

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

The Attorney-General Doubletalks

... page 6

'Thou Shalt Not Criticize Israel!'

... page 7

The Bureaucratization of the Needle-Trades Unions

... page 5

SEPTEMBER 14, 1953

FIVE CENTS

SPOTLIGHT

No Decency

There has been an argument this past week over whether Secretary of State Dulles is "stupid," but we are not going to get involved in it, not being believers in the I. Q. theory of history. If it was stupidity that caused Dulles to intervene in the German election, then it must be catching around Washington, for the Eisenhower administration has been making a habit of it. After all, American Ambassador Luce, in the midst of the last Italian election campaign, was even more brutal in her threats of what would happen if the Italians didn't elect the right people, and no one accused the lady of lack of intelligence, not out of gallantry.

Dulles, in a statement to the press, said that a defeat for Adenauer would be a "disaster" to the prospects for German unification. Luce had clearly threatened the withdrawal of U. S. aid.

What Dulles was making clear was that Adenauer was "his" man. But we must not forget that if Dulles closed the German election campaign by putting his brand on the German chancellor, the same German election campaign had been opened in Washington by a letter from Eisenhower boosting Adenauer also. We don't see why only Dulles should get the lumps. There's enough to go round, in fact.

The truth is that the cry of "stupidity" has gone up too frequently from liberals at acts of the Eisenhower administration, as if the trouble with the Republicans would be remedied by a Stassen-type intelligence test. Maybe the implication is that such things would be all right if they "worked"—and Dulles is now able to point to Adenauer's big

victory. It's a precarious, not to say amoral, standpoint of criticism.

There is a different pattern to these Republican "stupidities," like Secretary McKay's notorious remark about the businessman's government in Washington. The pattern is sheer unabashed, brazen, frank, honest reaction, which is so cocky that it doesn't even see the utility of deception on certain matters. After all, the Truman regime did as much arm-twisting on foreign governments as has the present administration. Being a liberal Democratic regime it knew it had to cover up. But these reactionaries—they don't even have the "decency" to be hypocrites about it!

That would seem to be the substance of the outcries about stupidity . . . on the part of people who persist in supporting the policies which Dulles is implementing.

Defenders of Democracy

"It may be regrettable but it is nevertheless a fact that America's two most important allies, England and France, and other allies such as Belgium and Holland, are colonial powers. Thus, whenever we undermine, or help to undermine, the colonial systems of these countries, we are driving another nail into the coffin of world democracy. And furthermore, we don't even, in the long run, help the colonial people whose freedom we seek, but on the contrary, in endangering our own democracy, destroy their chances for the future. This is not a matter of expediency. Liberals should never be 'expedient,' but neither should they be doctrinaire."

Above is a self-confessed "liberal" cautioning other liberals against "blind anti-colonialism." The undoctinaire writer is the columnist Hans Habe, dealing out wis-

(Turn to last page)

The Very Latest 'Victory' for U. S. Policy—

Adenauer Gains on The Neo-Nazi Vote

By HAL DRAPER

The German right wing led by Chancellor Konrad Adenauer came out of the election on September 6 with a one-vote majority in the Bundestag for the Christian-Democratic Union and a large increase in vote for the Adenauer coalition. The result is being hailed in the U. S. as a "victory" for American foreign policy and for the Western war bloc, with undisguised glee and relief. And there is no doubt that Adenauer's position in West Germany has been strengthened and that the Social-Democratic Party's hopes were not borne out.

The rather intense reaction of American circles is at least partly due to the fact that there has been mighty little in the way of "victories" for U. S. foreign policy in international developments for a very long time. It may be considered curmudgeonly to throw some cold water on this one.

But the election results seem to cry out a fact about this "victory" on which the jubilant press and government spokesmen understandably prefer to remain silent. It can be seen from a quick review of the ballot figures.

The Social-Democratic Party held its own. Its disappointment lies in the fact that it did not do better, but Adenauer made no inroads here that are visible. The Social-Democrats have the solid support of the main cadres of the German working class, and retained this support. Percentage-wise its vote dropped only four-tenths of one per cent, from 29.2 in 1949 to 28.8, in an election which saw the outpouring of over 6 million additional voters. Its absolute voting strength rose by a little over a million. This means that it has marked time, and this is the extent of its "defeat."

Quite probably, a good number of the additional votes that went to the SPD were taken away from the Communist Party, which dropped from 5.7 per cent (1949) to 2.2. This meant a drop in absolute vote of over three-quarters of a million, leaving it with no seats in the Bundestag as compared with the 15 Stalinist deputies it has had up to now. Such a collapse in voting strength to less than one half its previous figure is a catastrophe for the CP, and indubitably reflects its virtually complete discreditment in the eyes of the West German workers and people, a process for which the June 17 uprising in East Germany is no doubt partly responsible.

ADENAUER'S BONANZA

But if the Social-Democrats held their own proportionally and even gained in terms of absolute vote, where did the increased strength of Adenauer come from?

Adenauer's own party, the Christian-Democrats jumped from 31 to 45.2 per cent of the total vote, from a popular vote in 1949 of over 7 million to a figure of nearly 12½ million now. The sources of the increase appear to be three.

One is from Adenauer's own partners in the government coalition, in alliance with whom he fought the election campaign. The two other parties in this coalition, the Free Democrats and the German Party, declined by a little over three per cent. It is reasonable to assume that these votes were drawn to



ADENAUER

It Was Only the First Round in France

By ANDRE GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Sept. 2.—The strike wave here ended, for practical purposes, on August 29, and it is possible now to assess its general significance.

It is not an unqualified success. The government has managed to dodge commitments on some of the most important issues, and probably by so doing saved its neck. The Assembly was not convened, thus postponing a debate on the strike demands and on the infamous coup d'état in Morocco—also avoiding a possible fall of the right-wing government which would have had unfavorable repercussions on Adenauer's election campaign in Germany. No general wage raise was granted, as the unions demanded.

However, the outcome of the strike is very far from a defeat. All important issues that were left hanging in the air this time have only been postponed till fall, when Laniel will have to face them anyway. Moreover, several important concessions have been obtained by the unions; the law decrees, which were the initial cause of the strike, have been withdrawn.

The Commission on Collective Conventions will be called together, and the

unions are expected to obtain wage increases in at least some sectors of the economy. Also the government is frantically trying to reduce the cost of living without having to raise wages. So far it has decided to lower prices on some goods, such as meat, and to take, at last, decisive actions on big-business tax evasions, totaling 30 billion francs and going as far back as 1938. Nobody will be convinced of the sincerity of these attempts, but they reflect the government's nervousness before the coming Assembly debates.

NEXT ONE LOOMS

Over the whole scene looms the shadow of the next strike wave, which can be expected in the fall if the government does not satisfy the strikers' demands for a general wage raise and for decisive changes in social and foreign policy. The workers have once more become conscious of their power and are determined to use it again.

When Laniel broke off negotiations on August 19, the strikes flared up again in all sectors. Then, following an intervention by the MRP which, for its own reasons, was anxious to stop the strike, negotiations were resumed and an agree-

ment was reached in which the leaders of the independent unions allowed themselves to be put off with a lot of empty promises and some real concessions.

After this agreement, which was interpreted as a partial victory for the unions, the postal and railway workers slowly resumed work. The following days marked the decline of the strike.

Local strikes persisted and, in some instances, broke out again, not on the original demands but on issues arising from the strike itself: the strikers demanded back pay for lost time during the strike, and no sanctions against strikers who had refused to return to work when "drafted." On the whole, the unions won the day on these issues, due to spontaneous rank-and-file action on the local level.

These were the events in the last week of the strike:

August 20:

The public sector is still on strike; the movement is spreading slowly to the private sector (metallurgy, mines, building trades). The leadership of the MRP intervenes as "mediator" between the non-Stalinist unions and the government.

(Continued on page 4)

(Turn to last page)

Let's Not Talk About It — It's 'Depression-Mongering'

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, Sept. 1—In what must be described as sheer astonishment, many auto workers' union leaders read the August 24 issue of the national *CIO News* with its story on the CIO-PAC conference and President Walter P. Reuther's speech before that gathering.

The *CIO News* carries a picture of President Reuther waving a copy of *Business Week* magazine before him, and the cutline under the photo says: "President Reuther denounces depression-mongering article in *Business Week* magazine."

Is this the same Walter P. Reuther who only recently asked an emergency session of the Michigan state legislature to increase unemployment compensation benefits? Is this the Walter Reuther who warned the auto industry four months ago they were headed for trouble because of their fantastic production schedules? Or is this a New Yorker cartoon that slipped inadvertently into the *CIO News*?

As a matter of simple fact, the *Business Week* article was a rather sober, calm analysis of economic factors operating today, and it quoted many businessmen as concerned about 1954. It was

entitled "Everybody Expects a Recession!"

Perhaps a New Yorker cartoon is necessary—say, with Walter Reuther on a soap-box, near the Fisher or Chrysler building, haranguing a well-dressed crowd. "You capitalist bosses haven't got enough faith in capitalism," might serve as a caption.

Unquestionably, *Fortune* magazine didn't know what might happen to it in Reuther's present mood, for it carries an article in the September issue that is equally subversive and disloyal to capitalism and its faithful believers. *Fortune* makes a comprehensive study of the auto industry and suggests that a top of 4,800,000 sales in 1954 is very likely. The industry can produce that in 8 months without trying hard. What happens to auto workers the rest of the time? What effect on general business will that kind of auto-industry activity have?

Perhaps the many short work weeks that thousands of Detroit auto workers have had in the past six weeks are also products of someone's imagination. Or the employment cutbacks that keep creeping along, in spite of public concealment.

It looks like Walter Reuther of Detroit and Walter Reuther of Washington, D. C., ought to get together some time and straighten their line out. The ironies of the situation aren't very humorous to at least 150,000 auto workers in this area whose short paychecks don't amuse them.

S. F. BAY AREA

Car-Men Strike in East Bay

By JACK WALKER

BERKELEY, Calif., Sept. 1—Some 127,000 residents of 11 East Bay cities have been hitch-hiking, sharing rides or staying home since July 24 when 1690 Key System Transportation Company workers went out on strike for higher wages and fringe benefits.

The company's obstinacy has served to make this marathon strike challenge all previous transportation strike records in modern U. S. history, the last local transport strike in 1947 lasting a mere 18 days.

The AFL Carmen's Union has scaled its original 40 cents an hour wage increase down to a 20-30 cent increase, 10 cents retroactive to June 17 and the rest to take effect January 1, 1954. Key System, under absentee ownership as a subsidiary of National City Lines, has offered a total of 14 cents in three stages over a year period, and has made even the initial 6 cent pay increase contingent upon a fare increase being approved by the Public Utilities Commission—probably 5 cents.

The present 15 cents fare for busses and 35 cents fare for trains to San Francisco are already among the highest in the nation, and another minimum 5 cent increase on both services would really be adding insult to injury, since the Key System is notoriously inefficient and poor in its present service.

To date there has been no actual violence in the protracted strike although

the AFL has had to serve warning on (1) a free Alameda Chamber of Commerce "shopper bus," which ceased operation after a day or two on the streets, (2) a Richmond jitney service at 25 cents, which would have put 16 cabs paralleling 5 Key routes, never getting into operation, and (3) an inter-area bus line which sought additional PUC authorization to make short hauls through the Richmond business district, also never getting started.

Hugh Caudel, president of the AFL Labor Council in Contra Costa, answered these last two efforts in a strong fashion. "If any cab driver tries to scab, he'll find himself upside down. You can quote me on that." Picketts from the chauffeurs union (Teamsters) backed up his statement when they appeared before the taxicab garages at 6:30 a.m.; on August 29, half an hour before the taxis were to begin operations, forcing this move to fail. The Benninger Transportation Service, which sought a local franchise was advised: "If Benninger tries to run busses outside his jurisdiction he'll find them in the bay."

The Oakland "Citizen Transit Emergency Committee"—half labor, half business—appointed by Mayor Clifford Rishell, had a good chance to form an opinion of Key during an 8-hour bargaining session it attended on August 28. Key refused to break down its \$900,000 estimate on the cost of fringe benefits when the carmen's spokesman (Carmen's Division, 192) Stambaugh challenged him to prove up to \$400,000. Key also refused to give in to the union's demands if given a larger PUC increase. On the question of arbitrating the settlement, Key's spokesman Harold Davis said: "The company will not—I repeat—will not arbitrate under any conditions." Earlier an Albany councilwoman believed that the union stood to lose equally by arbitration. The union's position on arbitration was for "open" arbitration not limited in advance by the average wage elsewhere.

It was pointed out by one member of the Citizen's Committee that the Oakland carmen and busmen are 16 cents below the average of four other major West Coast cities (1.68 an hour to \$1.84) Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego. The company claimed extraordinary fringe benefits justified this differential!

Two other unusual aspects of the strike are the union's very mild past behavior, that had given many drivers the opinion that it was a company union to all intents and purposes, and the limited amount of sharp criticism directed at the union, even by Knowland's *Tribune*. How long the editorial policy will last is problematical, as "public sentiment" is being played up now as calling for "an end to the strike."

The best solution—municipalization—has been judged legal by Alameda County District Attorney Frank Coakley.

CIO TO LAUNCH NEW RADIO NEWS PROGRAM

Beginning with a 15-minute news program on Labor Day, the CIO will run a daily news program on approximately 150 ABC stations for a one-year period, according to *Advertising Age*, *The National Newspaper of Marketing*, August 17 issue. The original newscaster will be John W. Vandercook, while the commercials will "acquaint the public with the CIO and its role in the community," in the words of Walter Reuther, CIO president.

The program will reach major urban areas and some rural sections, and will originate in New York and Washington at 7 to 7:15 a.m. and from 6 to 6:15 p.m. local time in the Midwest, Mountain and Pacific Coast areas. It is meant "to serve the public by keeping it acquainted with the fast-breaking news of the day and [show] how it affects the daily lives of each and every one of us."

Another reason for this opening shot in a \$1-million public-relations campaign, approved June 18 by the CIO executive board, is for the commercials to emphasize that "its [CIO] members make progress only as the community progresses, and not at the community's expense."

A CIO-sponsored TV program is to be announced "in the near future," *Advertising Age* says.

Monument to American Culture

The official government form letter which is reproduced in the columns to the right is published here as a monument to the institutionalization of American chauvinism in Washington. The paragraphs in boldface tell the story.

The Informational Media Guaranty setup which is the subject of the letter is a government program designed to make it possible for American publishers and organizations to send books to foreign countries in spite of restrictions on dollar exchange. The government does not pay for the books but is involved in facilitating the transaction. The program is administered by the U. S. Information Agency.

As the middleman in the transaction, the government agency has now set up new standards which would stop the sending of such books which do not meet the criterion of serving the "national interest." It explains what books so serve the national interest in its view, especially when the author is not an American.

The book has to "reflect credit on this country" and, for another thing, it cannot be "exclusively identified with the life and culture of foreign nations." Even the reference to "American editions of the great literary classics" is qualified by the restriction that they have to "embody a substantial contribution by American scholars." However, all sins are forgiven if the book is "specifically anti-Communist in tone," for example. And so on.

It would seem that editions of Shakespeare would be able to squeeze through only by executive tolerance, since that author regrettably does not condemn Communism, at least not "specifically," and he is rather exclusively identified with the life and culture of a foreign nation. The Bible might have trouble too, in the King James version anyway, if the rules were enforced. (For that matter, somebody might point out that the Declaration of Independence was not written by American citizens.) It will also be a neat problem to determine whether the works of (say) William Faulkner "reflect credit on this country," in the eyes of people who are capable of setting up such criteria in the first place.

However, there is no question that the U.S.I.A. letter itself could not qualify under the agency's own standards since it does not "reflect credit on this country." In its chauvinistic interpretation of serving the "national interests," the U.S.I.A. helps to convince the nations abroad that the American capitalist government is on the way to as narrow an attitude toward freedom in cultural contacts abroad as the Russian totalitarianism.

Text of Government Letter on IMG Standards

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY
Washington, D. C.

In light of past experience and current trends, this office has found it necessary to re-evaluate certain types of materials being exported abroad under Informational Media Guaranty contracts. From the legislative history, it seems clear that the Congress in authorizing the IMG program had in mind that the guaranty would cover materials which were predominantly American in character.

The United States Information Agency, the agency now responsible for administering the IMG program, is now including a special covenant in all new IMG contracts and contract renewals, which excludes from the guaranty "any book of foreign manufacture, or any book by a foreign author, which does not make a positive contribution to a better understanding of the United States, or its foreign-policy objectives, in quantities exceeding three copies in any particular order," unless the approval of the Agency is first obtained.

Any book which deals responsibly with any aspect of American life, whether in fiction or non-fiction, could certainly be said to make a positive contribution to a better understanding of the United States. Similarly, books which promote a knowledge of the English language, or are specifically anti-Communist in tone, or which make a unique contribution to scientific and technical knowledge are examples of those which are in accord with our foreign-policy objectives. Also American editions of the great literary classics, which embody a substantial contribution by American scholars, have positive value under the IMG program. Anthologies which include a significant amount of American material are also admissible.

The IMG program operates under public funds authorized for this purpose by the Congress. Because of this, any limitations imposed by this office on the type of materials acceptable for the guaranty are solely for the purpose of insuring that the program will operate in a manner consistent with the national interests of the United States, as directed by the Congress.

This office does not feel that the national interest is served through the export, under the United States government's auspices, of literary works of foreign authorship which are exclusively identified with the life and culture of foreign nations. On the contrary, the works of any author who is a resident of, and presently identified with, the United States, which reflect credit on this country would be admissible for guaranty, whether or not the individual in question is actually an American citizen.

As with the other criteria of eligibility now in effect, the primary responsibility for observing this regulation will rest with investors, though the Agency will be glad to advise on specific titles. Authorities now in force under existing contracts are not affected, but all new contracts and amendments to existing contracts will incorporate this policy.

Robert M. BEERS, Acting Chief
IMG Branch
Information Center Service

Solidarity Across the Stalinist Borders — Did the June Uprisings Hit Poland Too?

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The revolution of June 17 in Berlin was the culminating point in the wide-flung workers' movement against the Stalinist dictatorship in the conquered countries. The Polish émigré press in England rightly calls the Berlin events the "June revolution." But this same press is very cautious about appraising the "Polish events."

According to the West Berlin Social-Democratic *Telegraf* and also the London *Times* and *Economist*, very serious "collisions" occurred in Poland between the Polish workers and the Russian forces as well as the Polish Stalinist police. According to these reports, there were riots in Slubice, that is, on the Polish side of Frankfurt-an-Oder. There were also disturbances in Kostrzyn on the Polish-German border between Poles and Russian soldiers. A Polish crowd set fire to a building where a Russian film was being shown, crying "We want to be free from the Russian yoke!"

According to the Berlin *Telegraf*, in Silesia and Dombrowa, big industrial centers and old strongholds of the old Polish Communist Party, there was a strike of 30,000 workers and also collisions with the security troops. In Cracow, the old capital of Poland, a great street rally was reported before the prison, with the crowd hanging some policemen and prison guards.

The railway used by Russian troops between Brest-Litovsk and Frankfurt-an-Oder was damaged so badly that the Russian forces were obliged to use the Stettin line, in spite of its distance. There were also hasty transports of Russian troops from East Germany, especially Berlin, to Poland and replacement of Russian forces stationed in Poland by fresh troops.

IT HAPPENED

The Warsaw government radio categorically denied all reports in the German, British and American press about such events in Poland. It hysterically denounced the imperialist warmongers and liars. The Polish émigré press in London, which is usually so antagonistic to Stalinist reports from Warsaw, this time treated the German and British press accounts very cautiously and finally ended by supporting the Warsaw government's version that nothing of importance had happened in Poland.

A curious solidarity!

But something did happen in Poland! There were acts of sabotage, strikes, demonstrations, street rallies, fights between Polish crowds and Russian troops, attacks on prisons, and so on. The same wave that ran through Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Germany also reached Poland: a revolutionary workers' movement, the first historic upsurge against the Stalinist autocracy.

It was purely a workers' movement, a class movement, without any nationalist overtones, bearing all the characteristic marks of working-class movements such as street-fighting, strikes, meetings and collisions between the workers and the armed forces. It was a spontaneous working-class movement; it outran all

Fight Fare Raise in L. A.

LOS ANGELES, Sept. 3—Jack R. Berger, attorney for the CIO Council here, spoke out against a new transportation fare hike requested by the city transit lines and the Southern Pacific-owned Pacific Electric Company. He pointed out it would mean the seventh fare raise in eight years and challenged the lines' that Adenauer was "his" man. But we labor. While wage rates have increased, the total labor cost has gone down, because of personnel cuts.

"The number of employees has decreased, with a serious curtailment in service, and poor service has resulted in fewer passengers, which the companies give as one reason for their request for fare increases," said the CIO attorney.

Even the conservative *Mirror* has gone on record against the fare steal, proposing instead better service to attract more riders.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION —
\$2 a year does it!

parties and revolutionaries and openly began a socialist workers' war against the Stalinist autocracy.

International solidarity between the Polish and German workers was very evident in this revolutionary upsurge. The Poles damaged railway lines in order to hinder Russian forces from quickly reaching revolutionary East Berlin. In doing so, the Polish workers forgot Nazi Germany's oppression of Poland, the German invasion, the German-Polish war, and thought only of helping their German class brothers in their fight against the common enemy and the common oppressor. What an example of international class solidarity and far-sighted revolutionary policy!

SOLIDARISTY

The Polish émigré press in England has also described the attitude of the Polish forces which the Kremlin sent to Berlin in the hope that the Poles would massacre the German workers in revenge for Nazi bestiality in Poland. But what a disappointment the Russian overlords suffered!

When the Polish tanks rolled into a Berlin street, a Polish officer stepped out of his tank, greeted the German workers with his sabre and said, "Don't be afraid, German workers; we Polish workers will not fire on you." After this episode, the Polish troops were very quickly withdrawn from Berlin.

We do not know what happened to the heroic Polish officer, but we know that a Russian company in Magdeburg which refused to shoot the German workers was immediately executed by its officers. Probably the Russian troops stationed in Berlin were withdrawn from Poland and replaced by fresh troops from Poland.

The German workers were also very courageous in crying, "We are striking in solidarity with our Polish comrades." There was no talk about the Oder-Neisse border; there were only the slogans of

class solidarity between the German and Polish workers, in spite of Russian incitement, in spite of nationalist agitation by German irredentists and Polish nationalists. It was a case of pure working-class language!

It seems that the frightened Polish émigré circles are displaying a very strange solidarity with the Warsaw quislings in keeping quiet about the independent and spontaneous working-class action in Poland. It is our duty and the duty of all revolutionaries in the world to protest against this conspiracy of silence between the Stalinist autocrats and the remnants of the Polish bourgeois politicians, and to emphasize the great importance of the independent class action of the Polish workers.

DON'T WANT WAR

Of course in the interests of objectivity we must mention the caution of the Poles, after their experience with their Anglo-American "allies." The Polish people want to be careful not to serve the foreign interests of Anglo-American policy against Russia, and not to deliver Poland up as a new Korea for the cold or hot war against Russia.

On the other hand, the Polish people fear German nationalism and the restoration of German imperialism, with their traditional expansionist aims on Polish territory. The Polish emigration seeks guarantees from Washington against German aims to revise the borders and guarantees about the future of Poland after the destruction of the Stalinist empire. Such factors weakened the Polish resistance movement against the Stalinist oppressors.

But the Polish workers overcame all these fears and calculations and spontaneously demonstrated their will to fight against the Stalinist autocracy and their solidarity with the German workers.

I believe they have done a great deal for the international working class, for revolutionary socialism, and for their own unhappy country. Together with their German comrades, they have participated in the initiation of the socialist and revolutionary war against the Stalinist counter-revolution — and this frightens both the Polish and international bourgeoisie.

LONDON LETTER

Labor Party's Executive Reports on 1952

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Sept 2—The National Executive Committee of the Labor Party has published its report to the Labor Party Conference to be held in Margate from September 28 to October 2.

This report on last year's activities contains a mine of information. First let me quote you a few figures of interest.

Trade Union Membership 1952 5,071,935
Individual Membership 1952 1,014,524
Apparent Total 6,107,659

(But some of these overlap due to politically active individuals belonging to trade unions affiliated to the party, and also belonging to their constituency parties.)

Membership of N.A.L.S.O.

(Labor Party Students organization) 3,000
Clubs affiliated 46
Socialist Intern't. Membership 9,915,000
No. of parties affiliated 36
Annual financial turnover of party \$574,000
Investments of Labor Party \$61,000

These selected figures are interesting because they give one an idea of the scope of the Labor Party machine.

Gathering from its own report the Labor Party has made few fundamental advances in 1953. Nevertheless, in the administrative and organizational field the following steps have been taken:

(1) Acceptance of the principle of a Labor weekly newspaper. Discussions of practical details are still going on.

(2) Protest about the \$89,600 cut in adult education. "Britain's adult education movement, especially the Workers Educational Association, has done a fine job. The number of students has trebled since the war. Nearly all of them attend classes after a day's work. These classes are an essential part of a lively and educated democracy."

(3) Allocation of Co-operative Trad-

ing Number to Labor Party so that any of the 9,000,000 cooperators can subscribe their dividends to the Labor Party Fund.

(4) Set up an International Union of Socialist Youth Hostels in London.

(5) Proscribed 18 "Peace" and "Friendship" organizations of a Stalinist trend, including People's Congress for Peace, the International Organization of Journalists, and, most important, the International Union of Students. "All these are Communist 'front' organizations," it says, "set up for the purpose of enticing non-Communists to support policies and activities in harmony with the Communist Party line."

(6) Sponsored a "British-Asian Socialist Fellowship" with a delegate conference addressed by Attlee. This tea-party organization can hardly be considered serious, in the opinion of my Indian Socialist contacts.

(7) Sent a fact-finding mission to West Africa, led by James Griffiths, early this year. Unfortunately, as you will have read in last week's *LA* the Tories stole a march on them.

THREE ISSUES

There were three very important issues upon which the National Executive took a firm stand.

A subcommittee was formed to oppose the denationalization of transport, iron and steel, "tooth and nail." It reaffirmed its intention to renationalize these industries, and pointed out that, in the latter industry, production has reached an "all-time high."

A deputation went from the N.E.C., consisting of Attlee, Greenwood, Griffiths and others to urge the government to delay Central African Federation. Its resolution stated that it "does not regard the scheme . . . as providing adequate safeguards for African interests, or ade-

Strike Insurance

The Seattle *Post-Intelligence* publisher, Charles Lindeman, is a firm believer in insurance, specifically insurance against financial losses caused by striking newspaper employees.

The *Pacific Northwest Underwriter* has revealed that Lindeman, the Seattle *Times*, and a large number of daily newspapers have joined a nation-wide system of "suspension insurance"—employers' unemployment insurance—handled by the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

This object of keeping strikebound publishers solvent became known in the course of a six-week strike against the Seattle *Times*, according to *Advertising Age's* retelling of the story on August 31.

"Deposits made into the strike pool by members have created a fund reportedly in excess of \$3,000,000 from which each publisher is entitled to draw benefits according to his contribution, up to specific limitations," the *Underwriter* reports.

Beyond these limits Lloyds of London and some American insurers underwrite three categories of "excess insurance." Apparently the plan has been in operation since 1939, through some reports, and any ANPA paper may join.

Qualifications for the "hush-hush ANPA plan" (*Advertising Age*) to begin are: (1) The first week's losses are not covered after the strike starts; (2) the amount of coverage varies for individual papers and limits are passed on by an ANPA committee; (3) the newspaper must agree to arbitrate and must abide by its contract, to prevent collision with labor—a "throw-out clause."

"The whole thing is highly confidential," *AA* reports, and ANPA offices in Chicago and New York did not want to discuss provisions of the plan or what newspapers were covered because it might give unions valuable information or because of the bad publicity it might cause. *Typographical Union Local 6* had heard rumors of a strike pool but did not know its character, while the National Association of Manufacturers did not know of any NAM carrying strike insurance—at least for interviewing purposes.

A Lloyds of London spokesman confirmed that strike insurance policies were being written occasionally. However, he thought the rates charged for a year's coverage might cost more than the higher wages paid out to workers in a year.

advance authority for H.M.G. to ensure . . . advancement on the basis of genuine racial partnership. It declares its opposition to the imposition of the scheme against the will of the African people. . . ." This statement sounded rather amusing to African Socialists who remember Labor's initiation of the scheme.

The other important statement issued by the N.E.C. did not receive as much publicity as it should have. I will quote it verbatim.

"The N.E.C. note with great concern the decision of the government to withdraw extended unemployment-insurance facilities from those who are unemployed for long periods, and instead to oblige them to apply to the National Assistance Board for means to live." [The N.A.B. is, in effect, an official government charity where those assisted have to demonstrate their poverty.—D. A.]

"There were 48,000 people receiving extended unemployment benefit on 5 July 1953, when the new regulations came into force. The Ministry of Labor were unable to find jobs for them, and they were only receiving extended benefit after their circumstances had been examined by local tribunals."

"One of the main results of the new regulations will be to leave worse off a number of disabled men, whose only crime is to have rendered themselves unable to work through industrial accidents and diseases."

I still cannot unfortunately see in Labor's publications the germ of a socialist policy, but look forward with hope to Margate 1953.

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

DISCUSSION

New Revolutionary Force Is Arising Within Russia

By A. RUDZIENSKI

All the "experts" on the Russian question have been mistaken because they devoted too much attention to the personal conflicts and differences among the men of the ruling clique in the Kremlin. It is impossible to foresee all such personal details, especially in a society hermetically sealed to the free observer and the initiative of the masses, and all the more because the "experts" know very little about the internal fight in the Kremlin.

We, the Marxists, must employ the scientific method here, by analyzing the social roots of the Russian crisis; and in this way we can arrive at better results than the bourgeois, social-democratic or renegade-Communist "experts." The basis for all analysis of the Russian "riddle" lies in the profound economic and social transformations that occurred in the post-revolutionary period, first as a consequence of the Bolshevik revolution and then, after its defeat, of the Stalinist counter-revolution under the banner of "socialism in one country."

The stormy development of Russian industry in consequence of the revolution, which defeated not only feudalism but also private capitalism, transformed Russia from a backward feudal power to an industrial empire, which today is a danger to the most industrialized state, the U. S. But this industrial development under the rule of the bureaucracy carries a shadow with it: the growth of the industrial proletariat.

As Max Shachtman correctly wrote in his review of Solomon Schwarz's book [*Labor in the Soviet Union*], at the time of Stalin's triumph, the working class of Russia was very small, something over a million industrial workers. The best workers perished in the civil war, and others merged into the new bureaucratic class. The working class was without leadership and the revolutionary party was in a state of exhaustion and crisis after the revolution. Bolshevism reached its historic limits and fell victim to the growing Stalinist counter-revolution.

NEW WORKING CLASS

Of course, the old revolutionary party did not die without a fight, as we know from the history of the Trotskyist opposition. But the Bolshevik revolution was exhausted and finished in Russia. Therefore was the victory of Stalinist nationalism so "easy." I will not deal here with the problem of international revolution.

In the Great Purge and in the imperialist war, the Stalinist counter-revolution touched bottom; but the program of "building socialism in one country," building the new and powerful industrial structure, created a new social force, a new industrial proletariat of 30-40 million, derived from the Russian village, from the feudal and backward countryside, and transformed it into a modern, disciplined industrial army. Thus the counter-revolution was trailed by its shadow, the industrial proletariat, which will also be its gravedigger.

During the war, millions of soldiers, workers and peasants underwent a new experience in getting acquainted with the "West," Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Germany and Austria, and in discovering the higher standard of liv-

ing of the "Western" workers; consequently also they exposed the impudent lies of the Stalinist leaders. This experience intensified the ideological pressure of the new working class on the ruling bureaucracy.

A new social consciousness was born in Russia; it was not yet concrete and definite but it was different from the consciousness of the Stalinist party and the bureaucracy.

The class war is now expressed not only in absenteeism from work, in passive resistance by the workers, in the forced-labor camps, in the remnants of the political opposition; a new ideological conflict was born in Russia between the new proletariat and the bureaucracy, a conflict which grows from day to day and exerts its pressure on the layers of the ruling bureaucracy, especially its lower layers which are closer to the workers and peasants.

FOCUS IN SATELLITES

I think that all talk about a "liberal period," or a "period of restorationism," or "Napoleonic tendencies," is a mistake; for the Stalinist counter-revolution has passed through all the stages from Thermidor to the First Consulate to the Napoleonic Empire and has ended in a modern totalitarian autocracy. What is beginning in Russia is a struggle, the ideological pressure of a new proletariat, which must reach the same point as the Bolsheviks and then go beyond the "old Bolshevism." In short, I mean that in Russia there is germinating a new revolution which cannot stop until it has destroyed the Stalinist counter-revolution, the bureaucratic totalitarian autocracy.

The events in Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary are the best evidence for this belief. If the new ideological development of the Russian working class—that is, the birth of the new social consciousness of Russia, as the political expression of the new industrial proletariat—is slow, the political development in the satellite countries is quicker, born of the disillusionment of the workers of Germany, Czechoslovakia, etc., in the industrial centers which used to be strongholds of Bolshevism, because in these places the vanguard of the working class was not so thoroughly liquidated by the GPU as it was in Russia itself.

The historical links between the old socialist generation and the revolutionary youth are easier to find, and the heritage of Bolshevism is still alive in the hearts of the "Western workers" as political teachings and a political program which come into collision with Stalinist reality and the false propaganda of Stalinism.

Therefore it is that the industrial centers of the satellite countries could play the role of a revolutionary focal point in the new revolutionary development beginning in Europe and in Russia. The working class of Germany, Czechoslovakia and Poland has spontaneously launched its political struggle against the Stalinist counter-revolution and has begun its own revolutionary socialist war against Stalinism, before the political groups of Trotskyism did so.

FORGOTTEN GIANT

There is born a new political revolutionary consciousness in the working class, a consciousness which has overcome not only the restrictions and limitations imposed by the Stalinist party and its lies, but also by the so-called "old Bolshevism" (am not referring to Trotsky) which was incapable of fighting Stalinism with arms.

It is clear that the events in Berlin, Pilsen, Silesia, etc., have great historical importance; that the new-born revolutionary development can end only by destroying the despotic, totalitarian autocracy in Russia and elsewhere. It is clear that the bureaucracy is seriously frightened, and also that the bourgeoisie of the "West" is a little "confused." They have very good political reason for their fear and confusion: the forgotten giant has spoken.

In the perspective of this revolutionary process it is insignificant whether Malenkov will win the fight against Beria or whether he will be supplanted by Bulganin or Vasilevsky. It is secondary whether Ulbricht or Grotewohl will become the "leader" or puppet in East Germany; whether Bierut or Zambrowski will hang on in Poland; whether the

The First Round — —

(Continued from page 1)

Actually it is trying to stop the strikes in order to avoid the calling in of the Assembly. If the Assembly had been called in, the MRP leadership would have to justify its participation in a government engaged in fighting its own labor base, the CFTC, on both the strike issue and the Moroccan issue.

August 21:

The MRP arranges a conference between the government, the MRP delegation and the independent unions. Some kind of agreement is reached in which the government promises definite deadlines for the convocation of the Commission on Collective Conventions and for certain government reports dealing with vital social questions. Only vague promises are given on two vital union demands: that no sanctions should be taken against the strikers and that the lost time should be paid.

FO (Force Ouvrière) and CFTC (Catholic union federation) railway and postal workers' federations issue back-to-work orders which are not then followed by the rank and file. Other industries remain on strike.

August 22:

The government quietly kills the law decrees on the retirement age of postal workers, but refuses to concede anything on sanctions and on back pay for lost time. The press announces back-to-work movements but in the main the strike remains intact.

August 24:

The government is temporizing on local wage demands. In the provinces railway and postal workers are going back to work. In Paris, the FO and CFTC rank and file remain on strike in the postal and railway services. Main issues are back pay and sanctions. Fines and prison sentences against strikers are reported in Brive (Corrèze). The CP press attacks the "stab in the back" and the "treasonable back-to-work slogans of the FO and CFTC leadership." It calls on all CGT (CP-led unions) workers to "continue the struggle everywhere."

FO and CFTC demand the resignation of the MRP ministers from the government and a joint conference of government and all unions, CGT included. The government asks for time to think it over.

The bureau of the Assembly decides not to call in the Assembly on a technicality. MRP delegates had been previously instructed to reverse their vote for the convocation of the Assembly.

August 25:

The strike recedes markedly in the provinces as a result of the non-convocation of the Assembly. CGT issues back-

party or the army will be dominant in the Kremlin. The most important thing is the growing pressure of the working class against the ruling class, which must split under this pressure, must fall back more and more, until its defeat and the victory of the masses.

The "disgrace" which Beria has suffered is certainly evidence of appeasement of the workers, because the GPU is the most hated representative of the totalitarian autocracy, hated not only by the workers and peasants but also by the lower layers of the ruling bureaucracy. The importance of the purge of Beria is, of course, quite different from that of the purge of the old Bolsheviks and their followers. It is a concession by the bureaucracy to the masses, and not a sacrifice of old revolutionaries to the Moloch of the counter-revolution. The film of Stalinist reaction is running in reverse.

Even the death of Stalin is secondary from the standpoint of this analysis. Of course, it can and will accelerate the process of the defeat of the autocracy but it did not begin this process. The growing pressure of the Soviet workers is slowly going forward, but the Western workers have shown them the way: the revolutionary socialist war against the Stalinist autocracy, against Stalinist slavery, against Stalinist exploitation.

Alea iacta est—at stake is not the personal fate of Malenkov, Beria or Bulganin; at stake is the fate of the Stalinist autocracy.

The forgotten giant has spoken; and he will not only speak, he will fight and he will win. Only a new imperialist war could opportunely save the dictatorship of Stalinism by preventing the workers' revolution; but in this case also the fate of the bureaucracy is sealed.

New times are coming.

to-work orders in the railways, the postal services and the Paris transports, after it appears that the local CGT federations, far from "continuing the struggle everywhere," go back to work on their own without waiting for orders from Paris.

The strike continues in the power plants, mines, metallurgy, building trades. The main demands are convocation of the Assembly and a general wage raise in the industry.

The government hedges on the issue of sanctions, makes verbal concessions and uses repression locally when it can get away with it. Local protest strikes break out again in the railways against sanctions. The government persists in not paying lost time.

Local sabotage acts are recorded in the railways; incidents in Paris and Nancy between police and strikers.

August 26:

The government declares it will pay all but three days of lost time in the postal services. The strike is virtually over in the railways and the postal services. Airlines are still on strike.

August 27:

The strike is over in the public sector. Local strikes persist in Lille and Le Havre on the sanction issue. FO demands joint talks between government, employers' organizations and independent unions in view of a general wage raise.

August 28:

The employers' organizations refuse to consider a general wage raise. In Rouen 55,000 railway and metal workers occupy the station as a protest against sanctions taken against three of the strikers. Incidents in Angers between police and strikers.

August 29:

Sanctions against the strikers in Rouen are cancelled. Work resumes in the railways at Rouen.

The government initiates a lowering of prices. The strike, for all practical purposes, is ended.

Four immediate conclusions can be reached from this first round:

(1) The government barely managed to save itself and emerges weakened from the contest.

(2) The fiction of the "liberal" MRP has been exploded. The MRP deputies voted in general against the calling in of the Assembly, that is, against the explicit demands of the CFTC, their trade-union base. Their strike policy and their stand on the Moroccan putsch are in complete contradiction with the policy of the CFTC. A rift has been created between the MRP and the CFTC which will be very difficult to bridge.

UNLEASHED FORCES

(3) As might have been expected, the FO and CFTC leadership has shown a consistent lack of courage, of imagination and initiative. The very contrary is true of the rank and file. Due to the action of their rank and file, the independent unions emerge as the leaders of the strike movement and are now in a position to lead future struggles.

The weakening of the hold of the leadership over the rank-and-file in the FO and CFTC is noted with alarm in the bourgeois press, which speaks of "unleashing forces one can't control" and of "sorcerer's apprentices." The CGT leadership has been outflanked all along the line by the masses of the FO and CFTC and by its own rank-and-file. It is now trying to represent its loss of initiative as a particularly clever political move.

(4) For the first time since the war the French workers have engaged in independent, spontaneous, united and conscious action in their own interests. They have suddenly become conscious of their power and of the possibilities of the situation. They know, as the government and the employers' organizations know, that this was the first round only and that the decisive issues of the strike are still to be settled.

YOU'RE INVITED

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



LABOR ACTION

September 14, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 37

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

BOOKS and Ideas

Reviewing a New Book on "Jewish Labor in the U.S.A."

From Socialist Ideals to Bureaucratism

JEWISH LABOR IN THE U. S. A., 1914-1952, by Melech Epstein. Published by the Trade Union Sponsoring Committees, 1953.

By **BEN HALL**

In writing of the Jewish labor movement, the author of *Jewish Labor in the U. S. A.* is compelled by necessity to deal with all the early currents of radical thought: Zionist, Bundist, Socialist, Communist. Any history of the two main unions founded and led by Jewish workers, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers, calls for a running account of the internal conflicts among these tendencies.

Their founding militants were not "narrow" unionists; they were inspired by socialist ideals and poured their energies into union-building as in their effort to build a new society. "The young movement," writes Epstein, "had three distinctive features: one, its builders were militant adherents of radical beliefs; two, ideological and political advances preceded industrial organization; three, young intellectuals had a decisive part in its formative stages."

Both unions have at last organized their industries almost completely. But the idealistic fires have long smoldered away, leaving nothing but a slightly warmed-over New-Dealism. Their leaders are cautious, benevolently bureaucratic, and, compared to the old days, models of conservatism. What were the causes of this transformation? How were the noble goals rooted out or allowed to disintegrate?

The author has succeeded in amassing a staggering mound of information in the 400-odd pages of this book: personal sketches of labor leaders; facts about Jewish cultural, social, and political committees and groups; historical outlines and anecdotes. All of this provides raw materials for a truly analytical history.

Unanswered Questions

But he has a strange facility for presenting the full chronology of debates and disputes while leaving us in the dark as to their basic significance. On the question which is of first importance to socialists—How did the great beginnings dribble out into the present stagnation?—he is most disappointing.

This failure is all the more regrettable because the author seems eminently qualified by ability, knowledge and experience to grapple with it. He was a member of the old Socialist Party and joined a left-socialist group that finally merged with the Workers Party (Communists) in 1922.

But in 1953 he seems preoccupied with presenting the official union leadership, its aims and policies, in an unwaveringly favorable light. His critical faculties, blunted in all discussions of living events, are permitted to operate within narrow limits only when applied to outlived struggles among men who are now dead.

A chapter on the "Decline of American Socialism" records briefly the objective factors which caused the decline of socialism as an effective political force in this country. The "Militant" group in the SP, Epstein tells us, "were animated by what they thought was the lesson of Germany and Austria, inaction and disunity." Was "what they thought" correct? Did the lessons of the rise of fascism demonstrate that socialism had to be refurbished and reoriented? The author is non-committal. Since socialism and the Jewish unions were so intimately intertwined throughout their mutual development, this gingerly treatment is inexcusable.

And what was the effect of the decline of socialism on the inner life of these unions? The author takes refuge in writing of the decline of socialism with virtually no reference whatsoever to the unions.

Exhausted Reservoir

Elsewhere, in passing, he identifies what he calls the "new political orientation," i.e., a non-socialist one, with "the process of Americanization—a fuller integration into the American environment" in which "Jewish Radicals since 1926 have consistently supported the Democratic Party or individual progressive Republicans." According to this implied thesis, the Jewish labor movement shed the socialism of its revolutionary days in Europe in a natural adjustment to American conditions.

In the same period, however, the Communist Party, which appealed in a perverted and distorted manner to socialist sentiments, became "no longer a small stream noisily trickling away in a corner; it was now a river flowing through the heart of the land." Socialism was undermined from two directions: "Americanization" and Stalinism, by American and world politics in this interrelationship.

At any rate, socialism is gone in the big unions. In 1947 David Dubinsky told the union convention, "In the earlier years of the ILGWU our leadership was nourished chiefly in the traditions and idealistic atmosphere of the old-time radical and socialist movement. That reservoir has gradually become exhausted." Are the garment unions, in their non-socialist, "Americanized" period as inspiring in their inner life as before, are they as democratic?

"The garment unions . . . are democratically conducted," Epstein informs us, describing how often they meet and how fairly elections are conducted. Of course, he has to point out, "there has been a marked shifting of authority to the top level." And like most commentators who describe and lament bureaucratic trends in the labor movement but who explain them so well that they explain them away, he ascribes this unfortunate process to weighty objective factors which tend to push the rank and file out of control. In this case he finds that "the ever-widening complexity of industrial problems and their tie-in with many state and federal agencies is a prime cause for this shifting of authority."

Half-Truth

Here is a classical half-truth which conceals the truth. In the early thirties (twenty years ago!) the ILGWU outlawed the formation of groups within the union, so the author informs us, and a resolution by Louis Nelson to rescind this decree and permit the free functioning of caucuses has been rejected by several conventions. Is this ban one of the regrettable but almost inevitable objective laws of union development or is it a conscious undemocratic practice perpetuated by a union leadership? Our author does not comment.

The impulse toward bureaucratism in union organization is an undeniable objective fact. But it is not the only fact. Based upon factors just as scientific and just as irremovable is the impulse of workers to control their union and preserve it as an instrument which will truly function in their interests. Unions lose their democracy not simply by the impersonal workings of some objective law but by the deliberate and conscious triumph of an internal machine in a process which sees the democratic aspirations of the membership crushed or disoriented.

Where thousands of workers are inspired by the liberating and democratic ideals of socialism and aspire to a new society of freedom, democracy is viable and powerful. And where this stratum has been wiped out, democracy is weakened and the "objective" trend toward bureaucracy is strengthened. That was the case in the garment unions; but because the author of this work is unable to examine the unions with a free eye, he cannot write of the genuine interrelationship of socialism and unionism.

Case of the ILGWU

Nevertheless, because he is so eager to compile facts, facts, and more facts, he almost unwittingly provides the basic material for following this process in the needle trades. Not, to be sure, in describing current events but in recording the outdated struggles of the past.

In the early twenties, the ranks of the ILGWU were becoming restive and distrustful of the union leadership. "Jewish workers had . . . been instilled with the spirit that their unions were but a part of a wider movement that would eventually do away with the present system and usher in the ideal society. This idea was reflected in the Socialist preamble to the early constitutions, though it was never a guide to action, merely an expression of social sentiment." When this preamble was eliminated at the 1924 convention, "the radical elements were chagrined. They felt that this action portended a surrender to Gompersism and "open collaboration" with the employers.

"Another disturbing aspect was growing signs of a deterioration in the relations between the rank and file and the officers." The ranks built the union by sweat and blood and now they saw careerists move in. Union officials were attracted by "the security of a steady income in comparison with the fluctuating annual income of the workers. . . . A strata of officials emerged. But the image of the pioneering days was deeply etched in the minds of the mass of workers; to shed this image without disillusionment was not easy." The officials built machines "by placing supporters in the best shops . . . by padding committee expenses to give his men a few extra dollars."

Opposition groups were forming among workers who sought to combat these disturbing trends; they grew and by 1920-1 united into a Shop Delegate League, uniting radicals of all shades who finally joined the Trade Union Educational League. In Epstein's opinion, these groups may have had a salutary effect in combating machine politics but they were "not permitted to pursue their normal course." The Communist Party succeeded in taking over and dominating this nascent left wing; within a few years, as the author relates, internal party bureaucratic maneuvers led the left wing to destruction.

CP Football

The CP-led left wing continued to gain in power. Every effort of the officialdom to cut it down with anti-democratic measures only infuriated the ranks against the union tops themselves and promoted the rapid rise of oppositionism. By 1925, the left wing had the support of the majority of the ILG membership (this is implicitly indicated by Epstein) and were prevented from translating this support into actual control over the international only by a system of representation which gave small locals, "many of them in semi-existence," exaggerated strength at national conventions. In New York City, the CP controlled the key locals and by 1926 was able to take over the Joint Board.

That year, the union in New York entered into nego-

tiations with the employers; a mediation commission report was rejected by the union and a general strike was called. It evoked unanimous and enthusiastic support from the membership; even though the CP leadership of the union was public knowledge, the strike was endorsed by a convention of the American Federation of Labor. It was a critical test of CP leadership in the union.

After eight weeks of the strike, the employers offered concessions that went beyond the mediation commission. The strike leaders who were ready to accept went to the CP for approval.

His account goes as follows.

Epstein's story, from this point on, is based upon conversations with men who were the leaders of the ILGWU in New York and members of the CP and who later broke with the party. "Lovestone (the mentor of the CP faction) in a frank mood later admitted that the crisis in the needle trades was tossed about like a football between the factions [of the party]."

The Faction Fight

The party at that time was in the throes of a faction struggle between the Foster and the Lovestone-Ruthenberg groups, each with an eye cocked on the reactions of the big bureaucrats in Moscow. Foster, "in the spirit of punishing his enemies, kept on insisting on the maximum demands," for the ILGWU party fraction was in the Lovestone camp.

On September 18, 1926, the ILGWU party fraction met with the party Needle Trades Committee. Meanwhile a top committee of party ILGWU leaders were meeting with a special party committee of Gitlow, Weinstone, and Joseph Zack. This top committee agreed to settle the strike and recommend that the whole fraction endorse its decision.

But a casual stupidity was enough to upset everything and set the wheels of party factionalism in motion. In the discussion at the general fraction meeting, one of the ILG leaders, "respected for his honesty, even by his opponents" but known as "somewhat of a nudnik," happened to remark, "Perhaps it is possible to get a little more." That was the end.

Weinstone, who was "building his own group," became alarmed and insisted on "another attempt." Gitlow, afraid of being accused of opportunism, sought safety by not defending the original decision. Zack, a Foster man, couldn't afford to be less uncompromising than the others. The party decision was withdrawn.

At the same time, the top ILGWU fraction, under fire by both party caucuses for right-wing deviationism, hesitated to insist upon settling the strike. And so the decision suddenly became: fight on until complete victory and steel the workers against compromise.

On November 9 the strike leaders finally had to settle with one major employers association for less than what they might have gotten before the strike began four months previously. But other smaller employers who had already settled locked out their workers, seeking better terms. And the strike dragged on.

The right-wing leadership of the International utilized the strike crisis to accomplish what they had found impossible before. They removed the left-wingers from office and later expelled them from the union.

Death of the Spirit

So much for Epstein's account. Taking it at face value, we hear the story of how the Communist Party, in the period of its own Stalinist degeneration, carried down the ILG left wing. The democrats and progressives who sought to counteract bureaucracy in the ILGWU were finally disoriented and disorganized by a party bureaucracy which was in turn disoriented and disorganized by Stalinism.

But this tragic episode leaves unchanged the story that Epstein tells so well of the rise of bureaucracy in the union, against which these left-wingers mobilized. The right wing in the union remained what it was. If the fight of the left wing was undermined by the CP, then machine politics was able all the easier to conquer within the ILG. If the famous 1926 strike became a football of inner-CP politics it also became a football for the union right wing. "The right," says the author, "was becoming bolder and not at all interested in having the left wind up the strike. Openly and covertly, they harassed the strike committee."

The needle-trades unions today have lost the old socialist tradition and take their place in the American labor movement along with all those unions which are benevolently run for the workers by liberal-minded officials. The democratic, crusading spirit did not disappear in a cold objective yielding to some complex laws of the inner development of unions. A top union leadership seeking the security, prestige, and perquisites of office built a bureaucratic machine that shunted the workers aside and, in the period of the New Deal, fattened and finally abandoned the last vestige of their socialism.

The genuinely democratic spirit of the most conscious militants was expressed in their readiness to join under the banner of CP leadership in the fight for democracy. But the CP in the process of becoming a tool of the reactionary Kremlin, misled them and destroyed their socialist consciousness. The explanation lies chiefly in the sphere of socialist and world politics, not in the "complexity of industrial problems."

Doubletalk from the Attorney General On the Smith Act and Subversive List

By PHILIP COBEN

In an interview dealing with the Department of Justice's "subversive list" and Smith Act prosecutions, Attorney General Brownell dotted his i's and crossed his fingers while loosing some of the most fantastic doubletalk heard from an Eisenhower official.

The interview which dealt with these subjects, as well as other Justice Department activities, has appeared in *U. S. News & World Report* (September 4), whose editors of course are quite sympathetic with the witchhunt and were not at all aiming to put Brownell on the spot.

The attorney general's premier announcement, which gave the interview its headline on the magazine's front page, was: "COMMUNISTS IN THE U. S. A GREATER MENACE NOW." This, if true, would be an astonishing fact in view of the battalions of Smith Act prosecutors, stoolpigeons, FBI men and assorted cops that have been thrown into the "war against subversion." Can it be that all has been a failure?

No, said Brownell, it's been a great success. As a result . . . the Communists are even a greater menace now than before!

This obviously required some dialectics on his part. Here's how he puts it:

"Q.—Is the Communist Party more or less active, Mr. Attorney General, than it was, say, a year ago? What does the FBI find on that?"

"A.—They think it is a greater menace now than at any time.

"Q.—Why so?"

"A.—The Communists have gone underground since the Smith Act trials started. They are better organized, and detection is more difficult.

"Q.—The membership is probably smaller, isn't it?"

"A.—It is cut down to about 25,000 now from 100,000—one fourth of what it was before the Smith Act trials started.

"Q.—That has no relation to the effectiveness, however, does it?"

"A.—No, that is correct."

This exchange was so crystal-clear and of so self-evident a meaning that the *U. S. News* interviewers did not bother to follow up any further at this point. In spite of the fact that three-quarters of its membership has been decimated, the remaining quarter is "a greater menace now than at any time" because it is more difficult to find them (naturally) and they are "better organized," having gone underground.

That Good Law

It would seem that it was the passage of the Smith Act and the consequent federal prosecutions which drove the CP "underground," compelled them or taught them to organize more effectively and rendered them more difficult to "detect." It would seem then, that it was the Smith Act and the federal prosecutions which made them "a greater menace now than at any time." That is, this would seem to follow from the attorney general's claims, if anyone took them seriously for a moment.

This does not occur to Eisenhower's No. 1 lawyer or to his interviewers. But a few moments later, Brownell is asked another question:

"Q.—Do you feel that the Smith Act is a good law?"

"A.—I think it is an excellent law and has done a great deal, first, to stop the activities of the top Communists and, second, to make the American people realize the danger of what they're facing from Communist activities in this country. But [Brownell hastens to add at this point] I don't think that's inconsistent with the statement that they are organizing their forces more effectively."

It would, however, seem to be a little out of line with the sensationalistic claim that "the activities of the top Communists," which the

Smith Act has done so much to "stop," are now "a greater menace now than at any time."

Brownell has run into the same contradiction that has often tied up his employee J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI: how to claim that wonders are being done by his department against "the Communists" while at the same time sounding the tocsin for intensified witchhunts.

Presumably if the membership of the CP ever gets down to a tightly-knit two dozen, this handful will be so solidly organized and difficult to detect that the Communist menace will reach a new peak.

But staunchly standing by the principles of democracy, Brownell refuses to say that he is in favor of outlawing the CP. The interviewers raised a cute question, which led all the way to Thomas Jefferson:

"Q.—It used to be said that people didn't want to outlaw it because then it would drive them underground. Well, if they are already underground now, what's the harm in outlawing the party?"

"A.—That's the argument in favor of outlawing it. We haven't taken any position.

"Q.—Well, aren't they outlawed under the Smith Act?"

[The government used to denounce this as a slander of its so-democratic Smith Act, but times have changed, as Brownell's evasive and squirmy answer indicates.]

"A.—That's an awfully difficult question to answer. Many people say that, in substance, they have been and might just as well formally be. So far, the prosecutions have been confined to leaders of the Communist Party for taking a very active leadership position in the American Communist Party.

"Q.—But it is still no crime to be a member of the party, is it?"

"A.—The argument is that if you are a member of the Communist Party you thereby advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence."

Well, Mr. Brownell (the interviewers did not ask), IS it a crime to be a member of the CP? What the attorney general is trying to indicate is that the government has given its affirmative answer in practice, even though no law has been passed.

Brownell on Jefferson

It was the interviewers' question which got to Thomas Jefferson. After Brownell affirmed that the Smith Act applied to any individual acting on his own beliefs even without any connection with the CP, an interviewer remarked that "That gets pretty close to a rather basic infringement of freedom," and "Isn't that a little hard on Thomas Jefferson? He said a revolution every 20 years would be a pretty good thing."

Brownell: "I don't think he meant by acts of force and violence."

The *U. S. News* editors may have snickered at this point but they passed on as if they had not heard this piece of ignorance. It is true that the Smith Act cannot be made retroactive to apply to Jefferson, but the attorney general might as well know that Jefferson was not entirely a "respectable" character. Here is where the reference to "20 years" comes from—a letter by Jefferson to William S. Smith in 1787:

"God forbid we should ever be 20 years without such a rebellion [Shays' rebellion in Massachusetts]. . . . What country before, ever existed a century and a half without a rebellion? And what country can preserve its liberties, if its rulers are not warned from time to time, that this people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, pardon and pacify them. What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time, with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure."

As a matter of fact, he also wrote to Madison: "I hold it, that a little rebellion, now and then, is a good thing, and as necessary in the political world as storms in the physical. . . . An observation of this truth should render honest republican governors so mild in their punishment of rebellions, as not to discourage them too much. It is a medicine necessary for the sound health of government."

These passages are so famous that even a cabinet member should have heard of them. Naturally the fact that they come from Jefferson's pen do not make these views legal for law-abiding citizens today in 1953; they would merely convince Brownell that Jefferson was a bit of a Bolshevik, though in point of fact he was merely a militant revolutionary democrat. We cite them only to round out the attorney general's Nebraska education.

Brownell gets entangled in more than American history. The interviewers, suffering along with him, try to give him a lead and a hint by suggesting that while the CP's membership may have declined, "wasn't it J. Edgar Hoover who said that for every member of the party there are 10 fellow travelers?"

Brownell fumbles the ball and comes up with a couple of howling irrelevancies:

"I think Mr. Hoover did say that. There is a greater amount of straight Communist propaganda coming in from Russia now than at any other time."

Alert the Coast Guard!

Brownell follows up this rough gem with the statement that the CP's "espionage activities are much more underground now than they were." Almost visibly wincing, the interviewers gently suggest that the CP's

espionage activities (if any) could hardly ever have been aboveground.

Another tack: In view of the smashing success of the Smith Act prosecutions (in making the Communists "a greater menace now than at any time") Brownell announces new prosecutions and new laws on the schedule. He states that new prosecutions are now pending on T-H affidavits; more names are being added to the subversive list; more Smith Act trials on the way; the Justice Department wants Congress to legalize wire-tapping evidence in certain cases, any "cases affecting national defense"; etc.

From unwitting clowning, ignorance and bombastic muddleheadedness, however, the interview descends to the depths of hypocrisy as Brownell is questioned about the "subversive list" which his department administers under a Truman presidential executive order, taken over and further implemented under Eisenhower.

It's Easy, He Says

The interviewers raise a key question: "Can an organization get off the list?" As readers of *LABOR ACTION* know, the Independent Socialist League has looked into this from every angle. Here is Brownell's doubletalk on this delicate question:

"A lot of them are off by reason of dissolution, but there has been none that has come in and been able to prove that—and they have the opportunity to do so at any time—it has changed its character."

Brownell skirts over the fact that the blunt answer to the question, as far as he is concerned, is, "Yes, the only way they can get off the list is by convincing us that we made a mistake." This is notoriously difficult with bureaucrats, when they are themselves acting as prosecutor, judge and jury. The "subversive list" system was rigged to try to make impossible any legal recourse by slandered organizations to overcome the administrative-decree system of proscription.

Brownell furthermore puts it in terms of convincing the Justice Department that a listed organization has changed its character. He apparently cannot even see the issue of how an organization is to convince him that the mistake was made in the first place.

He sanctimoniously points out that organizations are given hearings before being listed, but the hypocrisy of this claim was evidenced only a week ago when this same virtuous paladin of democracy announced in a speech that the National Lawyers Guild was going to be listed, labeled it in advance, tried and sentenced it on the newspapers' front pages—after which it will enjoy a "hearing" from its accusers. Besides, organizations that were on the list before Brownell came in were just kept on by the new Republican administrators of the blacklist, without hearings.

The interviewers ask about the "standards" used for the subversive list—

"Q.—Do you also have standards by which an organization can prove that it is no longer Communist?"

"A.—There's no specific standard, no, but they can easily disprove it if they came in and showed that there was a legitimate activity other than Communist or fascist or a subversive nature. That would be very easy for them to do."

Very easy indeed, in view of the fact that the evidence, if any, against an organization is naturally secret and not to be revealed to them, nor is it subject to full and free cross-examination and review for rebuttal.

—All you have to do is prove you're innocent of murder. What murder? Sorry, we can't reveal our sources of information. When did this murder take place? Sorry, that's classified information. How do you know there even was a crime? You'll have to take our word for it. . . . Now go ahead, prove you're innocent. . . . It's easy. . . .

Covering Up

"Is your [subversive] list under the McCarran Act?" ask the interviewers. The answer, of course, is no; the attorney general's list, created by executive decree, has nothing to do with the McCarran Act, which sets up its own list, under the Subversive Activities Control Board, with different standards. But interestingly enough, Brownell answers neither yes nor no—

"It is under Public Law 79, I think," he explains, "the law which authorized the old loyalty program and the new employee-security program."

This is only a partial truth, which means it is half a lie. The creation of the subversive list is not to be found in Public Law 79, nor was the subversive list set up by any act of Congress. The law which Brownell mentions is probably the statute under the general aegis of which Truman was enabled to issue his Executive Order. Brownell is not mentioning that the subversive list has no statutory authorization; he is giving the impression that it does have such a legislative basis.

But the especially insidious nature of the "subversive list" lies precisely in the fact that it was born of an administrative decree, operates solely under the administrative agency, cannot be directly tested in the courts because it is not a provision of any congressional law—that, in short, it gets around the whole machinery of legislation and the judiciary; or so it was intended to do. Even more than the McCarran Act, it is a typical product of the police-state decree methods growing up in the U. S.

As a man who combines the mentality of a corporation counsel, Republican machine politician and a cop, Herbert Brownell is perhaps eminently fitted to administer the department known as Justice in these capitalist United States today.

Two Jewish Leaders on the Relation Between Israel, Zionism and the Jews of the World—

'Thou Shalt Not Criticize Israel!'

By HAL DRAPER

Two recent episodes have underlined some truths about the dilemmas involved in the relationship between American Jews and the state of Israel—American Jews in particular though to a very large extent the same applies to all other Jewish communities outside of Israel.

The first was the statement made at the World Jewish Congress in Geneva by Dr. Nahum Goldmann, the leading figure in the world Zionist movement (if we except Israeli premier David Ben-Gurion himself).

Goldmann said: "Israel is unique among nations. There is no other state where 90 per cent of its people live outside it."

The Zionist ideology is epitomized in this capsule statement, particularly the Zionist view of what Israel is: the homeland not of its own inhabitants Jewish and Arab, and not even the homeland of its own Jewish inhabitants alone, but of all Jews everywhere in the world, regardless of the latter's own views on the matter.

This view of the state of Israel is the official ideology not only of Zionism but, unfortunately, of the Israeli government itself and of its leading parties and spokesmen. It is the ideology of the "Ingathering of the Exiles" which Ben-Gurion and others have so often enunciated.

"BLOOD" CITIZENSHIP

It is a view which (1) implicitly makes all non-Jews, especially the Arab Israelis, aliens and interlopers in the land, the short- or long-term objective being to drive them out, (2) makes the perspective of Israel expansionist, no matter what diplomatic declarations on that score are put out for occasional world consumption by its leaders, and (3) poses the question of dual national allegiance for all Jews in the world as the Israelis see them, regardless of the fact that only a very small minority of Jews are made happy thereby.

Nahum Goldmann's statement of the theory of citizenship-by-ancestral-"blood" is itself not unique, though the Israeli state is unique today as the one presently existing prominent government which holds and acts on such a theory. It has been seen before in the world, though the most recent historical instance cannot be mentioned without making Zionists froth with anger. His statement of it in such forthright fashion was enough to awake a storm of protest in Jewish circles, even though he was merely reiterating what the Israeli Zionists and other Zionists have said many times before in unmistakable language.

Now one must be clear, we think, on the main reason behind the indignation that Goldmann's statement evoked among most American Jewish organizations. This reason is primarily point No. 3 in the above-listed implications of the Zionist theory of Israel: it comes into conflict with their "Americanism," in some cases with their "American" chauvinism and bourgeois patriotism. Many of these elements have been able to swallow in silence, though perhaps not with equanimity of conscience, the

Israeli anti-Arab policies; but when the same ideology which leads to Israeli discrimination against the Arab people in the land also points to a conclusion touching on their own patriotic allegiance, they rise up in horror.

BEN-GURION'S "VICTORY"

But this only explains why this particular statement of Goldmann's led to such an outcry, as if he had been saying something new or unheard-of, when actually he was merely repeating the heart of the Zionist creed.

For example, the same thought which led to the "scandal" over Goldmann's speech can be found officially embodied in the last Israeli Government Yearbook, in the introduction by Ben-Gurion. Here the premier and Zionist leader wrote (we quote from *Zion*, the monthly published by the World Zionist Organization in Jerusalem, November 1952):

"The establishment of the [Israeli] State did not mean the vision fulfilled. For by far the greater part of the Jewish people is still divided among the nations, and so the State is not yet the consummation of redemption, but only its instrument and principal means. . . ."

Twice Ben-Gurion sets down a curious formulation in writing: "The greatest victory won by the Zionist idea over the Jewish people was the establishment of the State. . . ." And again, a few pages later, "I cannot too often declare that the State is the greatest conquest of the idea of Zionism over the Jewish people." He is referring to the fact that before the establishment of the state of Israel, the majority of the Jews of the world were opposed to the Zionist idea.

Has this changed? Indisputably, the overwhelming bulk of Jews are enthusiastic supporters of Israel's healthy development and self-preservation and development as a state; nor are well-wishes for Israel confined, or to be confined, to Jews. But the same question persists, though changed in form.

It is not: For Israel or Against Israel—this is only the way the Zionists inside and outside Israel see it. It is: For or against the Zionist program and ideology for Israel.

DIFFERENT QUESTIONS

And this is a program and an ideology which is harmful and even suicidal for the Israeli people, in the opinion of many, including ourselves as Independent Socialists. At any rate this is how the real question is to be put.

For the Zionists this is not in question. Ben-Gurion writes in the above-mentioned introduction to the Government Yearbook: "The Jewish people is not an abstract notion, or just a collective name for myriads of isolated and scattered individuals in various countries. It is a conglomerate whose actuality, will and common destiny are not open to question." This common destiny, etc., which is not open to question is the expansionist Zionist view of the manifest destiny of Jewry to be ingathered from their "exile." Therefore he writes also: "It is essential for the Zionist movement to . . . comprehend that it, the Jewish people and the State now form together a close-knit and indivisible unity."

The Zionists have been amazingly successful in their obscurantist effort to identify the two problems: (1) For or against Israeli, and (2) For or against the Zionist program and ideology for Israeli. That is, pursuing Ben-Gurion's thought that the establishment of the state is "the greatest victory won by the Zionist idea over the Jewish people," they have sought another "victory over the Jewish people," and this would be a victory indeed: to identify the cause of Israel with the cause of the Zionist ideology, if not the Zionist movement.

CHANIN'S LETTER

How much they have succeeded is indicated by the degree to which they have convinced non-Zionist Jews that all criticism of Israel is "disloyal" to the Jewish people and Israel. In this connection, a document of the greatest interest must be cited.

The interest which attached to it proceeds from the fact that in no other place we know of is the conception written down with such frankness that Israel must be considered immune from criticism by Jews because it is "ours." It is a letter sent by the general secretary of

the Workman's Circle, Nahum Chanin, to the periodical *Jewish Newsletter* edited by William Zukerman (August 17 issue). Here Chanin puts into words what few others would be willing to say openly though it is common indeed.

"I want to write to you about a painful subject which agitates Jewish life at present," begins Chanin. He introduces his remarks by explaining that he is "a friend" of the *Jewish Newsletter*, which is an outstanding liberal foe of Zionism among Jewish periodicals. He explains further, by way of preface:

"I am not a Zionist. I have been a Bundist (a Jewish socialist) all my life. I cannot accept the Zionist philosophy of life particularly in its application to Jewish culture and Jewish life in the Diaspora. . . . Zionism, which preaches the liquidation of Jewish life everywhere outside of Israel, will never strike a responding chord in my heart. . . . Thus my entire approach to Jewish life is in contradiction to that of Zionism and I cannot be considered a Zionist."

And indeed the rest of this revealing letter has its point just because of this avowal of (at least) non-Zionism. (We note in passing Chanin's reluctance to call himself an anti-Zionist, even though his statement of views add up to this: this is an example of a small-scale "victory won by the Zionist idea over the Jewish people.")

"YOU FIND FAULT"

"But, at the same time," Chanin's letter says as it comes to the point, "I believe that Israel will soon become an important factor in Jewish life and we have to help with everything in our power to put it on its feet. Your publication [the *Jewish Newsletter*] takes an opposite view. For instance, you frequently take the part of the wronged Arabs. I admit that great injustices have been committed against the Arabs. But to re-admit the Arabs to Israel now would mean a tragedy for the Jewish state. At the present moment, I dare to say that every Arab admitted to Israel would be a member of the Fifth Column for the state. Those Arabs who are in the country should, of course, remain. But to admit those who escaped would be a very grave mistake. I believe that the Arabs should receive compensation and reparation in money, but they should not be admitted to the country.

"There are black spots on the sky of Israel, but they are natural in a country which has just begun to reconstruct itself. And where reconstruction is going on under conditions worse than that of any other new state. It would be a terrible catastrophe for the Jewish people if the state of Israel were to disappear. The difference between my position and yours is that I say without hesitation that we must do everything possible to avert such a catastrophe and to help and strengthen Israel, while you say: We are for the state of Israel; we wish her success, but you proceed to find fault with it."

There it is in all its naiveté, set down no doubt with "painful" frankness by a prominent figure in non-Zionist Jewish circles. The key, of course, is the last sentence: "The difference between my position and yours" is that you criticize the policies and acts of the Israeli leaders.

EVASION

That is what speaks eloquently about this non-Zionist frame of mind, though we have quoted the whole of the passage for its interest as a specimen in political psychology. Its lack of logic and internal contradiction only manifest the split-thinking which has gone into it. Chanin,

for example, starts off by saying "Your publication takes an opposite view" when he seems to be talking about the desire "to help Israel with everything in our power to put it on its feet." He does not mean, of course, that the publication is opposed to helping Israel; on the contrary, he says in the next paragraph that it too agrees "We are for the state of Israel; we wish her success"—only . . . only it still insists on "finding fault," criticizing.

His discussion of the Arab question in Israel is purely evasive, at the best. The biggest problem is the policy of the Israeli government toward the Arabs now within its borders; but while the government has lately struck new blows at these its own Arab citizens, Chanin talks as if the only problem for a non-Zionist well-wisher of Israel is the readmission of those Arabs who fled. But it would be a digression, however tempting, to discuss these remarks on the Arabs. Chanin's intention is not to whitewash the Israeli Arab policy. He is saying: If we publicly "find fault" with what they are doing, this will weaken Israel.

ANALOGUE

To socialists the pattern is a familiar one. It is the pattern of the best-intentioned apologists for Stalinism, more familiar some time ago than today, it is true, but familiar nonetheless. Chanin's letter is written in the same accents, with the same confused groping, the same combination of heart-burning and reservations, as characterized so many people who so long continued to denounce all criticism of Russia as "anti-Soviet" and "reactionary" at the same time that they muttered and protested and criticized privately or secretly. What we have here is an analogue of the frame of mind of certain American liberals who, although never Stalinists, long persisted in avoiding any criticism of Russia for fear of harming a noble experiment—and to some extent still so persist.

Chanin cannot understand that liberal Jewish leaders like himself (he calls himself a "socialist" but we can ignore this little concession to nostalgia) can best serve the interests of the Israeli people by refusing to whitewash the deeds and policies which put the Jewish people in jeopardy in their little island-state in the midst of an Arab world. He cannot understand that loyal criticism is often necessary to loyal support.

"FRIENDS OF ISRAEL"

But there is very little to be said about this that has not long been said about the similar state of mind of non-Stalinist apologists for Stalinist Russia, and the rest of the argument will be well known to LABOR ACTION readers. For a long time during the period of degeneration of revolutionary Russia under the aegis of Stalinism, this same type of liberal used to call the press of our own movement "anti-Soviet" because it devoted its columns to signaling the crimes of the Stalinist leadership, instead of joining in the paeans of praise to the "great accomplishments" of the Kremlin.

Indeed, the Chanin-type is a victim of the Zionist euphoria which the establishment of the state of Israel caused. It is not unknown even among socialists, and LABOR ACTION's own criticisms of Israeli policies have met with reactions which stemmed from the same roots.

Such "friends of Israel" are no friends of Israel, we know from long similar experience with "friends of the Soviet Union," despite their excellent intentions. And the truth has to be said. Chanin has perhaps unwittingly done a valuable service in putting the question so clearly.

The definitive biography!
A masterly political portrait
of the totalitarian dictator

Leon Trotsky's
'STALIN'

This book is out of print, but
we have copies available for
\$6.00

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

Labor Action FORUM

New York City

WHY WE SPLIT FROM THE SOCIALIST PARTY

Speaker:

Bogdan Denitch

Member, YPSL, NEC, and N. Y. District Secretary

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, AT 8:30 P.M.

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Adenauer's Victory — —

(Continued from page 1)

Adenauer. A second, very likely, is from new and young voters.

The third source is to be seen in the fact that the much publicized danger of the neo-Nazi parties apparently failed to materialize. The German Reich Party, which the experts had expected to get as much as 10 million votes, actually came away with less than a quarter million; its leading individual candidate for a seat in the Bundestag ran a poor fifth in his area. Like the CP, this party failed to get a single seat in the house.

Here is clearly the biggest reason why the size of the victory was unexpected even by Adenauer.

NAZIS "BURIED"?

This electoral swamping of the organized neo-Nazis is one of the main reasons for the jubilation by the pro-Adenauer cheering bleachers in this country, which was led publicly by Secretary Dulles. The N. Y. Times, for example, comments editorially, "This means that the younger generation [in West Germany] is burying both the nationalistic ambitions of world power and the resentments in communism. . . . In that sense Germany is displaying a political maturity and is setting an example which may seem ironic coming from that source. . ."

It would seem, then, that the dire warnings that have come most especially from Times correspondents in Germany about the growing strength of national-chauvinism and neo-Nazi sympathies in the country were cries of wolf, that these sentiments do not really exist in any strength, that there is now no danger to speak of in the reawakening of fascist sympathies among the German middle class and bourgeoisie. This, at any rate, is what one would have to believe to join in the hallelujahs over the Adenauer victory.

It reminds one of how many other times an electoral "defeat" of fascist parties has been hailed by the same shortsighted observers as the "burying" of fascism. Not the least notable case was the reaction to the last democratic election in Germany in which Hitler and his Nazi party were "buried" under an "avalanche of democratic votes."

Unfortunately, the jubilation rests somewhat precariously (and perhaps unconsciously) on the naive view that a neo-Nazi sympathizer who votes for Adenauer rather than for the German Reich Party is a reformed character. For this seems to be a big part of the pattern of what happened in the German election.

As Times correspondent Walter Sullivan writes, "It was clear that votes that might have gone to the German Reich Party went to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union."

The results suggest that what really happened is that the votes of the potential neo-Nazi-sympathetic voters coalesced around Adenauer; that the "sinister forces" that political observers have decried flocked to his camp, to give him his great victory. And the Washington statesmen as well as the editorial commentators might well raise the question in their minds of what it means when their own pet German emerges also as the chosen representative of the extreme Rightist elements of the German middle class and bourgeoisie.

Adenauer's CDU succeeded in expanding to its own right, not in gaining as against the Social-Democratic Party.

HOSPITALITY

Now this is no entirely new development. Not long ago it was one of Adenauer's coalition partners, the Free German Party, which was the focus of a somewhat shady scandal when it was shown that its own party machine had been substantially infiltrated by neo-Nazis. The German Reich Party was the frank contender for the job of organizing these elements politically, but the Adenauer coalition is shot through with them. The Adenauer governmental setup, it is well known, particularly its foreign office, is chock-full of former Nazis. It would be unreasonable to believe that the open reactionaries are agreed on the use of a separate party of their own as their vehicle, when the governing parties have shown a certain degree of hospitality.

Nevertheless the question arises: Why weren't the Social-Democrats able to do better than hold their own? A few points can be suggested, with the consciousness

that we do not have anything like a close acquaintance with the immediate forces at work in the German election.

It is true that the German SPD, since the death of Schumacher, has not had any dynamic spokesman and leader—not only one comparable to Adenauer on the bourgeois side, but one even capable of popularity and imaginatively representing his party before the people. Erich Ollenhauer is an old party wheelhorse, but he does not begin to answer the description.

NO BOLD LINE

But whatever weight one gives this personal factor, it would be risky to overlook the general effect of what in Germany passes for "prosperity," and which by European standards today is indeed a kind of prosperity. Though it has not given the German worker a decent standard of living or even a standard as high as many other Western European countries, it has given the bourgeois elements more self-confidence and aggressiveness; and it overlays the general crisis in which European capitalism as a whole finds itself.

In the field of foreign policy, which Adenauer claims was decisive in the election, the clarity of the SPD program is more apparent from the Americans' denunciation and fear of it than it is when it comes out of the mouths of the SPD leaders themselves. American newspaper correspondents tend to paint the SPD as "neutralist" as against the "Europeanism" of Adenauer but the truth is that the German Social-Democrats have not even been clearly "neutralist" in the sense of being clearly opposed to becoming a partner in the West's war bloc. The uncertainty, hedging and wavering attitude of the party leadership was graphically shown a few days before the election when the party more or less repudiated a statement made by its press director Fritz Heine advocating the "neutralization" of Germany after the fashion of Sweden and Switzerland.

The SPD foreign policy is pretty amorphous, and it is hard to see how the party can manage to give the impression of having a firm, bold course which it stands for. Now given the fact that it already has the main mass of the working class pretty solidly in its ranks, the main field for expansion by the SPD had to be the middle classes; and no radical party has ever succeeded in coralling much of the indecisive, swayable middle class by talking with hot potatoes in its mouth.

NEUTRALISM WON'T DO

But while the SPD has not been even as clearly "neutralist" as one might be led to believe by the American press, it is true that as against the pro-NATO and pro-EDC policy of Adenauer its tendency is in that direction and its foreign policy is thus colored. And by no means do we wish to give the impression by the above remarks that "neutralism" (even a neutralism that was presented clearly and effectively) can be an effective foreign-policy program for a bold and militant socialist party.

Concretely, for example, the Social-Democrats became the champions of the slogan of "negotiations with Russia" for a deal by which, supposedly, German unity was to be obtained. We need not repeat here our own vigorous dissent from any such line—a line which is the Achilles' heel of the Bevanites in England too; but it may be that the SPD has found that the cry of "negotiations with Russia" is not only poor socialism (as it is in our own opinion) but also poor politics.

Everywhere in the world, the slogan of a negotiated deal with the Kremlin has an appeal in proportion to the degree to which illusions remain among the people about the Russian power (as in Asia), and it is not surprising if the German workers have fewer illusions about Moscow than others.

Although reformist-socialist leaderships have done most drum-beating about "appealing to the middle class," it is also true that rarely if ever have such reformists succeeded in doing so to any marked degree. For timidity, parliamentary middle-of-the-road-ism and fear of boldness has never made socialism attractive to middle-class elements looking for a way out; when petty-bourgeois are in the market for these wares, they usually go shopping for them among the bourgeois parties. The British Labor Party found this out in its last election also, and left-wing socialists in both parties have a certain community of problems in transforming their movements into dynamic fighting organizations on a bold class program.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

dom in the Los Angeles Daily News. But this undiluted specimen of shame-faced imperialism is a breath of fresh air (at least he admits supporting colonialism, even if for the best of reasons) as compared with the journalistic prostitutes who are currently referring to France's new decrees for Morocco as the "Moroccan reforms."

The "reforms" consist essentially in taking all powers away from the sultan (even the new pro-French sultan) and vesting "native rights" in a number of "consultative committees" set up by the French, disposable by the French, and controlled by the French. This will avoid any such danger to democracy as might result if another Moroccan ruler took it into his head that he preferred independence.

Naturally, the democratic nationalist Moroccan movement wants a democratic assembly under its own sovereignty, not an autocratic sultan, but the French imperialists cannot even afford to take a chance on the latter.

Truman's Omission

The outstanding thing about ex-President Truman's speech to a labor rally in Detroit on Labor Day is what he did not say. He was "going to give to them" and end his sideline role. And he did indeed tear into the businessman's philosophy of government of the Eisenhower administration, in good old Fair Deal generalities.

Conspicuously missing from his indictment was any criticism of the Republican regime on foreign policy. His sole attack on any issue affecting the international scene was on Eisenhower's cuts in the war budget. His other reference to foreign affairs was a pat on the back for the East German workers.

It would seem he has nothing against the handling of world affairs by the men whom he denounces (on some domestic issues) as representatives of the big-business interests. In foreign affairs, they become patriots.

This is the left wing of the Democratic Party, such as it is. On September 14 a Democratic Party gathering in Chicago will probably see an open or covert fight between these "left-wingers" and the Southern bourbons, with the 1952 "loyalty pledge" as the immediate bone of contention. Such is the choice.

The United States is just about the only important country in the world without any articulate opposition on foreign policy. This is not Truman's shame, for, in truth, criticism of Eisenhower on this score coming from him could be shameless demagoguery; for Eisenhower is attempting to carry out, well or ill, essentially the same imperialistic program that the Trumanites launched. It is rather to the shame of the liberals who are too cowardly or intimidated to criticize, and above all of the labor movement and its leaders who go along with the going policy or support the men who go along with it.

If abroad the U. S. presents people with a picture of monolithic reaction (as Adlai Stevenson recently implied, laying it all to McCarthyism), then it is not the Republicans who are alone guilty but the Fair Dealers who have abdicated their role as opposition, dragging labor along with them.

The Democrats have talked about "keeping our mouths shut while the GOP builds up the record for us." By keeping their mouths shut, the Democrats are building up their own record—as the most cowardly opposition in the history of the country.

Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2. New
 - 6 months at \$1. Renewal
 - Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

Get acquainted with the SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

Write to the SYL at

114 West 14 Street, New York City