

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 25, 1952

FIVE CENTS

'JOHN SPARKMAN—LIBERAL'

... page 2

The Squeeze on Britain's Economy

... page 3

Two Views on Tito's Yugoslavia:

The New Books by Ulam and Adamic

... page 6

## From Five Stars to Six Figures

Now that Remington-Rand has hired General MacArthur, and the general has agreed to fade for \$100,000 a year, more public attention has been devoted to the phenomenon that this illustrates. Sociologists can talk all they want about "class mobility" in the United States and how easy it is to rise from shoe-shine boy to industrial tycoon, but the real primrose path seems to lead from the camp of the army brass to the camp of the capitalist class.

So a recent issue of the big-business organ *Business Week* asks the interesting question: Why are the big corporations so anxious to put high-ranking army and navy officers on their payrolls?

"More and more general and admirals are beating their swords into corporate shares," says the magazine in a winged phrase. "Military men have had no trouble trading their brass hats for high-priced Stetsons—at salaries that make their military pay look picayune."

*Business Week* isn't wondering why the generals are so willing to swap their chance to do their patriotic duty for the fleshpots of Wall Street. "It's less obvious why industry, traditionally critical of military bureaucracy, seeks to hire them."

It goes on: "Some cynics see this trend as a 5-per cent scheme. As *Cosmopolitan* magazine puts it: 'In business circles the word has gone out: Get yourself a general. What branch of the government spends the most money? The military. Who, even more than a 5-percenter, is an expert on red tape? A general or admiral. So make him chairman of the board.'"

The business magazine poohs-poohs this cynical notion, for public consumption anyway, but it would be hard to think of a more adequate explanation. MacArthur isn't the only poor-but-honest general who has found his way to the top without saving the boss's daughter from a runaway horse. Some of them found the golden pot at the end of the Stars and Stripes at ages as young as 43, while still hale and hearty enough to endure the rugged conditions to which generals and admirals are subjected in their foxholes.

They include: General Joseph T. McNarney, now president of an airplane manufacturing company, Consolidated Vultee; Admiral Ben Moreel, chairman of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation; General Lucius D. Clay, chairman, Continental Can; General Brehon Somervell, chairman and president, Koppers Company; General E. R. Quesada, vice-president, Olin Industries; and General Ira Eaker, vice-president, Hughes Tool; and others, with salaries running into five figures or more. (MacArthur got his five-zero salary to match his stars.)

The permanent effect of these sterling examples of what American opportunity offers is not merely on the brass who get the shekels. It is a standing admonition to those who are still in charge of the army and navy's spending that, if they are good boys, they too can hope to trade fame for fortune. It makes them so much easier to deal with, and everybody knows how easily corporations get annoyed at interference by "bureaucrats" with their right to make a whopping profit.

## AFL to Abandon 'Nonpartisan' Line

By GORDON HASKELL

The Democratic and Republican presidential candidates are going to address the national convention of the American Federation of Labor. What is more important news, however, is that the AFL Executive Council has made it known that it proposes to have the convention endorse one of the candidates for office. This will be the first formal endorsement of a presidential candidate by the AFL since 1924 when it officially backed LaFollette.

The CIO top committee has already announced its endorsement of the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket. The CIO does not meet in convention till Thanksgiving, and thus the executive body had

to act for it. For the younger labor organization, however, this endorsement of a presidential candidate was not a new departure.

In inviting both candidates to address their convention, the leaders of the AFL are seeking to underplay the fact that they are taking a new step in politics away from their time-honored formula of "rewarding our friends and punishing our enemies" and their claim to be "non-partisan" politically. They want to make it appear that each candidate is being given an equal chance to get their support, depending on the promises he is willing to make to their assembled delegates.

**STEP FORWARD?**

It is hardly likely that either of the candidates, or anyone else, is beguiled by this pretense. The leadership of the AFL is nothing if not cautious. They would be stepping completely out of character if they left themselves open to the chance of a real struggle taking place at the convention over the endorsement. Their announcement, in advance, that an endorsement will be made indicates that agreement has already been reached among the key men in the Executive Council, and that they are as certain as men can be in politics that no major struggle will take place in their ranks. Without pretense of "inside" information and even less of prophecy, it can be said that the endorsement of the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket is in the bag. Eisenhower's presence will be nothing but a gesture to the past, a bow to a policy of "non-partisanship" now abandoned.

In his Labor Day message to the AFL, William Green said that although that organization maintains its policy of "non-partisanship," this should not be construed to mean that the AFL is "neutral" in politics. Although this may be taken as a quibble over words, in the context of the action which the AFL leaders propose to take it is an announcement of the new policy. We can expect to hear for some time to come that state and local AFL bodies have endorsed "friends of labor" for political office in both parties for a long time, and that therefore the endorsement of candidates for the presidency is just carrying this one step forward.

But the question will be asked, quite naturally: Why has the AFL failed to endorse presidential candidates for the past twenty-eight years? The answer is perfectly obvious. The endorsement of a presidential candidate is something different from the endorsement of local candidates, and even something different from the endorsement of candidates for Congress and the Senate.

(Turn to last page)

## Storm Over Sparkman Why the Liberals Are Soul-Searching

By PHILIP COBEN

John Sparkman, the Democratic Party's choice for vice-president from the South, has now given out with his most extensive presentation of political views to date, in a magazine interview. (See page 2.) It can best be read in the context of the larger question:

*Why such a to-do over the Sparkman issue at all?*

The fervency on the question comes not only from those who have been criticizing the Democrats' selection of Sparkman, such as Negro Democratic leaders like Adam Clayton Powell or trade-union Fair Dealers like the Sleeping Car Porters' McLaurin. The liberal and labor spokesmen have been devoting an equal amount of attention to explaining why they are willing to embrace him.

At first blush, the storm over Sparkman would seem to be disproportionate. After all, Franklin D. Roosevelt's vice-presidents were not all liberal paragons—remember Cactus Jack Garner of Texas—and the liberal-labor wing of the Democratic Party was considerably put out when Henry Wallace was dumped in favor of Harry Truman, who was regarded as a concession to the conservatives. Besides, the vice-presidency is notoriously not a very important post, as far as political influence is concerned, as long as the president is healthy.

Yet the intensity of the discussion over Sparkman is easily accountable, and meaningful.

The presence of the Alabaman on the ticket is the clearest concrete embodiment of OTHER doubts which have been assailing and still assail the supporters of the Fair Deal about the trend of the Democratic Party. One might say he was a symbol, if that did not make it seem too abstract.

Behind the questionings over Sparkman is the bigger question: Which way is the Fair Deal going?

**Why Sparkman Is an Issue**

• The Democratic choice of Sparkman was associated with, and is a token of, the turn to placate the Southern politicians which characterized the Chicago convention. It would be inaccurate to say that the Democrats "turned their backs" on labor in order to do this. It is very important to understand that they decided that they could afford to take labor's support for granted, in order to turn rightward and southward.

• The significance of the Sparkman nomination cannot really be brushed off with a reference to (say) Garner, precisely because it is not Sparkman himself who is the center of the issue, nor the importance of the vice-presidency. What Sparkman symbolizes is a step backward at a time when the labor-liberals were looking for another step in their own direction, and they are still a bit off balance as a result. It is the trend, the direction, that worries them. They feel the same way that a businessman does when sales take a drop down, even though the absolute level may still be higher than 10-odd years ago.

• Sparkman's power or lack of power as vice-president is not one of the main considerations that will determine whether or not the Democrats carry through a civil-rights program; but Sparkman's selection as vice-president is taken as a bad earnest of intention, especially in the context of the level of today's fight over civil rights. It could once be hailed as a new step forward if nice language were put in a party platform. What stands out before the Negro

(Continued on page 2)



# Storm over Sparkman Issue

(Continued from page 1)

voters is that no real attempt has been made by the Fair Deal to put steam behind their program. Commentators can talk, however legitimately, about literary advances in the Democratic 1952 platform. Sparkman is taken as the insurance to the South that still less will be done about it than by the Truman administration. (In this connection, it is worth mentioning that the sole task of the vice-president, to preside over the Senate, is relevant to the ability and will of the Democrats to curb that body's power to filibuster.)

Finally, the selection of Sparkman cast a back reflection on the No. 1 candidate, Governor Stevenson. For it was Stevenson who picked his running mate. And in many respects Stevenson's political and social views are almost as much an unknown quantity as those of General Eisenhower.

The soul-searching which is going on around the figure of Sparkman is really the expression of fearful doubts about the course of the Fair Deal itself in the event of Stevenson's election.

## Question Mark over the Fair Deal

Even the most dogmatic and doctrinaire proponent of gradualism (in the worst sense of the term) can justify himself only if he can point to gradual progress, if he can reject the idea of a break with both old capitalist parties with the argument that "we are getting what we want" if only slowly.

But in 1952 the question that besets them is: Have we reached the end of the Fair Deal rope?

The Sparkman issue focuses all this because it is the most concrete thing to latch onto.

Last week LABOR ACTION discussed some aspects of the efforts by the labor press to sell Sparkman. Even more, the process of rationalization whereby the liberals have been trying to reconcile themselves to plumping for Sparkman has been something to behold.

It was somewhat dramatized, for example, in two issues of the New York Post. Its immediate editorial reaction to the Sparkman choice was to deplore. The next day the tune changed. The editor had caught himself: he had to act "responsibly." Since there was no question about supporting the Stevenson ticket, it was bad tactics to diminish anyone's en-

thusiasm for it by being too outspoken about what was really happening. But even with the change in tactic, the Post has not particularly been representing Sparkman as a liberal bargain. Its line has been, roughly, "Look at Nixon. And Sparkman isn't as bad as you might think."

The brash liberal whitewash of Sparkman has been given by the New Republic, in its current issue. "John Sparkman—Liberal" is the headline and the theme. It is an interesting editorial statement, almost openly a portrait of a liberal wrestling with his conscience.

To its credit the New Republic does not simply rely on making the obvious case, which might be good enough for campaign literature but is not enough to reconcile thinking liberals to their fate. Certainly Sparkman supported a large number, or most, of the Fair Deal economic measures in Congress—on housing, crop insurance, rural electrification, social security, soil conservation, TVA, federal aid to education, etc. He is no Republican or Dixiecrat-type of troglodyte "free-enterpriser." That this makes him a kind of Fair Dealer, as Fair Dealers go, is undoubted.

Only—this was well enough

## Anti-Trust-Busting

One reason why anti-trust law enforcement doesn't get anywhere has been brought out by the House subcommittee investigating the Justice Department. The subcommittee has been looking into the histories of two former top Department of Justice officials now practicing privately as partners—Peyton Ford, who was right under the attorney general, and H. A. Bergson, who was head of the Anti-Trust Division.

They admitted that while in the department they "long planned" to resign and go into partnership. Then follow the "coincidences":

While in the department Bergson headed the officials who were pushing an anti-trust case against Seagram, the distilling company. After he left the department, one of his first clients was Seagram, which paid him \$3,250 for "advising" it about an anti-trust suit. While Bergson was tops in the department, the government had a case against Paramount. It too became one of his first private clients.

In addition, the committee found that many government lawyers carry on private practice while still on Uncle Sam's payroll. Ex-Attorney General McGrath defended this on the ground that he would lose a lot of lawyers if they were denied this right. "No man can serve two masters," opines the subcommittee.

know when his name first came up in Chicago and did not prevent the unmistakable reaction of disappointment (even dismay?) when he was tapped. Only—this does not gain say the fact that his nomination tokened a step back; provided that one knows enough to understand that a step back could not possibly in any case mean dropping the whole Fair Deal kit and kaboodle.

And so the New Republic—give it full credit—does what is likely to be rare among liberals in this campaign year. From the limited Sparkman issue it goes on to face up to the bigger question: Which way is the Fair Deal going, and is it good?

## RATIONALIZATION

Its main approach comes to this: If any real progress is going to be made through the Democratic Party, it will have to be made by bringing the South along with Northern liberalism, not by a head-on collision. Sparkman represents the type of Southern liberal who can be used for this purpose. He would become useless if he broke too sharply with his Southern colleagues, because then they would look on him as a traitor and not as "one of us." In Washington he will "grow" in stature and as he slowly "grows" can bring the South along.

Therefore it presents the following conclusion in its own italics:

"Until the Stevenson-Sparkman slate was nominated, it was logical for all civil-rights supporters to stand on the Truman strategy which no elected Southerner can support. Now that the decision has been made to work with the best forces in the South, the proper endeavor becomes to seek a bridge between Northern and Southern liberalism."

It is a peculiar conclusion. If the rationalization presented is correct, then the "Truman strategy" was wrong, if only in hind-

sight. But when it comes right down to it, the editors of the New Republic are willing only to say that it is "proper" to go along with the Stevenson strategy "now that the decision has been made."

MADE BY WHOM? The decision was not made by the liberals or by the labor forces. It was handed to them. They were thereupon given the task of finding a way to convince themselves that this strategy, which before Chicago they would have denounced as a retreat (or capitulation), has some hope in it too. It is a kind of rationalization typical of people whose FIRST conclusion is that they have to go along, because they have nowhere else to go.

With such rationalizations it is possible for labor and liberals to tag along in a slow or fast descending spiral as ever-new retreats are demanded by its allegiance to a party which they do not control, each capitulation persuading the Democratic Party that it can afford to go still further in wooing the Right—until the strain on the tie becomes too great and the alliance breaks. It is a rationalization of defeat.

## THEIR "BRIDGE"

"If elected, Sparkman . . . will become another Hugo Black," is the prediction the editors quote from the Afro-American. Maybe so—who knows? Essentially they are aware that a similar claim can be as easily made for Eisenhower, and is. Not without reason. Gentlemen of the liberal weeklies, how do you go about combating the feeling that, once in office, faced with the realities, with fewer ties to the GOP dinosaurs than Sparkman has to his Southern colleagues, with a flexible mind, etc., Eisenhower will not "grow" from conservatism to liberalism, like . . . why, like Truman!

Or will Sparkman be another Byrnes—that hard-bitten Dixie-

crat of today who, only yesterday, was not only a Fair Deal mainstay but was FDR's "Assistant President"? Somehow Byrnes didn't "grow" . . .

Nothing is excluded, naturally, but what kind of basis for judgment is it to bank on what is going to happen to the individual Sparkman—as if that would really change the South? For what the editors of the New Republic are trying to close their eyes to is that, by talking about building a bridge between the Northern and Southern wings, they mean not only that Southern politicians must advance but that the Northern Fair Dealers must retreat to meet them half way. And even such a half-way retreat is really no very clever strategy when the adoption of the strategy itself convinces the Southerners that they have the whiphand and can become bolder.

The first major clash between the Conservative government and the trade unions has just begun. The Amalgamated Engineering Union, representing 800,000 metal workers, had asked for a rise of 2 pounds per week for its members. This request was turned down by the employers and the government on the grounds that at this critical time it would cause too great increases in the money circulating and therefore in the price of goods. Since fabricated steel products are among this country's main exports as well as war goods, it would further increase the prices of exports and make them unable to compete with Japanese, German and American products. The general inflationary effect was also given as a reason for turning down the claim.

## THE TURNDOWN

We highlight the New Republic editorial because it is a snapshot of men caught in the act of arguing themselves into the virtue of retreat. There are some liberal types who can continue to do this indefinitely. But labor cannot and the Negro people cannot.

They cannot, not necessarily because their leaders are smarter than the editors of the New Republic but because they have behind them the pressure of mass demands which cannot be satisfied with either promises or rationalizations for the lack of them.

A turndown in the graph of the Fair Deal's course is the beginning of a turning point for them. The inexorable pressure of the war economy on the next administration will push to the right on the basis of the present relation of political forces, and the only way out will be the creation of a new political realignment to change that relationship.

This is what puts the dynamite in the Sparkman issue.

# 'John Sparkman—Liberal'

In an interview with the magazine U. S. News & World Report (Aug. 22) Democratic vice-presidential candidate John Sparkman has given the most connected account to-date of his political views.

It does not bear out the claim that is being made that he is a Simon-pure liberal except for the civil-rights question. Following are some highlights from his answers to searching questions.

(1) He is pained by the use of the word "repeal" in connection with the Taft-Hartley Act—it might be misunderstood. He prefers "rewrite" or "replace." Reason: outright repeal would be impossible because "I am quite sure that no one would want us to go back to the Wagner Act as it was, without any change."

This may be news to the CIO and AFL. (2) For what it may be worth he doesn't like the designation liberal. "I would say that I am—I rather like your term—liberal-conservative. I think I am conservative. A great many people might not believe this, but I am a kind of 'penny-pincher.' I am 'Scotch' by instinct."

## SAYS SOUTH WON

(3) He explains that he was against Truman's seizure of the steel mills, but voted against the Senate motion to "request" Truman to use the T-H Act because "I do not think that Congress has the right to tell the Executive how to execute laws." As is well known he had voted for Taft-Hartley but then switched to support the president's veto. In this interview he approves benignly of the wartime Smith-Connally Act.

(4) He is for "aid to Formosa" and thinks that Chiang Kai-shek is "a man of great sincerity. I think he has done a lot of changing within his own household. I think they are doing a good job on Formosa."

(5) "Q—How do you think the South came out in this convention? "A—Very well. I think the South regained a lot of the power, prestige—if you want to call it that—that it lost in the 1948 and perhaps in other conventions. I think the fight to seat the delegations was decidedly a victory for the South. . . ."

(6) He "can't see how there can be any great divergence between the views of General Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson" on foreign policy questions.

(7) Discussing his work in the congressional

Small Business committee, he hastens to add that "We're just as strong for big business as we are for small business."

(8) His opposition to civil-rights FEPC legislation is fully on record, but this interview adds some angles.

The term "FEPC" (fair employment practices committee), he says, is a "symbol" and therefore argues that it should never be used in platforms. What is of greater interest is an exchange in which he seems to be boasting that the Democratic platform was vaguer about FEPC than the Republican!

## "ADDED VERBIAGE"

He has been asked if there is "any real difference between the Republican and Democratic platforms on civil rights?"

"Yes. The Republican platform . . . does provide for a voluntary 'FEPC' as such. They use, as I recall, the term 'fair employment practices.' The Democratic platform does not mention any particular setup. . . . The Republican platform spells out 'FEPC,' but does recommend that it be on a voluntary basis."

And again:

"There is one other provision in the Republican platform that provides for elimination of segregation in the nation's capital as a pattern for the rest of the country. That is not in ours at all."

"Q—Is that an unintentional omission? "A—No. As a matter of fact, the amendment was offered in the drafting committee and was voted down. Then it was offered by a delegate from the District of Columbia in the full Resolutions Committee and was voted down again. . . ."

He carefully explains how he persuaded the Platform Committee to clothe the civil-rights plank in generalities, and winds up, a bit incautiously: "That was my plank and I think we succeeded pretty well in writing that with some added verbiage."

"Q—With the exception of 'civil rights,' do you find your views and Governor Stevenson's pretty close together?"

"A—I was about to say that I am not certain that we should even except 'civil rights.' . . ."

This Southern liberal, who objects to FEPC because it is a "symbol" then mentions that he also voted against the anti-lynching bill and the anti-poll-tax bill, as these were presented in the Senate.

# Britain's Economic Dilemma

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Aug. 12.—When the Conservatives came to power they decreased the subsidies on food. That, together with the rise in world prices, has recently begun to produce its effect in this country.

The first major clash between the Conservative government and the trade unions has just begun. The Amalgamated Engineering Union, representing 800,000 metal workers, had asked for a rise of 2 pounds per week for its members. This request was turned down by the employers and the government on the grounds that at this critical time it would cause too great increases in the money circulating and therefore in the price of goods. Since fabricated steel products are among this country's main exports as well as war goods, it would further increase the prices of exports and make them unable to compete with Japanese, German and American products. The general inflationary effect was also given as a reason for turning down the claim.

We highlight the New Republic editorial because it is a snapshot of men caught in the act of arguing themselves into the virtue of retreat. There are some liberal types who can continue to do this indefinitely. But labor cannot and the Negro people cannot.

They cannot, not necessarily because their leaders are smarter than the editors of the New Republic but because they have behind them the pressure of mass demands which cannot be satisfied with either promises or rationalizations for the lack of them.

A turndown in the graph of the Fair Deal's course is the beginning of a turning point for them. The inexorable pressure of the war economy on the next administration will push to the right on the basis of the present relation of political forces, and the only way out will be the creation of a new political realignment to change that relationship.

This is what puts the dynamite in the Sparkman issue.

lieve in "human fellowship, social equality, democratic freedom and economic democracy—this is our socialist faith."

Next come some hard facts: "We have 50 million people living on these crowded islands." Hitherto we have been "able to live off investments abroad—many of which we sold to fight the war." But our imports were smaller because of the millions of unemployed.

"Our problem [now] is to export more; to maintain full employment; to carry our defense program; to build up our industries; to safeguard fair shares and social security; and to play our part in helping the underdeveloped areas of the world."

After discussing Labor's great record in power and the Conservatives' miserable efforts, the pamphlet talks about Labor's return to power. "Three major problems have to be faced; we have to increase the output and productivity of our industry. We have to take steps to expand our world trade. . . . We must seek world peace and disarmament."

In the Labor Party's opinion the key to the country's solution is to produce more coal and steel, therefore more machinery, to carry out the latter tasks. Practical measures for achieving this end are the greater application of science to industry, and a greater degree of planning.

About this the pamphlet is equivocal. "Labor's policy will be to harness private enterprise in the nation's cause. Our privately owned industries must be encouraged and assisted to use up-to-date methods; costs must be reduced." Yes, but by whom? how? with what machinery?

Other practical measures suggested include the encouragement of greater food production and continued bulk buying by the government.

The least banal part of the policy promises restoration of all cuts in the social services.

## LOSING BOTH WAYS

A deeper analysis of our economic troubles comes in the London Observer. It presents the problem of the crisis.

The population of the world is growing at the rate of 1.25 per cent per annum while agricultural production is increasing at only 0.3 per cent. The British economy has, since the Industrial Revolution, been based on the im-

port of cheap food and raw materials and the export of manufactured goods. The increase in population and standards of living all over the world has brought about much greater competition for buying food and raw materials cheaply, and so their prices have gone up. Increased industrialization, especially of Germany and Japan, has brought greater competition to manufacturers and put their prices down. The British has lost both ways.

We depend for 30 per cent of our annual income on foreign trade. This is over twice the fraction of Germany or Japan, for instance. This makes us extremely vulnerable to trade fluctuations. We now have to export 27 per cent more than in 1946 to import the same quantity of raw materials. In time of slump no one wants to buy our exports, and in time of boom everyone has money to outbid us for raw materials. Either way we lose again.

## ONLY ONE ANSWER

Broadly speaking, the Observer suggests two ways of getting out of these difficulties.

Firstly, decrease our dependence upon the world for food imports. This is similar to Labor's suggestion; develop to the utmost our own resources and agriculture.

Secondly, we must concentrate more of our resources on exports which pay—e.g., jet liners are worth \$60,000 per ton of material used while automobiles are worth only \$1,800. As the textile industry's exports cost us more than we gain, and Japan and India can produce them more cheaply, we should divert our resources elsewhere.

"This is a revolutionary course, calling for patriotism and unselfishness," points out the editorial.

The question a socialist asks is: "Can such great manipulation and planning of a whole country's industry be executed by appealing to the capitalists' patriotism? Or will we have to nationalize our industries to gain a great enough degree of control to carry them out? It is quite clear that there can be only one answer."

One thing is certain: it is no longer simply a case of the government's calling for greater efforts from the English people; or as a comedian put it here—"How can the government tell us to tighten our belts when they've already taken the pants off us?"

# Los Angeles Trial of Stalinists Ends; Judge Imposes Top Sentence

By DAVE BERN

LOS ANGELES, Aug. 11.—The six-months' trial of 14 California Stalinist leaders came to an end this week when the jury, after six days of deliberation, returned a verdict of "guilty as charged." Federal Judge Mathes, who throughout the trial claimed to be entirely impartial and warned the jury that "revolution" meant any fundamental social change, showed his impartiality by giving the defendants the maximum penalty under the Smith Act: five years imprisonment and a \$10,000 fine for each.

Mathes turned down a plea for a directed verdict of acquittal two days after the jury found each defendant guilty of the specific charge of "conspiracy to advocate the necessity for the violent overthrow of the government." Following the rejection of this defense plea, Judge Mathes spurned a request for bail. A Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco is to hear the bail plea and an appeal from defendant Ojeter O'Connor Yates to remove an extra year from her sentence for contempt of court (for failure to answer questions about her associates).

After hearing the appeals for acquittal, Mathes said: "The jury, having found the Communist Party advocates overthrowing the government, I am inclined to feel that the jury could reasonably presume guilt on the part of the defendants. The jury's guilty verdict is apparently beyond reasonable doubt. I therefore deny the defense motion for a judgment of acquittal."

## PLEA DENIED

The acquittal plea had been based on the grounds that the government had failed to prove its specific charges against the defendants as individuals (Mathes had ruled earlier that CP membership per se was not to be taken by the jury as evidence of guilt), and that the government witnesses had been paid informers. The American Civil Liberties Union likewise asked for a verdict of acquittal recently because the Smith Act under which the Stalinists were tried penalizes for mere advocacy and therefore violates the Bill of Rights and is a menace to democracy.

As reported earlier, Judge Mathes also turned down a defense motion that a mistrial be declared on the basis that a so-called "super-secret" FBI report was released to the press just before the case was given to the jury, a "report" which quoted from Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin as proof that the CP advocates violent means.

The defense noted that the quotes were taken (out of context, of course) from books that have long gathered dust on public and school library shelves. The defense charged that the press release by J. Edgar Hoover's publicists had been timed so that the jury would be in a prejudiced mind as they retired to reach a verdict.

Mathes, ruling on the mistrial plea, stated: "The publication of Hoover's report does not, apparently, constitute grounds for a new trial. There is no reason for a new trial—the interest of justice does not require it." Then the judge asked the defendants if they were ready to receive sentence.

Mathes, ruling on the mistrial plea, stated: "The publication of Hoover's report does not, apparently, constitute grounds for a new trial. There is no reason for a new trial—the interest of justice does not require it." Then the judge asked the defendants if they were ready to receive sentence.

U. S. Attorney Walter S. Binns, who presumably claims some measure of fame for his handling of the prosecution case, said after the verdict: "I feel sorry for Mrs. Yates. I feel she was not exercising her own judgment [in refusing to turn stoolpigeon—D. B.]. She has been subject to the discipline of the Communist Party for so long she cannot shake off these shackles." In other words, Mrs. Yates is to be pitied because she failed to emulate a Budenz! Judge Mathes had earlier stated, in response to a defense statement about perjury, that the jury might even admire Mrs. Yates for her resolute position.

One need not make heroes or martyrs out of these Stalinist leaders in order to support the position that the trial which led to their conviction was characterized by vague, ambiguous charges, stoolpigeon evidence of a flimsy nature, and by a general atmosphere of bias due to the cold war and the press handling of the case. Nor need one forget that Stalinism as a world movement is dangerous to democracy (and above all to the interests of a free working class) when he recognizes the shallow pretensions of the government claim that it is defending democracy against Stalinism.

What the government is doing (or attempting to) is to defend capitalism against Stalinism as the two power blocs gird for war. The government hopes to remove a potential menace to its security on the home front in the event of war and to tighten its hold on the general population in order to prepare the people for war sacrifices. This orientation means, of course, that a regulated war economy, a smoothly-functioning political apparatus and militarization of the public mind require a minimum of dissent or opposition. The Stalinists are removed from the scene as much for the example it sets for others as for the actual menace they constitute.

The government aim (its general intent as the caretaker of capitalism, necessarily bipartisan) is to throttle opposition by discouraging organized radical criticism, even if it means scuttling a large measure of democracy and paving the way for a garrison state and its concomitant frame of mind. This is sufficient reason for liberals, as well as socialists, to oppose the Smith Act trials which, along with companion trends, are setting the precedents for the future.

Get it EVERY week!  
An LA sub is \$2 a year

**Marxism in the United States**  
By LEON TROTSKY

35 Cents . . . . . Order from  
Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

**Next — A Labor Party!**  
by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party

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

# Zionism & Anti-Semitism: Bisymmetric Phenomena

"I shall not be ashamed to confess that, if I had power, as I have the will, I would select a score of efficient young men—intelligent, decent, devoted to our ideal and burning with the desire to help redeem Jews, and I would send them to the countries where Jews are absorbed in sinful self-satisfaction. The task of these young men would be to disguise themselves as non-Jews, and acting upon the brutal Zionism, plague these Jews with anti-Semitic slogans, such as 'Bloody Jew,' 'Jews, go to Palestine,' and similar 'intimacies.' I can vouch that the results in a considerable *Alyah* [immigration to Israel] from these countries would be ten thousand times larger than the results brought by thousands of emissaries who have been preaching for decades to deaf ears."—Avraham Sharun, in the official organ *Davar* of the Israeli Mapai, the governing party of Ben-Gurion.\*

The above amazing statement, by a writer for the ruling Mapai of Israel, deserves wide attention. True, of course, it is not an official declaration and Sharun is putting down his thought with unprecedented frankness. But what he says comes right out of the Zionist ideology.

The background is the fact that the setting up of the state of Israel has not done what the Zionists expected: it has not solved the "Jewish question" in the world; Israel has attracted primarily those Jews whose life is made intolerable in their own countries by the lash of anti-Semitism. The Jews of the Western countries have not been drawn to Israel in any large numbers. The Zionist dream of the "Redemption of the

\* Quoted from the Jewish Newsletter of Aug. 18, which in turn credits the Yiddisher Kempfer of July 11.



### The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### INTERESTED? Get Acquainted

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

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

NAME .....  
ADDRESS .....  
CITY ..... ZONE.....  
STATE ..... TEL.....

### HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

### LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

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

- NEW  RENEWAL
- Bill me.  Payment enclosed.

NAME .....  
ADDRESS .....  
CITY ..... STATE.....  
APT.....  
ZONE.....

## Not in the Headlines

### Forced Labor

The government's program for compelling conscientious objectors to do two years of civilian labor started on July 1. The forced-labor program will require COs to work for agencies of state and federal departments or for "non-profit" and "charitable" organizations.

### On the Whitelist

The League of New York Theaters has announced its opposition to blacklisting. The management organization agreed to join Actors Equity in signing a statement condemning such discrimination on principle. The League is probably the first employer group to take a public stand on blacklisting. Actors Equity had previously declared that no performer should be barred from working only because his name appears on a so-called blacklist.

### Confession

Have you ever been asked the stumper, "Which shoe do you put on first in the morning?" In Stalinist Rumania, you'd better pay attention to how you lace them, too.

Modi Sandalovici, a young Rumanian worker, has beat his breast in confession about this in the Young Communist organ *Scanteia Tineretului* for March 27. He recognizes his "errors" and grave sins. Among these are "spending too much time running after the girls in the shop" (we were young once and understand that) and "doing his work poorly" (which may or may not be a consequence of the other sin).

In addition, however, he confesses: "I began to like the waltz, that decadent dance, to lace my shoes like the young bourgeois, and to wear a hunting cap."

### Justice

The minister of justice in the Czech Stalinist government informs defense lawyers how to defend the interests of their clients when the government is prosecuting them:

"The lawyer must not wish for the acquittal of his client at all cost. He does not have the right to defend a cause which he considers unjust. The lawyer must not blindly pursue the often selfish interests of his client. The lawyer must undertake the duties of material truth, but he must also defend his client in conformity with the interests of society. Therefore he must drop all ruses, all dissimulation, all bias; he must make his contribution to truth and justice fittingly and honestly. He must always keep in sight the higher interests of the community. He has to protect and strengthen the socialist state and never seek to hurt it." (*Rude Prava*, June 12.)

And of course the "truth" and "interests of the community" which the defense lawyer must uphold is decided on by the same state which is prosecuting his client.

### Whose Security?

Apropos of the case of General Robert W. Grow, who was court-martialed for leaving his diary where the Russians could get it—and quote his war-mongering thoughts: The army says the diary must be kept secret for reasons of "national security."

The weekly *Labour* properly inquires: "What would be risked by letting Americans learn something the Russians already know?"

In other words, what else was in that diary?

### Housing

One fourth of the houses in America are in pretty bad shape, says a new report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the federal government.

Two and a half million non-farm houses are in such terrible condition that they are classified as "dilapidated." Four million more have no sanitary facilities, such as toilet or bath; and another 2.3 million even lack running water. Altogether this bad housing is about 25 per cent of the 35 million non-farm homes.

## READING from LEFT to RIGHT

### IS PREMIER ZAPOTOCKY A PROTEGE OF MALENKOV? by Daniel Simon.—Masse-Information, (Paris) July-August.

Daniel Simon argues that involved in the internal conflicts which beset the Stalinist satellites is the clash of cliques beholden to different powerful figures of the Russian bureaucracy. He explains a method of inquiry: *who quotes whom?* "For someone who is not used to reading between the lines of Stalinist prose, it may seem bizarre to try to deduce from a number of quotations the affiliation of a Communist chieftain to an international clique. But it is not we who are splitting hairs. It is the rules of Stalinist etiquette which oblige us to study a question which would be normally so futile: from what source this or that leader draws his quotations. The fact is that we are not dealing with normal phenomena but with another world, a byzantine world. Between a simple quotation and a byzantine quotation there is nothing in common. The latter, in fact, aims not only at indicating the source of a thesis but at glorifying the person from whom it is taken and at the same time reinforcing by the authority of this person the words which are quoted. Thus the art of quotation has attained unprecedented refinement at the hands of the Stalinist leaders. . . . By quoting your boss as you should, you show loyalty and obedience; by neglecting to quote him as you should, you adopt an impermissible attitude; by starting to quote excessively from the head man, you betray an urgent need for his support; by quoting only the words of this leader, you risk being considered fomentor of a sharp conflict between the rival factions; by quoting the leader of another clique too much, you become a turn-coat; and so on."

It's a tough life. Simon proceeds to show why he believes Zapotocky of Czechoslovakia is a protégé of Malenkov, who is No. 2 or No. 3 man in the Kremlin.

## WORLD POLITICS

### THE FATE OF ANA PAUKER IN THE RUMANIAN CP PURGE

By VALENTIN TOMA

The recent purges among the leaders of the Rumanian Communist Party are following the inexorable course laid down by the Moscowite dictatorship and applied to all the satellite countries. Those who believed themselves to be most invulnerable are the very ones whose heads are now falling under the same accusations. And almost without exception the victims are suffering a sad end.

On September 4, 1951, the Moscow daily *Pravda* published an article signed by Gheorghiu Dej, "Father of the Rumanian Workers," bearing the title "The Revolutionary Vigilance of the Peoples who Struggle for Socialism." Actually, the secretary-general of the Rumanian Communist Party merely retraced the brief history of his party, scoring the supposed deviations it suffered before and after its rise to power. In conclusion, the author seems to recognize this dangerous situation: "Being a governing party, it is undeniable that many elements alien to our organization have infiltrated its ranks, above all in the leadership of the party."

If the organ of the Bolshevik Party published this phrase so charged with threats, it is only because Gheorghiu Dej already had the consent and support of Moscow. Nothing remained except to liquidate, one after the other, those collaborators who could challenge his leadership.

### THE WIND BLEW

Understanding from whence this wind was blowing, Ana Pauker and Vasile Luca hastened to perform the necessary rite of contrition and obedience before the "most beloved Father of the Rumanian workers." But possibly this was already not sufficient. Six months afterwards, on March 6, 1952, Vasile Luca was deprived of the post of finance minister; six weeks later he was stripped of the vice-presidency of the Council. A short time later he was ousted from the party secretariat and the Politburo, while at the same time a Control Commission proposed his definitive exclusion.

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Communist Party, convoked on May 27, motivated its decision in the following way: "Luca has set himself in opposition to the general line of the party, imposing his own right-wing opportunist and factional concepts which give heart to the capitalist elements. . . . Through his attitude, the former minister of finance has been responsible for enormous losses to the state and caused difficulties in meeting the needs of the working class." Save for the fact that the statement in question openly recognizes the deplorable situation

with regard to its material and food requirements, the other accusations are completely ridiculous.

The May 27 Plenum also sealed the fate of the other two secretaries of the Rumanian Communist Party: Ana Pauker, minister of foreign affairs, and Theohari Georgesco, minister of the interior.

Officially announced together with the exclusion of Luca and Georgesco from the Central Committee of the party, Ana Pauker's fall from favor did not receive much publicity in the first days, nor were any accusations against her made public. Only the measures taken by the Plenum, with the aim of renovating the party secretariat and the Politburo, were made known. At first she disappeared from one and then the other party organism in order to be relegated to a secondary place on the Organization Bureau.

### SCAPEGOATS?

But a few days later the newspaper *Scanteia* publicly posed the case of Ana Pauker, who was still minister of foreign affairs. The organ of the Rumanian Communist Party revealed that at the May 27 Plenum, Pauker had been severely criticized for having aided and encouraged the deviations of Luca and Georgesco. She was openly accused of complicity in the activities directed by the above-mentioned against the head of the party, Gheorghiu Dej, and the word "disloyalty" was uttered.

According to the official newspaper *Scanteia*, the three vice-premiers and ministers had secretly joined together and established plans to oppose the official line of the party. Contradictorily, Ana Pauker was accused of defending the individual peasants against collectivization, and at the same time, of accomplishing collectivization through authoritarian measures. She was also accused, along with Luca and Georgesco of "leading an aristocratic way of life and of having lost all contact with the popular masses." However, this kind of aristocratic life is peculiar not merely to the three accused, but to the whole leadership of the Rumanian Communist Party, including its secretary-general, Gheorghiu Dej. According to certain Viennese circles, the purge of Ana Pauker is the sign of a wave of anti-Semitism in the leadership itself of Rumanian Stalinism.

The liquidation of the triumvirate of the Rumanian Communist Party and the establishment of a one-man leadership of the party and state apparatus, the preference given to the Rumanian Gheorghiu Dej, secretary-general of the Party and new premier in place of Petru Groza who was

kicked upstairs to the presidency, to the detriment of the Hungarian Vasile Luca and Ana Pauker, whose Jewish origins have had disagreeable consequences—all of this has the appearance of giving minor satisfaction to the national resentments of the population.

Reorganizing the leadership of the Rumanian Communist Party, Gheorghiu Dej hopes to assure himself of the support of the young elements, and above all, of the old collaborators of Ana Pauker, who have climbed to the top levels of the organization. In addition, this renewal of the leadership cadres also corresponds with the "hard" tactic of the Cominform.

### SELF-DEVOURING

In playing Moscow's game of subjugating the country economically, the Bucharest regime has come up against serious difficulties which it cannot conceal. And in order to calm unrest it has turned against those who are supposedly culpable. Someone must pay for each defeat: Vasile Luca appears as the person responsible for the financial and economic situation; Georgesco has not filled the concentration camps adequately; Ana Pauker is directly responsible for peasant resistance to collectivization.

It is clear that these latest purges extend to the most loyal Stalinist cadres, sufficiently loathed by the population because of their submission to the exploitive policy imposed by the Russian imperialists, as well as to the Western and "cosmopolitan" Communist formations and the old Social-Democrats, who according to Moscow are not offering the regime support worthy of trust.

Following closely the internal struggle of the Bulgarian, Hungarian, Polish and Czech Communist Parties, the crisis of the Rumanian totalitarian party shows us once again the instability of the Stalinist dictatorship, which with each political turn is compelled to devour its own creatures.

(Translated from La Batalla.)

The BEST recent book on the labor movement—

### "The UAW and Walter Reuther"

by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick \$3.00 Random House

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

## Youth and Student Corner

### The Conference of the British Labor Youth

This article on the conference of the Labor League of Youth (youth section of the British Labor Party), held at Filey on June 15-16, is based on the full report of that conference in the League's official paper *Socialist Advance* which has just been received in New York. Although the conference took place in June, we believe that its results will be of particular interest to young socialists in America. —Ed.

One of the peculiarities of the British Labor Party is that it has never had a really autonomous youth movement. The Labor League of Youth has been considered not so much as a separate youth movement, but as an adjunct of the Labor Party for young people. The party leadership has exercised complete administrative as well as political control over the LLY in the past.

Actually, the LLY has not been regarded as a political organization in the specific meaning of the term. Its officers have been appointed, and its conferences have been compelled to confine their deliberations only to specific "youth" problems. It has been prohibited from discussing the general issues of party policy, and has had no representation at party conferences, nor the right to present its views on general political questions before the party.

As a matter of fact, the LLY has been considered by the party as primarily a social organization whose members are expected to pitch in with Jimmy Higgins work during political campaigns. Aside from that, they were to be seen and not heard.

This role has been bitterly resented by the majority of the LLY membership for some time. The result has been that recent national conferences of that organization have been characterized chiefly by running battles between the floor and the National Consultative Committee, which is the LLY's top body. The NCC has had to fight tooth and nail to keep the ranks from coming into head-on collision with the National Executive Committee of the Labor Party.

### TOWARD A DEMOCRATIC STRUCTURE

The LLY conference held at Filey during June 15-16 of this year presented a radical departure from and a big advance over past conferences in all respects. Not only did the conference pass resolutions which, if carried out, will make of the LLY a really autonomous youth section of the Labor Party, but equally important, these resolutions were carried with the support of the NCC.

According to the *Socialist Advance*, debate at the conference was lively and became passionate at times. Speaking on an amendment to delete the words "affecting youth" from the resolution calling for discussion of party policy at future League conferences, the youngest of the 190 delegates, 16-year-old Bill Drewer, stood almost on tiptoe to reach the microphone and said, "Give this amendment your support. And why? Because all policy affects youth, comrades. All policy affects our lives." This resolution was passed, together with one providing that LLY resolutions be forwarded to annual conferences of the party.

One of the most heated discussions took place over the demand that the *Socialist Advance* be edited by an elected editorial board. This resolution included a section asking "that its [the *Socialist Advance*] columns should not be unduly devoted to anti-Communist propaganda." After full debate, the resolution was accepted by Roy Cole on behalf of the NCC. In discussing the policy of the paper he pointed out, however, that "We shall continue to examine CP policy both at home and abroad—but we shall not forget hypocrisy from the State Department."

### ON THE EUROPEAN YOUTH CAMPAIGN

Another major issue was held over the question of continued affiliation of the LLY to the European Youth Campaign. The resolution called for the NCC to break off all relations with this movement. Here is the *Socialist Advance* report on this debate:

"Moved by Gordon Poyner (Wembley South) it was soon obvious that the resolution had the support of most delegates. 'What sort of youth organization could afford to produce lavish publications so cheaply?' he asked. The Campaign was connected with the European Movement which, as everyone knew, had Winston Churchill's allegiances.

"Listing some of the bodies affiliated to the Campaign, Poyner continued: 'Why should we have anything to do with them? Have they socialist principles in mind? One of the French publications of the EYC says that its object is to build a 'European political con-

### Books for Germany: Help Build Socialism!

From many parts of Western Germany we have received requests for Marxist literature IN ENGLISH. Books and pamphlets by Trotsky, Lenin, Marx, etc., are in urgent demand, but any Marxist works are needed. Almost none of this literature is available at present. All books and pamphlets contributed will be widely circulated.

Help rebuild Germany's socialist movement! Send us your unused or duplicate copies of any and all Marxist literature, or any you can spare. They will be forwarded immediately to those who will make good use of them.

Send them to: LABOR ACTION, 114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

struction.' Are we joining with the Tories for this end, comrades? 'Amid laughter and cheers, he concluded: 'This body is financed by the American Committee for a United Europe. What have the Americans got to do with a United Europe? Shame on the NCC for associating with the Campaign.'

Speaking later in the debate, one delegate, Ron Grange (St. Marylebone) said: "Our solution is a real Socialist International campaigning on the slogan of a Socialist United States of Europe, and not a Capitalist United States of Europe."

The resolution was overwhelmingly carried.

### WILL THE LABOR PARTY CONCEDE?

A resolution to permit the local units of the LLY to elect delegates to their own national conferences without interference or dictation from the Labor Party branches was also carried overwhelmingly. Only one speaker rose to suggest that as the local branches of the LP help the local units of the LLY financially, it is only natural that they should seek to have some say in the selection of delegates and the passage of resolutions.

"He was bitterly attacked," says the *Socialist Advance*, "by NCC member Albert Booth, who said the committee supported the resolution 'right up to the hilt.'"

"It's a bit thick for a Socialist to come on a Socialist platform and use the capitalist argument that he who pays the piper should call the tune," Booth concluded.

A call for LLY representation on the National Executive of the Labor Party and at party conferences was also given full support in principle by the NCC at the conference.

The *Socialist Advance* reports that throughout the conference, while vigorous attacks were being made against the Labor Party's executive for its policy toward the LLY, Morgan Phillips, secretary of the party, and other executive members sat "imperturbably" on the platform. Apparently they did not attempt to intervene in the deliberations. Taken together with the support of the NCC for all the resolutions demanding autonomy for the youth organization, this fact might suggest that the Labor Party leadership is prepared to grant the demands of the youth organization.

From the distance, we can only conjecture the reasons for this change in policy. Aneurin Bevan made the chief address at the mass meeting held in conjunction with the conference, and we are informed that the LLY is overwhelmingly Bevanite in its sympathies. In these circumstances the party leadership could follow one of two courses: it could either seek to crack down further on the youth in order to prevent it from exercising any influence on the internal party conflict. Or it could seek to lessen the antagonism of the youth (many of whom are also party members) for the party leadership by showing a willingness to give it a degree of recognition and a status for which it has been fighting for some time.

### THE FRANCO FRONT

## Churchill And Franco

From LA BATALLA

The British Conservative government has raised the embargo on export of war material for Franco's army. As is known, this embargo had been maintained for several years.

The fact has aroused strong feeling among the British workers and has had repercussions in the House of Commons itself. Mr. Davies, former undersecretary of foreign affairs in the previous Labor cabinet, protested the government's decision in the name of the Labor opposition.

The Conservatives showed enough cynicism to say that the raising of the embargo on war material for Franco was adopted "for economic reasons" and in order to "increase exports." And, what is more, a spokesman of the Foreign Office stated that "when the Churchill government came into power, the high officials of the Department had made known to the Spanish ambassador the desire of His Majesty's government to re-establish normal relations between the two countries."

So then, the thing is very clear. Churchill is sending arms to Franco for frankly defined economic and political reasons.

What will the Labor movement and the trade unions do about this? Will they permit the London government to strengthen the police and military apparatus of the Falangist tyranny?

Churchill's plans can fail, they must fail. The British Labor movement is strong enough to stop the shipment of any military cargo to Franco!

Arriba, a Franco organ, has come out with a blast against tendencies among the intellectual younger generation to turn their attention to the great poets of Spain who were anti-Franco—Garcia Lorca, Machado, Salinas, Alberti, and others.

It can be imagined that these people, who stand with the assassins of Garcia Lorca, fear such trends.

Enrique Castro Delgado, who broke with the Spanish Stalinists and wrote a book entitled "I Lost My Faith in Moscow," has now also broken with the amorphous group formed by the Stalinist dissidents. He has now come out against Marxism, and theorizes that the Russians really are the "faithful interpreters of Marx."

Upon his break Delgado became sympathetic with the Titoists for a while and was greeted in Belgrade.

The 27 Stalinist prisoners of the FSUC (the Catalan Stalinist party) have finally appeared before a Franco military court and came off with relatively easy sentences, from 7 months to four years in jail; five were acquitted.

It is likely that the Stalinist mouthpieces who thundered about them in the UN were disappointed—it doesn't quite make out-standing martyrs out of them. These same Stalinist representatives never raised their voices about the fate of Franco victims who were anarchists, socialists or POUMists.



## BOOKS and Ideas

On the New Books by Adam B. Ulam and Louis Adamic

## TWO VIEWS ON TITO'S YUGOSLAVIA

By HAL DRAPER

The two books published this year on the subject of the Tito regime in Yugoslavia present a tremendous contrast. In most respects two books on the same subject could scarcely be more different. Ulam's is worth reading—if it's Titoism you want to read about. Adamic's (it was the book he was working on when he was mysteriously killed) is a mess of inanity—unless you're interested also in documenting the psychology of the fellow traveler. Ulam's is a work based on serious scholarship and close application to original documents; Adamic's is a meandering personal record of conversations with and feelings while talking to the Yugoslav high brass. Ulam obviously understands a great deal about the background of Stalinism and of the people he is writing about; Adamic's book is enough to convince one that he understands nothing whatsoever on any political subject whatsoever, though no doubt this can't be as true as his book would seem to prove.

**TITOISM AND THE COMINFORM**, by Adam B. Ulam.—Harvard University Press, 243 pages, \$4.

Solid substance in a book by Ulam (who is in the Russian Research Center at Harvard) is to be expected if one has read his published articles in *Foreign Affairs*, *Review of Politics* and other magazines. His first chapter, on the history of the CP of Yugoslavia, also had the aid of Anton Ciliga. It is very interesting, and skillfully analyzes the merger documents (in large part, the documents of the Yugoslav CP itself) to show Tito's past. It is of current interest in view of the attempt by the Titoists, since the break, to project their independence from Moscow background into the past. (In passing, it shows up Adamic's account of the same subject, taken straight from the Titoists, as the unartistic fabrication it is.)

The Tito story nowadays is that, in the period before Moscow handed the party over to him, he was merely "anti-fractionalist," i.e., against factions and for doing work. Merely reading Tito's report on the history of the CPY (at the post-split congress of the party) would be enough for anyone with sophisticated knowledge of Cominform politics. In typical Stalinist fashion, Tito's story amalgamates the "fractionalists" with spies, informers, Trotskyists and other unsavory personages. Ulam dots the 's: the truth is that Tito rose with the Stalinist group as it beat down all opposition in the name of "anti-fractionalism."

So also the Titoists now claim that their guerrilla warfare started before the German attack on Russia, and that they took a national approach during the war itself. Ulam's discussion of this is good. It is not a matter of white or black for him. There were differences in policy between the Yugoslavs and the Russians—just as the Russians insisted that the CP camouflage itself better under the mantle of nationalism while the Partisan leaders insisted on aping the uniforms of the Russian army and using Stalin's name as a battlecry.

In general it is useful to remember that in all probability not only the Yugoslavs but the other CPs could tell a story of differences with the Russians—if they ever set out to "prove" that they were "always independent." During the war Moscow had no direct contact with Tito's forces. Before the war there is not a scintilla of evidence that Tito ever acted as other than a Stalinist hatchet-man.

Ulam pays due attention to the fact that, immediately following the war, the drive toward the complete Stalinization of the country was rougher and faster in Yugoslavia (and Bulgaria) than in the other satellites. In those days also, Belgrade's aggressive attitudes and expansionism was even bolder than its Stalinist neighbor's. It is only since its difficulties that the Tito regime has pretended that it has always been a peace-loving lamb.

## Ulam's Limitation

For all the informative sections of Ulam's book, the central question to be explained, of course, is: why the break? The author provides a good slice of the factual background. When he gets to his own interpretation he is laboring under a great difficulty which flows from his own political limitations. It is simply this: He seems to be of the view that political movements and developments are to be explained purely in terms of lust for power and riddles even the attempt to look "deeper."

This isn't confined to the problem of Titoism. For him, "Trotskyism . . . grew from a clash of personalities into something vaguely resembling an ideology." This banal comment is about the level of all his remarks when it is a question of analyzing political ideas. "Lenin . . . may well have disagreed with Rosa Luxemburg not because of any ideological convictions, but simply because her theory . . . would have weakened the revolutionary appeal of socialism for the masses."

Perhaps he once discovered that ideologies can mask purely power conflicts and concluded that the latter are the only conflicts possible. It sterilizes his approach to the nature of Titoism, and leads him into crying contradictions.

The Russians, he explains, tried to subvert Tito's positions within Yugoslavia itself, by infiltration, and

Tito had to react. But why did the Russians have to do this, if otherwise Tito was a model Stalinist?

He admits: "The reasons behind the Soviet policies . . . are hard to ascertain." They certainly are, on his basis. Besides, if it was just a power struggle between the Tito leadership and the Moscow leadership, why did the Russians find it impossible to subvert Tito's position from within Yugoslavia? Ulam falls back on the "loyalty" of the Yugoslavs to Tito, but he himself has emphasized also their fanatical loyalty to Moscow. It is clearly no explanation.

Of course, the question of power was involved, but questions of power are concretized when differences arise on policies. And insistently Ulam argues that the question of economic exploitation and domination is as secondary as that of ideology. He actually refers to the draconic exploitation which Russia imposes on its satellites as a "small thing."

## Cold-War Viewpoint

It is easy for him when he is arguing that the explanation was not the Cominform charge that the Titoists were too slow in collectivization. What is harder to understand is his failure to discuss (outside of a fairly empty sentence) the issue which the Yugoslavs themselves have insisted was the focal point of the break, the question of Russian opposition to Yugoslav industrialization. In fact, these economic questions scarcely exist for him since his postulate is that Power Explains All.

This is a rather basic weakness, and it leads him to a very contradictory discussion of "national-Communism" (read: national-Stalinism). Since it is an "ideological" concept, he pooh-poohs it, but in his chapter on "Titoism" in Poland and Bulgaria (Gomulka and Kostov) he is forced to employ it time and again. In this case, in spite of his biases, the presentation of the material itself corrects his misinterpretations by its own weight.

He has no illusion about the "democratic" reforms which the Tito regime has concocted, but here he shows recognition of the fact that the pressure on the state has forced it to loosen up its practices. What has not loosened up is the essential of totalitarianism—the complete monopoly of politics by the ruling party and the crushing of any oppositional elements. But, then, Ulam does not even think that the regime should "go democratic." Looking at the problem purely from the point of view of the effectiveness of Belgrade as a cold-war ally, he actually states that no "sane man" could recommend that it "relax." He is for American aid to Tito, on practical, hard-headed imperialist grounds only. The point of view of socialist democracy is as alien to him as it is to Tito—Adamic.

**THE EAGLE AND THE ROOTS**, by Louis Adamic.—Doubleday & Company, 531 pages, \$5.

It is tempting to exhibit all the gems in Adamic's *The Eagle and the Roots* at length, but it would also be entirely unenlightening—unless, as we have already mentioned, you are interested in how the mind of a neo-Stalinist operates. He does the same kind of whitewash job for Tito that he had been previously ready to do for the Kremlin. Before his native Yugoslavia fell out with the Genial Leader.

The period of his visit to Yugoslavia, which he records in turgid detail, was not an uninteresting one: it was during 1949 when the Titoists were in the process of transition to the conviction that the break was irrevocable. He makes nothing of it.

He details his conversations like a tape-recorder. One is at liberty to suspect that they are partly literary products—especially when he confesses in one place that he is "taking the liberties of a novelist."

In the midst of much hogwash are interesting sketches of the heroism of the Partisans in the guerrilla war. He does this well, and there are extremely moving stories to be told. To Adamic the tales he recounts are simply human anecdotes or else examples of Yugoslav patriotism; he certainly does not understand that he is describing what men are capable of when they believe they are fighting for a revolutionary ideal. These things anyone should read who sneers at the revolutionary spirit as a military power stronger than tanks and cannon.

## Self-Portrait by Adamic

It becomes somewhat incredible in some sections but, actually, Adamic keeps going out of his way to portray himself as a political idiot. He starts right in the first chapter, as he describes his attempt to get a Russian visa from the Washington embassy (he wanted to go to Russia, first). Nobody could really be quite that naive, but it is only after his unsuccessful conversations that he records it occurred to him that the difficulty might be that the Russians might not want to admit him because he was pro-Titoist: "the realization that I had never had a chance began to form under my thick cortex."

Throughout the book he keeps emphasizing his utter disinterest in, and ignorance of, "Marxism-Leninism," that is, any of the political ideas of the Titoists. He flaunts it. "I am a political ignoramus," he keeps informing his readers, in effect—which does not prevent him from passing all kinds of political judgments on the admitted basis of a look in a man's eye or the angle of his

jaw. Personally, we began to believe that he was laying it on too thick; no modern man, with a record of pro-Stalinism like his, could possibly be the ideological cretin he pretends to be. On the other hand, to be fair, there is no objective evidence in the contents of the book that he is not just what he makes himself out.

In a number of passages of greater psychological than political interest, you can almost see the Yugoslavs trying to keep a straight face as he unlooses his banalities.

For politics he substitutes analysis via personalities and intestinal feelings. He sees evidences of the Titocult all around him and rhapsodizes about it. He gives a detailed description of an ovation to Tito at a meeting; his reaction to it is weirder than the business itself. He philosophizes about the practice, which the Titoists picked up from the Russians, whereby the Leader applauds the audience while he is being applauded by it. He thinks pityingly of the foreign correspondents in their hotels who aren't having this wonderful eye-opening experience. He decides, watching Tito, that here is no dictator—a dictator simply couldn't look like that—he's just a Yugoslav Wendell Willkie. . . .

## Gets the Red Carpet

He has five-minute "deep" political discussions with Tito while standing on one leg (so to speak) but when he gets him alone for hours he goes into his biography. He ends a chapter: "Tito's smile was half a scowl. 'I think I like this man,' I thought." He sees his old mother in her village and decides that she expresses the essence of affairs much better than the Belgrade newspapers, which he says he can't read because they irritate him. He has not a sentence which shows any concern with the state of democratic rights in Titoiland. He makes no attempt to speak with peasants who, he is told, are NOT for the regime.

He ironically reports that he saw no "terror" around, as if dictatorships are supposed to beat up every other citizen in the street, but he touches the apex when he adds that he was never restricted. He never indicates that he understands that everywhere he went the highest officials in the land took time off to smooth his every footstep. (That this was so is evident from his account, particularly one naively told anecdote: On arriving in Ljubljana a "young man" met him, took care of his baggage, etc.; came to his guest house next day to inquire about his needs and comfort, and so on. Adamic thought he was some kind of charge. He later learned he was the vice-premier of the People's Republic of Slovenia.)

He visits Tito's villa in the Dedinje residential area of the bureaucracy, and notes—ka, ka—that the stories are false about the armed guards that protect Tito. A couple of hundred pages later we learn quite incidentally that the crack regiments of the Yugoslav army are garrisoned all around Dedinje.

Not that Adamic was uncritical of the Titoists, you understand. On the contrary, he keeps recurring to a running dispute between him and them, in which he maintains his convictions to their great annoyance. His criticism: that the Yugoslavs don't know how to handle their public relations, and that if they only told the world their story they would gain much sympathy.

## Weird Tale

Nothing much need be said about his combined biography of Tito and history of the CP of Yugoslavia. It is simply straight from Tito's lips. (He remarks: "there was no reason, within the context of our relationship, why Tito should lie to me.") But while this is the official stuff, the Titoists would never be as stupid about it as Adamic; the latter explains that Gorkic, Tito's predecessor at the head of the CP, was at one and the same time an agent of the royal regime in Belgrade, the Pilsudski government in Warsaw, the British-French interests in Eastern Europe, the Jesuits—and a GPU man as well.

One weird tale can't be skipped. We have no idea just why Adamic tells it, except that it is supposed to illustrate something deep about Tito's personality. It is about Tito and Vladimir Nazor, a leading Croatian writer and a Partisan during the war. Another man is relating the story—

"After Nazor came to Supreme Headquarters in '43, he saw Tito every day for three or four months. Then one evening the two of them were in Tito's hut alone. . . . They were talking about something or other. . . . at one point in their conversation they fell silent. Tito looked at him and said, 'Drug [Comrade] Nazor, I know who you are; do you know who I am?'—Of course I know,' Nazor said, 'you're Tito, you're the Supreme Commander.'—Tito shook his head. 'I mean, do you know who I am apart from Tito and the Supreme Commander; what my real name is, where I came from, and so on?'—Nazor was taken aback. Although he was a writer, he had never asked anyone, had never even wondered who Tito was. . . . 'Well, who are you?' asked Nazor.—'My name is Josip Broz,' Tito said. 'I was born in Kumrovec. I'm a metal worker.'—But to Nazor, too, as he himself told me, this information didn't matter. He was impressed by the way Tito told him these few facts. It confirmed his feeling that Tito was Tito. That was enough. He wrote several poems about him. . . ."

There it is. You don't have to suppose that anything like this happened. We quote it to give the flavor of the book.

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor. . .

## About Charity

To the Editor:

As a Christian Socialist I was surprised and disappointed to read in the issue of LABOR ACTION which I have just received (July 7) the narrow-minded and ill-informed attack on Christianity entitled "Charity, Welfare State and the Walls of Jericho."

I am no Papist, and I dislike as much as Mr. Coben the reactionary social principles of Popery, but to proceed from a criticism of Cardinal Griffin to a polemic against Christianity is as illogical as to proceed from criticism of Stalinism to a condemnation of socialism.

Mr. Coben makes two major accusations against Christianity: (1) it offers nothing to the workers now, only "pie in the sky when we die"; and (2) "the social principles of Christianity preach the necessity of a ruling and an oppressed class" (this last a quote from Marx and Engels).

Coming immediately after a sneer at Christian charity, the first charge makes no sense at all. What does Marxism offer workers? Better material conditions at an indefinite time in the future. Christianity is more practical. Recognizing that economic problems are not likely to be solved for a considerable time and that the solution of these problems is itself only a means to an end—the fulfillment of God's purpose for man—it preaches a doctrine which can help even the poor to make the best of things now, by establishing a relationship of love with their fellow man.

Still more ridiculous is the accusation that Christianity is based on class oppression. Mr. Coben's knowledge of Holy Writ appears to be confined to those passages from the Pentateuch which come from the pen of the priestly caste.

Has he never read the prophets? "Hear, I pray you, ye heads of Jacob, and rulers of the House of Israel: is it not for you to know judgment? who hate the good, and love the evil; who pluck off their skin from off them, and their flesh from off their bones; ye, they chop them in pieces, as for the pot, and as flesh within the caldron."

Does he really believe that Christianity demands from the rich only a few miserable coins tossed to the poor? When a rich man asked Jesus "what must I do to be saved?" he replied, "Sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor."

"Go to now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries that are coming upon you. . . . Behold, the hire of the laborers who mowed your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth out: and the cries of them that reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord."

So let us work together, Christian and non-Christian, to overthrow the oppressors and warmongers and to establish a society where all men (to whatever class they now belong) may be brothers. Utopia or the Kingdom of God—it is the same road that we travel.

E. G. DAVIES

Norwich, England, July 21.

I will not call correspondent Davies' attack on my article "narrow-minded" and "ill-informed" but I would suggest to him that he re-read it in the best spirit of Christian charity, which we secularists would prefer to call "trying to see the other fellow's point of view."

Marxist historical materialists have often discussed the social principles of Christianity as such, but my column did not venture on this territory; in any case to do so would not have been pertinent to its point. It was apparently the quotation from Marx and Engels which aroused Davies' wrath, but I would ask him to look back and see that I myself introduced this quotation with: "It was of such churchmen as the cardinal [Grif-

fin] that Marx and Engels were thinking when they wrote . . ."

And in another place I quite clearly stated that I was discussing "Cardinal Griffin's concept of Christian charity." All my own remarks in the column were directed to this cardinal's views—which, we should recall, were a denunciation of the secular Welfare State on the ground that it muscled in on the church's monopoly on charity-giving. This I presented as a socially reactionary viewpoint and went on to discuss some questions it evokes.

Davies' first point in his alleged summary of my "accusations against Christianity" is also his very own. I did not discuss the "pie in the sky" aspect of the Christian ideology, nor even use that hallowed phrase, since I was interested in arguing against Cardinal Griffin's position: "Personal charity as a social institution assumes the rule of one class over another," and "This charity corrupts."

I make this clear first because I am not very much interested in "attacking" Christianity as such, even under provocation, and because Davies' righteous wrath apparently did not permit him to pay due attention to the ideas which I was interested in discussing. We are interested in social and political viewpoints, and do not feel debarr'd from attacking socially reactionary views even when they are presented in ecclesiastical garb.

I can assure Davies that I'm quite well aware that, especially since Marx and Engels' day, minor schools of Christian thought have arisen which, under the impress of the social struggle, have reinterpreted "the social principles of Christianity" toward closer conformity with modern liberal and even radical thought. I have even read many a Christian Socialist tract, and would claim to be well acquainted with the arsenal of Biblical quotations which are available, some of them a good deal more radical than the ones he chooses to use. But this sort of exegesis would be quite beside the point.

For Marx and Engels, even in their day, were not primarily interested (except in their youth) in the abstract "principles" of Christianity, whatever they may be thought to be, but in the role of religion as a dominant social institution and particularly the role of the dominant Church institutions in society. In any case, this is what we are interested in; and, I would remind Davies, so are Christian Socialists, who try to separate the church as an established and powerful social force from the "true Christian spirit" which they advocate.

Historically the remarks by Marx and Engels have been more than justified if we keep our eye on what the primary social role of the dominant church institutions has really been. It is not relevant to this to counterpose the often laudable social views of the Christian Socialist current, or (for that matter) of the Unitarians or Jehovah's Witnesses.

It is quite pointless for Davies to refer to the prophets in this connection. For the powerful churches of today have no more to do with the spirit of some of the highly quotable prophets than they have to do with the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount.

One might proceed to explain to Davies why it is that the institutions of religion (not merely Christianity) have lent themselves to these social uses, in spite of the opposition of socially radical heretics, but this would be a longer task than I need undertake here. Besides it has been very adequately done elsewhere.

I must add: I do not think that all Christian Socialists would quite agree with Davies' fourth paragraph. At any rate, it verges perilously near the idea that, since social emancipation is far away, it is a good thing for the "poor" to reconcile themselves with things-as-they-are in the

spirit of love with all fellow men. I do not think this is Davies' opinion; I think he has merely written carelessly. I would rather arouse them to wrath to "overthrow the oppressors and warmongers" and would not preach reconciliation through "love" in order "to make the best of things now." (Some narrow-minded person might read into Davies' remarks precisely that social contempt which Marx and Engels flayed with such evident justification, in the quotation I used.)

Finally, I would caution Davies not to use the loaded terms "papist" and "popery." He means Catholics and Catholicism. "Papist" and "popery" are derogatory labels of the same order as "limey" for Englishman, "kike" for Jew, "nigger" for Negro, or "froggie" for Frenchman. They are hangovers from the period of British anti-Catholic intolerance and persecution. On the social and political plane, even as far as the Catholic Church is concerned, the antagonist is the Catholic hierarchy, not Catholics.

Philip COBEN

## ACJ and Zionism

To the Editor:

Thank you for the fine display you gave to the *Jewish Newsletter* in the current issue of LABOR ACTION [Aug. 11].

But where in the world did you discover influences of the "conservative American Council for Judaism" in the *Jewish Newsletter* and in me? I am afraid that you, too, have fallen a prey to a Zionist propaganda cliché. It is American Zionists who are spreading the legend that anyone who opposes the nationalistic aspects of their movement is a "Council" man, and that is supposed to dispose of him forever.

For your information, the American Council for Judaism is the youngest organized anti-Zionist movement. There are at least half a dozen movements and organizations older and larger than the Council who have opposed the nationalistic philosophy of state nationalism among Jews. I was an anti-nationalist a generation before the Council was born. Like a multitude of other Jewish socialists, radicals and liberals of all description who came to this country from pre-revolutionary Russia, I was brought up on the Jewish Labor Bund and I still draw a good deal of my spiritual sustenance from the same source, although I never shared with the Bundists their faith in cultural nationalism, nor their Marxism. I am generally, one of those non-conformists and individualists of a past age, who could never fit into any party and they mostly walk alone, or march with some party a little way. In this age of ideologies, parties and mass movements when even thoughts and emotions are collectivized, people like myself find themselves very much isolated and lonely and some of us try to reach out to others like themselves, unorganized individuals who do not fit into any camp, for an affinity of ideas or comradeship. The *Jewish Newsletter*, which was started nearly five years ago, is one such effort of individually minded people to get together on Jewish problems.

It is true that in the course of its career, the *Jewish Newsletter* and I often marched together with the Council, but we did more so with the "Bund," the "Freeland" people, with the Jewish labor movement in its non-nationalistic aspects, with the Jewish culturalists and with most Jewish liberals who apply their liberalism to Jewish problems as well as to non-Jewish. (For you must know that there is a regrettable tendency among many Jewish liberals to apply one standard of liberalism to Jews and another to non-Jews.)

Among the Jewish liberals who apply the same standards of liberalism to Jews and non-Jews alike, I have found the American

Council for Judaism most consistent. Ideologically their program—that Jews are a religious group and nothing else—is the simplest and most logical formula advanced. I share their view that in this country, at least, Jews have no other reason for group existence except religious affiliation. I differ from them in the interpretation of what religion is and in their faith in the role that religion, in its institutionalized form, can play in modern society.

From the point of view of Judaism and Jews, I believe that they are the only consistent and real Jews in America who have a reason for their existence as Jews and who state that reason clearly and unequivocally. They are certainly better Jews than the Zionists whose religion is entirely racialistic, or at best glorified nationalism. They are also better Jews than the millions of non-Zionist Jews who, like myself, are Jews by mere accident of birth. It is the irony of our age that this small group of Jews who, theologically at least, cling to real Judaism, while the bulk of Jews have watered down their Judaism with chauvinism, or agnosticism, are denounced and hated as renegades.

I do not know why you label the Council as "conservative." This is as inaccurate as any generalization about groups of people. I have met some very strong and true liberals among Council members and some hard-boiled liberals among modern Jews in this country. To me they are the equivalent of the Unitarians among Christian sects and I find them infinitely more congenial and progressive than the fiery zealots of the ancient Torah or of the more modern Zion.

There is one virtue of that group which must be mentioned in a fair evaluation of its place in American Jewish history. This is: Its courageous stand on Jewish problems in the face of an overwhelming tide of chauvinism which has swept the Jewish people the world over and in this country. Whether or not one agrees with their theory about Judaism, the courage with which they stand alone in the midst of rising fanaticism, hatred, contempt, snobbery and indifference cannot but be admired by any one who hates band-wagons, mobs and "loyalist" parties. I frankly admit my sympathy for people who have the courage to stand alone with their God in these days of hysteria, no matter of what type it is.

One more point in the conclusion. During the last war and the Nazi occupation of Europe, many decent Christians in the occupied countries of Western Europe—France, Belgium, Holland and the Scandinavian countries—often put on yellow insignias which the Nazis made the distinctive badge of shame for the Jews. These people were not Jews and often had nothing to do with the Jews. But they wanted to share the humiliation and hatred to which the Jews were subjected, and they also wanted to express in some way their protest against such indignities and hatred.

As far as I am concerned, the hatred of the Jewish nationalists for all Jewish anti-nationalists, including the Council, flows from the same source that all Fascism sprang from. I hate fascism in all manifestations and in my feeble way, I protest against it wherever and whenever I can.

I trust that this clarifies my position which, incidentally, is the position of many other Jews like myself, and that you will not fall into the trap of Zionist propaganda in the future.

William ZUKERMAN

The comment which Mr. Zukerman discusses appeared at the tail of a boost for his *Jewish Newsletter*, and he knows of course that I don't really want to get into an argument with him. But I do want to make clear the thought behind the comment, for

his consideration, since his remarks do not quite bear upon it.

It is obviously not a question of the conservatism or liberalism of the American Council for Judaism on general political questions but of its approach to the "Jewish question" which was and is under consideration. No doubt there are liberals in its ranks as well as Tories; but this is also true of the Zionist Organization of America—which does not gain-say the fact that with respect to the problem at hand the ZO is as such the more conservative wing of the Zionist movement.

Among anti-Zionist Jews, the general tendency of the ACJ (to my mind) is the nationalistic basis for its opposition to Zionism. I suspect that this may seem to Mr. Zukerman to be a surprising statement, since he has been accustomed to making this charge only against the Zionist ideology (with entire justification and great effectiveness, I need scarcely add). The nationalism, indeed chauvinism, of the Zionists which he has attacked so well is grounded on their attitude toward Israel and their view of the Jews as an alien people in every country.

But not less nationalistic is the approach of those anti-Zionist elements who oppose Zionism from the standpoint, implicit or explicit, of middle-class American patriotism; who are appalled by the pro-Israel orientation of Zionists because they themselves look at the question as "good Americans" and not as internationalists. This is the general tenor of the ACJ, in spite of the fact that, as is always true, there are all kinds of people in it and it is by no means homogeneous or "monolithic."

Every now and then, an echo of this gets into the *Jewish Newsletter*. In the proper setting (e.g., a friendly cup of coffee) I would get disputatious about this with Mr. Zukerman; here I'll just give one illustration of what I mean: the tendency to applaud uncritically those ZOA people who draw back at the consistent Zionist demand for the Return from the diaspora. In a long article last year ("The Triple Crisis of Zionism") I discussed the character of this tendency as a reflection of American chauvinism. To greet them as coming over to the right point of view is one-sided.

I know about the frenetic Zionist hatred of the ACJ and other Jewish anti-Zionists, including Mr. Zukerman. My criticism of the ACJ has nothing in common with theirs. (So also we are militantly anti-Stalinist, but we are not thereby obligated to be uncritical of any opponents of Stalinism, from whatever side.)

As for admiring the courage of the ACJ people, I am willing to go along with Mr. Zukerman a certain way. But on this plane, one is also obliged to admire the courage and devotion shown by consistent and militant Zionists, who often are forced to make much more meaningful sacrifices for their ideas than the people of the ACJ. And I'm afraid that many sections of the Zionist movement would win on points if the scoring is done this way.

Mr. Zukerman wins on his objection to the use of the word "influence." I didn't really mean to say that he learned his ideas from the Council. He's perfectly right about that.

H. DRAPER

## For Discussion

To the Editor:

LABOR ACTION and *The New Internationalist* could render a major service to contemporary Marxism if they set themselves the task of reshaping the fundamental theories which have hitherto guided the action of revolutionary socialists the world over. It is not sufficient to blunder along and discover in "retrospect" revolutions in half of Europe, as the Fourth International

(Turn to last page)



# AFL to Break with Policy of 'Nonpartisanship' —

(Continued from page 1)

The presidential candidate is a symbol of his party. Even more than that, he becomes the titular and actual leader of his party the moment he is nominated by its national convention. To endorse him means, in effect, to endorse the party of which he is the head, to endorse its record, its platform, and the administration which will run the country if he should be elected. It is to take responsibility for that administration in a sense which is not involved when the labor movement endorses specific candidates for lower offices from both parties.

And this holds true even if the AFL continues, on a local level, to endorse a certain number of Republicans who have a more favorable legislative record than their Democratic opponents.

Is this action a step forward for the leadership of the AFL? Or does it simply indicate that this leadership is getting more involved than before in the morass of capitalist politics? It is one of the paradoxes of the politics of the American labor movement that both questions must be answered in the affirmative.

## PAC'S POLICY

In almost any other country in the world, the endorsement by the leadership of one of the major trade-union federations of a candidate for the highest office in the land who is openly dedicated to the preservation of capitalism and whose party is financed and in large measure controlled by capitalists would be an almost unthinkable retreat for the whole working class. In all other countries labor has long ago built its own political organization, separate and independent from the parties supported by the capitalists. In some countries the workers support more than one anti-capitalist party, especially in those where the Stalinists have succeeded in creating powerful political organizations.

But in the United States, the mass of the labor movement has up till now rejected the very idea of assuming an independent role in politics, even long after they have been fighting the employers in the economic field with their powerful trade unions. The labor leaders have been so afraid of the consequences of bringing the power of the working class to bear on the political field in any organized form that they have, until quite recently, even refrained from operating as a bloc within one of the capitalist parties.

Most of them have consistently used their influence with the workers to propagate the idea that labor has no distinct political interests, and that the only result of an attempt to assert itself as an organized force in the political arena would be to isolate it from the rest of the population, and thus deliver it into the hands of its enemies. The AFL leadership has been even more reluctant than that of the CIO to break with this tradition of non-partisanship in politics.

It was not a great many years ago that both sections of the labor movement took a step away from this position, when the CIO formed its Political Action Committee and the AFL later formed its Labor's League for Political Education. Both of these represented an effort to give the leadership of both federations greater leverage and bargaining power in politics. It was a reaction, in part, to the taunts of the politicians in both parties that they could not deliver the labor vote, that the unions do not represent the workers when it comes to politics, that their endorsements or condemnations meant little as they had no organization through which to make them effective.

It is true that both the LLPE and PAC continued to endorse the candidates who were chosen by the capitalist parties and who were beholden to them. Only in very exceptional cases did these political arms of the labor movement seek to impose their own candidates on the old political

machines. Between elections they devoted themselves to educating the workers to the idea that politics is an important factor in their lives, and their chief emphasis was "register and vote" without saying for whom or for what the workers should cast their ballot. During campaigns they tended to become adjuncts of the regular political machines in the various localities. Here and there, they took over the functions of these machines in getting out the vote.

Although the LLPE and PAC did not present their own candidates and did not seek to propagate a political ideology which was distinctively that of the workers, the very fact of their formation was a definite advance over the previous political involvement of the labor movement. They were distinctively trade-union organizations. Their very existence demonstrated, and continues to demonstrate, that labor does have a distinct role to play in politics, and that it needs its own organization if it is to play that role effectively.

To the extent that they involved the workers more directly and

effectively in the support of capitalist politicians it could be said that they were being entangled more fully in capitalist politics. But to the extent that they organized the workers politically (the workers, it should be remembered, having been already individually in the same morass if they were anywhere), they were and are building a ship which makes it possible for the workers to float themselves out and proceed on their own way under their own steam.

## PART OF PROCESS

The endorsement of a presidential candidate of the Democratic Party by the AFL is not, of course, the same kind of thing as the formation of their own LLPE. Yet it is part of the same process of the growing consciousness of the labor movement that it can and must involve itself in the political life of the country if it is to defend the gains it has made and to make further advances. It is, further, an indication of a growing awareness of the fact that organization plays as vital a role in politics as it

does in the economic field; and that the specific organizations in politics are political parties just as the specific organizations in the struggle for better wages are trade unions.

This is such an elementary and obvious idea that it is hard to believe that the American labor movement has not understood its importance up till now. Nevertheless, that is a fact. And the endorsement of a presidential candidate, which symbolizes the active support by the AFL of the Democratic Party as such, indicates that the leadership of the AFL is prepared to involve itself as never before in the life of that party.

It would be foolish to deny that the immediate effect of this involvement will be to take the AFL even more deeply into collaboration with the political machines which make up the Democratic Party, and to involve it more directly in the kind of deals and compromises which are the hallmark of capitalist politics in this country. Nevertheless, for them, and for the workers whom they lead, this is a step forward, relatively speaking. They have been and still are imbued with pro-

capitalist ideology. They have been and still are committed to the support of the capitalist system, and of the government and the policies which are a product of it. But in their own way, they represent the interests of the workers. And these interests are bound to clash, sooner or later, with the interests of the class which still dominates the party into which they are now entering more actively and consciously than ever before.

We could wish that the process of involving the working class in organized political life were taking a much more independent, a much more self-conscious form. As socialists, we will continue to do everything within our power to hasten the development of the political consciousness and the independent political organization of the working class which is bound to accompany it. But we must also recognize that however devious its path may appear to be, the actions of its leadership in this campaign indicate that it is moving toward a new stage in its political development, and that this has a positive value in pointing toward the future.

# READERS OF LA TAKE THE FLOOR: LETTERS —

(Continued from page 7)

has done. It is necessary to predict in advance the possible developments—favorable or otherwise—which might arise in a given situation.

I have no doubt that looking back on our attitude to the Second World War—particularly in relation to the Resistance movements—our attitude to the European and Asian social-democracies, our attitude to the colonial bourgeois-nationalist movements was profoundly sectarian. Mechanically applying Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution we came to the conclusion that we (the advanced guard), and only we, could carry out any of the tasks that world society placed on the agenda during and after the last world war. We were convinced that the social-democracies would not carry out their nationalization measures, because they were, we thought, wholly linked up with the interests of private capitalism.

But the facts are different. Social-democracy, particularly in Britain, has carried through changes in the capitalist system which Marxists did not believe possible. Moreover, particularly with the rise of Bevanism in Britain, there is more than a possibility that the Labor Party will establish effective control over the commanding heights of the remaining private capitalist sector. In such circumstances, Britain would have been transformed into a workers' state—however crude and bureaucratic in form.

Surely this implies that social-democracy is not a fixed political category, but rather a process. Owing to the weakness of British capitalism, the Labor leadership might well carry out the economic side of the transitional program of the Fourth International. This is not to say that a healthy workers' democracy could be established by any social-democratic leadership. Quite the contrary. The long-term strategical end in British Marxists have in mind implies that though the "reformist" or "centrist" leadership can proceed along the path of social revolution, there are distinct limits upon this advance. These limits arise from the bureaucratic, non-participating, nature of the revolution itself. Put simply then, social-democracy can do part of the job; it cannot complete it.

I am convinced that social-democracy in Belgium, Western Germany, India, Indonesia and Burma can also project (but not complete) a revolutionary orientation.

During the last war we held the view that the national bourgeoisie of Europe could not re-establish a bourgeois democracy, but that only the proletariat

could do this and in so doing would establish a workers' democracy. The facts are different.

We immensely overestimated the significance of the bourgeois element in the national struggles of Europe. The truth was that only the shadow of the bourgeoisie was involved in the national struggle. Our errors were best shown up in Eastern Europe, and particularly in Yugoslavia. Not only did we take a sectarian line on the Resistance movements, but we also incorrectly criticized the Stalinists and the *maquis* [underground resistance against the Nazi occupation] for transferring their base of operations from the towns and industry to the country at large during the German occupation.

Very fortunately, in South Africa the most intelligent Marxists have not repeated the errors we made during the war. They have correctly entered the national liberatory movement and centered it not on the shanty towns so much as on the peasantry expropriated by the white bourgeoisie in the country at large. The same goes for China. The Chinese Stalinists were correct when they "went to the peasantry" after the Chiang Kai-shek bloodbath and the ultra-left putschism—for which they were mainly responsible in the first place, of course. The Chinese Trotskyists who stayed in the large maritime towns played little or no role in the post-war events, as a result of their tragic error.

Then again, we rejected the view that the Indian bourgeoisie, for instance, could play any significant independent role. We did not think it possible that the Indian bourgeoisie could achieve political independence, and at the same time, slowly but surely shift the economic center of gravity from foreign to native capital. The facts are different. I have no doubt that in Egypt, as in Iran and Syria, we shall find ourselves faced with further unforeseen situations. Even in Bolivia, the MNR [Nationalist movement] is playing an unexpected role—though this does not justify the FI's capitulation to the native bourgeoisie.

As far as Spain is concerned, dogmatism about the course of future events would be unwise. It is possible that an alliance of the POUM, the Spanish socialists and Anarchists could carry through the substantial tasks of the socialist revolution.

Even in Yugoslavia, Titoism is taking many strange turnings. Recent writings and statements of Yugoslav leaders indicate that Titoism is not simply national-Stalinism. It is more than that. On a European scale, Titoism has had little influence as an independent political force — UAP

(West Germany), MCF (France) and PUP (Italy). However, Titoism might well help to fructify social-democracy, if its small but ideologically important sections entered social-democracy.

It is now twelve years since Leon Trotsky was assassinated by the GPU. The movement he founded is engaged in a wordy theoretical liquidation of Trotsky's essential ideas. Worse still, the small groups which have tried to revise the course of the FI have either disappeared into oblivion or passed into the stratosphere.

The Independent Socialist League is fighting a hard battle to preserve the great tradition of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. It is essential that Marxists in the U. S. give serious thought to the facts of the situation, and bring up to date the contribution Leon Trotsky made to pre-war Marxism.

I hope that this letter will help to open up a lively discussion on the place of Marxism in the world today. If it only succeeds in this, its purpose will have been amply served.

Allan VAUGHAN  
London, August 5.

Comrade Vaughan (who also participates in writing the London Letter for LABOR ACTION) proposes that the ISL set itself the task of re-examining and reformulating the views of the movement on a number of questions which he presents. It is our fault and not his if he is unaware of the documents and resolutions of the ISL which have set out to do exactly that, over a number of years since the early stages of the war. It would, we think, be an excellent contribution to the discussion of comrades abroad if the ISL were to publish in handy available form the several basic documents of the League which it has adopted.

The discussion which he seeks to "open up" with his letter has been going on here for a rather long time.

It is true that many sections of the Marxist movement in Europe, particularly the Trotskyist movement, took a sectarian attitude toward the Resistance movement during the war, as Comrade Vaughan says. That discussion we opened in 1943 and at our 1944 convention adopted a position on the question of the national struggle which makes excellent reading today. In advance, and not merely in retrospect, we also anticipated the re-establishment of bourgeois-democratic regimes, though this in the context of a more basic analysis of the question than we can summarize here.

We do not, however, think that

Vaughan makes out a case for "transferring [the socialist] base of operations from the towns and industry to the country at large during the German occupation," or in South Africa, and (it would seem) generally throughout the world. We would gather that, by counterposing "the country at large" to "towns and industry," he must mean the countryside. But perhaps we do not understand his thought.

In our 1949 statement on "Capitalism, Stalinism, and the Struggle for the World," we also took up the theory of the permanent revolution, the significance of India's independence, the new character of the social-democracy and a new attitude toward it, and several other questions which Comrade Vaughan does not raise, including the whole question of the third world war.

This approach was continued in our resolutions of last year, on the situation in Asia, the Labor government in Britain and its nationalizations, and on Titoism. On the latter question, the illusion about Titoism as a basic break with Stalinism and not merely with Moscow is precisely a view which we have vigorously tried to combat, through a very large amount of analytical and factual material.

The intent of this comment is not to claim that discussion on these questions has already gone as far as it can and that the books have been closed on them, but merely to point out that we have brought such discussion quite a distance beyond the mere posing of the problems, as far as our own contributions are concerned. The problems themselves are still before the whole socialist movement.—Ed.

## You're Invited

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

## Subscribers — Attention!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

16-34

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

RENEW NOW!