their democratic duty now and then. And who will remind the reminders? It's an old story in all the Stalinist states, at bottom.

(6) BUREAUCRATIC REVOLUTION

After some assertions about the laudable aims of the Tito bureaucracy, Roberts gets to the nub of his basic problem: the theory of "bureaucratic revolution" from above. He manages to do this without devoting a word to our resolution's main point on that question. To put it bluntly, he avoids it like the plague.

Instead, we're asked about Pablo. This professor answers: Yes, on the basis of the premises, only the Pablo Trotskyists are near logical consistency, and they haven't traveled the whole road yet. Fortunately, consistency is rarer than a two-headed man.

Instead, we hear something about chess, a game I know nothing about, I regret. It seems to have something to do with Moscow's ability to control its CPs like pawns. That this is not true is shown by the spread of Titoist deviations, and therefore . . . that's as far as I follow it.

Instead, we get a sturdy defense of Bolshevism vs. Menshevism, and after that windmill lies in ruins we are asked a question. In its meaningful form, it would be this: Is the totalitarian regime a fundamental characteristic of the Stalinist state?

Of the Stalinist state, Comrade Roberts, yes. For ourselves, we made that analysis 10 years ago. As a reminder:

In a completely stultified economy, where political power and economic power are fused, the working class can be said to be the ruling class only as long as it exercises decisive political control over the state which owns and controls everything. The degeneration of the Russian Revolution was the process whereby the Stalinist counterrevolution destroyed every vestige of democratic control over the party, soviets and state apparatus.

That will do for a brief reminder. But on the heart of the question of bureaucratic revolution? Not a word from Roberts. This is: If, as he claims, the Yugoslav state bureaucracy is leading the country toward a socialist democracy, from something which yesterday was not even a workers' state, then somewhere along the line a social revolution is occurring, as an organic development out of the preceding regime. That's the "bureaucratic socialist revolution" which is staring out of his views on Yugoslavia. Maybe there is such an animal, let's not be dogmatic, etc., etc.—but if we ever accept it, our position on Titoism would be one of the minor casualties.

"VPERED"

is the organ of the Ukrainian socialist resistance movement, published by its section in emigration in West Germany, recording the thinking and activities of the new anti-Stalinist underground fighting behind the Iron Curtain. It is written in Ukrainian, of course, but an English summary of the contents appears in each issue.

For Ukrainian friends, Vpered is a must. Others will find the English page of extreme interest—and can help the movement by subscribing. One dollar for 5 issues.

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

Read The NEW INTERNATIONAL A basic pamphlet— "SOCIALISM: THE HOPE OF HUMANITY" by Max Shachtman 10 cents Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL America's Leading Marxist Magazine 35 cents \$2.00 a year

# IN KOREA: IS IT PEACE? — —

(Continued from page 1)

Malik stated that "as a first step discussions should be started between the belligerents for a cease-fire and an armistice providing for the mutual withdrawal of forces from the Thirty-eighth Parallel." Malik's use of "belligerents" is interpreted to mean the Chinese, North and South Koreans, U. S. and UN forces—those actually fighting. The Chinese, on the other hand, appear to lay down the condition that all foreign troops be withdrawn from Korea and that the solution of the Korean question be left to the people themselves. Yet at the

same time, the Chinese approved the Malik proposals as making "for peaceful settlement of the Korean question."

If there are substantial differences between Russia and China on a settlement, they undoubtedly relate to the fact that the Chinese Stalinist government has assumed greater control over the course of the Korean war and greater prestige and influence among the nations of Asia through its intervention against the U. S. forces at a time of the lowest ebb of Western influence. There is no question but that initially the North Korean blow was prepared,

timed and aimed by Moscow. Moscow may now be attempting to stop this trend and call a halt.

For there are other considerations. Russia may feel that the "fluid stalemate" in the region of the Parallel cannot be decisively settled short of Russian intervention and a consequent Third World War. Since she is unprepared and unwilling to risk that, she may be bargaining for time. She is grasping this opportunity to pose as "peace-maker" and appeal in that role to the peoples of the world.

The year since the beginning of the Korean war has also seen the military strengthening of the

Western bloc, the growth of armaments on a huge scale and the establishment of strategic U. S. bases in Europe. The Russian proposal may be an attempt to weaken the Atlantic Pact and slow down the armaments race in order to gain a breathing spell for themselves. Unquestionably, the Korean war has cost Russia a good deal.

## TOOK THE PLAY

There is no indication that the Chinese military preparations have in any way slackened off. It is also true that they have been heavily dependent upon Russian assistance. Russia may have been unwilling to accede to further demands for assistance, feeling that a "fluid stalemate" could continue indefinitely unless she herself intervened—or this situation may have combined with aspects of Chinese Stalinist dissidence.

There is no doubt that momentarily Russia has taken the play away from the United States. Factionally torn by the MacArthur controversy over the conduct of the war in Korea, the U. S. government could not at this juncture press anew with a bold offer of cease-fire or peace. Rather, under the initial assault of MacArthur and his supporters who would extend the war the administration leaned in their direction. Yet the Russian proposal on its face is roughly similar to those made by the United States in the past—cease-fire first at the Parallel and discuss afterward.

It is possible, of course, that Malik or other spokesmen for the Kremlin will reveal conditions that will void any discussion of a cease-fire and that this move is calculated for purely propagandistic purposes.

While the U. S. and Russia continue to discuss whether and on what conditions they will agree to discuss, the casualties continue to pile up in Korea, the armaments continue stockpiling every-

where, the dominant trend to the third world war continues. Even granting a cease-fire, the question of peace will then rise up to be settled. What kind of peace can be envisaged in the physically and morally mutilated and devastated land of Korea? Left truncated and occupied at the conclusion of World War II, will it be returned to that condition which bred a Stalinist puppet regime in the North and an American-controlled regime in the South and the bloodbath which ensued? Will the buffer zone proposed by the U. S. at the 38th Parallel be the setting for new border incidents and a redivision into the *status quo ante bellum*?

## TRAGIC IRONY

It is the ironic, tragic commentary on our times that, however demagogically, it was the totalitarians—in this case, the Chinese Stalinists—who put forward the democratic demand: withdrawal of all troops and let the Koreans settle their own problem. They can permit themselves this luxury in Korea only because of the centuries-old discredit of Western imperialism in all of Asia. How can the UN, which supports the bloody regime of Syngman Rhee, counter that? No wonder Rhee, who could not last a moment in an all-Korean election, wants to pursue the war to the last drop of the blood of his own people and of the American-UN soldiers.

Russian Stalinism appeals to the masses by means of the trappings and slogans of democracy; by the offer to exchange old feudal oligarchs for totalitarian ones. U. S. capitalism rests upon the old. Between the two, hapless millions starve and die.

Cease-fire or a divided or Stalinized Korea—what will this be but an episode between wars? Only this, unless a breathing spell gives the oppressed peoples of the world a chance to offer a new alternative.

# Gov't Roundup — —

(Continued from page 1)

political appeal. This is one of the ideas behind the Point Four program, and the Marshall Plan before it. A similar idea is to be found behind all the government's efforts to help anti-Stalinist groups and leaders to undermine the governments behind the Iron Curtain.

Now, with one strike, the administration once more demonstrates how cynical it really is about "democracy," how shaky is its faith in the superiority of capitalist democracy. For here, in the wealthiest and strongest capitalist country in the world, it proceeds with sheer police power to destroy a Stalinist movement which is admittedly one of the weakest and most helpless movements the Kremlin has been able to develop in any major country.

## NATIONAL SECURITY?

The influence of the Stalinist party has already been reduced to minor proportions in the labor movement. Their influence in the cultural world has almost vanished. The broad periphery they once had among muddleheaded liberals has melted away in the increasing heat of the cold war. Gradually the truth about the totalitarian character of the governments which the Stalinists support has penetrated so deeply into the minds of the workers that the CP is no longer able to attract to its banners those who are beginning to realize that there is something fundamentally wrong with the economic and social system of capitalism.

And it is precisely this WEAKNESS of the Stalinist movement in the United States which makes it perfectly clear that the government's determination to crush it by police measures is a danger to the civil liberties of everyone.

No honest person who is in his right mind can claim that this action is necessitated by "national security," or that it represents the legitimate self-defense of a democratic government confronted with the danger of armed overthrow. Even the self-regimented judges of the Supreme Court majority, who constitutionally the Smith Act, did not claim this. They simply proclaimed that the words "clear and

present danger" and the notion of an obscure and distant possibility of danger mean one and the same thing.

Thus the arrest of the Stalinist leadership, and the announcement that further arrests will follow just as rapidly as a new leadership is set up, is an action which strikes at the foundations of the idea of civil liberties, and hence at the foundations of political democracy. It is an attempt to illegalize a political movement and a political ideology. The indictment on which the arrests are based is so broadly drawn that a book dealer or a librarian who sells or circulates the classic works of Marx or Lenin could quite conceivably be arrested on similar charges.

## FIGHT NOW!

As a matter of fact, the irresponsible arm of this police law could extend farther than that. Who could state with confidence today that it is "safe" to advocate and teach the revolutionary doctrine contained in the Declaration of Independence?

Is it not high time that the labor movement, and those people throughout our country who are still attached to the principles of genuine democracy, made a serious and concerted effort to stop this development of a police state here? Is it not high time that they stopped contenting themselves with formal resolutions against the Smith Act and against the growing abuses of civil liberties perpetrated under it?

Are civil liberties, the very foundation of democracy, so unimportant that the labor movement can continue indefinitely its alliance with the party and the administration which is engaged in their progressive destruction?

No one has a right to denounce the terror of the Stalinist regimes who fails to throw his full strength into fighting the terrible portents of the police state in this country. Where it is not hypocrisy, it is downright stupidity and shortsightedness—not to speak of cowardice—to save one's conscience with the easy evasion that "After all, Russian totalitarianism is worse."

Of course, Russian totalitarianism is worse. In its own way and with all the necessary qualifica-

tions, it stands before us precisely as a signpost of the direction in which this capitalism of ours is heading.

Of course, the U. S. is not a police state yet. If it were, we would not be able to write this appeal to fight the trends now. But does that really sweeten the consciences of those who keep their shameful silence, or mutter in their beards, or content themselves with a formal recorded protest, and who refuse to fight against the strides being taken now toward police-state methods?

The CP is justly hated by every real lover of freedom. That is WHY the enemies of freedom at home feel free to direct their blows against it. They feel they can get away with it. They reckon on the scared, muddleheaded, timid and intimidated labor and liberal leaders to swallow their attack on democracy BECAUSE the present victims are the Stalinists.

How long will labor permit their reckoning to go unchallenged? Until its own head is in the noose?

# Lewis, Reuther — —

(Continued from page 1)

talk at the UAW top circles, both Ford Local 600 leaders and Lewis emphasized a rank-and-file approach and the contribution of workers made to building the union.

The second blunder of the UAW top leaders was their attempt to force a boycott of the Lewis appearance. One press release suggested that UAW locals as a matter of policy should boycott the rally at Ford 600, but a later one just said that the top UAW leaders had voted to boycott it. Now the impression was given in the shops that Reuther was ordering the workers not to listen to Lewis. And this was utilized by every anti-Reutherite to agitate successfully for a real Lewis rally.

On the world situation Lewis said: "Charles E. Wilson is saying that by 1953 Russia will be afraid to fight. If Russia doesn't want to fight by 1953, who in the hell is he going to fight? We'll be all dressed up with no place to go."

On Reuther, Lewis declared: "John L. Lewis was opposing communism before Walter Reuther ever went to Russia. John L. Lewis was opposing communism before Walter Reuther ever read Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* and failed to understand it."

## LEWIS AS SYMBOL

It was the same old John L. Lewis: a mixture of militant unionism, reactionary economic philosophy, and Midwest isolationism, reflecting distrust of the pro-war policies of Washington. His cracks at the intellectual nitwits running Washington stem from his long experience with New

Deal flunkies. And his contempt for the other labor leaders who time and again have defeated labor unity at the request of Washington politicians from Roosevelt down was shown time and again in his speech.

It is not likely that any specific idea or program of which Lewis spoke attracts the auto workers' attention. They are not for \$2.50 dues, let alone the \$4 that the coal miners pay. Nor are they for iron-handed bureaucracy, nor for the "Republicanism" which Lewis symbolizes at times. Rather, it is as a tough, militant union leader that he is a magnet for many auto workers.

And the fact that so many of the UAW secondary leaders who attended the mass rally greeted each other in a special way indicated the lesson of the event for the UAW. They meant: "What are you doing here? I thought Reuther said you couldn't come. He ordered us to stay away." By the hundreds, if not the thousands, the auto workers rebuked Reuther by the warm welcome they gave John L. Lewis.

Of course, the sum-total effect of the Lewis triumph in Detroit was to give the career of Reuther in the UAW a real shot in the arm. For they no longer feel isolated or powerless before a victorious Reuther regime. John L. Lewis has as much stature, if not more, than Reuther, and for the dissidents in the UAW he is now THE Leader. Nevertheless Lewis was quick to ridicule suggestions that he intended to raid or split the UAW—something that would be impossible for anyone to do—but that he intends to lend moral support to the anti-Reuther caucus is quite clear. His visit to

Detroit was an important victory for them.

## STELLATO'S MODEL

Outside of making two cracks at Reuther at the banquet and later ridiculing Reuther's anti-Communism as Johnny-Come-Lately stuff, Lewis refrained from personalities. His attack on the escalator clause didn't catch much fire, for the recent raises speak for themselves.

But with Layoff's increasing and the UAW floundering with the problem, Lewis was widely cheered when he said: "These profoundly intellectual union leaders should stop dreaming dreams and pay attention to the bread-and-butter needs of their members."

From this background Carl Stellato, Ford Local 600 president, made a new demand on Reuther that is bound to increase Reuther's problems. Stellato spoke for new contract talks now, to get the auto workers a guaranteed annual wage now. He insisted that Reuther call a national UAW emergency conference to discuss this issue, and to go in for industry-wide bargaining as the coal miners do.

What Stellato is doing, of course, is partly what he learned from the career of Reuther. You "out-radicalize" the leadership, and since you do not have the responsibility for results you look good in contrast to those in power. Nor can Stellato be dismissed as a minor figure in view of the obvious support he has from Lewis, as well as the whole anti-Reuther tendency in the UAW.

The only other point of importance that Lewis made was the renewal of his offer for the coal miners to contribute \$10,000,000 to a proposed \$50,000,000 labor-defense fund.

A brilliant study of the labor movement—

A vivid insight into a great union—

## "The UAW and Walter Reuther"

by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick

\$3.00

A Random House book

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York