

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 20, 1953

FIVE CENTS

EISENHOWER AND THE 'WILD MEN OF THE RIGHT'

... page 3

Brazil: Vargas' Hypnosis Is Waning

... page 3

The Heroes of the Warsaw Ghetto

... page 5

The British Labor League of Youth

... page 4

SPOT-LIGHT

He'd Better Be on Time, Too, or Joe'll Be Mad

Last week's score-card on McCarthy: April 11: McCarthy sends MSA Director Stassen a public letter telling him to get on the ball and announce to the world that the U. S. government will favor any shipowners who agree not to ship materials to China.

Next day Stassen replied: "Dear Joe: Thank you for your thoughtful and cooperative letter of April 11. . . I will be pleased to go over the information which you have with you to see how we can best work together. . . I could stop in to see you Monday afternoon, about 2 o'clock."

That is, if McCarthy isn't busy transacting business with some ambassador.

Secretary of, and in, A State of Panic

Secretary of State Dulles was testifying before the House Appropriations subcommittee. Talk came around to the Voice of America (see article in this issue.)

Rep. Preston (D-Ga.): "Doesn't it seem to you that the attacks on the program [of the Voice] have reached the point where they have seriously impaired its usefulness? It seems that way to me. And we have done it ourselves; we have aided and abetted the Russians by attacking and condemning our own program. Now that it has been dragged through the mud, I'm wondering just what can be done to make it effective."

Dulles (turning hurriedly to Committee Chairman Cliff Cleveland): "I'm sorry, but I will have to be excused. I have a very important engagement."

Preston: "You can't be doing anything more important than to meet with this committee. We are discussing your budget."

Dulles: "I have spent five hours today up here in Congress."

Preston: "You didn't spend them with us."

Dulles: "No, but I have spent an hour with you, and I have an extremely important meeting with other Cabinet officers that I must get to. If you want to talk more about the Voice of America, I'll be glad to come back, although there are other people who know more about that than I do."

Preston: "Yes, but you are secretary of state and the program is part of your agency."

Dulles: "But I have no control over the activities you referred to. If you think they are inimical to the Voice and if you have complaints on that score, there are other places to make them than to me."

Preston: "That isn't answering my questions."

Dulles (picking up his hat and briefcase, nodded to chairman Cleveland): "Thank you very much, I must leave now." And he never came back.

Dulles Gets Pushed from Bad to Worse: 'Hard' Line on Asia Peace Deal, Scrapping of Point 4 Program

By GORDON HASKELL

Two events have pointed up the administration's trend of thought in foreign policy matters. One was a "trial balloon" let up by Secretary of State Dulles, and the other was testimony given by the same Dulles before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on March 18. Although the latter statement is over a month old, its text has been released to the press only recently.

The trial balloon was let up at a small off-the-record luncheon given by "a high administration source" for a select group of reporters.

The moment its contents appeared in print, they were denied as "without foundation in fact" by a White House spokesman. A day later, however, it leaked out that the "high administration source" to whom these views had been attributed was actually Dulles, and even the administration has not been brazen enough to deny it.

Dulles told the reporters that an overall peace in Asia, if peace comes, is going to be more embarrassing to this country than to Russia. He went on to say that the administration might be willing to accept a division of Korea at the narrow waist of the peninsula, about 90 miles above the present battle-

lines. The United States would seek to include Indo-China and Malaya in any over-all settlement, this presumably meaning that the American government would seek a pledge from the Russians and Chinese to stop any aid to the Vietminh movement in Indo China and to the guerrillas in Malaya.

Further the United States would be willing to accept the idea of an independent Formosa, possibly as a United Nations trusteeship. This would obviously involve an agreement by the Chinese Stalinists to give up their claims to the island, while in return the United States would give up the fiction that Chiang Kai-shek's government represents the whole of China, and would stop arming it for raids or other offensive action against the Chinese mainland.

No sooner was the balloon released, than it was under heavy attack by Senator Knowland, the rest of the China Lobby, and the whole right wing of the Republican Party. From their clamor the fact emerges that these gentlemen will be satisfied with nothing short of all-out war in the Orient. At the very least it is clear that the kind of "settlement" to which they aspire could not possibly be achieved short of such a war.

DULLES' FEELER

The administration's feeler is being denounced as a betrayal of Chiang Kai-shek and the Syngman Rhee government of South Korea. A moment's reflection, however, shows that the terms outlined by Dulles are probably far harsher than anything which would be accepted by the Chinese and Russian Stalinists as a basis of a settlement of the struggle in that area, even a temporary one. They probably exceed what the United Nations allies (with the exception of France) would be willing to demand. At the very least, they are at the outer border of what could be conceived of as a "bargaining position" in the Far East.

On this basis, the Chinese and North Koreans would be expected to give up what the United Nations have not been able to win in war. They would have to accept a North Korea which is nothing but a territorial buffer strip while South

(Turn to last page)

(Turn to last page)

U.S. Is Doing a Good Job —Of Isolating Itself

By WALTER JASON

Once again powerful strata of the Republican Party exercised a decisive influence on foreign policy at a critical juncture in the development of a breathing-spell in the cold war between Stalinism and American capitalism, and the Eisenhower administration repudiated its own leading spokesman in foreign affairs.

The repudiation of the views of John Foster Dulles, secretary of state, regarding negotiations and possible terms of settlement of the Korean war and the Far East crisis was a sharper rebuke than Dean Acheson ever suffered at the hands of Congress, and Dulles discreetly retired for a few days from the Washington scene.

Nor has the shock of this event enabled the Washington press, including the conservative New York Times, to catch its breath and ask: What is going on in this country? Just what kind of an administration is the Eisenhower team?

President Eisenhower's action in calling off his weekly press conference and going to Georgia for a week of golf wasn't calculated to assist the press in answering its queries, or in easing the anxiety of the Western world which has been watching the spectacle in Washington with incredulous astonishment.

SPOON-FEEDING

What happened in Washington last week does seem incredible unless one grasps the dilemmas of the Eisenhower administration.

On April 6, in typical Washington fashion, John Foster Dulles held an off-the-record briefing conference with the most responsible and influential members of the press and radio. The purpose was to explain American policy on the current crisis and to begin to spoon-feed the American

people for a turn in their thinking. It may well be necessary to "coexist" with Stalinism for quite a few years, and this calls for some adjustments. In addition, a war-frightened world may well insist on a breathing-spell in the drive toward all-out world war.

Dulles told the conference, among other things, that a settlement in Korea which put America 90 miles north of the current battle lines would be OK; that Formosa may end up as an independent entity or perhaps under a trusteeship of the United Nations; that part of any general settlement would be a demand that the Stalinists cease-fire in Indo-China, and other ideas along those general lines.

Besides, there was nothing hard and fast in these ideas; they were just general outlines of a possible policy. After all, maybe the Stalinists might not want to retreat another 90 miles; perhaps

(Turn to last page)

Anti-Franco Rallies in N.Y.

NEW YORK, April 16—Celebrating the anniversary of the Spanish republic, the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims and the International League for the Rights of Man held a well-attended public meeting last night which was especially noteworthy for the wide expressions of sympathy and support which were put before it. Next week's LABOR ACTION will carry a full report on it.

On the Monday before, the picket line before the Spanish Government Tourist Office took place in a pouring rain, which reduced it to token size; the next day, the second picketing was manned by about 35 in the cold weather.

Messages and speeches to the public meeting on Wednesday evening at Freedom House showed that there has been an important increase in support to the anti-Franco committee's work.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

703

CIO's Midwest Committee Gives Up Against CP

By PETE JARMS

CHICAGO, April 14—The Midwestern CIO Organizing Committee has been dissolved!

The organizing committee was set up in May of last year in order to get back into the CIO fold those plants which were represented by Stalinist-dominated unions such as the independent United Electrical Workers (UE), whose farm-equipment section (FE-UE) is a competitor of the United Auto Workers (CIO) agricultural-implement division.

The facts show, unfortunately, that the committee's campaign has been virtually a total flop. The money and organizers for its work came from all parts of the CIO.

What put the finishing touch to the rout was the result of the election at the West Pullman works of International Harvester, on the South Side of Chicago. It was the third case in six months in which the UAW-CIO suffered defeat at the hands of the FE-UE.

This defeat was especially painful because it took place despite the fact that the UE had met with a humiliating defeat in its 1952 strike, when the company wrote its own contract and the FE signed it. The FE leaders also swallowed the discharge of over 50 key militants, at the same time.

Also shown is the fact that the craft unions were on the ascendancy. Here is the tabulation:

Main production and maintenance workers:—FE beat the UAW with 1277 votes to 573, with 52 votes for "No union." (Number voting 1914, out of 2237 eligible.)

Tool and die makers and machinists:—FE topped, with 84 votes to 76 for the AFL's International Association of Machinists, the UAW trailing third with 54 votes. A runoff will be necessary between the two highest, FE and IAM. (Number voting 220, out of 230 eligible.)

Pipefitters, steamfitters, plumbers:—AFL 13 votes, FE 3, UAW none.

Carpenters:—AFL Carpenters 9, FE 4, No Union 1; no votes for the UAW.

Millwrights:—FE 16, AFL Carpenters 12, IAM 3, UAW 1, No Union 1. Runoff necessary between FE and AFL Carpenters.

This report shows several things. The AFL was successful in carving out several craft units and delivering a blow at an industrial union. Within the AFL the fight goes on between the Carpenters and the IAM over representation of the millwrights. The UAW-CIO was painfully beaten in every single election in spite of the fact that it was the UAW which was the petitioner.

Shortly after this election, the UAW announced its withdrawal from the ballot in an election at Harvester's Farmall plant in Rock Island, Illinois.

To top it all: during the year of the existence of the Midwestern CIO Organizing Committee, the largest local of the CIO's electrical workers union (IUE-CIO), in the Honeywell plant at Minneapolis, left the CIO to go to the AFL!—and to go into the Teamsters, at that.

NOT EQUIPPED

The CIO has simply not been equipped to fight the Stalinists. The people it has entrusted with the organizational drives do not understand what they are up against in the case of the Stalinists' political methods. They are helpless against the latter's propaganda, even though it is largely built around outright lies. The initiative in every situation has been taken by the FE-UE, and the CIO has always been on the defensive.

The CIO has not been able to appeal successfully to the Negro workers, on the basis of its line: The phony CP line directed to the Negro workers could not be successfully opposed by people who have no understanding of the political flipflops of Stalinist policy.

[LABOR ACTION has on several occasions discussed the mistakes and inadequacies of the CIO's attempts to counter the FE-UE, from 1949 on. For 1952, see issue of Dec. 1; for 1950, issues of Jan. 9, May 8, Sept. 4 and 25, Nov. 13; for 1949, issues of Feb. 28, May 30.—Ed.]

Walter Reuther's 'Conspiracy'

There was an interesting, and unwitting, sidelight cast at the UAW-CIO convention, just held in Atlantic City, on the current hue and cry raised by witchhunters to make the use of an assumed name equivalent to evidence of "subversive conspiracy."

At the UAW convention, James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO and head of the CIO electrical workers union, greeted the delegates with a talk in which he told the following story about Walter Reuther, who is now president of both the UAW and the CIO:

"Walter came awfully close to being bounced out of his own convention, the very first UAW convention which was held in South Bend, Ind., in 1936," Carey related.

"Walter, as I recall, wasn't even seated on the first day of that convention. He went to South Bend as a delegate from Local 86 and informed the Credentials Committee that he had worked at the Turnstedt plant in Detroit. Somehow a protest was raised against his being seated because no one had ever heard of a Walter Reuther at the Turnstedt plant.

"The Credentials Committee held a hearing, and then the facts came out. Walter had indeed worked at the Turnstedt plant but under an alias. The Credentials Committee delicately called it 'an assumed name.' . . .

"There was a sound reason, of course for Walter's using an 'assumed name' on his job at Turnstedt. Walter was black-listed, as were many other active unionists in the auto industry at that time. If he had used his own name, plant gates would have been slammed in his face from one end of Detroit to another."

• In the language of certain apologists of witchhunt methods today, this made Reuther a "conspirator."

Stellato About-Faces on Local Democracy

DETROIT, April 13—LABOR ACTION'S analysis of Carl Stellato, president of the large Ford Local 600 of the United Auto Workers, as a man who has no firm principles was confirmed this week when he proposed to the Executive Board of the local that the April 12 membership meeting be asked to approve the holding of biannual elections at the Rouge plant, instead of annual elections.

At the Atlantic City convention of the UAW, the Ford delegates voted against the constitutional proposal for biannual elections. All their speeches were along the lines of preserving local democracy. Speaker after speaker rose to stress the necessity of preserving democracy.

But no sooner did they get home they changed their tune.

Ford Facts (the Local's organ) of

April 4 announced also that the membership meeting will take up the question of the length of the term of local officers, but nothing was said in the issue that indicated what course the leadership would follow.

If the Ford local adopts Stellato's recommendation, it will be a real blow to those in UAW who wish to preserve the annual local union elections. Now that the convention has left it up to the local unions to decide, local after local will be told: Ford 600 is doing it, why don't you?

All the locals will be under greater pressure to institute two-year terms. What was defeated at two past conventions may become an accomplished fact in this way, and Stellato, in this case, would not be among the least responsible.

UAW Purge Rule Moves CPer to Resign

By KEN HILLIER

CHICAGO, April 12—The first reaction to the new trial procedure established by the United Auto Workers convention in Atlantic City—a procedure whereby Stalinists who run for offices or hold appointive positions in the union can be tried and expelled from the union—has come in Chicago, in Local 453.

Hillard Ellis, a business agent, announced to the press that he has resigned from the Communist Party. This will relieve the International union of a tough administrative problem, and no doubt they are breathing a sigh of relief.

If Ellis had not taken this step, a head-on fight with this fairly large amalgamated union would have produced no better results than the UAW leadership was able to get when Ford Local 600 was taken over.

The Chicago Daily News, reporting the news item, carried an interesting statement by the plant management which had dealt with Ellis:

"Stowell C. Wasson, plant manager of the National Malleable & Steel Castings Company, . . . manufacturing armament for the armed forces, said: 'Ellis,

with whom I have negotiated for eight years, always has been truthful. He's never interfered with production. Though he's a militant union man and fights hard for what he thinks is correct, his philosophy has been, "We must have production in order to pay high wages." I trusted him to the extent of never keeping him outside the plants, though we're manufacturing material for the armed forces.'"

Need any more be said about the Stalinist line of conduct in the union? During the last war, union militants were fingered and fired for the slightest show of resistance against this company's attacks.

ISL FUND DRIVE Two Weeks to Go! We'll Make It—If the Pace Holds

Box Score			
	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$11,500	7902.00	68.7
Streator	25	30	120
Oregon	50	50	100
St. Louis	25	25	100
Detroit	500	455	91
SYL	1,250	1092	87.3
Pittsburgh	150	112	74.6
Chicago	1,800	1316	73.1
Cleveland	200	144	72
Reading	50	35	70
New York	4,000	2756	68.9
General	1,075	681	63.7
Oakland	500	295	59
Los Angeles	600	352	58.6
Buffalo	650	345	53
Philadelphia	250	129	51.6
Newark	250	48	24
Seattle	200	32	16
Akron	50	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

If the present rate of contributions continues to the end of the drive there is no doubt that the campaign will end successfully. Reports from all branches indicate that they will all reach or surpass their quotas.

This week's contributions reached \$1034, raising the national percentage to 68.7. Chicago took honors with a contribution of \$319 from the ISL and \$124 from the SYL. As a result of large payments from the youth, the national SYL is now within reach of its quota with a percentage of 87.3. The SYL has now sent in \$1092.

Detroit sent in another sizable payment and now has a percentage of 91, which is really an excellent showing for them. Los Angeles, too, is picking itself up. A \$100 contribution lifted them above the 50 per cent point and we are advised by its Fund Drive director that the branch will make its quota. New York, although following a slower pace, continues to move up. It now has almost 70 per cent of its quota.

Although the General portion has slowed up, its total was upped by a \$50 contribution from Boston. Our friend insists, however, that even though Boston has no special place in the standings, it ought to be listed. We appreciate the efforts so much that we think it fitting to mention Boston's contribution to the drive.

There are two weeks left to the drive, or three to stretch it a bit. These are the weeks that really count. We are advised by all our friends not to worry. The various branches and the SYL are preparing to complete their quotas in these coming weeks and that is what makes us confident that we can make it by the end of the drive period.

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

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

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL 1953 Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

specializes in books and pamphlets, on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2. a year!

Eisenhower

As He Fumbles, the 'Wild Men of the Right' Make Hay

The White House and Joe McCarthy

By **WALTER BARRON**

In its first two months in office, the Eisenhower administration, elected by voters who vaguely wanted some kind of "leadership" as against the supposed fumbling of the previous administration, has acted more confused and disorganized, and has less achievement and leadership to its credit than the last previous Republican administration of Herbert Hoover in its worst days. The new era of harmony and direction, as planned by the "sophisticated conservatives" of *Business Week* magazine and *Fortune's* editorial staff has not begun with the expected "honeymoon."

Responsibility in office, it was explained during the campaign by many publicists of the more respectable Republican press, would tone down the "wild men" in the party. The forceful but benign personality of the famed military leader in the White House, surrounded with "practical" but far-seeing men, would so stimulate at least all Republicans, possibly most of the nation, as to give the country a sense of unified goal and purpose seen, in recent times, only during the war and in Franklin Roosevelt's first "hundred days."

Of course, these varied Republican propagandists never mentioned program. Without any such program, the man who, presumably by combined charm, vigor, and know-how, kept Generals Bradley, Montgomery, and De Gaulle working harmoniously together, finds himself in an atmosphere in which Secretary of State Dulles, Mutual Security Director Stassen, Majority Senate Leader Taft, demagog McCarthy, and Press Secretary Haggerty are at loggerheads on questions which are not of major policy import. "Do-nothingism" is the principal theme of Republican stewardship thus far. With minor questions holding the spotlight, there seems little idea of what the administration actually wants.

ADRIFT

In foreign affairs, the promise of a "bold positive foreign policy" has been transformed into the same daily improvisation as in the Truman-Acheson days. As before, future courses depend on what Moscow wants. A report spreads that Dulles wants to settle the Korean war with a particular dividing line and UN trusteeship for Formosa, a program which, if it came from the Democrats, would be called "appeasement." But the White House staff pulls the rug from under that apparent feeler.

On domestic questions, there has been

even less. The only meaningful legislation presented is on the one campaign promise which is being kept—the plan to turn the tidelands oil deposits over to the states. Otherwise—nothing!

Washington within the past two months has merely continued the picture of Republican congressional behavior of the previous few years—more investigations, exposures, and furthering of personal political ambitions. These investigations are, of course in no way designed to be guides to legislation, as congressional investigations are supposed to be. From McCarthy's inquisition of Voice of America employees to Representative Velde's plan to probe the pulpits, they are keyed only to get publicity for the investigators. After all, one such inquiry several years ago set up the road to the vice-presidency for the present incumbent of that office.

With so many of his fellow Republicans in Congress hellbent only for headlines, with such a slim majority in both Houses, with great trepidation about using Democratic votes to get victory margins, Eisenhower, in the absence of any program, hardly looks the genial savior who (millions fervently hoped) would "do something" to pull us out of the present impasse. The theme is still: "After the trip to Korea—what?"

NO REAL CHANGE

Yet this writer must part company from most commentators in stretching this analysis of weakness to the point where "Eisenhower has surrendered to McCarthy." Surely, Stassen had to "eat crow" because he chastised McCarthy for working out a personal deal with Greek shipowners to stop shipments to Stalinist countries. Surely, no one has openly slapped the junior senator from Wisconsin over the knuckles. But the McCarthys, Jenners, et. al. have not changed anything that the administration really wanted.

These did not gain a moral victory in the Bohlen case, as some have suggested. The State Department wanted Bohlen in Moscow, and he is going there. The Voice of America inquiry harassed many individuals, but there has been no appreciable change, and there will be none unless the administration itself wants one.

McCarthyism can disturb, annoy, and upset political plans—it can not alter them completely. For inherent in the entire McCarthyite approach is the complete lack of any proposals. It feeds on a

generalized frustration in the face of Stalinist victories and the existence of an unpopular and directionless war; it seeks explanation in the seemingly easily understood realm of "conspiracies and plots." At the present time such "know-nothingism" has a much more limited potential than is realized by many.

The Republican victory in November, particularly that of the head of the ticket, was largely a result of the same type of diffuse frustration. But the Republican administration and its ideologists, with all the fumbling and lack of concreteness of their approach to date, do have some fundamental ideas, and also the most powerful group in the country to back them up.

GOP TENDENCIES

The axis of its planned political emphasis is a continuation of the main drift—a partially militarized capitalist America, with enough production of civilian goods and a modified welfare state, dominating as much of the world as possible through its wealth. Its slogan is Henry Luce's "American Century"; its methods are business know-how and success rather than force; its desired bedrock is "responsible leadership" in all spheres; its principal power base is what has come to be euphemistically summarized (with much accuracy) as "Wall Street."

Dealing with an existent political situation, particularly with its own party, it has faltered and will continue to do so—except when the chips are down. The Bohlen affair was one example. The refusal to cut taxes before the budget is balanced indicates the realization that U. S. world leadership becomes more important for the businessmen in government than the immediate filling of their pockets.

In contrast, what are the other tendencies in the Republican party?

There is the powerful Taft wing, which would love to get back to the Hoover days; but, the Senate leader is no political maniac and knows he cannot upset the appointment of his party's new administration so early.

The McCarthy-Jenner wing is improperly termed "reactionary" insofar as the word implies a conscious political approach, something they do not approximate. For the want of any better term, they may be best summarized as the right wings' "wild men." Such "wild men" have had an important part in the political history of many countries. The earlier Nazi movement is a good example.

But they do not have an immediate place, beyond demagogic shouting and building their own personal careers, within the current political setup today.

Without McCarthy the Republican Party leadership at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue would probably be much happier; without the Republican Party McCarthy would be lost.

THE 'WILD MEN'

In one of his recent New York Post columns, Max Lerner inadvertently compared McCarthy to Huey Long, then, after further thought, seemed to notice the difference: Long led a "movement," McCarthy has not and cannot.

Long had the solid backing of the "up-hill" marginal farmers of Louisiana with his "Share the Wealth" program. McCarthy has only many disparate people who fear "Communist conspiracies." He hardly inspires anyone as the figure of Bonapartist strength who personally cut the conspirators down. The country is not even ready for a MacArthur to accomplish that. Only the fatherly image now in the White House is trusted with that function.

A figure like McCarthy could go places in other type-situations—when frustration becomes desperation and the maddest appeals produce action as well as support. The Hitlerite "wild men" were fervently followed by declassed German middle-class elements. Much of the contemporary American middle class may be very much displeased by some of the recent and current doings of the government; they may applaud the accusations of a McCarthy. But his way is not their way today. As they plan to move to their mortgaged suburban homes and figure out new ways to cheat the Bureau of Internal Revenue every March 15, they think of themselves as junior Charley Wilsons or George Humphries. They do not want to be like Joe McCarthy. They may send him telegrams of appellation, but he cannot mobilize them. Without such mobilization, McCarthy will be unable to combat the combined wealth and power behind the administration whenever its course is definitely set on any action.

It is the further belief of this writer that McCarthy, wild man that he is, has shot his bolt very early. Much of the public will tire of his voice. The administration need merely show some results in both domestic and foreign affairs (which fortune and the Russian shift may soon grant it) to all but completely ignore his shouting.

BRAZIL

Election Campaign in Industrial Center Shows—

Labor Shaking Off the Vargas Hypnosis

By **MADEIRA**

RIO de JANEIRO, March 30—On March 30, the two largest cities and industrial centers in the state of San Paulo went to the polls to elect mayors. This election was a very important event, for it displayed the results of the political development in Brazil that followed the victory, in 1950, of the demagogic "Laborite" movement led by Vargas and Ademar de Barros.

It was, as well, the first concrete event that allows political observers to sketch the trends in the campaign looking toward Vargas' re-election in 1955. In a country like Brazil, where real trade unions and mass parties do not exist, and the means of information hardly reflect the political state of mind of the people, politics is always in a sort of state of suspended animation and explodes only through the electoral campaigns.

As this writer predicted in articles on Vargas' election (see LA, Nov. 20, 1950), Vargas' government has followed a line exactly opposite that of his electoral campaign. Not one of his demagogic promises on wages and lower prices, agrarian reform, industrialization, solution of basic Brazilian problems, etc., has been fulfilled.

In the international field, Vargas has been as good a lackey for U. S. imperialism as former President Dutra himself. On the other hand, the gap between prices and wages—which had been the main source of Vargas' victory—as well

as all the other problems arising from the sharp contradictions in Brazilian social structure were deeply aggravated. A typical expression of the artificiality of Brazilian industrialization and the crisis in the old agrarian system is the shortage of foreign currencies, which fell to unusual lows in these first months of 1953.

All these facts destroyed Vargas' popularity, specially among the working class.

TEST ELECTION

The Stalinists were unable to get hold of the disillusioned masses, since their only concerns are the "peace" campaign and the preparation of guerrillas in the Chinese style in the backward areas of Brazil, in case of war. Their attempt at developing an anti-Yankee, neutralist tendency among the officers of the army also failed when the Stalinist-inspired nationalist group was defeated in the elections at the Military Club.

The destruction of the trade-unions since 1937 and the control of Vargas' "laborite" bureaucrats and political police upon them prevented the unions until now from being a rallying center for an independent workers' movement in spite of a few signs of revival in union life and a few important strikes at the end of 1952. The Socialist Party, on its side, was completely monopolized by electoral adventures and abandoned by its left wing.

So it was expected that Ademar de Barros would gain the possibility of

breaking with Vargas and launching in the next presidential election, a demagogic campaign against him, along the same lines as they had both done in 1950 against the Dutra government. Barros does not participate in Vargas' government; they have not been very friendly lately and Barros had limited himself to playing the part of a "gray eminence" in the present government of the state of San Paulo, where he does possess a very powerful electoral machine.

It was also expected that Vargas and the big bourgeois parties would run a common candidate, possibly the present governor of S. Paulo who, besides enjoying great prestige among the bourgeoisie, would split Barros' following in his own stronghold of S. Paulo. What was difficult to foresee in this development was the attitude of the masses toward a repetition of the 1950 events.

How far had their experience gone with regard to the stage of political development that Vargas and Barros represent in Brazil?

THE LINEUP

In the election for S. Paulo's mayor, four candidates were put forth.

Cardoso, the first, was backed by all the forces and factions of the Brazilian bourgeoisie, Vargas and the big bourgeois parties (UDN and PSD) for the reasons above-mentioned, plus A. de Barros, who intended to strengthen his machine in the most important industrial center of Brazil, plus the whole bour-

geois press, radio and television.

Popular disgust with present conditions in Brazil centered around Jânio Quadros, a very active deputy in the State Assembly. The man is a demagogue who lacks a clear political ideology or platform, does not point to the true causes of Brazil's plight and agitates the masses without organizing them. However, he had always strongly opposed Barros' dishonest methods, and fought for a number of immediate popular demands in S. Paulo.

Besides, his emphasis on morality in public affairs, his keen interest in the conditions of the people as well as his personal role as the apostle of popular disgust had deeply impressed the masses; he is looked upon as a sort of S. Paulo municipal Gandhi. He is backed by the Christian-Democrat and Socialist parties, which are both nearly non-existent.

The Stalinists also put forth a candidate of their own under the aegis of a minor bourgeois party. It is commonly believed in S. Paulo that A. de Barros invited the Stalinists to do so in exchange for a large sum of his party's funds and permission to attack the Brazil-U. S. military pact in public meetings, so as to split Jânio's popular following. As a matter of fact, in spite of the CP's illegality in Brazil, its candidate was not molested.

The fourth candidate, Ortiz Monteiro, was supported by some small bourgeois interests but also had the additional interest of being supported by Crispian's

(Continued on page 7)

Youth and Student Corner

British Labor Party's League of Youth Assesses Its Problems

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, April 6—The Labor Party League of Youth held its conference over the Easter weekend in a chastened mood. The high hopes entertained with the launching of a national membership campaign shortly after last year's Filey Conference were disappointed.

The League of Youth has declined over the last three years. The number of League branches in 1951 was put as high as 755. In 1952 it had gone down to 666. And this year's figure is 538.

It is true, of course, that the 1951 figures were somewhat inflated. But the decline was still serious. The National Consultative Committee's report explained this decline as due to "the apathetic attitude of youth to politics." This is a one-sided explanation, as it fails to take into account that facts that (1) the Labor Party's individual membership has reached 1,000,000 for the first time in its history; (2) the Tory government has forced young workers to take a far from apathetic attitude to their conditions.

No, the fault lies somewhere else. It has often been said that the League of Youth's decline is due to the insistence by the National Executive Committee of the Labor Party that the League of Youth conference has no right to discuss political questions. Although there is much truth in this view, it cannot adequately explain the fact that the branches have gone down in numbers, while the authority and power of the League's branches, regional federations and National Consultative Committee have increased. Not only that, but important political concessions were given both to last year's Filey conference and, more strikingly, to this year's conference by the party NEC, as the result of a powerful and prolonged struggle by the League over the last four years.

EXPLOSIVE REPORTS

The conference was planned to cover discussion of (1) the report of the National Consultative Committee; (2) resolutions from League branches; and (3) discussion of the two Study Group reports, "Youth's Attitude to the Control and Management of Industry in a Democratic Socialist State," and "Youth's Contribution to World Peace and Recovery."

The latter two reports were collated from material submitted by the Regional Youth Advisory Committees (elected from the regional federations of League of Youth branches). There was considerable overlapping, and some confusion resulted when it became apparent that no less than three Emergency Resolutions had been submitted to the conference.

The Standing Orders Committee report ruling that the Emergency Resolutions were "out of order" or "outside the terms of the Conference" was rejected no less than three times by the conference—after tumultuous demonstrations by delegates. Eventually the most explosive of these three Emergency Resolutions was moved

by a delegate from Harrow-Weald.

The resolution expressed the solidarity of the conference with the young workers of Austin Motor Works locked out by the employers. The resolution was carried by acclamation, and a money collection realized a fair sum. The fact that this strike has not received the official support of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress—it had only the support of the National Union of Vehicle Builders—only increased the obstinacy of the Standing Orders Committee and the delegates.

Among the other resolutions passed were some dealing with discussion of party policy. They ran as follows, after having been composed in committee:

(1) "Conference regrets that the National Executive Committee [of the Labor Party] has not implemented the decision of previous Conferences that resolutions on policy matters be accepted for National Conference agendas. Conference calls on the National Executive Committee to reverse its previous attitude and, without further delay, to authorize the acceptance of resolutions on all policy matters at future conferences of the League."

This was moved by the delegates from Shoreditch (London), accepted by the League's National Consultative Committee, and passed with overwhelming majority.

DRAW UP PLANS

(2) "The National Conference of the League of Youth approves the decision to establish the Study Group report system. As it is anxious to obtain the maximum expression of all points of view from the system, it instructs the National Consultative Committee to adopt the following procedure for obtaining future reports:

"(a) A discussion pamphlet shall be drawn up by the National Consultative Committee on chosen subjects.

"(b) Pamphlets shall be circulated to branches at least four months before conference for discussion and submission of resolutions and amendments for con-

ference.

"(c) Formulation of final reports based on conference decisions are to be submitted to the National Executive Committee for endorsement and used as an aid to recruitment to the League."

This resolution was moved by the St. Marylebone delegate, Ronald Grange, who also topped the poll for next year's Standing Orders Committee—with 70 votes. The resolution was accepted by the National Consultative Committee and passed with overwhelming majority.

On the membership campaign, the following resolution moved by the Norwood delegate was passed:

"That this conference notes with regret that the recent national membership campaign did not achieve the success that had been hoped. Being concerned to increase the size and influence of the League, it recommends that future campaigns be supported financially by the party and that steps be taken to ensure that—

"(1) the fullest possible publicity is given to the campaign throughout the Labor movement;

"(2) all sections of the Labor press are asked to cooperate in publicizing the membership drive;

"(3) ample supplies of good literature of all kinds are put at the League's disposal;

"(4) Constituency Labor Parties [branches] be asked to support branches campaigns both financially and physically;

"(5) that a National Youth Fortnight be organized with posters, demonstrations and mass rallies."

On the subject of *Socialist Advance*, the League's official organ, the following composite resolution was moved by the Hampstead delegate and passed with overwhelming majority:

"This conference congratulates those responsible for the all-around improvement of *Socialist Advance*. It however deplores the fact that controversial material does not feature in its columns. It calls on the Editorial Board of *Socialist*

Advance to popularize the matters passed at the 1952 conference discussion on 'Youth and Employment,' particularly: (a) the desirability of the abolition of age scales; (b) the desirability of the implementation of the Gower Committee report [on office workers' conditions]; (c) the desirability of full trade-union rights for apprentices. It should also lay down a solution based upon a constructive socialist policy and including the points: more training schemes; financial aid for young workers' tools; work beyond 40 hours prohibited for under-21s; no exploitation of female labor; equal pay for equal work; priority for school building."

LEFT WING STRONG

Although there were only 193 delegates at the conference, discussion and debate was on a high level. Outside the conference, many local branches and regions displayed their magazines and pamphlets. (Not one was pro-Stalinist.) Titles like "Can There Be Peace?", "Keep Left," "Salisbury Young Socialist," hit the visitor in the eye as he passed through to the conference hall. This apart from the official paper (*Socialist Advance*), semi-official paper (*The Tribune*), and openly unofficial papers (like *Socialist Outlook*). Nearly all the unofficial publications reflected strong left-wing influence in the League of Youth.

Despite the discussion on the decline of the League, it would be quite wrong to convey the impression that it is on the point of collapse. The special *Tribune* article on the League of Youth has certainly awakened adult members of the Party. The militancy and high level of the conference augurs well for the future. A clear-cut policy from the NEC, a great effort from the party's new record-high membership, and, above all, a great push from the League of Youth will establish socialism in the minds and acts of millions of young workers in Great Britain.

After all, the future of British socialism rests in great part with the Labor Party League of Youth.

World-Federalism's "Russian Question"

By BERNARD CRAMER

The World-Federalist movement is plainly not what it used to be, if we think back to the spurt of interest and organization that followed the Second World War. Fundamentally it was not an answer or a program but a hope—the hope that somehow the American and Russian giants of world imperialism could be induced to give up important sectors of national sovereignty and live together under the aegis of a world government.

For American world-federalists the big rock on which the post-war wave of enthusiasm broke was the "Russian question." Was there really any possibility of persuading the Kremlin to yield to an envisioned world government when this would mean giving up its totalitarianism, power, aims and basic social characteristics?

A section of the federalist movement "solved" the problem of raising the program of a union without the Russian empire—but for the others this was too plainly a program for organizing half the world in an alliance against the other half, with war inevitable as before.

But what has happened to the thinking of these others on the "Russian question"? A very interesting view of it is given by an article in the federalist magazine *World Frontiers* (Winter 1952-53) by a member of its editorial board, John C. Holt II. Holt was formerly executive director of the United World Federalists in New York and is now a leader of the federalist group W.O.R.L.D. He writes as follows.

"Perhaps the most typical Federalist answer to the Russian question has been, 'We don't know what they will do until we ask them, and even if there is only a chance in a million that they will accept, we must make the offer.' This never satisfied anyone, and it satisfies nobody now, not even when followed by the assertion that our offer of world government and Russia's rejection of it will 'prove to the world' that we want peace and they don't.

"Other Federalists hope, like George Kennan, that in some mysterious way, under inexorable military pressure and the ever-present threat of atomic annihilation, the Russian government will become more moderate and tractable, and will even evolve into something reasonably democratic and peace-loving. Still other Federalists talk wistfully about revolutions in Russia. More and more Federalist speakers are saying that if the Russian people find out that the West has offered them world government, or security, or universal enforced disarmament, they will rise up and compel their government to accept the offer. Others speculate vaguely about the possibility of fomenting underground movements, and the like.

BACK DOOR TO WAR

"None of these answers stand up for long in the cold light of day. All, sooner or later, tend to lead to the dangerous alternative answer that we can only get world government after we have wiped out the Communist regime in a war. Few Federalists like to admit this to themselves, much less say it to others. Only in very frank personal conversations will any of them remark that 'it may take a war to get world government.' This feeling is not so bad; we may have several wars before we get world government—if we are stupid enough. What is bad is that people tend to add that if World War III brings world government, it will be 'worth it.'

"The most notorious, widespread, and skillful expression of this view was the World War III issue of *Collier's*, that appeared in October 1951. Its theme was that since World War III would bring freedom to Russia and—delicately hinted—perhaps world government to the world, such a war would be one of the finest things that ever happened, and would usher in a Golden Age of universal freedom, peace and prosperity. The writer of the lead and principal story, Robert Sherwood, a prominent Federalist, was presumably induced to take part in this

'a - good - big - war - will - solve - all - our - troubles' project by being allowed to suggest that the anti-Communist nations (referred to throughout as the United Nations), would in the middle of the war sign a 'Denver Declaration,' promising to give the UN power to enforce disarmament and prevent further aggression. Much more recently, in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, Thomas K. Finletter, long a leader of the Federalist movement and now Secretary for Air, was quoted as saying that if we should have to fight a third World War, universal enforced disarmament is what we would be fighting for.

"It seems much more likely, however, that if we fight World War III, we will be fighting solely for the destruction of Communism, and, perhaps, for the balkanization of Russia. It also seems quite probable that the Federalists, who once spoke out loud and clear about the stupidity and futility of war, and the dreadful danger to civilization of World War III, can be lulled into silent acquiescence in such a war, or even into vociferous support, by the merest shred of a suggestion that world government may come out of it. It would be a tragic thing if this once powerful voice of constructive criticism against war and power politics should be so silenced; but that seems to be what is happening."

It is an old pattern that Holt is tracing, though probably unawares; the pattern of a well-intentioned form of pacifism turning into its opposite as it grapples with a reality.

For those who go through the experience for the first time themselves, it is always unique; and of course it always has a specific and unique form whenever it repeats itself. But at bottom all this has happened before.

In all fairness we must mention that Holt himself, naturally, does not think that the trend which he describes the one "that seems to be what is happening," was at all inevitable. That is our view, not his. But he can make his

(Turn to last page)



LABOR ACTION

April 20, 1953
No. 17, No. 16

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Asst. Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

On the Anniversary of an Historic Battle or Freedom

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising

By AL FINDLEY

April 19 is the tenth anniversary of one of the few events of World War II which is worth commemorating: the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising.

Warsaw wrote two brilliant chapters in its history during the war, and also entered a dark blot on its pages. The first was the uprising, against the Nazi occupation, of the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto, starting on April 19, 1943 and lasting about six weeks. This struggle of the Jews, and especially of the Jewish workers, against overwhelming odds is one of the most glorious episodes in the book of struggles of oppressed peoples and labor for freedom.

The second event took place a year and a half later in October 1944. This, often referred to as the Warsaw Insurrection, was the work of the Polish underground against the Nazi overlords. Despite heroic efforts, both attempts at freedom failed but they remain a source of inspiration and encouragement in demonstrating to mankind the extent to which men are capable of heroic sacrifice in the fight for liberty.

The blot that hangs over the fair name of Warsaw is the fact that there was little or no support from the Polish underground to the Jews of the ghetto.

They Rose in Revolt

When the Nazis occupied Poland, they pushed the Jews into ghettos and isolated them from the rest of the population. Beginning in the spring of 1942 there were deportation to concentration camps, where the Jews—men, women and children—were exterminated in gas chambers and crematoriums. The Nazis, to avoid too much trouble, told the deportees that they were being shipped to work in war factories. It took some time before any inkling of the truth—which was so horrible and inhuman that even the victims found it hard to believe—was discovered.

In the fall of 1942 there was talk of resistance against the Nazis. The conservative elements among the Jews opposed "rash" action, fearing that it would provoke complete extermination. They still hoped that there was a little truth in the Nazis' pretext about war work. The Polish government-in-exile and the Allied powers refused to give arms to the Jews on the ground that resistance was futile. By now, only 40,000 Jews remained out of a previous population of 400,000.

In the winter of 1942 there was some sporadic underground resistance. The Nazis held off complete liquidation of the ghetto for a few months. In April they resumed the campaign to exterminate the Jews. The time, especially the winter lull, was effectively used by the Jews to collect and manufacture arms and to form a fighting organization. On the Passover of 1943—April 19—they launched their revolt against the Nazis and drove them from the ghetto.

Left in the Lurch

The underground forces of the Polish government-in-exile gave them no aid whatsoever. Despite the pleas and demands of the Jewish representatives in the government, they did not even issue a proclamation in support of the uprising until late in May, fearing to antagonize anti-Semitic elements among the Poles.

The Polish labor movement, the PPS (there was no Stalinist underground to speak of), was generous with its moral support and resolutions, but extremely niggardly with material aid. There is dispute over whether the Jews received any aid from them. The evidence, I believe, shows that a few crumbs of aid were received but these amounted to almost nothing.

The leaders of the Bund (Jewish socialist group) made a direct appeal for help to the underground organizations of the Polish work-

ers, if not help with arms then at least through a strike. The latter refused; they were divided by anti-Semitism. Many sympathized with the Jews but the general attitude among the non-Jewish population was one of unconcern for the fate of the Jews.

The record and action of the great powers of the Allied bloc—both the "humanitarian" democrats of the West and Stalin's totalitarian state—belong to the most infamous chapters in the history of mankind. None of them lifted a finger to prevent the extermination of the Jews by the Nazis. During the ghetto uprising, there was no attempt to divert the Nazis, no arms were given, no bombings were ordered. Not even their voices were lifted in support.

Workers' Heritage

While Russia was nearer and therefore perhaps bears a greater share of the responsibility, since it was physically possible for it to have helped more, all the partners must take the guilt, since none of them did anything or said anything to help the Jews. There was not even a demand that the Nazis treat the fighters of the ghetto as prisoners of war.

(Later on in 1944 in the second revolt, the Warsaw insurrection of the Polish underground, in which the few surviving Jews participated, the valiant fighters met apathy from the West and betrayal from the East. The Moscow regime, after having called for a revolt, deliberately halted its army before Warsaw and allowed Hitler to destroy the flower of the Polish labor movement. The Stalinists thus spared themselves the need of doing the dirty job themselves, since no more than Hitler could they tolerate an independent workers' movement under their control. They allowed the Nazis to do the deed for them.)

The ghetto battle of 1943 was far from being a blind fight by hunted unorganized individuals who were interested solely in saving their lives.

The uprising was well organized and was the accomplishment primarily of Jewish workers. While the Bund was the prime force in its organization, the Hashomer Hatzair, a left-wing socialist-Zionist movement, also played an important role. A central fighting organization was formed. The Germans were forced to retreat and, in the first weeks, lost about 2000 men. They had to set up a virtual general staff to fight the intrepid, untrained Jewish fighters, who had only the most elementary weapons.

The Warsaw Ghetto uprising belongs not only to the Jewish people but is also part of the heritage of the working class. The bourgeois elements hesitated. The Agudas-Israel, an orthodox-Jewish force, did not participate, while the Revisionists (rightist Zionist group) had a small independent vengeance organization which fought a few days.

To Arouse the World

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising would not have taken place without the background of years of socialist agitation and organization which lay behind the Jewish workers.

It is not true that every desperate man chooses to die fighting. Once the chance of personal survival is gone, the average person caves in, in despair, and awaits the end. Only those with an understanding of the political meaning of resistance, those with a sense of history, those with a larger view than the immediate threat, choose to die not in blind desperation but with a purpose.

The heroes of the ghetto uprising fell with arms in hand because their whole socialist past had prepared them not merely for a last act of vengeance against the hated enemy but for a blow for freedom and against anti-Semitism. The documents of these martyrs are filled with the one hope that their act would arouse the world.

Not only was the leadership composed of

Jewish socialist and trade-union leaders, not only was the entire movement permeated by a socialist spirit, but in point of numbers the workers of different opinions constituted the overwhelming proportion of those left in the ghetto. The Nazis had left to the last on their list those who were working in factories. The ghetto in its last days was therefore preponderantly proletarian.

A Myth Was Exploded

The ghetto uprising had an electrifying effect on the Polish resistance movement. The rubble heaps of the ghetto were silent testimonials before the Poles to the fact that the Nazis were not invincible. Until they had met the ghetto resistance, the strength of the SS troops lay in their myth of invincibility, a legend that paralyzed their victims even before the battle began.

The ghetto fighters exploded this legend. The despised Jewish workers, armed with pistols and crude home-made grenades, proved more than a match for the highly touted troops of the SS.

The Nazis were able to win only by using planes, flame-throwers, tanks and higher concentration of artillery than was used in the siege of Warsaw in 1939.

Even these powerful armaments were not enough. The Germans were forced to burn the entire ghetto to end the resistance.

Even then the battle continued at scattered points, from the sewers and canals under Warsaw.

The battle of the ghetto was a catastrophic moral defeat for the Nazis, a defeat from which they never really recovered in Poland. The Polish underground learned a great deal from the ghetto fighting, which blazed the path to the 1944 insurrection which was so cynically betrayed by the Kremlin.

Warsaw stands as a profound symbol of our times. Crushed on the one hand by the forces of fascist capitalism and on the other side by counter-revolutionary Stalinism, with the quiet acquiescence of the capitalist democracies, this betrayed city mirrors the forces of modern civilization and its fight for survival.

The Lesson of Warsaw

The indifference of the world to the fate of the Jews during the war and the utter breakdown of all human decency in the battle of the ghetto is no mere passing phenomenon. It was an indication of how fast decay can spread, and at what an awful speed barbarism can replace the habits of "Western civilization." At the same time Warsaw is added proof that Stalinism, far from being a barrier to social decay, is itself the epitome of barbarism.

Warsaw stands as a star lesson of the inhumanity that grows out of the seeds of anti-Semitism and racial doctrines. This lesson must sink deeply into the consciousness of everyone. Society is doomed to go under unless it is thoroughly cleansed of the disease that made, and continues to make, such brutal sadism possible.

Warsaw stands as an object lesson to those of the oppressed peoples, and also those in the labor and socialist movements, who look to one or another of the great powers of the world for salvation and aid. Their indifference to, and betrayal of, the Warsaw struggle should be enough to warn that this is reliance on a broken reed.

The memory of the ghetto fighters is enrolled in the great book of revolutionary heroes along with the martyrs of the Paris Commune of 1871, of the Spartacus League of 1918 in Germany, of the Austrian Schutzbund of the 1934 civil war, and of the Spanish militiamen of the fight against Franco. They are part of the great tradition of the fight for socialist freedom.

PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION

'Vpered' Editor Says Kremlin Is Taking a New Direction

The following article by A. Babenko was submitted to LABOR ACTION by our contributor S. Horoshchenko (whose own discussion article on the same subject was published last week). Comrade Babenko is an editor of VPERED, the organ of the Marxist wing of the Ukrainian anti-Stalinist resistance, published in emigration in Germany, from which the article is translated.—ED.

By A. BABENKO

The very first changes which took place in the USSR after the death of Stalin indicate the great historical significance of this event.

Stalin died on the evening of March 5, and already on March 7 there was published a decree by the three highest institutions in the USSR—the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Council of Ministers, and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet—which announced cardinal changes in the structure of the state, party organs of power, and important personal shifts.

The authors of the decree were in such a hurry, and so eagerly wished to put a *fait accompli* before everybody, that they even forgot to indicate that, properly speaking, it was not a decree but only a draft, which legally had to be approved by the legislative institutions, that is, by a session of the Supreme Soviet and by a plenum of the Central Committee. A phrase in the decree, "to avoid disarray and panic," only illustrates in what a tense atmosphere Stalin's "orphaned" colleagues [*soratniki*] had to act.

In the decree of March 7, as well as at Stalin's bier, they pledged themselves to continue to work for his cause. They were forced to do this by strong underground blows, which frightened them and made them unite. But they have gone not along the path followed by Stalin but in a precisely opposite direction. Some facts will be sufficient to show this.

The decree of March 7 announced an amalgamation of ministries; this means the "autonomization," independence, of the ministries from the trifling party guardianship. Stalin pursued the course of dividing up the ministries precisely in order to attach them to the corresponding divisions of the Central Committee. Now, as in Lenin's time, the ministries will receive orders not from the party apparatus but from the Presidium of the Central Committee (formerly the Politbureau). In general Stalin's "orphans," it seems, try to follow Lenin rather than Stalin.

A second fact is the abolition of Stalin's Secretariat of the Central Committee. In Stalin's time, the Secretariat almost always carried out decisions of the Politbureau (Presidium) in advance. The decree of March 7 significantly kept silent about the Secretariat. And only on March 14 did the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, "with regard to the personal request" of Malenkov, dismiss him from the post of Secretary of the CC. The Secretariat was taken over by people of minor importance.

NO OTHER WAY OUT

Another fact which is very symptomatic and, in our opinion, dangerous to the revolution, was the appointment of Marshal Zhukov to the post of assistant minister of war. Stalin dismissed Zhukov from the military leadership, not because he hated him personally, but rather he hated him because Zhukov was an authority in the army and therefore in the country, and as such he cast a shadow on the authority of the party and pushed it into the background. Now, when the authoritative Stalin is replaced by his non-authoritative colleagues, Zhukov, offended by the party and thirsty for power, again becomes an authority.

There is no doubt that if war breaks out tomorrow, the "orphans" will be compelled to hand over to Zhukov not only the military power but also the political power. And even if Zhukov were personally even more leftist than all of Stalin's colleagues, he, as the representative of the army, would necessarily fulfill the program not of the party but of those whom he represents—that is, the military, or, more concretely, the counter-revolution.

Did the orphans understand the danger of such an appointment? Surely they did, but they had no other way

out, and in this there is the tragedy of revolution.

Now, as Malenkov heads the government and the party is headed by a 10-member Presidium, as the role of the party is reduced to the technical functions only, there has returned in the USSR a division of power which very closely resembles the epoch after Lenin's death—but with two basic distinctions only: Firstly, at that time the party apparatus was growing up, whereas now it is going down. Secondly, at that time the Communist Party blazed with faith and idealism, whereas now disillusionment and moral rottenness rule, if indeed we should not say further that the CP practically does not exist at all.

But what happened? Why did Stalin's colleagues undertake measures which are so far-reaching and so dangerous for them?

World opinion answers this question with an explanation like the following: At the top in the USSR there is taking place, they say, a struggle between cliques, between the Stalinists headed by Malenkov and the Leninists headed by Molotov. At the beginning Malenkov won. Then he was dismissed from the secretaryship of the CC, and the Molotov-Voroshilov group (the Leninists) has taken over.

Some people even think that now Khrushchev's career is starting, since he became the first secretary of the CC. But these people judge by old stamps: since he is the first secretary, he is the future Stalin. People forget that the functions and importance of the institutions of the USSR have changed during this time. The importance of the first secretary has radically changed too. At present his role is not greater than the role of Krestinsky in Lenin's time, not to mention the fact that Khrushchev, as compared with Krestinsky, is a big zero.

The world exaggerates the struggle of cliques among the Bolsheviks. There was much talk about such struggles even when Stalin was alive. But though antagonistic groups existed even then, the struggle among them could not be a sharp one.

INDIVISIBLE LIBERTY

Sharp struggle exists only where the cliques feel hard social ground under their feet. The victory of one clique or another does not then destroy their social basis. But when all the cliques are sitting on a volcano which will soon push them to the precipice, then they have neither time nor desire for a serious fight among themselves. Failing this, the ruling clique may quietly liquidate a most dangerous oppositionist, as happened with Zhdanov. But in general, in such circumstances all the cliques are compelled to unite against the common danger.

After Stalin's death, his colleagues found themselves in an atmosphere of terrible "disarray and panic," and they would have been crazy in such a situation to begin a fight among themselves over relatively unimportant disagreements. It must therefore be admitted that the decree of March 7 was adopted without much of a fight. Perhaps it was even a more or less precise carrying out of the testament of Stalin, who surely wished that his colleagues carry out the line without major changes.

But the problem is that to carry out Stalin's line without any change was difficult even for Stalin himself. In order to maintain the status quo Stalin himself had to search for "enemies of the people" and oppositionists, and even for Stalinists who were loyal to him, like those fifteen hanged in Prague. In order to pacify the beast of anti-Semitism which he had petted, Stalin got ready to feed it with the blood of innocent doctors. Even during Stalin's lifetime the conspiratorial, terrorist methods of settling social problems in the USSR were coming into sharp contradiction with life, and one can only regret that he did not live till the moment when the mad system of government which he had superimposed upon society would begin to collapse.

It was impossible for his colleagues to carry out his line unchanged. The first thing they did after his death was to draw breath with a feeling of relief. Then, without looking fearfully around, they began to talk. These were, to be sure, the most dramatic moments in their lives, and perhaps many of them

remembered at that moment the winged answer of the Abbé Sieyès when he was asked what he had done during the period of Robespierre's terror. "I kept alive," answered Sieyès.

But, having obtained liberty for themselves, Stalin's colleagues evidently were not going to share it. At the Central Committee plenum on March 14, all of them unanimously supported the March 7 decree. But this was the last plenum of the CC at which the ruling leadership, in accordance with tradition, did not show its internal rifts.

Liberty is an indivisible thing. Therefore, having regained it for themselves, the "orphans" could not keep it contained within the precincts of the Presidium only. Moreover, with their decisions they carried that liberty far outside of those precincts. The decree of March 7, on the amalgamation of the ministries, already tore away the fetters of the apparatus from the lower echelons of the bureaucracy.

The general hatred of tyranny was so strong that Malenkov, thirsty for power and relentless as he is, without any murmur asked that he be freed from the post of first secretary of the CC; that is, with his own hands he cut the last cord which even formally attached the power to one person. The dethronement of Malenkov was the greatest betrayal of the colleagues against the testament of their dead patron. But they could not have acted otherwise even if they wanted to.

But they did not even want to, because they felt physically nauseous at the very memory of yesterday. Oh, they understood the behavior of the left Jacobins (Hébertists), who participated in the Thermidor, and consciously opened the doors to counter-revolution in order simply to destroy the tyranny!

HISTORICAL ANALOGY

Thus, silently and unnoticeably, there took place an event whose significance can be compared only with the coup d'état of the 9th Thermidor, 1794, in France.

The author of this article has always defended the argument that both of the great revolutions of our epoch—the French revolution at the end of the 18th century and the East European revolution of 1917—have common features and even common *laus of development*. In brief, this development took place, and takes place, according to the following schema.

At the beginning there is a democracy on the social basis of the old regime (Gironde, Kerensky). Then comes tyranny which, by means of terror, sweeps out the remnants of the old social relations. Then a short period of Thermidorean democracy which, however, is not able to defend the young republic from the intervention of feudal Europe and consequently is again succeeded by a dictatorship, but this time it is a military dictatorship (Bonapartism). This dictatorship is called upon not only to defend the new society from the danger of restoration but also to spread the revolution all over Europe by means of military force and terror.

In my brochure *Bolshevist Bonapartism* (1946) I put forward the idea that Stalin's regime is a combination of two analogous aspects of the French revolution: the terror of the Jacobins and Bonapartism. The terror of the Jacobins was personified by Robespierre, who exhausted the possibilities of terror to its very end. In the same way the Bolshevik terror was personified by Stalin, who also exhausted all the possibilities of terror. The Bonapartist properties of Stalin consisted of limitless militarization and the attitude of fighting capitalism not through revolutions but wars.

Now the Robespierrian period of the Soviet revolution has come to an end. It came to an end not with the execution of the tyrant but with his death in peace and honor. But this, however, does not change the Thermidorean nature of the post-Stalinist period. Just as in France the Jacobin "swamp" (the Thermidoreans) had to eat porridge which had been cooked up by Robespierre but with their own cowardly support, so the Bolshevik "swamp" has to eat porridge which had been cooked up by Stalin with their own cowardly support.

Trotsky, once said that Thermidor is not a counter-revolution but, so to speak, a normal end of revolution. This

is true only in one aspect, namely, insofar as Thermidor liberates the new social relations from the rigid dictatorship which created them. But the French Thermidor swept out not only the rigid tyranny but also the people's democracy, which had been frozen by the tyranny and which the following bourgeois democracy never allowed to appear again. Therefore the Thermidor is a counter-revolution.

The clue lies only in the fact that both in France and in the USSR this counter-revolution was prepared in advance: in France by Robespierre and in the USSR by Stalin. It is not accidental that in the last months of the Robespierre terror not only the aristocrats were guillotined but also ordinary citizens. In the USSR also it was not accidental that the White Guards long ago got the chance to return from exile and take certain vacancies in the Soviet apparatus at a time when oppositionists were dying in Siberian camps and the camps were filled with workers and peasants.

COUNTER-REVOLUTION LOOMS

If we consider the Leninists generation of Stalin's colleagues [*soratniki*], then it is obvious that they became Thermidoreans not because they had long since cultivated a counter-revolution, but because they did not have the character to oppose the crimes of the tyrant. Only in this do they differ from the executed oppositionists. But this "only" is a fact of colossal significance. They voted for the execution of Bukharin, Zinoviev, Rykov, Kamenev and others only in order, subsequently, to facilitate the coming to power of the frank counter-revolutionists today (the latter will not keep us waiting long to see them). In this way history makes bitter mockery of the unprincipled, opportunistic revolutionaries!

As far as the younger generation of Stalin's *soratniki* are concerned, we must admit that they never put themselves forward as independents. This is, at present, the most enigmatic and suspicious element, especially if we remind ourselves that Stalin selected people not by their high moral qualities, but just the contrary, "by their meanness." It is enough only to remember his personal secretary Bazhanov, who escaped abroad in 1927 and published his sensational revelations about his patron in a monarchist [!] paper.

However, the fate of the Bolshevik Thermidoreans may be more enviable than that of their French predecessors. The latter opened wide the door for the counter-revolution by their coup d'état; but the former, having helped Stalin put the revolution before the firing squads of the police, at least saved the apparatus of power, are as yet apparently independent, and, it seems, are trying even now to slowly restore the revolutionary — democratic institutions which were suppressed by Stalin and defend them from the danger of capitalist restoration.

We will see in the near future whether history will give them the opportunity.

Vpered, No. 1-2, 1953

Comment

Comrade Babenko's conclusions are indubitably startling but his basis for drawing them seems to us (to say the least) as startlingly inadequate. According to him, Stalin's heirs are going "in a precisely opposite direction" to Stalin's. (Yet, we must note, he later writes that perhaps their present line is "a more or less precise carrying out of the testament of Stalin.") We are not at all sure how these two statements fit together in his view.)

He cites three "facts" to underpin his account of what is happening in Russia. The first is the amalgamation of ministries. From this fact he leaps to rather surprising conclusions, without in the least indicating how the fact implies the conclusions. In our March 30 issue, Comrade Horoshchenko discussed the amalgamation in what we considered a sober and excellent article. At that time his interpretation was:

"[The amalgamation] reveals once again the nervousness and fear of the new executive committee of the bureaucracy's will." Malenkov took the measure "in order to help stabilize his power . . . in a more concentrated setup. This concentrated power he distributed among

(Continued on page 7)

Brazil: Labor and Vargas — —

(Continued from page 3)

Stalinist splinter group which made its first public appearance (see LA, April 1952).

Jânio Quadros won an overwhelming victory, defeating Cardoso by a large vote. The Stalinist candidate polled a ridiculously small number of votes.

This election in S. Paulo is of the greatest importance in pointing to the next political development in Brazil. It clearly shows that the Brazilian working class will no longer fall for a masquerade like that of the 1950 presidential campaign, as long as the team of demagogic leaders is not entirely replaced.

Vargas, Barros and their followers are deeply demoralized. The stage of political development in which the workers followed demagogic leaders is not yet passed but, within that stage, they jumped to the apparently opposite extreme: until now they voted for men from whom they expected fantastic enterprises; now they vote for men, like Jânio, from whom they expect nothing concrete but who do in some way represent a protest against present conditions.

Jânio used to say in his meetings: "I have no promise to make. As long as I

am not elected I do not know what I can promise." At these words, he was enthusiastically cheered.

STALEMATE

However, on the national level there are no forces, not even individuals, around which a new demagogic movement distinct from Vargas and Barros could rally, as was the case for Jânio in S. Paulo. So, the crisis of Vargas and Barros' "laborism" has brought Brazilian politics to a stalemate.

The Brazilian working class has not yet passed through the above-mentioned stage of its political consciousness and at the same time the existing political forces that embody it are worn out. The working class will be pushed to find a way out, outside of these explosive electoral campaigns.

A nation-wide campaign led by a bourgeois politician which sets out a program of social demands—like Vargas' in 1950—is unlikely to come again. If Barros wants to be a candidate for the presidency of the Republic he can, but his campaign will be one of a vulgar bourgeois politician with his own "electoral machine" and not a campaign backed by a mass movement.

The S. Paulo election shows the complete bankruptcy of all the main forces of Brazilian political life in the last few years: the "laborism" of Vargas and Barros; Stalinism, which already clearly appears in the eyes of Brazilian workers as the tool of something alien to them, as the very split in the CP has proved; and the big bourgeoisie represented by its press. It has also proved that the Brazilian ruling class is not only unable to run the country but even to influence the minds of the people for electoral purposes.

DISSIDENT STALINISTS

In this election, as we mentioned, Crispim's group at last appeared in open public activity. They remain 100 per cent Stalinists and claim that it is they who stand for the "authentic" Stalinist line in Brazil. They have been unable to understand the real reasons of their own split, let alone get rid of their Stalinist ideological background.

Crispim's political idiocy goes so far that he actually expects a CP congress that will recognize the mistakes of the leadership. The official name of his group is "Committee for a IV National Congress of the CP."

His support of an unimpressive bourgeois candidate proves that Crispim does not even consistently follow the policies he advocates in the document he wrote against the official Stalinist leadership, according to which one might expect his group to follow Jânio's candidacy. The telegram Crispim sent to the Russian CP on Stalin's death—it is printed in the first issue of his organ *Unidade*—is even more Byzantine than the official Stalinists'. Under a volley of rotten eggs and tomatoes thrown at him by the official Stalinists, Crispim spoke at a public meeting to accuse the leading "troika" of the Brazilian CP—"the FBI agent João Amazonas, the Zionist Grabis and the workers' enemy Arruda Camara," as he put it—of having once more sold the party to bourgeois politicians.

P.S.—This article was already finished when a wave of strikes broke out in São Paulo. As this is being written, there are more than 200,000 workers on strike. Strikers' demonstrations have been attacked by the police, with consequent serious riots in the streets of São Paulo on March 30-31. This buries all thought of the workers' allegiance to the demagogic "laborism" of Vargas and Barros.

PRO and CON: 'Vpered' Editor on Russia — —

(Continued from page 6)

new and younger bureaucrats whom he probably trusts more or less . . . By centralizing the power, Malenkov probably intends to have the same effect as a cobra which swells its neck and swings its body in front of a goat . . . That is, as we read it, the amalgamation was a measure of internal consolidation in the face of fear of "disarray and panic."

FACTS—AND THEORIES

Whether this is all or not, Comrade Babenko's conclusion is, strangely enough, that this is an example of how "In general Stalin's 'orphans,' it seems, try to follow Lenin rather than Stalin." In what respect? Because, he says, now the ministries will get orders "not from the party apparatus" but from . . . the party Presidium! But the party Presidium is the very hub of the "party apparatus."

Babenko's thought may be that the ministerial bureaucracies are being freed from lower party control, as compared with the system before Stalin's death. There was a good deal of such "freedom" under Stalin, too. Certainly a key stress at the 19th party congress was insistence on greater party-unit responsibility in "controlling" (actually the term means supervising) the government bureaucracies. But Babenko proceeds from his construction to the statement that the amalgamation "already tore away the fetters of the [party] apparatus from the lower echelons of the bureaucracy." He gives no evidence of such a trend "in a precisely opposite direction" to Stalin's; he merely points to the amalgamation.

He goes further, as his article goes along. We find (italicized) the claim that the party's role "is reduced to the technical functions only"; in fact, he questions whether the party really exists at all! This seems to us a free leap in imagination from a springboard which is already very flimsy. It is something of a feat to deduce all this from the facts he points to.

WHAT'S THE EVIDENCE?

Babenko's second "fact" is the "abolition of Stalin's Secretariat." If by this he means the change in personnel of the Secretariat, he is indeed referring to a fact; but we would like to know why he thinks "The Secretariat was taken over by people of minor importance"—that is, we would like to know why he is so very sure that Khrushchev is of minor importance now. It may indeed be true that the Secretariat has sharply declined in importance, and that Khrushchev is a "zero"—we know of no firm evidence on this moot point, and if Babenko has any, it would be a good idea for him to lay it before his readers.

The main point is: suppose either is true, how does the asserted shift bear upon Babenko's thesis? He does not demonstrate how even the claimed "fact" is supposed to lead to his sweeping conclusions.

His third fact is the new role of Zhukov. It has been reasonably suggested that Malenkov is taking a chance with Zhukov's elevation in order to add a

more "popular" element to the new leading group. Again, perhaps there is more to it: but what we would be interested to know from Comrade Babenko is why he is so sure that "There is no doubt that if war breaks out tomorrow, the 'orphans' will be compelled" to give Zhukov the political power. Without such an explanation of the crux, his assertion remains an assertion, perhaps as good or better than the next man's.

WHAT COUNTER-REVOLUTION?

But such an assertion by Babenko must be based on some political analysis. We find such an analysis only hinted at: Zhukov represents "the military, or, more concretely, the counter-revolution." What counter-revolution? capitalist restoration? Babenko seems to indicate this at his close, though we are not sure. What capitalists does Zhukov want to restore—Russian capitalists? (He will have to disinter them first.) Foreign capitalists? Then Zhukov is really an agent of Western capitalism? We do not wish to impute any thoughts to Comrade Babenko that he has not put down, but we have some difficulty making it out.

Against the threat of this "counter-revolution" (which we are promised will emerge pretty soon), Stalin's heirs try

to "slowly restore the revolutionary-democratic institutions" which Stalin suppressed! These new Kremlin masters feel "physically nauseous at the very memory of yesterday," so strong is the general hatred (among them also, it seems?) of tyranny! The trouble with them before was only that they didn't have the "character" to oppose Stalin's crimes; now he is dead, and democratization comes.—We fear that all of this also comes straight out of the imagination; certainly not from Babenko's three "facts" or any others we know.

We regretfully do not take the space to discuss Babenko's schema on the French and Russian Revolutions. We hope that he has not been influenced by the desire to force-fit present events into that schema.

Finally, if Babenko's interpretation were correct, has he considered the absolutely necessary political conclusion? It is, without any doubt at all, critical support of the regime, with the perspective of hastening the inevitable revolutionary-democratic reform (and defending it against Zhukov's "counter-revolution"), abandoning the perspective of revolution. That doesn't mean his interpretation is wrong, but . . . surely, it should induce more caution.—Ed.

PRO & CON: Discussion on Titoism

Following is the second part of Comrade Allan Vaughan's discussion letter. The first part, which dealt with a question of war policy, appeared last week.—Ed.

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

Which brings me to the next point—the nature of Titoism. It seems to me that the ISL has reacted so sharply to the idiocies of the Fourth International on Tito—"Dear Comrades," the Tito-Bannerjee interview, etc., etc. and then Pablo's "discovery" that the internal regime is moving "away" from the previous high-pitched claims—that it has failed to grasp the enormously progressive influence of Titoism.

The Tito bureaucracy was until July 1948 part and parcel of the Stalinist bureaucracy, participating in all its crimes against the working class. If anything, if reports we have read are true, it was the Yugoslav Stalinists who were urging the French and Italian Stalinist parties to be less "opportunistic," i.e., more rigidly Stalinist. With the break, however, the Tito bureaucracy found itself in conflict with the Great-Russian bureaucracy and set in motion a whole train of developments which the Titoists themselves could never have envisaged.

The damaging admissions made by Yugoslav spokesmen about their mistaken belief that the Soviet Union was a bastion of socialism, far from confirming the "national-Stalinist" thesis makes it untenable. The fact that, as I have stated before (LABOR ACTION, Sept. 22, 1952), objective accounts of the degeneration of the Comintern have been freely circulated inside Yugoslavia confirms the

views I have held.

In the comment to this previous letter, the editor dismisses this fact by insisting that "historical integrity" of the Yugoslav Titoists is a farce, and that "it consists in revealing telling truths about the Russian (insofar as this can be done within the framework of the Titoist ideology) while using all the standard methods of concealment and distortion in falsifying their own roles." But surely the Titoists' revelation of telling truths about the Russians is some "comment" on their own origins, their own "history"—precisely because the Tito bureaucracy took part in all the treacheries and betrayals of the Stalinist machine, precisely because the pre-1948 Tito history is the same as Stalinist history proper.

In other words, it is quite impossible for the Titoists to tell revealing telling truths about the Stalinist bureaucracy within the framework of a national-Stalinist ideology. And it is this factor which is responsible for the complete lack of orientation or fixed position on the part of the bureaucracy.

Tito has no ideology in the Stalinist form, for the Russian Stalinists are waging a war against all national, social and revolutionary forces within her borders and without—and an absolutely consistent counter-revolutionary struggle at that. History gets mauled and mutilated in ways that not even George Orwell could dream of—but when a section of the bureaucracy breaks with the all-powerful Russian bureaucracy it finds itself waging a just revolutionary national struggle. Pseudo-history then can be revised, straightened out.

In this sense the Tito bureaucracy is

moving backwards to the less consolidated, less rigid Stalinism that existed, say, before the Great Purges. Clearly Titoism can only break with Stalinism to a limited extent. However, it would be folly to fail to recognize that Titoism has evolved away from Stalinism and that its contradictory role makes its position very weak. The Yugoslav workers and peasants will be able to take advantage of Tito's evolution away from Stalinism, by pushing him further and eventually overthrowing his regime.

Comment

Comrade Vaughan's discussion on Titoism is a continuation of his letter in the Sept. 22, 1952 issue, to which we gave a rather long reply. To our regret, however, we see that he makes little attempt to meet the points we made in that reply but mainly merely restates his own viewpoint. That kind of boggs the discussion down. In return, we cannot here repeat the points we have already made.

With one exception—he does deal with our main point on those "objective" accounts of the Titoists on the degeneration of the Cominform, and to this he simply replies: "But surely the Titoists' revelation of telling truth about the Russians is some 'comment' on their own origins, their own 'history'—precisely because the Tito bureaucracy took part in all the treacheries and betrayals of the Stalinist machine, precisely because the pre-1948 Tito history is the same as Stalinist history proper."

But the nub of this matter is that on every point where the Titoist group (and Tito himself, above all) was partner to the Stalinist crimes, they fiercely deny the truth and industriously rewrite history. The "telling truths" they have revealed about Moscow are on such things as (for example) Moscow's exploitation of the satellites, etc.—crimes in which they did not participate except as the victim, and which they are therefore "free" to reveal. We already referred Vaughan to Ulam's excellent book on the Titoists' rewriting of their history.

The other thing we would point out to him here is the blatant non-sequitur in his next to last paragraph: "Tito has no ideology in the Stalinist form, for the Russian Stalinists are waging . . ." (Our emphasis.) What Vaughan is proving (and it is typical) is that the Titoists' ideology is not in the Russian Stalinist form. But of course! That is the whole point about "national-Stalinism!"

If, as Vaughan seems to think, Titoism is moving away from Stalinism, breaking with it, or has already broken with it (as he seems sometimes to say), why does he insist on the necessity of "overthrowing" it, rather than reforming it from within? This is also a blatant non-sequitur. The consistent conclusion is that of the Stalinoids—critical support.

But all of this is really on the fringes of a rounded analysis of Titoism, which basically involves the discussion of the nature of the Stalinist system as distinct from Russian nationalist Stalinism.—Ed.

'Hard' Line on Asia Deal — —

(Continued from page 1)

Korea would have a fairly well rounded economic area. As the American government has now committed itself to a build-up of South Korean military forces to a point at which they would be in a position to withstand any possible future military attack on their territory alone, they would have an army which would also be capable of a military attack on North Korea. Syngman Rhee has made it quite clear that his government will not pledge itself to refrain from making such an attack, or will hold such a pledge lightly if it is forced upon him.

With regard to Formosa, the situation is not much better. An independent Formosan government would be the best solu-

tion for the people of that island, and a very strong moral case can be made out for it. But the Chinese government would have to give up a territory on which it has a "traditional" imperialist claim, and one which was confirmed at the negotiations which ended the last world war. To abandon their claim to Formosa would be to accept a major loss of prestige in Asia. This could only be accepted if China puts very great store on a breathing spell in the cold war. It would remain as a permanent source of conflict in the future.

With regard to Indo-China and Malaya, the American case would be even weaker than it is on the Korea and Formosa "proposals." If what was proposed were an arrangement whereby France would grant full independence

to Indo-China, in return for which the United Nations and China would undertake to guarantee free elections and a government set up on the basis of such elections of that country, this would come as close to a just viable settlement here as is possible under present circumstances. But it is certain that France would not agree to such a proposal, and that the United States does not have it in mind. What the American government does seem to have in mind is a procedure by which China would agree to collaborate in the suppression of the Vietminh government.

'UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER'

Although the morality of Stalinism is quite capable of carrying out such a betrayal of its own supporters, there does not seem to be anything America can offer in return which would be worth the price. And the price would be: an enormous blow to Stalinist prospects throughout the whole of the colonial and semi-colonial world.

Thus, what Dulles was suggesting amounts to a "peace settlement" which is based not on a compromise deal, but could only be demanded by a government which has its opponent on the ropes. That is not the situation in Asia at all. Yet powerful forces in the Republican Party took deadly aim at this proposal before it could get off the ground. It is obvious that they want a complete capitulation of Stalinism in Asia, something like an "unconditional surrender." For that they will have to fight an all-out war now, or reconcile this country to a continuation of the cold war on about its present terms (with, perhaps, a cease-fire in Korea) for a long time to come while they are getting ready.

KNIFE FOR POINT 4

On learning of the "proposal" as it relates to Formosa, Chiang Kai-shek's representative to the United Nations remarked that it is "unthinkable," and that his government is not to be traded like a bunch of cattle. If the proposal were acceptable to the Chinese Stalinists, the gentleman's indignation could well be in vain. It is quite possible that ironic though it may seem, Chiang Kai-shek will have to depend on the intransigence of the Stalinists for the continued existence of his government in Formosa! It is in this way that both Stalinism and capitalism feed upon each other.

In the same conference, Dulles also made a few remarks about Europe, though they were far less concrete. He told the reporters that Russia's willingness to conclude a peace treaty for Austria would be the acid test of whether or not they have really made a major "peace" turn in their policy. This would make it possible to seriously take up the question of re-unifying Germany. That question is so fraught with danger for both sides, however, that Dulles did not speculate publicly on what America would be willing to offer in return for a unified Germany.

So much for the "trial balloon." Dulles' testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee dealt with two other aspects of American foreign policy: the Point Four program and the Voice of America. The gist of his remarks was that the administration must gradually "get out of the business of handling activities of that sort [Point Four] through public appropriations."

"In some cases," he went on, "we have to move gradually, because the abrupt shock of a total change might have serious political repercussions. It might be misunderstood."

"But my hope is gradually to work our way out of that type of grant aid and as far as practicable to replace it by programs which perhaps the larger foundations and private companies will develop, perhaps with some governmental help but not of great magnitude."

WORST FOOT FORWARD

In brief, what the administration proposes to do is to scuttle even the miserably small Point Four program, but to do it so slowly that it will not have too severe a political kick-back. The great program which was to have been America's answer to the social drive of Stalinism, which was to raise the standard of living in the backward parts of the world to a point at which neither Stalinism nor other revolutionary movements would be able to attract the masses to their banners is now to be turned over to "the larger foundations and private companies."

Specifically, Secretary Dulles went on to say that the Point Four contributions to Pakistan and India must be "carefully reviewed" and that Latin America will not need any "large grants" in the future. In the Middle East, although he said that "the drift is dangerously unfavorable to us," and the situation is "quite precarious," it would probably be desirable to spend "perhaps a little more" to provide a minimum of armament (not Point Four—G. H.).

TEETH OF THE JACKASS

He finished up by telling the subcommittee that the whole Voice of America and information program is being reviewed, and that he thinks that they will probably be greatly curtailed and their methods changed in the future. In his opinion, he said, the Voice might do well to stick to straight news reports in its overseas broadcasts and avoid propaganda.

This was indeed an astounding revelation coming from the man who has been heralded as our foremost psychological warrior. Yet such is the present government's drive to get out of any operation which could conceivably be done by private business, that we would hardly be surprised to wake up some morning and find that the whole Voice of America had been turned over to some major advertising agency with time to be sold to manufacturers of soap, beer and Coca-Cola who believe their marketing prospects could be enhanced by making their products better known behind the iron curtain.

No one should be thrown off by the fact that the White House repudiated Dulles' statement on Asia, or that they might repudiate the Secretary himself by replacing him one of these days. He is giving voice to the authentic policies of the administration, or rather, to the direction of their thinking in the process of reaching policies.

In Washington last week the Gridiron Club held their annual dinner, at which they produced skits lampooning high government officials. In one skit they portrayed Dulles leading an archeological expedition in search of a foreign policy "with teeth in it." After much digging, the party came up with nothing but the skull of a jackass. That is indeed a fitting commentary on the "new" foreign policy.

World-Federalism—

(Continued from page 4)

federalist optimism stick, however, only by himself proposing a solution to "The Problem of Russia." We are not at all sure that he himself thinks his article proposes a solution; our own impression is that he is mainly urging that the problem not be given up:

"Before we can get world government, before we can even start any serious talk about it, the U. S. and Russia have got to decide that they can, must, and ought to co-exist. . . . We have got to make some rules of the game. . . . How we are to get to such a point from where we are today, when many Americans consider almost treasonable the mere suggestion that co-existence is desirable, is very hard to say. It will be just as hard to resolve the problems involved in establishing the world government, not the least of which is the combining of totalitarian and democratic governments under a representative federal government, and the safeguarding of that government against seizures of power by highly organized minorities. . . . [We have to] spread and strengthen the conviction that intelligent men can find answers to these problems, and to help in the search for the answers. We have not worked long enough or sincerely enough at the problem of Russia to be entitled to say that the problem has no solution. Let us at least spend a few years—ten or twenty—looking for the answers, and trying them out, before we decide that there are none. . . ."

Certainly a demand for such 10-20 years' grace is legitimate as a personal program, but surely no one can expect a movement to go into suspended animation during the search. Isn't Holt really explaining why world-federalism has declined as a movement? It would seem so. We ourselves would suggest that the trouble is that world-federalism seeks its solution within the framework of the existing social orders and their respective imperialisms—an arbitrary self-imposed limitation.

Isolating the U.S.—

(Continued from page 1)

they'll just announce a cease-fire, and demand an exchange of prisoners; perhaps a truce in Korea may lead to a revolt against Chiang Kai-shek. . . .

Like the well-behaved gentlemen that they are, the reporters wrote discreet stories on this conference briefing, with the *Wall Street Journal* and the *New York Times* presenting the most rounded-out and authoritative accounts.

JUST CROSSED WIRES?

And then the deluge began. The so-called senator from Formosa, William Knowland of California, led the attack: How dare the American press print such vile slanders about the Eisenhower administration policies? No responsible American official would put out such ideas; it was a nasty plot of New Deal writers, left-wingers, etc., to discredit the Eisenhower administration.

Although Senator Knowland calmed down a bit after a session with President Eisenhower, the substance of his charges against the press remained. This was just too much for the press. Two CBS broadcasters told in detail over their radio programs the story of the conference with Dulles. Arthur Krock of the *New York Times*, stuck to the original story on Dulles' off-the-record views, even though the White House specifically repudiated it.

Krock issued the understatement of the week when he declared, "It is another instance of the administration getting its wires crossed and blaming the consequences on the press." As an analysis of the situation, it's an attempt to hide one's head in the sand; when a storm is coming.

For the alternative, for American capitalism, to some kind of "peace" deal with Stalinism along the lines suggested by Dulles, is war, that is, a purely military answer to the vast problem of world Stalinism.

The present line of Stalinism, its so-called peace offensive, has thrown a roadblock against the policy of the Eisenhower administration. Peace, it's embarrassing. Besides, as Walter Lippman correctly pointed out, America is less prepared for peace than it was for the outbreak of hostilities in Korea.

There is scarcely a single problem which is not intensified and aggravated for American capitalism by a breathing-spell from expanding war: the American war economy; Japanese war prosperity; the question of German unification; the effect of the new Stalinist line on elections in Italy; Formosa; and others.

There is the domestic problem of sign-

ing another Yalta, as any agreement with Stalinism will be branded by sections of American opinion. There is the danger of a wave of peace feeling sweeping through the country to demand lower military expenditures. Perhaps there goes NATO?

In this context of this world situation, the Eisenhower administration is trying to stall. The trip to Georgia was not merely a golfing junket. It was probably a deliberate stall in the hope that things don't turn out the way it appears they might. For the Stalinist "peace offensive" is far more dangerous than continuation of war in Korea. The stock market reflects this fact.

As so often in the past, perhaps the European nations, reflecting the deep-rooted fear and antagonism to war of their populations, may soften the American intransigents, may tip the balance between war and peace along the lines of a breathing-spell from war. Unless there is a sudden switch, it seems likely that the Stalinist regimes in Russia and China are determined to pursue the "peace offensive" which already has given them many advantages in the struggle for men's minds on a world scale.

TOWARD ISOLATION

What a fate for the American people to have at this delicate point in its history a president who never understood—in fact, always resented—the political implication of the Darlan affair in World War II; and to have in power a political party blinded by its own prejudices, its campaign demagoguery, and its plain ignorance of the problem of Stalinism. No one could be less fitted to meet the tests ahead.

Stalinism cannot be summoned before a congressional committee and sentenced to jail for the contempt it has for American politicians, nor does it have to hide behind any constitutional immunity. If only it were merely a conspiracy of a few men, how easy its defeat would be! But the truth is that the strength of its world policies is firmly rooted in the yearnings of millions of hungry embittered and restless people. It understands the need for appealing to men's minds. It plays on the theme of peace, the most enticing music the world wants to hear.

As a matter of fact, one of its greatest victories in recent years has been its ability to poison and paralyze its opponents with Stalinist-phobia, one of whose American names is McCarthyism. If this tendency in America triumphs completely, and Senator Knowland is doing his bit to help it along, a major strategic objective of Stalinism will be accomplished: the isolation of America from the rest of the world.

Reserve May First for the
New York I.S.L.'s
May Day Dinner
Friday, at 7:30 p.m.

At the WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE,
247 Lexington Ave., near E. 34th Street