

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 21, 1953

FIVE CENTS

SPOTLIGHT ON KHRUSHCHEV:
Concessions with an Iron Fist

... page 6

Tammany Wins with Wagner

... page 2

The Two Right Wings of British Labor

... page 3

**SPOT-
LIGHT**

Does Stevenson Have A Foreign Policy?

Durkin Slinks Out

From Mr. Dooley to Vinson

By HAL DRAPER

By BEN HALL

The death of Chief Justice Vinson and his coming replacement by an Eisenhower appointee points up the contradictory position of the Supreme Court in the governmental system. In theory the Supreme Court is supposed to be independent of the other branches of government, and it has sufficient power to act as a check-and-balance to a limited degree, once its members are appointed. Thus, more than once the Supreme Court has stood out against legislative or executive action, on either the reactionary or progressive side.

But besides the innumerable social pressures on the members of the court which make it something less than a council of objective seers lifted above the class struggle, the problem of appointment comes as the most immediate reminder that the judges of the high bench are not outside the political world, as Vestal guardians of the sacred flame of the Law and the Constitution.

It is almost enough to mention that the three men most prominently being considered by Eisenhower for the post of chief justice are Governors Warren and Dewey and Attorney General Brownell.

None of these has any standing whatsoever as a jurist. They are successful machine politicians who happen to be lawyers by origin. For any of them to become the chief justice, objectively considered in terms of the theory, would be like the appointment of a laboratory assistant to head the National Science Foundation because he happened to be a Republican. (That may happen yet, too.)

Of course, in this course of reducing the
(Turn to last page)

Adlai Stevenson, in his Chicago speech of September 15 which purported to be a report on his world trip, presented the first discussion by any Democratic Party leader on the subject of foreign policy—a delicate subject which the opposition party has thus far more or less avoided; and at the same time he obviously sought to suggest as much of a program for foreign policy as possible. The result invites the closest attention.

The evasive content of this carefully worded speech can hardly be appreciated without understanding the Democratic dilemma. This dilemma was underscored by the whole character of the Democratic Party rally in Chicago to which the Stevenson foreign-policy speech was the climax. The sign under which this rally assembled was that of girding the opposition to "open up" against the GOP administration.

Up to now the Democrats have positively been boasting of their "support to the president." They have been patting themselves on the back about their "responsible attitude"—by which they mean their brilliant tactic of "building up the record" against Eisenhower by themselves keeping their mouths shut. We're not snipers, they have been telling the country in self-congratulatory tones.

Stevenson is not behind the rest of the party leadership in this policy of cowardly opposition which masquerades as "patriotism" and "responsibility." Only the day before his foreign-policy report, he had given another talk to the rally, one in which he had boasted that "the Democratic Party in Congress has functioned with great intelligence, courage and restraint as the party of the opposition." The one phrase here which is not exaggerated is the reference to restraint.

Comfort

Marquis Childs, the liberal Washington columnist, shows how warmly Truman feels about Stevenson by quoting the ex-president's comforting words to the man who hasn't made up his mind about 1956:

"Now listen, Adlai, if a knucklehead like me could be president, what in the world are you worrying about?"

(Turn to last page)

The Democrats have understood, he had said, that "there is a time to oppose and a time to agree, a time to challenge and a time to cooperate. They have known with precision when the nation would best be served by opposition,

The U.S. as Imperialist Arbiter

Washington Taking Over Onus of Indo-China Mess from France

By GORDON HASKELL

The United States has become the dominant power in the capitalist world at a time when victories, diplomatic or military, come hard and can be won only at a high price. This is certainly true of its "victories" over Stalinism (Korea), and applies equally to its "victories" within the capitalist world itself.

As the "leader of the free world," the United States has become the arbiter among the imperialist antagonisms that clash within this capitalist world. Thus it also tends to assume responsibility for the imperialist policies not only of itself but also of the openly colonialist powers of the Western bloc. In this way, all the anti-imperialist sentiments of the small and new nations coalesce into the famous anti-Americanism which mounts like a tide all over the world.

It is being illustrated now as Senator Knowland holds his court in Indo-China, in the course of his travels there. It was illustrated when the U. S. threw its weight on to the side of the French oppressors in Morocco, in stopping discussion on the issue at the UN. It is also illustrated in the heart of Western

Europe itself as the United States plays its role as Supreme Arbiter in the collision between French and German capitalist interests.

Three years ago the American government decided to rearm Western Germany. This was to be part of the plan to create a European military organization which could balance the military strength of Stalinist Russia. But the French government, which regards German rearmament as a threat to its own power position in Europe, insisted that any German rearmament should take place only as part of a "European Defense Community," an international army in which Germany would play a subordinate role.

FRANCE VS. GERMANY

Although the basic agreements for the formation of the EDC were signed by the foreign ministers of the six European nations involved in May 1952, nothing has been done to implement the army to date. In Germany the EDC was opposed by the Social Democrats, and in France itself the shaky governments avoided bringing the treaty before the parlia-

(Continued on page 7)

When a member of the cabinet resigns he must expect to create a public splash; but Martin Durkin, the plumber in the millionaire cabinet, tried to make his exit as unobtrusive as possible. His private walk-out letter to Eisenhower on August 31, lay unmentioned until the President unveiled it ten days later. Even then, the brief note, considerably devoted in the main to technical suggestions for running the Department of Labor pending the selection of a successor, simply announced that Mr. Durkin had decided to return to his work as president of the AFL Plumbers Union and concluded with wondering words of gratitude: "Words fail me," he wrote, "when I attempt to express my thanks to you for selecting me for the position of secretary of labor."

Later Durkin told reporters that his resignation was the direct result of a dispute over the Taft-Hartley Law. American for Democratic Action (ADA) attributed his move to "the obedience of the Eisenhower administration to the anti-labor bias of those big-business interests who would like to shackle the American trade-union movement." And the United Automobile Workers (CIO) explained for him that he was protesting the efforts "of the Republican administration to use him as window-dressing to hide their weakening attacks upon labor and collective-bargaining generally."

Thus comes an official end to the honeymoon toleration of Eisenhower by labor and liberals.

End of a Truce

Republicans console themselves with the thought that nothing has really changed. After all, they insist, Durkin was not really one of labor's top-ranking leaders anyway; those who counted were not consulted in his appointment. Besides, they say, labor leaders had been attacking the administration even while Durkin was in office. Joseph A. Loftus, Washington correspondent of the New York Times, comments, "His resignation did not wreck any truce or honeymoon, because there was none."

But there was a truce. It is true that the resignation could not wreck what was already foundering; it was the end of the truce

(Continued on page 2)

NEW YORK

Tammany Wins City Primary with Wagner

By SAM TAYLOR

New York City has witnessed the first primary fight for the Democratic mayoralty nomination in more than fifteen years. As much as the various sides of the Democratic machine tried to drum up enthusiasm in the primary it remains pretty much a dull affair.

The winner was Robert Wagner Jr., the candidate of the Tammany-Flynn machine, beating incumbent Mayor Impellitteri who was supported by the Democratic bosses of the other three boroughs.

The split in the Democratic Party in the city was more or less in the cards after the recent series of electoral defeats which it suffered, topped off last year when Eisenhower carried New York and the Republican Senator Irving Ives got more votes in the senatorial race in the city itself than did John Cashmore, in the three cornered race with the Liberal Party's candidate, George Counts.

After these setbacks, a party split was likely over how best to win the next big election—the mayoralty job in New York City. A winning party usually reaches the necessary

compromises to avoid a primary fight and subsequent post-primary bitterness in order to preserve its patronage position. But when it has been losing and the prospects for victory are none too bright, there is bound to be a fight over how to win.

The present Impellitteri administration is probably as inept an administration as any going back to the days of another Democrat—Jimmy Walker. But it is more than Impellitteri's incompetence which is involved. There was the financial crisis of the city, gangsterism on the waterfront and the levying of new taxes and costs on those least able to pay. Schools, housing, the rent increase and the subway fare rise have all hit hardest at the workers and the low-income groups. And to top it all, there was Impellitteri's surrender before the reactionary Dewey legislative program for the city.

ENTER WAGNER

Three years ago Vincent Impellitteri bucked the city Democratic machine and ran an "independent" campaign, winning against the Democratic-Liberal candidate Judge Pecora and the Republican Edward Corsi, with the Republicans knifing their own candidate. But three years later in the usually accurate New York Daily News poll, Impellitteri could muster only a little over 10 per cent. This immediately raised doubts about his ability to win, and the Democrats began looking around for a winner.

When the time came for the Democratic nomination, the "independent" of three years ago, Impellitteri was busy buttering up the Democratic bosses in an attempt to "buy" the designation. Whatever appointments were available were thrown out to the machines, and lavish promises made of future jobs; no doubt the same job was promised to more than one person. There was also the implied threat that if refused the nomination, Impellitteri would run another "independent" campaign.

But the promises and threats failed to win over the two big bosses of the Democratic machine, Carmine DeSapio of Tammany Hall and Edward Flynn of the Bronx (the latter since deceased). The promises of a losing candidate do not look too promising. They looked around for their own man and came up with Robert Wagner Jr., son of the New Deal senator and presently borough president of Manhattan.

TAMMANY STRATEGY

To the Bronx-Tammany machine, there was the problem of how to avoid making the primary fight appear as the machine fight which it is. The gimmick decided upon was to make it seem to be a struggle between the liberal and conservative wings of the party—the New Dealers against the incipient Dixiecrats. For Wagner to run upon his record as Manhattan borough president would be a complete disaster for he is a Tammany politician who has built up a distinguished record of do-nothingism. There is nothing to set him apart from a hundred other products of Tammany Hall, except his name.

The purpose of this maneuver was to attempt to win back to the crumbling and corrupt Democratic machine the hundreds of thousands of votes that will go to the Liberal Party's candidate, Rudolph Halley. If those who are disillusioned with the Democratic Party could be led to believe that there is a big struggle going on for the resurrection and rehabilitation of the party by the forces of liberalism and democratic government, then the strength of the Liberal

Party would be undermined. This was one of the main purposes of the primary fight from the angle of the Wagner camp.

A glance at those behind this maneuver shows that this was a fraud. It is argued by the Wagner group that the Democratic Party has fallen into disrepute in the city and the state because of the conservative leadership which is in cahoots with the Dewey machine in Albany and because of the county machines which have grown callous to the needs of the people, working with the gangsters who wield much influence in city politics. Wagner, it was claimed, will mean a break with this disastrous policy and bring about a rebirth of the party.

FRONT MAN

Then there is the problem of the 1954 state and congressional elections. A new Wagner leadership will stand a better chance of winning, especially if the Lib-

Durkin Slinks Out — —

(Continued from page 1)

which caused the resignation. But no one could be blamed for not quite noticing the "truce"; it was one of the most futile, trivial and ephemeral tactical maneuvers ever concocted by the labor movement.

For Eisenhower, what Taft had called the "incredible" appointment of Durkin, a Stevenson Democrat in 1952, was an attempt to purchase at bargain rates the neutrality or support of sections of the labor movement for his new administration. Having succeeded in the astonishing coup of snaring a labor official into his cabinet, he soon forgot why he had done it and proceeded to carry out a policy in complete disregard of the wishes of labor's officialdom.

"LESSER EVIL" LINE

Labor leaders, at first, were quite willing to go part way with Eisenhower, if only he made it tolerable for them. While Durkin apparently accepted the secretary of labor job on his own responsibility, his entry into the post was a practical application of labor's actual policy.

At its convention immediately after the '52 elections, the CIO expressed readiness to support Eisenhower when he was "right"; it saw the main enemy in the Taftite-Dixiecrat bloc in Congress and drew a sharp distinction between this bloc and the Eisenhower administration. It would wait and see. If Eisenhower fought the reactionary bloc, said the CIO, it would be on his side.

George Meany, newly elected president of the AFL, held out the olive branch; the AFL, he said, had never been committed to the support of any political party; it would continue, as in the past, to follow a non-partisan line. It intended to be constructive, he emphasized, not "opponentist."

It might seem strange that a labor officialdom could issue a call to arms

against Eisenhower the day before election and predict dire disaster if he were elected, only to fall in line with him the day after. So strange that it almost went unnoticed. But it should not be too startling. Union leaders were simply toying with the same policy of "lesser evil" that has guided them through twenty years of Democratic Party rule.

What this really says is that the Democratic Party cannot be reformed or rebuilt for there is no alternative leadership. The gangster-influenced patronage machine of Tammany Hall and the Bronx is presented as the vehicle of liberalism in the Democratic Party. If it is granted that this is the "liberal" wing of the party, then it stands for all to see in broad daylight that the Liberal Party is the only alternative.

The record of Wagner in office has been a combination of do-nothing and subservience to Tammany. He has only discovered his difference with the Impellitteri administration in the last few months, just as he has only "found out" about the scandalous waterfront situation in the last couple of weeks. He has served as an organizer of the annual Joseph Ryan Association dinners and never said a word about the waterfront until Ryan came out for Impellitteri. Wagner never uttered a peep about the known corruption and criminal elements in Tammany until some of the leaders refused to support him.

WAGNER'S RECORD

The record of Wagner in office has been a combination of do-nothing and subservience to Tammany. He has only discovered his difference with the Impellitteri administration in the last few months, just as he has only "found out" about the scandalous waterfront situation in the last couple of weeks. He has served as an organizer of the annual Joseph Ryan Association dinners and never said a word about the waterfront until Ryan came out for Impellitteri. Wagner never uttered a peep about the known corruption and criminal elements in Tammany until some of the leaders refused to support him.

Durkin Slinks Out — —

little as Eisenhower understood why he was appointed. Durkin was careful to shield the president from criticism, as though he remained the underling he was. He told reporters that the Eisenhower staff, not the great man himself, had promised action on the Taft law. (Meany tells a different story.) A few weeks before, the acting president of his own union had criticized the administration. Durkin repudiated him. "And now?" reporters asked after the resignation had taken effect. There will be no such criticisms, was the reply. (In the days of the Roosevelt administration, the president was sacrosanct; all injustice emanated from the scheming aides who surrounded him. This habit of thought lingers on.)

WHY IT DIDN'T WORK

It was proper, according to this line, to support a Democratic Party and Democratic administrations which moved constantly toward the right in order to stall off a Republican victory which would move faster toward the right. Then why not support one wing of the Republican Party which was moving faster . . . against another wing which wanted to go even faster . . . against labor? It was ludicrous, but logical.

But the boundary between "anti-labor" and "more anti-labor" was drawn so faintly that it was lost. Eisenhower was unable to make even those feeble empty gestures that labor leaders magnify into mighty significance. With the Democrats in power, one could walk the streets and corridors of Washington with the feeling that one belonged. Even if the labor movement got nothing, at least such decisions were arrived at only after intimate man-to-man consultation with labor's highest officials. But poor Durkin never felt at home. The nine millionaire cabinet members liked him but could never forget that he was only a plumber on leave. He got the impression that conversation ceased and then became awkward when he entered the room.

THE HABIT LINGERS

Matters went from bad to worse. Eisenhower ignored labor. Durkin had to attend the AFL convention on September 21. He went to Eisenhower requesting that his campaign promise to amend the Taft-Hartley Law be implemented. "Of course," answered the president, and his staff, together with Durkin, worked out a series of amendments. Eisenhower was just about to send the recommendations to Congress as an official message, when in stepped Vice-President Nixon and the Republican leaders. "No," they said, and no it was. Durkin resigned.

He understands why he resigned as

Mayor Impellitteri is perfectly correct in saying that Wagner has no right to criticize his administration, because he has served as a member of the City Council and up until the last couple of months has been a supporter of the administration.

In Brooklyn the "liberal" Wagner slate nominated for borough president a Democrat, William Troy, who was subsequently discovered to be a vocal supporter of Senator Joe McCarthy. The ADA protested his inclusion on the "liberal" slate inside the Democratic Party, but never announced it to the press. Troy was not dropped from the Wagner slate like a hot potato, but merely switched places on the ticket to run as a judge.

SAME OLD DEMS

The real reason for the fight was given by City Controller Lazarus Joseph of the Bronx machine, who usually voted with Impellitteri on the City Council. In announcing his support of Wagner, he argued: "I am convinced that Mayor Impellitteri cannot win the general election. I am convinced that Bob Wagner, if nominated for mayor, can and will undoubtedly win the general election in November." No New-Dealer versus Dixiecrat (as Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. puts it; no liberalizing the Democratic Party; just a winner.

There have been many liberals and labor officials who have backed Wagner, thereby giving something of the air of a fight for liberalism to the primary. But it in no sense changes the fact that their alliance is with the very elements who have repelled the most militant liberals. This primary fight is certainly a clear example of the fact that the Democratic Party cannot be reformed and that a new party is needed to carry out a program of social reform.

END OF A TACTIC

But the authoritative labor leaders are aware that something has changed. The UAW International Executive Board concludes that "there is no place in the big-business-dominated Washington scene today for the voice of the working man and the policies of organized labor." And it now lumps together the "Republican Eighty-Third Congress and the administration in Washington," between which it had drawn so fine a distinction before. They now abandon their maneuver with Eisenhower which failed in so simple a fashion. They return to their maneuver with the Democratic Party, which also failed, only in more complicated a manner.

GET ACQUAINTED
with
Independent
Socialism

For further information and literature, write to the Independent Socialist League, 114 West 14 St., N. Y. 11, N. Y.

Subscribe to
LABOR ACTION
Only \$2 a year.

LONDON LETTER

Trade Union Congress Highlights the Latent Conflict Between

The Two Right Wings of British Labor

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Sept. 9—At time of writing, the Trade Union Conference at Douglas has just jumped over one of the big hurdles placed before it. The right-wing elements in the General Council of the Trade Union Congress have secured a majority (of one million in the weighted ballot) for their Interim Report on Public Ownership, the document which was described by the *Daily Telegraph* as "the tombstone of socialism."

Apparently Bryn Roberts of the National Union of Public Employees—who moved rejection of the General Council's report—has sharply outlined the conflict that clearly exists between the Labor Party's document *Challenge to Britain* and the TUC's document.

There can be little doubt that the Labor Party Conference at Margate will now be faced with a first-class crisis—a rift between the right-wing trade union leaders and the right-wing Labor Party leadership. The question which thrusts itself to the fore now is this: Will the hidden and concealed conflict between these right-wing leaderships, one of the trade unions and the other of the party, be brought out into the open? Also: Is the right-wing Labor Party leadership sufficiently strong and sure of itself to be able at one and the same time to clamp down both on its trade-union counterparts and its Bevanite opponents on the left?

The withdrawal of Mrs. Irene White from the contest for her place on the National Executive Committee of the party as representative of the Women's Section, which took place over the weekend, has thus an additional interest. The statement she issued throws some light on the conflict, which has hitherto been kept behind the scene at Transport House, between the leaderships of the two wings of the Labor movement.

MRS. WHITE'S CHARGE

The most important sections of her statement are quoted below:

"I have good reason to think the leaders of some of the bigger unions have decided that a person of my moderate views is not acceptable to them on the Executive.

"Last year Mr. Arthur Deakin, general secretary of the Transport and General Workers Union, cast his union's 800,000 votes against me. I understand that it was because I had tried to act as a peacemaker between the two factions [the Attlee and Bevan factions—A. V.] . . . Mr. Deakin and those who act like him are as guilty as the left wing of trying to form a partisan group within the party."

Deakin himself had only this to say: "I care neither what Mrs. White says nor what she does."

But Mrs. White has found a powerful supporter in her dramatic attempt to stand against the ruthless bureaucratic efforts to crush all left-wing or even moderate opinion within both the trade unions and the Labor Party. Emanuel Shinwell—whose activities and oscillations from right to left have been spotlighted in this London Letter from time to time—has come out firmly on her side. He said:

"Mrs. White has hit the nail on the head. If you support the right wing you incur the hostility of the Bevanites. If you happen to say anything which indicates left-wing views, you arouse the anger of the extreme right wing, and if you just happen to be a plain socialist, sticking to socialist principles, you are regarded as neutral and get the worst of both worlds.

"It is time the leadership of the Labor Party put an end to this sort of nonsense."

STRANGE SUPPORT

It may astonish the reader to note the attitude of the staid and steady sections of capitalist opinion to this fight in the Labor movement. The *News Chronicle*, for instance, a paper of right-wing Liberal views, in an editorial headed "Cour-

age" comes out in support of Mrs. Irene White. It states: "It takes courage these days for a Labor politician to spurn the right and the left wing of the party simultaneously." This, in an approving context.

We can be sure that the solicitude of the *News Chronicle* for the health and unity of the Labor movement is not altogether sincere. What the *News Chronicle* realizes is this: that the right-wing trade-union bureaucrats, by their impossible methods and brutal political behavior, are exposing the Labor and trade-union bureaucracy for what it really is, to the rank and file of the movement. "Give concessions!" "Use velvet gloves!" "Use sweet words!" "String out the old platitudes!" "But don't give the game away by telling delegates that we (the bureaucrats) hold the purse strings, or shut your gob" (Sir William Lawther).

PAGING ATTLEE

What is happening now can be briefly summed up in the idea presently in circulation in "respectable" Liberal and Labor circles that it would be a good thing if Clement Attlee "asserted himself" as the leader of the movement. Even if Attlee has to make concessions and rebuke the Deakins and Lawthers, the moderates realize that this is better than having the whole conservative leadership of the Labor Party hopelessly compromised in front of the rank and file, a sitting target for the Bevanite "poisoned arrows." ("Poisoned arrows" is the anti-Bevanite description of any

socialist criticism of right-wing policies.")

It will be interesting to see how Attlee will react to the advice being whispered into his ear—at the Margate party conference at the end of this month.

FIASCO IN AFRICA

The scrapping of the "Overlords" by Churchill is a belated admission of the clumsiness of the top-heavy structure of his cabinet. However, it would be a great error to assume that the Tory party is in a "crisis." Although the Tory party is not exactly in a state of crisis—primarily because the right-wing trade-union bureaucrats have so ably assisted them to consolidate their national position—it would be equally wrong to take it for granted that all is well within their camp.

The Tories' over-all colonial policy in Africa has proved a complete fiasco, and there is no real evidence that the troubles in Kenya are likely to diminish. On the contrary, with the imposition of Central African Federation the unrest is likely to spread.

It is quite hypocritical for either the Tory or Labor Party right wing to look askance at the policy of *Apartheid* in South Africa, when a policy of colored discrimination at least as vicious, if less publicized, is carried on in the East African territories.

Moreover, the United Party of Strauss in South Africa (Malan's opposition), which is different only in the smallest degree from Malan's Nationalist Party, is held up as an example of a democrat and English party "as it should be."

And even on the left, Solly Sachs, the former general secretary of the Garment Workers Union in South Africa who is a member of the South African Labor Party, is held forth as for approval in trade-union meetings and conferences. His book *The Choice Before South Af-*

rica, which was favorably reviewed in all "advanced" circles, failed to bring into focus the fact that even in his own union there are separate organizations for white and black workers.

It is not surprising, therefore, that considerable confusion is prevalent in left circles about the meaning of the color bar, the role of the United Party and the South African Labor Party, and even the African National Congress. Rarely, if at all, is any reference made to the Non-European Unity Movement, which is, in fact, a more important organization than the ANC. Both the South African "liberals" and the Stalinists, for their own reasons, have artificially boosted the ANC.

Recent events in South Africa have severely shaken the ANC, particularly after its failure in the much-publicized passive-resistance campaign.

LABOR'S SORRY ROLE

However, despite and quite independently of the confusion and fog that surrounds the African question, the force which will, as in Asia, shake the foundations of British imperialism, the colonial revolution, will bring rapidly to the fore the only real solution to the problem of Africa—the withdrawal of troops from all British colonies and possessions.

It cannot be doubted that Tory prestige is very low in respect to its East African colonial policy. Although on the home front the reactionary class-collaboration policies of the Labor Party and trade-union leaderships have given the Tories a certain stability, the colonial revolution even in its early phases has induced a definite instability in the Tory Party leadership.

It need only be added that the sorry and pathetic role of the Labor opposition in respect to its colonial policy hardly upsets the Tory Front Bench. The Labor Party still has a great distance to travel, a long road to traverse, before it can itself side with the true aspirations of the African peoples.

Testimony to a Betrayal

Indicting the Failure of the U.S. in the East German Uprising

"How the West Betrayed the East German Revolt" is the sensational title of an article in the September 7 *New Leader*, by Norbert Muhlen. The editors' subtitle for the article reads:

"U. S. and West German officials went out of their way to give no aid to the workers' rebellion despite many appeals and opportunities."

In an editorial note, the editors note that "a great historical opportunity for peaceful liberation was *deliberately* lost," the italics being their own.

These are sensational statements for a magazine which admits few competitors in the fervent, if not frenetic, character of its support for U. S. foreign policy in the cold war. Muhlen himself, is a Catholic refugee from Nazism who often writes the grossest pro-war stuff for the *New Leader*. The accusations contained in the headings are therefore made with the greatest feelings of disappointment.

The title is a good deal more sensational than the article itself. Muhlen's generalizations are much stronger than the evidence he points to. It is perfectly true that the June Days gave the American authorities a case of the jitters and that they reacted by advising calm and order. LABOR ACTION, at the time, carried a good deal more evidence of this than will be found in Muhlen's piece.

His language is strong—"Not only did American and West German officials fail to aid the uprising, but in many ways they went out of their way to impede and hinder its progress"—but he does not himself understand the motives of the American policy he is lamenting.

WHO WAS INTERESTED?

Muhlen arrived in Frankfurt four days after the uprising broke out, while strikes were still going on in East German cities. The first point in his indictment is the "indifference" and lack of interest in the event which he found among the West German people. From his own account, it would appear that the "people" whom he found to be so uninterested were represented by the

Frankfurt radio announcer, diners and drinkers in "Frankfurt's restaurants and cafes," and the press. "The majority of West Germans, the *Unpolitischen*, considered the East German uprising a distant, foreign matter, if not an undesirable intrusion into their private rest, recovery and happiness—perhaps even bad for their business."

Now of course, it is doubtful whether the "majority" of West Germans have "businesses" to be worried about, eat in restaurants or cafes, or are unpolitical. Muhlen does not report on the reaction of the West German workers, which would have been interesting if he himself had had any interest in this part of the "people"; he is concerned with the middle-class types and petty-bourgeois and bourgeois elements he met. As such his report is interesting as reflecting the temper and reaction to the June Days of these social strata, who failed to get wildly enthusiastic about a proletarian uprising, much to Muhlen's disgust.

REUTER HOBbled

The one new piece of evidence he adduces is worthwhile:

"The policy of 'neutral non-intervention' [by the U. S. authorities] went so far as to keep Mayor Ernst Reuter [Social-Democratic mayor of West Berlin] out of Berlin during the hours of decision. When the uprisings began, he happened to be in Vienna at a mayors' meeting, where he could not find commercial plane space to fly him immediately to Berlin. He got to Munich and, in a telephone conversation with U. S. army authorities, requested a berth on a military plane to his city.

Mayor Reuter was informed that, 'unfortunately,' this could not be done. Did a few sergeants' wives returning from vacations hold priorities—or could it be that someone in the American command considered it a rather happy accident that Mayor Reuter did not chance to be in Berlin that critical day, where he could provide intelligent, aggressive leadership for freedom's uprising?"

The rest of his evidence has more or less been known before:

"Not a single American voice identified the United States with the rebels against Communism. In contrast to several years of presidential and congressional statements committing America to support and encourage all democratic movements for the liberation of the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain, American officials went out of their way to show their detachment at this first serious beginning of such a movement. (True, measured notes were sent—afterward—by American officials in protest against a few Soviet terror measures—and the protests, of course, were quietly filed away and ignored by the Russians.) . . .

" . . . in contrast to the Berlin city flags, the American flag on the Kommandatura of West Berlin was not lowered to half mast when the victims of Soviet terror were buried after June 17. To protesting West Berlin students, U. S. officials coolly explained that Americans, according to an old four-power agreement, could only lower their flag if the three other members of the Kommandatura—Soviet, British and French—approved. . . .

" . . . American authorities even rejected the suggestion of democratic West Berliners to deploy U. S. army soup-kitchens at strategic frontier points, to show their peaceful solidarity with the Easterners. . . .

"Most conspicuous, perhaps, was the attitude of RIAS [the American-controlled radio station in West Berlin] . . . RIAS

(Continued on page 7)

YOU and SCIENCE

New Frontiers in Biology Opening Up

By CARL DARTON

Socialists, quite properly, are primarily interested in the science of analyzing and improving society. From their viewpoint the individual is to a large degree the product of his environment. Thus a new society will nurture a new type of individual—there will be new goals, new aims, new standards and new accomplishments. We can begin the building of socialism with "human nature" the way it is, but over a period of time socialists envisage a change in "human nature" for the better—not a change due to inherited characteristics but an over-all improvement in individual behavior and relations.

In addition, socialists are also interested in the biological improvement of the human race. They want people to be healthier, better constituted, and to live longer as well as fuller lives. They are interested in those experiments which shed some light on just how these goals may be accomplished.

There have recently appeared two articles which are very interesting, telling of some investigations into the mysteries of cell renewal and the aging of living organisms. The first is "Experiments in Aging" by Albert I. Lansing, in the April *Scientific American*. The second is a brochure entitled *You May Live Forever* by the New York Times science writer William L. Laurence.

ROTIFER STUDY

The first article summarizes some studies made of the relationship between growth and aging, particularly those made by the author on a microscopic but rather complex animal, the rotifer. The rotifer reproduces sexually but the female's eggs are fertilized by sea water; thus only one parent transmits hereditary characteristics.

The life characteristics of one family of rotifers are as follows: the eggs hatch in one day, the young grow rapidly and begin to lay eggs on the fifth day, are fully grown on the sixth, remain vigorous adults until the fifteenth day, and die of old age on the twenty-fourth day.

In this family of rotifers a number of lines were developed with the successive mothers in a given line laying eggs at a selected age. The mean life span of the line of rotifers from senile mothers 17 days old declined from the average of 24 days to 18 in one generation, to 14 in the second, and produced non-viable eggs in the third generation. A line from 11-day-old mothers took four generations to die out. Six-day mothers showed a slow but steady decline through 17 generations but a line from 5-day-old mothers was maintained through 54 generations (tests then ceased). The last line showed a steady increase in life span from 24 days to 104 days in the last generation. It took longer for each successive generation to reach full growth and the average size increased.

REGENERATION

Perhaps a similar controlled experiment with human beings, if it were possible, would give similar results. In fact, insurance companies report that the children of younger parents have a greater life expectancy.

We know that the human life span is increasing not because of the fact de-

scribed above (assuming that it would be applicable to humans) but rather in spite of it. Improved medical science and living habits, particularly dietary habits, are probably more than offsetting the influences of middle-aged parenthood. It may well be that the economics of our existence in capitalist society, by delaying the marriage date, is cutting down the span of our existence.

The Laurence article deals with the newest discoveries concerning the regenerative processes of living cells. The author predicts that within the span of decades, or centuries at the most, scientists will discover the substance which enables tissue not only to replace and repair itself but to develop other types of tissue as well. Such a discovery would enable an individual to be completely regenerated out of the tissues of his original body.

NOT IMPOSSIBLE

"To duplicate the individual in his original image, all one would need would be just one cell of scar tissue, a microscopic bit taken from a slight wound that had just begun to heal. This phoenix seed would be planted in a phoenix bed, or phoenix garden, in which the 'soil' would be impregnated with the proper chemicals and otherwise provided with the tools needed by the master sculptor to fashion living beings out of the elemental clay of regenerative scar tissue."

The above description, though expressed in mystical and flowery terms, does not seem impossible of accomplishment as Laurence reviews some experiments. It has long been known that salamanders can regenerate lost limbs. A Dr. Hans Speman has demonstrated that in the early embryo of the salamander skin tissue transplanted to the brain developed into brain tissue. But when transplanted in later stages, the skin tissue developed only into skin tissue.

GENIUS BANK?

Later his pupil Professor Oscar E. Schotté succeeded in growing new heads into the tails of salamanders by transplanting bits of ordinary, unorganized connective tissue. Dr. Schotté concluded "that every cell in the body of an adult individual, amphibian as well as man, possesses potentially everything to produce any type of tissue or organ. The same essential principles are involved in the development of an entire embryo from a single germ cell and in the regenerative tissue of an adult."

Laurence proposes that we start a scar-tissue bank so that bits of outstanding personages may be kept alive until the secrets of regeneration are completely discovered.

There are many biologists who, with some justification, will scoff at Laurence's "scar-tissue bank." Also, sociologists, who realize that genius is of cultural as well as biological origin, will be skeptical of its value. However, we mention these two articles, sketchily reviewed, as examples of recent biological research which are of revolutionary implications for our biological future. Above all, they indicate that mankind cannot indefinitely postpone greater acceptance and an intelligent approach to "human biological experimentation." We write "greater acceptance" advisedly since birth control and even widespread use of powerful antibiotics in medicine can only be considered as experiments with human lives.

A CHALLENGE

Such developments offer an interesting challenge to socialist thought. The infamous Nazi medical experiments in human lives for "scientific purposes" showed how much research can be perverted in a reactionary society. In any event we can be assured that the scientific movement to improve biological composition and characteristics of human beings will, within a short historical period, become a political issue.

The opposition to birth control gives us an inkling of the organized social opposition which might arise to any establishment, if it were considered scientifically advisable, of a scar-tissue bank or of a controlled experiment to develop a line of offspring from younger parents. Undoubtedly, there is not, nor should there be, any rigid formula to handle such developments, but a socialist attitude should be objective and unhampered by tradition and superstition.

Reading from Left to Right

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH AND JIM-CROWISM

THE BEAM IN THE EYE OF PROTESTANTISM, by James Farmer.—*World Frontiers*, Summer 1953.

The field secretary of the SLID, writing in this federalist magazine, puts a spotlight on the slowness of the Protestant churches in even catching up with the Catholics regarding race-discriminatory practices within the church. He emphasizes the reaction of the Negro people, to Protestant policy.

"In recent years, the reaction of the Negro has been different from that of the white man. To a very few Negroes, the widespread practice of segregation in Protestant churches has been simply one of the many reasons why they have turned to communism. Many others have ceased to go to church, and become indifferent to religion. The most significant trend, however, is that increasingly the Negro has been turning to the Catholic Church."

This is Mr. Farmer's thesis, and he reviews some of the reasons why even good intentions among many Protestant circles have not been sufficient to effect any rapid change.

"Well-established religions are not often a powerful force for social change. Those teachings which run counter to existing beliefs are usually either blandly ignored, or 'interpreted' in such a way as to eliminate conflict. This situation is in-

tensified in the Protestant churches, where authority is generally highly decentralized. Many Protestant ministers are totally dependent for their continued tenure on their congregations. For a minister to risk his social and financial status (and that of his family) by speaking out boldly against the deep-seated prejudices of his flock requires a great deal of courage."

The greater centralization of the Catholic Church, and the consequent greater degree of independence which the Catholic priest enjoys with relation to his own parish and its immediate prejudices, have permitted the Catholics to build up a better record in many cases. Farmer mentions a number of examples, particularly in the South.

The article reviews the episodes in a number of attempts within Protestantism to make a drastic change in race relations within the church, including some courageous and spirited moves. Farmer sums up:

"While the Catholic Church is able to speak with a clearer conscience on its record within the church, it has been no more successful than Protestantism in combating race discrimination where it matters most—in the day-to-day secular world of living and making a living. Since ours is a predominantly Protestant country, however, the principal blame must be accepted by Protestantism."

Youth and Student Corner

REPORT ON THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-WAR CAMP

The second New England Anti-War Camp and School was held at Harvard, Mass., during the week of September 6-12. Some 40 young people, coming from as far west as California, and as far south as West Virginia, participated in its sessions during the week, with average attendance a little over 20 for all sessions.

The school was organized to present socialist and pacifist views on the struggles of the peoples of the world against war and for a better social order. Special emphasis was placed on the colonial struggles for freedom and the implications of the East German rebellion against Stalinism as being of fundamental importance in the world social scene.

The organizations which sponsored the camp and school were: Focal Point of Yale; Peace Section of the American Friends Service Committee, New England; Fellowship of Reconciliation; War Resisters League; Young Socialists; and Socialist Youth League.

Throughout a heavy schedule of classes and discussions, Cecil Hinshaw of the Fellowship of Reconciliation presented the principled pacifist position for the use of non-violent techniques as an alternative to war and a method of social change. Later in the week, a forum discussion was held, led by Hinshaw and Gordon Haskell for their respective views, on the pacifist view versus the Marxist criticism of pacifism.

George Houser spoke on the struggle for civil liberties, and gave an informative talk on the South African resistance movement which is opposing Malan's *Apartheid* decrees.

Lewis Coser spoke on the suppression of information in totalitarian countries as well as here in America as a danger to social change, and described some of the changes in socialist thinking about the problems confronting a socialist society that have been brought about by the experience of the Stalinist movement.

Victor Yates delivered a guest talk on a British view of the cold war. Yates

is a British Labor MP now touring the U. S. for the War Resisters League.

Gordon Haskell, assistant editor of *LABOR ACTION* spoke on the Russian Revolution, the nature of Stalinism, and the struggle against it.

The formal sessions of the school were followed by a series of round-table discussions in which the pacifist and socialist points of view got a chance to confront each other head on, so to speak. Most of the evenings were given over to informal discussions of the topics which had been presented during the rest of the day. An unexpected event, and the one which perhaps provoked the liveliest discussion at the school, was a presentation of the materialist approach to ethics ("The Relations of Means and Ends") by Hal Draper, editor of *LABOR ACTION*, who dropped in at the school on Friday.

Although the school was a most stimulating and educational experience for all who participated, it was clear that the overwhelming majority of the participants were young socialists, and that the pacifist organizations which co-sponsored it had failed to get their members to participate in adequate numbers. An evaluations session held on the last day led to the conclusion that if a similar school is to be planned for next year, either a stronger effort on the part of these organizations to support the school through attendance will have to be assured, or the lectures should be planned to clarify and develop specifically socialist ideas rather than as a dialogue between pacifists and socialists.

The heavy schedule of discussion was interlarded with plenty of fun in the form of hotly contested volleyball and baseball games, as well as swimming. The Friendly Crossways farm at which it was held provided excellent meals and a general atmosphere which was conducive both to serious thinking and pleasant relaxation. The place, the occasion, and the lively intellectual interest of the participants made this summer school a memorable event in the year for all who attended.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.
- I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY..... ZONE..... STATE.....

SCHOOL IF ANY



LABOR ACTION

September 21, 1953

Vol 17, No. 38

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

WORLD POLITICS

A Line on Foreign Policy for Israel

One of the few voices of sane anti-chauvinist opinion in Israel, on the question of the relations between the Jewish and Arab peoples inside the country and the relations between Israel and the surrounding Arab states, is Ner, the organ published by the Ichud group which was founded by Judah Magnes. Below we publish two excerpts from its July issue.

In the first, Ner, taking off from the reaction of the Israeli press to a recent maneuver by Churchill which was designed to use Israel as a stick to beat the Egyptians over the head, emphasizes a fundamental proposition. This is that Israel must realize its community of interest with the peoples of the Near East, and not allow itself to be used as a pawn of the imperialism which is hated by all these peoples. Ner writes:

Beware of Britain!

After Churchill's famous May speech in the British Parliament in regard to Anglo-Egyptian relations, our newspapers "rubbed their hands with glee" about the good things he said about Israel. It is obvious that the Briton had a diplomatic ax to grind in praising Israel and giving Egypt a "diplomatic kick." What is not clear is how many could have seen in such crude and crooked diplomacy something to hail as "vision."

There can be little doubt that these pro-Israeli sentiments—whose source is hatred of Haman, not love of Mordecai—serve the interests of England, which needs them at the present time during the negotiations over the evacuation of the Suez Canal. However, from the point of view of our interests—from a long-term point of view and not from the angle of momentary advantage—they do us a great deal of damage.

Some say: the friendship of Great Britain is important to us. But we well remember still how we were sacrificed by them when their interests demanded it. Only a few weeks ago, the British refused to answer an Israeli request to participate in the Suez talks because they then favored Egyptian interests over Israel's interests. Without a doubt, they will do the same again tomorrow, despite the bouquets to Israel which we have received from them; for these sentiments are false and are only a diplomatic tactic.

On the other hand, these bouquets—especially when they are received joyfully and even rapturously—arouse public opinion in the Arab countries against us, and in accentuated form. They are used as additional evidence for the old, old argument that Zionism and Israel are tools of British imperialism to perpetuate its rule in the area. It was not accidental that the Arab press of various countries headlined the speech, "Churchill Praises Israel," and then served their usual concoctions up for their readers.

WARNING

The papers of Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Iraq stressed the point that once again the "cat was out of the bag" and revealed the tie between Zionism and imperialism which was aimed against the peoples of the Near East. The positive reactions of our press only strengthened the idea that Israel was more than a "passive partner" in the affair.

Strange indeed is the official opinion in Israel on this question. On the one hand, the government of Israel publicly declares its desire to sign a peace with Naguib, and on the other hand Israel prides itself on being used as a stick

with which to beat Egypt. Won't the Egyptians be justified in doubting our professed desires for peace?

It is worthwhile remembering a fundamental proposition that should serve as the basis of our politics. In the political struggles that are taking place in the Near East we must not follow the interests of the imperialists even if it is to our interest at a particular time. These interests change and do not pay off in the long run. We must try to align our interests with the true and permanent interests of the peoples of our area. They remain here—no matter what happens.

It would be foolish on our part to look with glee on the struggle between Egypt and the English—with the possible exception of using the occasion to open the door to peace negotiations with Egypt and the other Arab countries, to a much greater extent than merely trying in Washington and London to get the British and Americans to force the Arabs into a peace with Israel.

If we were to make this policy, which is both realistic and morally right, our basic policy, the old fox Winston Churchill would not even attempt to use us as a pawn in the game of British interests against the real interests of Israel. We repeat what we said in May. The policies of Israel are like those of the small merchant who is greedy for profits in pennies and thereby loses profits in dollars.

In the second excerpt following, Ner discusses the responsibility of the Israeli government for the "trouble" with the Israeli Arabs, and explains why it is the former which bears the guilt for any sentiments of "disloyalty" which arise among the Israeli Arabs:

'Disloyal' Arabs

After the latest incidents along the Israeli-Transjordanian frontier and the clashes in Galilee, there appeared a number of news reports asserting that the latest investigations prove the correctness of the hypothesis that certain villages of the minority people in Israel [the Arabs] are bases of operation and hiding-out places for the bands that are sheltered by the local populations. In the investigations among the minority nationality resident in the vicinity of the incidents, the security forces often run into the replies "We know nothing . . . we are not interested." Such an attitude can be explained only as a lack of will and lack of readiness to help the government maintain order.

We do not at this moment want to debate the truth or falsity of the hypothesis that a portion of the population secretly support the incidents. We do want to point out that even if it is partly or wholly true, it should come as no surprise. It is a natural and logical result of the policy of the government in relation to the Arab minority—a policy that has been in operation for five years, since the establishment of the state of Israel.

Many times we pointed out the dangers of such a policy which did everything to arouse feelings of resentment and hatred among the minority. We have dined into the Arabs' ears, morning, noon and night, that they represent a fifth column and that we do not trust them. Some of them have finally decided to believe the propaganda, and have concluded that in a country that does not attempt to give them a feeling of belonging, there is no reason to be loyal.

Let's not blame the minority . . . we are guilty. We reap what we sow. Unfortunately, innocent people pay with their lives for this wrong policy, a policy which is a responsibility of the "experts" and officials in charge of Arab relations in Israel.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

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

Send for our free book list.

'Psychological Warfare': The Dud Is Dumped

By PHILIP COBEN

The Eisenhower administration has just dumped its "psychological-warfare" setup and the Psychological Strategy Board that was supposed to operate it. Its motives for doing so contain a half-portion of wisdom, seen as through a glass darkly, and a half-portion of political bankruptcy.

The government has come to the conclusion that "psychological warfare" is no separate activity. Here is the portion of wisdom, as given in a White House press statement recently, reporting on the conclusions reached by the president's Committee on International Information Activities.

The "technique" for presenting "American ideas" should be a "total effort," the responsibility of the whole government in all its policies. The Psychological Strategy Board was set up in 1951, the committee felt, "upon the misconception that 'psychological activities' and 'psychological strategy' somehow exist apart from official policies and actions and can be dealt with independently by experts in this field." But "In reality," it continued, "there is a 'psychological' aspect or implication to every diplomatic, economic, or military policy and action."

To continue this bit of insight further, we should add that inevitably the primary "psychological warfare" is the government's foreign policy, and even its domestic policy too insofar as the latter has an impact abroad.

The U. S. has been engaging in "psychological warfare" every time it has had to adopt a policy in the cold war or in the UN. Most often, this "psychological warfare" has consisted of shooting itself in the toes—as when it blocked a discussion of the Moroccan question in the UN, or whipped the UN into line with a blunderbuss on the issue of India's presence at the Korean conference. But "psychological warfare" it was.

THE POLITICAL VACUUM

The term "psychological warfare" is a misnomer, of course. It is political warfare that is involved: the task of countering the political and social appeal of Stalinism to the peoples of the world.

But here was the inextricable difficulty. The U. S. has no political appeal to make to the peoples of any positive sort, with which to match the Stalinist dynamic. It can only proclaim generalities about democracy and freedom, while supporting the imperialist colonial-oppressors; its main political strength consists in pointing to the crimes of the Stalinists (who, of course, can point right back), but this negative counter-punching cannot be turned into anything positive.

The political war against Stalinism can only be won with a consistently democratic foreign policy, not with the imperialist policy and reliance on military might which makes up the contest of Washington's strategy.

Given such a dynamic foreign policy, a "Psychological Strategy Board" could have something to work on; without it, it could only try to think up "schemes" and "gimmicks" like a TV producer try-

ing to make something out of nothing. It had to work in a vacuum. Its abandonment by the administration is no loss to them.

But by abandoning it, the government admits the vacuum.

Last January, the psychological-warfare chief of the army, General McClure, described in a magazine interview the operations of his department in Korea (see LA, Jan. 12). The "psychological warfare" which he described consisted largely of putting loudspeakers on the front to blare out to the enemy soldiers: "Come out or we'll blow you to bits." That's a bit of an exaggeration for the sake of conciseness, but not very much.

McClure described to the interviewer all the details of his squads' leaflet-drops: the physical size of the leaflet, how many are scattered, the kind of bomb used for the drop, and many other very vital facts—except one: what the leaflets said. He didn't think of mentioning this detail, and the interviewer apparently wasn't any more interested. With such "psychological warfare," they expect to counter the demagogic appeal which the Stalinist regime of North Korea has for the Korean people when they promise land to the peasants and an end to the butcher-regime of Syngman Rhee.

GOOD RIDDANCE

The Psychological Strategy Board was created in 1951 in the wake of the realization, which began dawning on some of the more advanced intellectuals in Washington and among the intelligentsia, that Stalinism had made great inroads, and enjoyed important bastions of strength, in both Asia and Europe not because of its arms but because of the political ideas which it put forward. It became quite a fad for pundits of the press columns to cry that "America has got to meet this 'new' weapon. Something had to be done."

The concept of political warfare for the minds of the peoples of the world, which is nothing new at all, was "Americanized"—that is, translated into terms that could be understood by the limited bourgeois minds of these "leaders of the free world." Heavy thinkers made it easy for them by pointing out that there was no reason why America should be behind hand in world huckstering when everybody knows that this country has more advertising know-how than any sixteen Russian republics. It was envisioned as a matter of technique. The "product" didn't matter—a good salesman can sell a snowball to an Eskimo.

Thus the "answer" to the Stalinist appeal became "psychological" warfare. Everything was figured out except the politics involved. Hence the whole thing has been a farce from the start, and the Eisenhower administration is now saying "Good riddance."

The standard biography

KARL MARX

by

Franz Mehring

\$3.50

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, New York City

READ ABOUT SOCIALISM

The Fight for Socialism cloth \$2 paper \$1
by Max Shachtman

Socialism: the Hope of Humanity10
by Max Shachtman

Marxism in the U. S.35
by Leon Trotsky

Plenty for All: The Meaning of Socialism25
by Ernest Erber

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism10
(LA Special Issue)

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

A Marxist Classic

Rosa Luxemburg's

The Accumulation of Capital

Yale Univ. Press \$5

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books (publication date September 30):

The Theory of the Leisure Class, by Thorstein Veblen; introduction by C. Wright Mill; Mentor, 264 pp., 35¢. The Consumers Guide to Better Buying, by Sidney Margolius, Signet, 244 pp., 35¢. The Brigand, by Giuseppe Berto, Signet, 168 pp., 25¢. Naked to Mine Enemies, by Susan Yorke, Signet, 160 pp., 25¢. Ranger Man, by William Colt MacDonald, Signet, 160 pp., 25¢. Riddle Me This, by Mike Roscoe, Signet, 144 pp., 25¢. Heaven Pays No Dividends, by Richard Kaufmann, Signet Giant, 312 pp., 35¢.

SPOTLIGHT ON KHRUSHCHEV

The Bureaucracy Grants Concessions but Shakes the Iron Fist

By A. STEIN

There can no longer be the slightest doubt that the new regime in the Kremlin has embarked on a course of economic concessions to placate the masses—with special attention being given the grievous burdens of the collective-farm peasantry. This turn, which had already begun while Stalin was still alive, was heavily underscored at the recent session of the Supreme Soviet between August 5 and 8 in Moscow.

In his presentation of the state budget for the current year, Finance Minister Zverev outlined a sweeping series of fiscal measures designed to cut in half the taxes levied on the private plots of the collective farmers. This policy was further amplified at great length by Malenkov, who made a surprise appearance at the closing session of the Supreme Soviet on August 8. We shall deal with the meaning and implications of this new turn in policy in coming issues of LABOR ACTION.

What interests us now is why the Kremlin has entrusted the implementation of this policy to Nikita Khrushchev. We learn from the latest Moscow dispatches that Khrushchev was formally confirmed in his post as first secretary of the Stalinist party at a plenary session of the Central Committee just held in Moscow. On this same occasion, Khrushchev delivered a lengthy and much publicized programmatic speech on the government's new agrarian policy.

Khrushchev's Record

We are presented here with a contradictory phenomena that is puzzling the poor "Russian experts" in the Western press. On the one hand, the Kremlin is reversing the general policy that was followed in the post-war period of squeezing the peasant to the bone. On the other hand, the execution of this "soft" policy has been handed over to one of the most ruthless and "hard" bureaucrats who ever climbed to power over other people's corpses in the Stalinist apparatus.

Khrushchev became famous as the secretary-general of the Ukrainian Party in the mid-thirties. Along with other members of the Stalinist terror machine, he carried out endless purges designed to wipe out the last vestige of "Ukrainian nationalism" and democracy in the party.

After the war, he was in charge of combating the Ukrainian underground movement. Together with the NKVD general, Ryassny, he conducted a political and military campaign against the Ukrainian national movement and its organized military formation, the UPA, in the new Western Ukrainian territory. Despite promises of amnesty and special treatment, he failed to win over any important segments of the Ukrainian underground, and under Moscow's orders moved to a war of "pacification" that lasted until 1947-48.

As a reward for his services, he was called to Moscow by Stalin in 1949 and appointed party secretary of the Moscow area. But most important of all, he was the man Stalin chose to carry out the infamous policy of amalgamating the collective farms into gigantic "agro-gorods" or agricultural towns.

The Iron Fist

Khrushchev began the drive to merge the collective farms in his own Moscow area. And in a report delivered on June 24, 1950, he boasted that since the beginning of that same year he had reduced the number of collective farms in the Moscow oblast from 6,069 to 1,668!

One can well imagine the kind of methods that were used to tear the peasants from their accustomed surroundings. They must have rivaled those that were used to force the peasantry into the collectives in the early thirties.

Khrushchev's original successes did not continue. There was tremendous, though passive, resistance from the peasantry everywhere. What is even worse, the regime lacked the material means to create these ill-conceived administrative monstrosities. It tore the peasant from his old home, but could not even provide him with a new one!

By the middle of 1951 the regime was so alarmed by the disastrous consequences of its program that it dropped the whole question like a hot chestnut. All propaganda about the glorious conquests on this new

front ceased abruptly, and Khrushchev's name receded into the background.

It is Khrushchev's past record, his ruthless rule as party boss in the Ukraine, and the fact that his name is synonymous with the campaign to create the "agro-gorods," that makes the whole matter seem puzzling. Khrushchev now voices concern about the private plots of land of the collective farmer. But every collective farmer is aware that it was Khrushchev who voiced the opinion that the peasant really did not need so large a personal homestead, and that in the near future he would be deprived of this meager patch of ground altogether. The whole country knows the bloody and violent past of this typical product of the Stalinist apparatus, and knows that this is one leopard that will never change his spots.

Behind the 'Liberalism'

Why, therefore, was he assigned to make a major speech on agricultural reform on the occasion of his being formally named first secretary of the party's Central Committee? As first secretary, he runs the apparatus, and the party apparatus runs the country. The conjunction of these two events means quite simply that he is going to have a major voice in executing this "soft" policy. Since the regime knows that such a choice will only provoke the disbelief of the peasant, why didn't it choose a comparatively obscure and new personality to initiate the turn in line, someone toward whom the peasant might adopt a wait-and-see policy on the slender chance that the regime really had experienced a genuine change of heart?

The answer is not so difficult. Stalin also had his brief spells of "liberalism" during which he allowed a wracked and ruined peasantry momentarily to recover from the intolerable burdens imposed by his regime.

By 1932, for example, the violence of the collectivization and the forced requisitioning by the state of what little grain the peasant had, brought agriculture to a complete standstill. The peasant simply refused to go into the fields to work, and not only the peasant but the entire country was threatened with starvation. Stalin had to yield and granted the peasantry certain concessions which have their parallel with what the present regime is offering the peasantry. Stalin ended the system of forced barter, a polite term for direct expropriation of the peasant's grain, and permitted the opening of free markets so that the exchange of goods between town and country might be restored. He also granted the peasant the right to own a small amount of personal livestock. In 1935 this right was extended, and the peasant was also given the right to use a small plot from the collective farm for his "private use."

Crumbs and Crackdowns

But during all these turns from a "hard" to "soft" policy and back to a "hard" policy, Stalin maintained complete control of the apparatus.

The cycle that began in the post-war period, first forcing the peasant to give up his livestock to the collective farm, then attempting to drive him into the large "agro-gorods" and simultaneously cutting down the size of his private plot, is now entering the latest "liberal" phase. Of course, the struggle between the regime and the peasant does not have the same fundamental life-and-death content it had in the early thirties; nevertheless, it has the same essential characteristics. Now, as then, the Stalinist regime strains to extract as much as it can from the peasant, to reduce him to complete servitude, and then is compelled by objective circumstances beyond its control to retreat temporarily.

Through Khrushchev, the hard Stalinist core of the bureaucracy is making its will manifest. By having him deliver a major speech on the (temporary) need for agricultural concessions at the very moment when he assumes formal command of the party apparatus, it is informing the entire apparatus throughout the country and the peasantry as well that it has no intention of relinquishing control of the situation. The regime will make economic concessions, but only on its own terms and for its own purposes. There is to be no thought of a dialogue between the peasant and the bureaucracy, no thought of democratic expression from below.

To put the matter concisely, the economic concessions are to be accompanied by a "tightening-up" of the political apparatus. This is the meaning of the importance given Khrushchev's speech on the "right turn" in agriculture at precisely the moment when he formally becomes first secretary of the Stalinist state party.

New Issue of 'Anvil' Probes Stalinism

A new issue of *Anvil and Student Partisan*, the student anti-war quarterly, is out, with the entire number devoted to studies on "Stalinism: Retrospect and Prospect."

After a short editorial introduction, in which the editors explain the importance of the subject, the symposium leads off with an article by Philip Zimmerman on "Hannah Arendt vs. East Berlin." Here the much-praised book *The Origins of Totalitarianism* is criticized by setting its ideas against the events of the East German workers' uprising. Zimmerman attacks Hannah Arendt's view that modern totalitarianism has outmoded conceptions like class, ruling class, rational political goals and party, as used by Marxists and others in analyzing society.

Gerald Nickerson contributes a sketch of the rise of Stalinism under the title "From Romanov to Malenkov." It is not an historical chronology that he writes but an attempt to trace the social forces which first produced the Bolshevik revolution and then led to the overthrow of the revolutionary regime and party by the Stalinist counter-revolution.

"Intelligence in Captivity" by Irving Howe is a discussion of the recent book by Czeslaw Milosz, *The Captive Mind*. Milosz, a Polish poet who broke with the Polish Stalinist regime in 1951, attempted to analyze the attractive power of Stalinism on the minds of intellectuals.

"Russian Leaders and the Hero Cult" analyzes the theoretical rationale of the Stalinist ideologists for the cult which led to the Byzantine worship of Stalin. In a final section, the author, Robert C. Herzog, also comes to the conclusion that "though the cult-of-heroes has been modified in the post-Stalin era, its essential ideological framework remains."

Jack Stuart surveys "Science Under Totalitarianism," raising the question of the extent to which the terror regime has depressed the level of Russian scientific achievement. He covers mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, genetics.

Michael Harrington criticizes Isaac Deutscher's *Russia, What Next?* in a review which challenges Deutscher's perspective of a democratization-from-above which will transform the Stalinist regime.

"A Student Reading List" on Stalinism rounds off the issue, with bibliographical suggestions and notes on various aspects of the subject.

A brilliant study of the labor movement, Now out of print—

"THE UAW AND WALTER REUTHER"

by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick

\$3.00

A Random House Book

Order from

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Imperialist Arbiter — —

(Continued from page 1)

ment for fear that it would be rejected and bring about their fall.

Last week, however, the victory of Adenauer at the polls made further French evasion of the issue much more difficult. The primary European champion of the EDC had won the election with unexpected strength. Although the German Supreme Court still must decide constitutional issues involved, it is probable that it will bow to the mandate of the voters and approve the remilitarization of Germany. But unless France can be brought to ratify the EDC treaties, it will become clear that American policy in Europe has failed once more.

There is more than one reason for France's reluctance to see the beginnings of German rearmament. The French know that whatever the initial commitments may be, an eventual revival of Germany's armament industry will be unavoidable if once the creation of a German army is accepted "in principle." This will bring with itself a further increase in the industrial build-up of Germany, which has already expanded faster than any other industry in post-war Europe due to American financial aid, and above all, to the fact that up till now it has been free of the armament burden carried by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization powers.

There is another circumstance which has put a heavy strain on the economy of France. That has been the long and hopeless struggle in Indo-China, which has taken a fourth of the country's armament expenditures, and has drained it of the officer corps so necessary for the creation of a powerful military organization.

DOLLARS TO THE RESCUE

The recent government crisis in France showed that the Indo-Chinese war has sapped her vitality to a point at which large sections of the French people want to give up the struggle. For the first time, a candidate for the premiership (Mendès-France) openly stood on a platform of giving up the war there, and received strong support in the Chamber of Deputies.

Resistance to the continuation of French rule in Indo-China has become so strong among anti-Stalinist political leaders there that the French government has been compelled to call a conference for the purpose of quieting them by promising or even actually instituting "reforms." If these amount to anything at all, they will have to constitute a further loosening of France's grip on the political and economic life of that rich country.

At this point, however, the United States enters the picture. As imperial overlord of what is called the "free world," its interests are involved, both in Europe and in the Far East. The "American victory" in the German elections will come to nothing if France cannot be brought into line on the European army plan. Its policy of containing Stalinism in Asia will be endangered if France's rule should actually be withdrawn from Indo-China, for the United States has no force among the masses of that country to oppose to the Stalinists.

The American government has now hit upon a plan which is designed to kill two birds with one stone, or more accurately, with \$785,000,000. As is supposed to be the case with all great plans, this is an extremely simple one. It is simple enough, in fact, to get the approval of John Foster Dulles. The idea is that the United States will take the whole financial burden of the war in Indo-China off France's shoulders. This will relieve France to the point where she will be able to contemplate entering the European Defense Community with less fear than before. At the same time, it will shore up the French will to continue the fight in Indo-China.

SUBSIDY FOR COLONIALISM

If it works, the U. S. thinks this plan would be cheap at double the price. And it must be added, in order to make it work, not double, but ten times the price and more will have to be spent in the long run. For at bottom what is involved here is not just the money for enough tanks and guns to defeat the guerilla armies of the Vietminh in Indo-China in military struggle, but a continuing subsidy for French colonial rule of that country for an indefinite period.

The struggle for independence in Indo-China is not simply a struggle between the French and the Stalinists. In fact, the Stalinists were able to gain control over the Vietminh inde-

pendence movement only after a long period of internal conflict within what was originally a broader movement of many political tendencies.

And now, the independence movement has found voice among Indo-Chinese elements which were at one time considered harmless tools of the French. The king of Cambodia demonstratively left his capital in protest over continued French rule. The Cambodian premier has flouted the French and Americans by independently offering a truce to the Vietminh forces. The government of Laos demands independence first, and discussions with France as to the future relations between the two countries afterwards. And even Bao Dai, the tiger-shooting ruler of Vietnam, is taking the firmest stand for independence he has taken in years.

The American government claims to be sympathetic to the desires of the peoples of Indo-China for "greater self-rule." But these people do not want "more" self-rule; they want independence, and nothing less. Even if American money is to be used to train and equip more native troops than the French have been willing or able to train before, that is no answer to their demand. They have no desire to continue to fight their Stalinist fellow-countrymen in the interest of the French.

BUYING ANTI-AMERICANISM

Thus the increased American financial support for the military struggle in Indo-China may deliver stronger blows against the Vietminh. But at the same time it is bound to turn the hatred of the peoples of the whole country against the Americans, whom they can view only as the last bulwark of French colonial rule in their own country. For the French are not going to continue to fight in Indo-China, with their own money or the American dollar, only to relinquish the country to its inhabitants when the struggle against the Vietminh is over.

And in Europe, too, the \$785,000,000 will reap a harvest, not so much of military strength as of increased resentment against American pressure and manipulation of the governments and peoples of that continent. It is not only the French who fear a resurgent militarism in a Germany under the control of the conservative and reactionary industrialists and financiers who paved the road for Hitler and who now finance Adenauer's campaigns. German militarism is feared by all the peoples of Europe, and on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Its re-establishment would be one of the strongest weapons in the political arsenal of Stalinism.

This type of American political "victory" comes dear, not in money alone. The days are gone when a rising and expanding capitalist imperialism had before it an open world in which to expand over the economies and territories of backward and docile peoples. America now faces a colonial world which is fighting for its freedom, and a capitalist system in Europe which has been pushed in on itself and is crumbling into rubble. Every attempt to shore up the structure only increases the internal strains of which it can never rid itself.

HEIR OF IMPERIALISM

This is just one illuminating example of the specific character of America's imperialist destiny. Confronted by a mortal enemy in Stalinism, the businessmen and generals who direct and control this country's foreign policy find their only friends and supporters throughout the world in those ruling groups who are against social and economic change and the freedom of the colonial peoples. America cannot itself take over the control of the colonial areas which are in revolt against their old masters. It cannot inherit empires which have been consigned to destruction by the march of history. It is doomed to preside over the liquidation of Western imperialism as it has been known in the modern world.

But its frantic efforts to slow up the process benefit the Stalinists on the one hand, and earn the hatred of the peoples of both the colonial areas and the old imperial nations on the other.

Only the American people can reverse this disastrous course. And they cannot do it while supporting this government, or any other which represents the interests of capitalism rather than those of the people. An end to political support for this government and its foreign policy—not just this or that aspect of it, but its whole conception and the economic foundations on which it rests—that is a primary necessity for the restoration of political health to America, and the world.

Testimony to a Betrayal — —

(Continued from page 3)

paid scant attention to the momentous movement in East Berlin which had gained impetus by 11 a.m. on June 16, and which had become common talk in West Berlin by noon. Except for two short routine items in its regular newscasts, it ignored these events and chose to go ahead with its regular music programs. It was 5:30 p.m. before the directors decided to belatedly inform their listeners by special comments and news bulletins of what had happened that day a few miles away.

"... RIAS did not even report that the Berliners had called for a 'general strike'; it left it to its listeners [in other

East German cities] to decide for themselves that they should show their solidarity with Berlin by also striking. Nor did RIAS report that quite a few People's Police in East Berlin had mutinied, removed their side-arms and in some cases their uniform coats, and joined the rebels..."

Also "Western officials permitted no Russian voice" to broadcast information or appeals to the Russian soldiers on the nature of the uprising or to "encourage their fraternization with the workers."

WAR DRUMS

Why? Muhlen explains this gross "betrayal" by the fact that the American authorities were exclusively concerned with "not provoking the Russians," because they were so exclusively concerned with not starting a war—as if even these American authorities might have seriously thought that a show of solidarity with the East German workers might have provoked the Russians into attacking west! It is likely that Muhlen may have gotten such rationalization from Western officials, but he was not required to take them seriously.

It does not, however, occur to him that the American policy—which has not at all been chary about "provoking" the anger

of the Russians—did not look upon a WORKERS' uprising as the kind of "liberation" it talked about; that the imperialist and capitalist outlook of the officials was scared and disconcerted when a mass movement NOT UNDER THEIR CONTROL rose against the Stalinists; that these officials were made jittery by such evidence of mass action from below and indeed openly showed that they were worried about the possibility of such disregard for "law and order" spilling over into the Western sector.

In fact, we have not yet mentioned Muhlen's main count against the Western officials' reaction, one which he repeats in two different places. This is the complaint that the Americans did not line up their own tanks on the border "demonstratively... to warn the Russians." The fact is that, politically, Muhlen thinks like the American military mind; only he would not at all be reluctant to beat the war drums with the workers' action as the excuse.

But while this is his own approach, the story he tells shows that the American officials avoided taking any significant steps, even the most peaceful, to show solidarity with the uprising. And this testimony is more important than his own war-mongering.

That 'Good' Imperialism In the Congo

By DANIEL FABER

Life's special issue on Africa described the Belgian Congo as a territory in which "enlightened colonialism" prevails—as distinguished, no doubt, from the unenlightened kind that prevails everywhere else. The meaning of this compliment becomes clear in one's mind after reading an item from the New York Times of August 16 entitled "Congo White Group Opened to Negroes."

It seems that the white settlers in the Congo are organized in the Federation of Colonists. This organization has now been opened to Negroes, but the terms on which this has been done and the context of the measure must be known to understand its full significance. When the federation started admitting Negroes it changed its name to Federation of Colonists and Middle Classes of the Congo.

This is what *L'Essor du Congo*, the semi-official organ of the settlers, has to say about the change of name:

"This modification, or rather this completion, of title confirms what the association of settlers has always been, that is to say, a movement of the middle classes. They intend to make a place in the heart of their movement for all representatives of the middle classes of the Congo, without distinction of color, origin or, of course, opinion or religion. In fact, the white settlers' associations have declared their intention to promote the interests of the native African advanced group and to reach out their hands to the Black middle classes. These latter have the same needs and the same aspirations as the European middle classes and they have the same interests to defend."

"ENLIGHTENED"

After reporting that there is "some opposition from old-time elements" who apparently haven't caught on yet, the New York Times correspondent goes on to explain how the new line works:

"A Southern Rhodesian native helper of a European mechanic was traveling in a 'reserved,' a Jim-Crow second-class compartment. When he got to the frontier he found that there were no separate facilities for native Africans. There was, however, a rather uncomfortable wooden bench in fourth class, the class used by ordinary natives. He wore rather shabby overalls. The station master ruled that if he had been dressed in a business suit he could have ridden second-class with the Europeans, but as he was not dressed in 'civilized' fashion he had to ride fourth-class... The campaign now on in Elisabethville is to convince educated bank clerks, small entrepreneurs and other middle-class Negroes that they should join what has been the white colonists' federation and that they should... break down the color bar that exists not legally but as a social institution."

"Enlightened Colonialism" then, is based on the insight that irrespective of race or color "the middle classes have the same interests to defend" against the working class irrespective of its race or color. It aims, in effect, to deprive the Negro emancipation movement of its educated leadership.

Those who are familiar with the question in the U. S. recognize the time-honored tactic of attempting to buy off the thin layer of educated, middle-class Negroes in order to better keep the Negro working class in a state of "enlightened" subjection.

NOW—IN ENGLISH
THE FAMED "VOLUME 4"
OF "CAPITAL"

Karl Marx's
HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC
THEORIES

PART ONE

Langland Press—337 pages—\$5.00

Order from
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Get acquainted with the
SOCIALIST YOUTH
LEAGUE

Write to the SYL at
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Stevenson's Foreign Policy — —

(Continued from page 1)

and when it would best be served by support. . . .

The precision-tool which Stevenson and his party use for discovering the right time for opposition seems to be the calendar, which, as is well known, has been highly refined by modern science. The calendar has told the Democrats that it is time to prepare for the congressional election of 1954, as Truman has been making clear in his own speeches, and so the time has come to hint to the country that the Democratic Party has differences with the party whose jobs it wants.

Hence that old block-buster, the ex-president, was put on the stump to make tired Fair Deal speeches about the interests of the People versus Big Business.

There is one thing that Truman knows, however: that the Democrats are not going to get anywhere by patriotic-responsible-restrained-precision support of Eisenhower. "Now the business of a political meeting is politics," he told the rally, "and I think we ought to get down to business." A few weeks ago even Senator Connally had expressed the fear that the business of boasting of support to Eisenhower was being overdone—you can have too much of a good thing.

Parenthetically, before leaving the subject of the Democratic rally as such, we must note that, aside from the belt-girding speeches, the one concrete-action taken was to capitulate before the Southern Eisenhowercrats on the famous party "loyalty pledge." The result was announced as a "compromise." One view had been that the loyalty pledge should be kept; the other that it should be scrapped before the next convention. The "compromise" was — that it was scrapped. Mississippi Governor Hugh White said, "I am going back to Mississippi very happy." On the other hand, Blair Moody, original sponsor of the loyalty pledge, asked whether he was satisfied with the action, replied "Absolutely," thereby proving that all sides were happy. The vote was unanimous. No one—repeat, no one—even spoke up in favor of the loyalty pledge.

ENDS AND MEANS

Thus the party is girded. The problem was also to do some girding by informing the ranks that it was open season on harsh words about Republicans.

But not on foreign policy! This is where the Democrats, watching the dials on their precision instruments, show their continuing restraint, not to speak of their intelli-

gence and courage. Not the least of the questions entering into their calculations is this: Do they have a foreign policy which can be counterposed to that of Eisenhower in criticism?

The gingerly wording of Stevenson's speech, then, was conditioned by two incompatible aims: (1) to support the foreign policy being carried on by Washington, which does not differ in any essential from Truman's, and (2) to separate themselves from it if only by a couple of steps. The first is a patriotic duty, and the second is a party responsibility.

In the N. Y. Times magazine of September 13, Richard H. Rovere, writing on Stevenson's dilemmas since his return to the country, noted:

"What bothers Stevenson is that if he attacks certain aspects of administration [foreign] policy, as he earnestly feels he should, the attacks will in many parts of the world be read as a repudiation of American ends rather than as a criticism of administration means. He does not want harm to our foreign policy to be a consequence of his efforts to improve it. 'Our prestige is low enough as it is,' he says, 'and I don't want to be used to depress it even more.'"

In order not to impugn the ends, which are his own, he does not want to criticize the means. It is on other occasions that he philosophizes about that horrid "Bolshevik" philosophy that "the ends justify the means."

UNEASY APPROVAL

His own means to his end is to give that foreign policy an approving stamp, with cautionary remarks which are supposed to hint that he is uneasy. Thus in his September 14 speech he flatly stated that "anyone who has traveled about the world in recent months is impressed again and again by how right and how effective our foreign policy has been since the war." In spite of his private opinions about the low state of American prestige in the world, he also assured his audience that this policy has "paid off in confidence and respect for America."

In his report on September 15 he stated that, on his travels, he had found "surprisingly little" hostile feeling against the U. S. He offered Winston Churchill in evidence, right away. At the beginning of his speech he had offered his credentials by explaining that he had talked with many people "from Syngman Rhee and the emperor of Japan to Pope Pius and Queen Elizabeth," a cross-section of opinion over the world from A

to B, in other words. This was not intended to be one of his well-known quips.

Stevenson admirers who do not share this reluctance to attack at least the "means" used by Eisenhower in foreign policy—arm-twisting in the UN, alignment with French colonialism, etc.—will comfort themselves with the knowledge that really, in his own heart, he is much more critical. No doubt. But apparently one thing that Stevenson did not learn on his trip is that so many of the peoples look on America as a monolithic reactionary bloc.

It is the only important country in the world where there does not seem to be any articulate opposition to the going war policy, even meaningful criticism of it. Is there no one in America who understands what is wrong? they ask. Is there no one who is an ally of freedom and not merely a shielder or apologist for American imperialist interests?

But Stevenson sees his "patriotic" duty, which is more important than truth, more basic than personal integrity, more demanding than the interests of peace and democracy in the world. The "ends" of American imperialist policy justify silence about the means.

And so he comes out four-square, or anyway as forthrightly as he can constitutionally manage, in "emphatic" approval of Washington's Indo-China policy, where the U.S. is paying French colonialism to continue the war, without a hint that maybe the Indo-Chinese should be independent. He echoes the widespread joy over Adenauer's victory, without a hint that the German right-wing leader is not precisely Europe's hope for democracy and social justice.

He speaks of the "rampant" nationalism of Asia in the essentially imperialist tones of all the other pundits who bewail the Asians' "lack of understanding" or lack of concern for world problems or for "the ideological conflict." He lists their "misunderstandings," even fear of McCarthyism being put under this head—a statesmanlike way of not himself taking responsibility for criticisms which may be his own. We must not add to the "misunderstandings" by showing that there is at least one prominent American who agrees with some of their fears! It will weaken "America." . . .

HINT AT A PROGRAM

Now there can be no doubt that Stevenson's foreign-policy tactics would be different from Eisenhower's. But this is not sufficient basis to permit Stevenson to develop a counter program, which is what American needs. To the extent that a program is indicated in his speech, it appears in four ideas:

(1) Push for European integration.—But this is what Washington is already doing.

(2) Make proposals on a system of "non-aggression pacts" with Russia, if only to "expose" them.—It is a rather wistful hope. Assuming that Stevenson does not really believe that any non-aggression pacts (of which the world has seen scores, especially before wars) could have any effect in maintaining peace, and assuming (as indeed he seems to indicate) that he is playing with the idea as a means of putting the Russians on the spot, he does not indicate why he thinks Moscow might be embarrassed by signing such pieces of paper.

(3) A new effort in disarmament and A-bomb-control proposals.—The idea is mentioned by Stevenson in a kind of tired way, and it would be difficult to do otherwise without at least hinting at what kind of new effort would be expected to produce any results.

(4) Most distinctive about his speech was the relatively strong emphasis on "negotiations" with the Russians, a "flexible attitude" looking to a deal, even perhaps with regard to recognition of Stalinist China. (The latter is only hinted.) If Stevenson wishes, he could indeed develop this into a program, the same kind of program which is so characteristic of elements in Europe, for a negotiated deal with the Kremlin. As he puts it now, it is a matter of emphasis and a warning to the administration not to be "inflexible," though Washington has never excluded conferences, negotiations or deals with the Stalinists.

But to make it a program he would have to counter the stiff-necked Eisenhower attitude by indicating what kind of deal he has in mind, what is the quid-pro-quo in negotiations with the Russians, what he thinks he can give them in return for illusory promises of good behavior. Insofar as he approaches this line, however tentatively, he faces all the problems of the futile "neutralists" of Europe who think that the word "negotiations" constitutes a programmatic idea.

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—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

chief-justiceship to a high-level political reward (if such turns out to be the nature of Eisenhower's appointment), the GOP president would not be original. The man who has just died is himself the best contemporary instance of the trend. Truman appointed his friend and fellow politician Vinson to the job without creating any illusions among anyone that he was thereby raising the caliber of the Supreme Court.

Neither Warren nor Dewey (to be honest about it) would be a come-down from Vinson's level, either from the professional point of view or from the standpoint of social outlook; but that is just another way of noting the deterioration of the high court's highest post. In the days when Mr. Dooley said that the Supreme Court follows the election returns, that was an irreverent and unusual insight into a truth, but the humor has gone out of it.

Adenauer Gets a Bill

German big capital, which so largely financed Hitler's rise to power, has openly handed in the bill to pay for the money which it laid out to pile up the votes for Washington's darling, Konrad Adenauer.

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dimes and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!

The mouthpiece of West German heavy industry, *Handelsblatt*, publicly listed what it expects from a grateful Adenauer. It wants the No. 2 position of power in the government for the reactionary Erhard, whom it frankly raises up as its man. It wants tax relief, that is, a greater burden of taxation on the workers rather than on the rich; it wants less government spending (though like its American counterparts it views any government subsidies for business not as "spending" but as evidence of laudable sympathy with the ideals of free enterprise); it wants to muscle in on the housing program; it wants the government, to sell all state-owned industrial enterprises; etc.

That does not mean that Adenauer can give them all they want, at least right away; but he can make installment payments. Thus one of his first acts has been to aim a rabbit-punch at the trade unions. Although the trade-union federation was officially neutral in the election, he didn't like some of the ideas it had put forward, and he has threatened to work for a split of the Christian-Democratic unionists from the united federation unless they show more "cooperation."

Now that he is feeling his oats and is less restrained by considerations of discretion, Adenauer bids fair to pile up the kind of record which will convince much of the world that the same type of German reaction is back in the saddle as greased the way for Nazism. The new Thyssens and the new Krupps have won on Adenauer's bandwagon. And Washington has been so openly jubilant at the turn of events that this record which will be made in Germany cannot help but be tied to American responsibility.

Somehow or other, the American press in its overwhelming majority informs us, all this is a blow against Stalinism and the Russian menace.

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