

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

"PERSPECTIVES, USA":

Fordizing the Cold War
For European Intellectuals

... page 7

The Leadership Fight in the NMU

... page 2

Djilas and the Crisis of Titoism—III

How the Djilas Crisis Grew: A Reconstruction

... page 5

FEBRUARY 15, 1954

FIVE CENTS

Fair Deal Senators Fold Up Before McCarthy

Senator McCarthy is swinging through eight-odd states on a tour of official enlightenment for the Republican Party, getting ready for this year's elections. While Attorney General Brownell and his staff pick through 20,000 dusty old documents, searching for little bits of overlooked information to cast discredit on Communists and Democrats, McCarthy sums up in one philosophic generalization his public analysis of Democratic rule: "Twenty Years of Treason" is the title and theme of all his public speeches.

"The hard fact is," he told a crowd of admirers in Charleston, "that those who bear the label Democrat wear with it the stain of an historic betrayal." Stalin rewrote the history of Russia to serve the aims of Stalinism. McCarthy modestly seeks to duplicate the job for the United States; recent American history is to be rewritten to show the New Deal and Fair Deal as one gigantic conspiracy to turn our nation over to Communists. Research for this project is done by his roving Senate subcommittee.

WHERE WERE THEY?

But he needed money. And he needed a committee. There was a positively ferocious battle in the Senate on this question.

First, in preparation for this struggle, the Democrats on McCarthy's committee, who had pulled out some months ago, returned and thus gave it their endorsement.

Then, the Senate voted on granting his committee an appropriation so that it might continue its invaluable service to the nation. McCarthy failed . . . to get a unanimous vote. Only one man voted against the donation from the public treasury.

Where were the great tribunes of the people, the mighty fighters for life, liberty, democracy, the strong and stern enemies of McCarthy and all he stands for?

Where, in short, were men like Herbert Lehman, Hubert Humphrey, Wayne Morse?

They did not stay home. They did not evade. They did not shrink. No, they simply voted to give McCarthy his money.

Thus, McCarthy was victorious in the Senate: 85-1 by rollcall vote.

Thus the liberal Democrats fought another pitched battle against McCarthyism.

NEXT WEEK:

Report on founding convention of the Young Socialist League in the first issue of the

YOUNG SOCIALIST CHALLENGE

Who's Winning the Propaganda Battle at the Big Four Confab?

By GORDON HASKELL

The propaganda battle of Berlin continues as we go to press. But it remains a purely verbal propaganda battle, as neither the capitalist side nor the Stalinists are willing to risk anything in the effort to make the other side yield.

The Russians and the Western powers have stood on the positions with which they came to the conference. The latter demand free elections throughout Germany under some form of foreign supervision. Such elections would result in the formation of a new government with which a peace treaty would then be negotiated by the victors of World War II. The former demand that the present governments of East and West Germany form a new provisional government which would organize elections. They insist that the rearmament of Germany and its inclusion in the so-called European Defense Community be abandoned as the price of any unification.

Throughout the conference, the Stalinists have proved themselves the cleverer propagandists. They have come up with a number of schemes the purpose of which is to make it appear that they are flexible in their approach while the Western powers simply stand on prepared positions.

Molotov has proposed a plebiscite throughout Germany to be conducted on the issue of whether the Germans prefer a peace treaty or the Bonn and Paris pacts which provide for the creation of the European Defense Community (EDC). The idea of a plebiscite always sounds democratic. In addition, it has been the Social-Democrats in West Germany who have insisted in the past that entry of Western Germany into EDC is incompatible with the unification of the country, or at least would be a major obstacle to it. Now Molotov presents the two as alternatives for the German people.

He has also proposed the withdrawal of Russian

(Continued on page 2)

The 5th Power in Berlin: East Ger. Workers Take the Floor

By A. STEIN

A fifth and unbidden voice was heard at the conference table of the Big Four foreign ministers in Berlin last week—speaking out against the futile propaganda debate on a German peace treaty.

It was the voice of the East German workers, raised in sharp political protest against the continued division and occupation of Germany, and placing equal responsibility for the failure of the conference on both Washington and Moscow.

According to Walter Sullivan, the New York Times reporter in West Berlin, a steady and persistent stream of reports have been reaching West Berlin of "unrest in at least 10 East German factories." These demonstrations have taken place despite the presence of 22 heavily armed Russian army divisions and 7 East German Volkspolizei divisions, totaling about 400,000 men.

Cabling from West Berlin on February 7, Sullivan writes, for example, that in the gigantic Leuna Chemical Works near Mersburg, with a labor force of 28,000 workers, "a police guard was established inside the factory Thursday with radio connections to ready (Bereitschaft) units in near-by barracks. This plant, whose workers revolted under Communist leadership after World War I, was a center of anti-Communist demonstrations June 17. In recent days it is said to have been the scene of unrest again." (My italics—A. S.)

NO EYES TO THE WEST

These workers' demonstrations in the main industrial centers of East Germany, of which the Leuna Works is but one example, have centered their fire on the refusal of the Russians to permit free all-German elections. As Sullivan quite correctly points out, "one of the most important slogans June 17 was 'We demand free elections.'"

However, Sullivan is also compelled to

report what is generally known in West Berlin, that these political demonstrations have also turned their fire against the three Western powers as well. Sullivan phrases the criticism of the East German workers in euphemistic terms when he writes that "The reports also contained some criticism of the Western powers, especially the United States, for exhibiting what was termed excessive inflexibility on the unification problem."

The East German workers understand very well that America pursues the same ends as does Moscow—either the compulsory incorporation of a united Germany into its own economic, political and military bloc, or the continuation of a divided, occupied Germany.

Washington objects not only to the Russian Trojan-horse tactic, the creation of an all-German provisional regime that would include the East German Stalinists; it also demands from the very beginning the inclusion of a united Germany in the European Defense Community or some other form of military alliance. The abstract "right" of a united

Germany to join military forces with the Western powers is in reality a concrete obligation that it would inherit from the Bonn Government under the terms of the General Agreement signed by Adenauer in May 1952.

BINDING GERMANY

In the middle of last December a savage dispute broke out in the West German Bundestag between Chancellor Adenauer and the Social-Democrats. At that time Adenauer declared that under Article 146 of the Bonn constitution only a constituent assembly could be elected by all-German elections in a united Germany. Consequently, the Bonn constitution (and all treaties negotiated under it—including the European Defense Pact and the General Agreement with the three Western powers) would remain in effect until a new basic law had been approved by the people.

To this the Social-Democratic Party replied that, in the first place, it might take months or years before a new constitution was drafted and approved; and in the second place, Adenauer was violating a resolution unanimously adopted by the Bundestag in 1951. This resolution stated that an all-German constituent assembly should be both a constituent and legislative body with authority not only to write a constitution, but also to form a government.

However, to this day Adenauer has insisted on his interpretation of the new famous Article 146. This would limit a future all-German constituent assembly to a legislative role and perpetuate his regime after all-German free democratic elections had taken place. What is just as significant is that the United States backs Adenauer's position. Writing from Bonn on

(Continued on page 3)

Leadership Fight Breaks Out in NMU, Curran Henchman Pilloried by 2 Officers

By BEN HALL

A split in the top leadership of the National Maritime Union (CIO) has plunged the union into a bitter faction fight in which Neal Hanley, secretary, and Hulbert Warner, vice-president, are out to unseat the national treasurer, M. Hedley Stone. Joe Curran, president, has announced full backing to Stone.

The virulence of the fight is revealed in the last two issues of the official NMU publication the *Pilot*, which has become a faction organ for Curran and Stone, and, as a matter of routine, presents their one-sided version exclusively. So far, we have been compelled to extract what seem to be the facts from these biased accounts.

Warner and Hanley accuse Stone of a Jim-Crow policy, insist that he is responsible for stimulating prejudices among white seamen, and argue that he has discriminated against Negro seamen in the Gulf of Mexico area. Warner is himself a Negro. Their hostility to Stone was forced into the open by approaching union elections. All candidates must file by February 28; obviously, if anything was to be done about Stone, it had to be done quickly.

Hanley and Warner, at a private conference with Curran, demanded a special emergency meeting of the union's ruling National Council where they could present their accusations publicly. Curran refused; whereupon they announced that they would attempt to unseat Stone in the elections and might also run candidates against the two other vice-presidents, Adrian L. Duffy and John B. McDougal. Hanley will oppose Stone and Warner will run for Hanley's job of secretary.

PORT COMM. BALKS

Duffy, by the way, was one of the most hated men in the NMU faction fight of 1949-50 when the present leadership, then fully united, crushed and expelled an opposition led by former Vice-President Jack Lawrenson. It was Duffy who was held responsible for organizing and directing the brutal beating of oppositionists and he was considered top man in charge of a full-time terror squad. At one time, infuriated union members broke through police lines to get at him, the only top officer so honored.

It appears, too, that the two insurgent top officers or their supporters had demanded the election of a special union Rank and File Committee, to investigate the illegal sale of phony membership books at fancy prices to would-be seamen. One NMU member, Andrew Mele, is now under indictment for such charges.

Curran opposed the election of such a committee, which would clearly be an expression of lack of confidence in his regime, arguing that this was a simple police job.

Curran summoned a special meeting of patrolmen in the port of New York (where every opposition has had its strength and where the Lawrenson group of 1949 had a clear majority) to demand that they (24 in number) take a stand against Warner and Hanley. According to his account, all but "three or four" seconded his attack against them. It is significant that the members of the top Port Committee, however, refused to go along with Curran.

One of them, Leo McCarthy, Engine member of the committee, announced that he would stand by the new opposition because the Port Committee had been stripped of its freedom and because he was not satisfied with the handling of the membership book sale scandal. The elected port agent in Galveston, John Moriarty, is also with the opposition to Stone. Curran complains that Hanley has already informed Walter Reuther, CIO president, of the looming NMU fight.

CURRAN'S TACTICS

The fight was made public by Curran in the January 21 and 28 issues of the *Pilot* and at an NMU membership meeting in New York on January 25, where Warner and Stone were absent. Curran reveals that he has lost none of the skills and crafts acquired during his long years as a Stalinist fellow traveler. "Union-busting program" falls quickly from his tongue. When his opponents confer, he accuses them of "conspiring outside the union." Not very subtly, he insinuates that their real objective is to steal union funds:

"Certainly, you will have to show to the membership that you will make a better treasurer than Stone. If you do not, they can only come to the conclusion

that you want to oust Stone because he is too protective of the union's treasury and that you want to loosen up the handling of money in the union and they may come to the conclusion that an attempt is being made to sabotage the union's treasury. With racketeers being exposed as they are, the public too would not understand such a 'palace revolution.'"

Why did you wait so long before airing your grievances against Stone? asks Curran. If all these crimes occurred months ago, why speak up now? On this theme, he harps without cease, knowing that his critics find it difficult to reply without diplomatic evasion.

GROUNDWELL

But the answer is quite simple. These are not men who are anxious to buck Curran and his machine; they themselves were part of it and demonstrated their ability to go along with one of the vilest assaults on inner-union democracy: Curran's expulsion campaign of 1949-50. Now, it would seem, a strong wave of resentment has been gathering inside the union, focusing its hostility not on Curran himself but on some of his chief lieutenants.

The new opposition is probably stirred into motion by such a groundswell, perhaps against their own instincts.

Above all, Warner and Hanley knew that an attack on Stone, not cleared by Curran, could only plunge them into a

life and death battle in which their own union posts and membership would soon be at stake. And so they hesitated. They were correct in such a feeling. The fight has just started and Curran is already preparing to cut them down to the ground.

"I wanted them to be clear on the consequences of their actions," Curran says, vaguely but obviously threatening them with the fate of all who opposed him. And he asks: Do you oppose Stone "because you want to see the union split?" It is clear that if Curran is allowed to have his way, there will be new expulsions and perhaps even a split in the union.

JOE BALANCES

Curran's troubles are not confined to internal union disputes. Shipping is bad. All maritime unions fear unemployment. Meanwhile, the NMU faces the constant overhanging rivalry of the Seafarers International Union (AFL) whose Atlantic Coast District is headed by Paul Hall, a very ambitious man. Hall aspires to enter the higher AFL echelons in New York and has been a leading figure in the drive to end ILA domination over New York docks.

Curran carefully balances himself in the longshore fight, maintaining a position of strict neutrality between the old ILA and the AFL. He obviously is afraid that Hall's power on the waterfront would become a threat to him if the AFL won and he sees no reason to antagonize the ILA; for it might win in the end. From the point of view of petty maneuvering, he has nothing to lose from neutrality.

The whole present NMU leadership from Curran down is made up of men who were, at one time, members of the Communist Party or fellow travelers. After the war, however, when Stalinism was no longer fashionable, they broke with the CP and

in a sharp faction struggle succeeded in wiping out its hold in the NMU.

But Curran was not satisfied with ending CP control over the union. He insisted upon expelling all members of the CP from the union; and upon this question of democratic rights, the faction which had just defeated the CP split apart. Vice-President Jack Lawrenson and New York Port Agent Dave Drummond headed the opposition to Curran and the present officers.

AGAINST THE MACHINE

The opposition succeeded in defeating Curran's proposal in a national referendum, and this made him determined to wipe them out. He bureaucratically removed all opposition members from their posts in New York; he declared Drummond removed as New York agent and installed Warner in his place as a receiver. He organized a series of fake membership meetings patrolled by the New York City Police Department and later by full-time, paid strong-arm men hired from among his supporters outside of New York.

At these meetings, he went through the formal motions of electing trial committees and then of expelling oppositionists. NMU members who were brave enough to protest against this farce were beaten right on the floor of these "meetings."

It is the same Curran whose administration now demands the amendment of the Taft-Hartley Law to allow unions to expel "Trotskyites and Communists" from membership, a man scrupulously devoted to observing all the rules of anti-democracy.

Three years ago, Warner and Hanley helped to crush and demoralize rank-and-file democracy in the NMU. Now the machine they assisted in creating and entrenching is about to be turned against them.

Who's Winning at Confab — —

(Continued from page 1)

and Allied troops from the territory of Germany, either before an election or immediately afterward, "to prevent foreign pressure on the German people." Of course, his proposal was modified by excluding from this proposed withdrawal "limited contingents left to perform protective functions arising out of tasks of control by the four powers." Thus the Stalinists have sought to create the impression that they are for a plebiscite and the withdrawal of troops, while at the same time covering themselves against any commitment which would deprive them of the military forces to suppress any East German revolution.

WHAT DULLES WON'T DO

The Stalinist proposals are transparent enough, despite their cleverness and "flexibility." Their propaganda weight is greatly enhanced, however, by the fact that the Western powers have simply met them with a flat "no" rather than countering with proposals based on them which could expose their hollow content.

To turn Stalinist cleverness into a rout, all Dulles would have had to say was this:

"You propose that all occupying powers withdraw their troops. Good. We are willing to pull all American, French and British troops out tomorrow. But we really mean all troops. Nine years of occupation is enough. We have confidence in the ability of the Bonn government to maintain democracy and law and order, and to meet their foreign obligations. You say that your 'Democratic People's Republic' has the support of the people and that it is also a stable government. So you don't need any troops to perform 'protective functions' either. Let us get all foreign troops out of Germany, and then let the two governments arrange plebiscites or elections or whatever other peaceful measures they want to for the unification of their country."

U. S. HANDS TIED

Actually, all Dulles could think of to say was that a withdrawal of American troops from Western Germany would leave that country and the whole of Europe open to attack from the East. But this is the same Dulles who announced a couple of weeks ago that American foreign and military policy was now

based on the power of overwhelming retaliatory action against any aggressor, rather than on local containment. From that announcement, and from the political and military facts as they stand today, it is clear that the danger of Russian aggression is not held back by the six American divisions in Germany, but by altogether different power-political considerations.

Thus, if the Western Allies were actually willing to withdraw their troops from Western Germany before getting the guarantee of the creation of a German army integrated into the EDC, they would place the Russians in a completely untenable position. For the latter know, since June of last year, that the withdrawal of their armed forces from Eastern Germany would in all likelihood mean the end of their puppet government within a very short time. Molotov would have no answer.

But the American government is not willing to withdraw its troops and thus expose the real nature of Russian imperialism in all its nakedness. It is not willing to take a chance on the revolutionary, democratic desires and sentiments of the East Germans, even after the June events. For although this would weaken Stalinism and Russia, it would create a situation in the center of Europe over which the United States could exercise a control of only the most indirect kind.

STALEMATE

And although the diplomats of both sides at Berlin have been overflowing with words about the desirability of letting the Germans decide their own destiny, about the danger of continuing to impose policies on them from abroad, neither side is willing to make a single move which would risk its control over the situation.

In an effort to raise as many propaganda issues as possible to obscure their refusal to permit free elections in Germany, the Russians have also proposed a conference on Asia which would include Stalinist China, an agreement to ban atomic weapons, and a general disarmament conference.

So far the Western answer to these proposals has also been the same "no" without anything new of their own to offer. The Stalinists have again urged that the United States pledge itself not to use atomic weapons in warfare, and this time

have added weight to their proposal by dropping the demand that such an international agreement be accompanied by the destruction of all existing stocks of atomic weapons (now that they have some themselves). They know very well that a government which has just announced that its whole military establishment is being reorganized around the use of these weapons could not very well pledge itself to refrain from using them. But America hardly endears herself to the peoples of the world, the potential victims of atomic warfare, by refusing to give even verbal assurances that they will not be used.

It is hardly likely that either side will win a clear-cut propaganda victory out of this conference. For neither is willing to give up even a fraction of its military position in the interest of democracy and freedom for the weaker nations. Thus the cold war will remain a stalemate, and Germany will remain divided.

Read about Independent Socialism

in the special pamphlet-issues published by LABOR ACTION—

10 cents each

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.

Independent Socialism and the Third World War.

The Fair Deal: A Socialist Criticism.

Socialism and Democracy: The Independent Socialist View

Order from:

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street, New York City

LONDON LETTER

Britain and the Gibraltar Riots

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Feb. 4—First we heard that the prospective visit of the queen to Gibraltar had provoked anti-British demonstrations all over Spain, for the return of this territory. At the same time, General Monereo, the governor of Algeciras, paid an official call on the governor-general of Gibraltar. They exchanged toasts. It is not at all clear who was the first to propose a toast to whose government; different versions have it differently. Nevertheless there is no doubt that the British governor-general and commander-in-chief, in his official capacity, proposed a toast to General Franco.

No words of protest were heard from the Labor benches in Parliament.

Franco has reason to feel pleased with himself. Not only has he been awarded the highest honor of the Papacy but he has consolidated his regime. The agreement on bases with America and the concordat with the Vatican have put him in a stronger position than ever before.

The Western bloc now has a vested interest in keeping him where he is. It is clear that the Pope has demonstrated amply his role in Spain by honoring so highly one who has been responsible for the death of 2,000,000 (presumably all Catholic-baptised) innocent Spaniards.

Following the anti-British riots, the British newspapers were indignant. What right had the Spaniards to Gibraltar? What about the 30,000 who work for the naval base? Would they be glad to see Britain go? The British ambassador protested in the severest terms, and demanded compensation. The British government was not satisfied. Just to show the Spaniards how insulted it was, it called off the courtesy visit of the Mediterranean fleet to Spanish ports. Now it will visit the ports of Britain's oldest ally, Portugal.

Amid the turmoil, Portugal has been

reviving its memory. Salazar's dictatorship protested to Spain about the occupation by Spanish troops during Napoleon's Peninsular War of Olivenza, a Portuguese border town from which Spain has not yet withdrawn.

It has not yet occurred to either the British government or the British press that the best stick to beat the Franco regime would be an appeal to democratic sentiments in Spain, but then maybe it's a bit late to think of that.

FRANCO'S MANEUVERS

Talking about democratic sentiments reminds me that Franco has been playing a shady role in Morocco.

As you know the "protection" of the Mahgreb is shared between Spain and France. The French imperialists did a dirty trick on their Spanish friends by dismissing Sultan Mohammed ben Yusef—who had authority in their zone as well—without consulting them. This rather burned up the Spanish regime, so they started making friends with the Middle East. Foreign Minister Artajo made friendly overtures to the Moslem League to get their support. There are reports of a prospective visit of Franco to that area, and many "ties of friendship" are being consolidated.

It is even reported that Franco has liberalized the military government of his part of Morocco, and his attempts at a Concordat with Mecca as well as Rome seem likely to meet with success. This turn has not escaped the attentions of the British Foreign Office which views with concern the likelihood of Franco supporting Naguib's stand on the Suez Canal affair.

Thus Franco has made friends with Eisenhower to strengthen his regime, made friends with the Arab League to beat the French and the British, made enemies of the British just for fun. On top of it all, he is still the biggest enemy of the Spanish people—whether the Vatican likes it or not.

ISL FUND DRIVE

On the Mark!

By ALBERT GATES

Last week we announced the opening of the annual Fund Drive of the Independent Socialist League for the year 1954. We remind our readers once more that on February 15 the fund drive will begin with a campaign running for ten weeks, to end May 1.

You will note a slight change in the quotas for this year in the absence of a quota for the Socialist Youth League, which has always conducted an exemplary campaign. In every fund drive it has surpassed the quota assigned to it by anywhere from twenty-five to forty per cent.

This year, however, there will be no quota for the youth organization because by the time this issue of LABOR ACTION appears, the SYL will have completed its unity convention with the YPSL. As an unaffiliated independent socialist youth organization, the new body cannot have any quota assigned or suggested to it, as part of the ISL drive, unless, of course, the new youth organization made such a decision. We understand, however, that the new youth organization will conduct its own fund drive. Therefore, this year, the ISL campaign will have to carry toward its goal without a quota which formerly was assigned to the SYL.

This makes it all the more necessary

for the branches of the ISL, for sympathizers and readers of our press, to fill the breach. If you haven't made yourself ready for the opening date of the drive on February 15, you can easily make up for it by sending in your contributions when you finish reading this story.

All payments in the fund drive should be made to Albert Gates, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Below is the list of branches and quotas.

Branch	Quota
New York	\$4000
Chicago	1800
National Office	1500
Los Angeles	600
Bay Area	500
Newark	400
Detroit	300
Philadelphia	250
Buffalo	200
Pittsburgh	150
Seattle	150
Cleveland	150
Indiana	50
Akron	50
St. Louis	25
Oregon	50
Streator	25
Reading	50
SYL	—
TOTAL	\$10,250

YPSL Debates SWP on Socialist Policy

By MAX MARTIN

NEW YORK, Feb. 6—A debate between spokesmen for the Young People's Socialist League and the Socialist Workers Party on the subject of "The Road for American Socialists" was held here on February 5 under the joint sponsorship of both organizations.

Bogdan Denitch, the YPSL speaker, met Murray Forbes, the speaker for the SWP in that rare event, a confrontation of Third Camp socialist views with the ideas of the Cannon group of "orthodox-Trotskyists." The debate drew an audience of over seventy people.

Forbes put forward the SWP point of view that McCarthyism is "fascism" and that the United States was entering a period of imminent fascist danger. At the same time he expounded the idea (although mostly by implication) that the workers in this country have already become radicalized or, at the very least, are on the verge of radicalization. The tasks and struggles in the next period will then, in the eyes of the SWP speaker, revolve around socialism or fascism.

To meet this situation and prevent the catastrophe of a fascist victory, Forbes stressed the need for a revolutionary party—his Cannonite group being that party in his eyes. In this connection he criticized the YPSL for its lack of Marxist orientation, its support of the Liberal Party's independent candidacy of Halley in the last New York City mayoralty elections, and for its forthcoming merger with the SYL, a unity which he predicted would soon result in a split.

His references to Stalinism were extremely vague and evasive; he maintained a delicate balance between the view that Stalinism and the Stalinist parties were capitulating to the bourgeoisie, and the notion that they are leading the world revolution.

The SWP speaker's evasiveness, undoubtedly reflecting the confusion in the SWP ranks over the political meaning of this party's recent halt in its headlong flight into the Stalinist swamp, was underscored during the question period.

THIRD-CAMP POLICY

In reply to a question about his attitude in the event of an attack by Stalinist Russia against India, Forbes evasively said only that the SWP would aid the Indian masses in their struggle to—"achieve the program of the October Revolution." Denitch answered the same question by asserting that socialists should, in so far as a genuine struggle for national independence was being conducted, be for the defense of India. Denitch added that such a war, however, would soon turn into an imperialist world war, at which point socialists could support neither side.

In his presentation, Denitch presented the viewpoint that a major task of socialists in the coming period was the defense of civil liberties and democracy generally, and pointed out the connection between the attacks on civil liberties (at the same time, criticizing the extreme notion that McCarthyism is fascism) and the cold war. He pointed out the necessity of opposition to both imperialist war camps and a struggle for the Third Camp.

The YPSL speaker analyzed the next development in the working class as the formation of an independent labor party. He said that socialists should support such a party even though it would initially be a conservative workers' party without a socialist program. He defended the YPSL support of the Halley campaign on the grounds that the Liberal Party was a rudimentary labor party.

The spokesman for the SWP characterized this analysis, and another statement of Denitch's to the effect that the workers' mood at the present was a conservative one, as indications of "pessimism and lack of confidence in the working class."

In the SWP's view apparently, the independent labor party will at its very formation have a revolutionary socialist program. In other words, for Forbes, tomorrow is today.

REVEALING INCIDENT

At the conclusion of the debate an unsavory incident developed. At the request of the SWP, the YPSL had agreed that there would be no question and discussion period for the audience. But Bill Ainsworth, the chairman of the debate, not knowing about this arrangement, called for questions and discussion. A member of the audience put a question to both speakers.

(Continued on page 4)

The Fifth Power—

(Continued from page 1)

December 18, 1953, the N. Y. Times reporter Clifford Daniel stated, "The United States seemed to be inclined toward the Chancellor's [Adenauer's] position. . ."

Neither Washington nor Adenauer is interested in constitutional niceties. If Adenauer wants the Bonn constitution to remain in effect if and when Germany is united, he has very specific reasons for his constitutional passions: it is the only way to bind a united Germany politically and militarily to the United States.

This is why he has rammed the ratification of the EDC treaty through the Bundestag; this is why two weeks before the Berlin conference opened, he insisted on introducing a constitutional amendment authorizing German rearmament and conscription within the framework of the EDC.

Consequently, when French Foreign Minister Georges Bidault denied Molotov's charge, at the February 4 meeting of the Conference-on-Wheels, that a united Germany would be bound by the General Agreement and the EDC treaty, Bidault was simply not telling the truth. Adenauer commands a sufficient majority in the Bundestag since the September 6 elections to make the constitution mean what he wants it to mean, including Article 146. And leaving constitutional questions aside, Washington is basing its entire military strategy in Western Europe on the creation of German armed units. This is known not only to the obdurate, stubborn Molotov but to the East German workers as well.

SPD FEEBLE

By their latest actions, modest though they be, the East German workers have once more demonstrated that only they speak in the name of the entire German working class; that only they authentically represent both the immediate and historic interests of the German people and nation. It is lamentable but true that they have demonstrated more courage than the Social-Democratic leaders in West Germany.

The SPD leaders are not confronted by large contingents of heavily armed troops and police; they are not threatened by a death sentence or long years in a far-off Russian concentration camp; nevertheless, they have remained silent while the East German workers have taken tremendous risks.

The SPD in West Germany has not called for the immediate departure of troops in their occupied part of Germany. As a matter of fact, to this day the Social-Democratic leadership has not once expressed one word of criticism of the American position at the Berlin conference, which symmetrically complements that of the Russians and condemns Germany to further division and occupation.

Dwelling in a desperate cloud-cuckoo-land of hybrid "neutralism" and "Big Power negotiations," they insist on seeing all kinds of optimistic possibilities in the Berlin conference. They have even suggested that perhaps better results would be gotten if the Big Four met in secret session! It would seem that Yalta and Potsdam never took place, and that the spoliation and division of Germany were not agreed upon by the Big Three behind closed doors in 1945!

THE SAME VOICES

To be sure, every other day the SPD parliamentary fraction has a sudden attack of understanding and does condemn Adenauer as a "saboteur of German unity." But this only happens every other day, and they manage to overlook what even an American reporter can see, that behind Adenauer stands American imperialism. The German bourgeoisie are only reaping the benefits of a junior partnership with American imperialism. It so happens that both mutually benefit from the continued division of Germany.

One final aspect of the demonstrations in Eastern Germany needs to be mentioned. The deliberate attempt of the East German workers to intervene, and bring pressure to bear on both sides at the Berlin conference now, settles a point much debated since the June 17 uprising. The timing, organization and political intent of the present demonstrations were obviously inspired by the very same politically mature and class-conscious workers who were the heart and brains of the June 17 uprising. They are acting in the best traditions of German and European socialism.

We shall hear from them again.

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

Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

Youth and Student Corner

Youth Branches Preparing for Unity Drive

The local sections of the SYL and YPSL have already begun to project activities as sections of the new united socialist youth organization.

SYL units on the West Coast, in Los Angeles and Berkeley, have distributed circulars hailing the socialist youth unity and inviting socialist and anti-war youth to join the new Young Socialist League. The Los Angeles SYL announced a meeting immediately following the unity convention to hear the reports of the West Coast delegates to the convention and to greet the new Young Socialist League.

Berkeley distributed a leaflet stating in part:

"Today . . . under the pressure of extreme reaction and McCarthyism in the United States—which has driven some youth into the fatal embrace of Stalinism and others from politics altogether—both socialist youth organizations have set aside traditional differences for their common struggle against both imperialist camps and for socialism and democracy. The new organization will clearly be the largest socialist youth organization in the U. S., thus being better able to attract new members. . . ."

"All independent socialists who find themselves in reasonable agreement with the program of the YSL are urged to join the YSL in the recruitment drive that will follow the convention. We of the Berkeley Socialist Youth League, as future participants in YSL, urge our friends and sympathizers to join this new youth organization and take part in building such a long-needed united youth group."

LOOKING FORWARD

Politics Club of the University of Chicago announced the unity convention and a discussion meeting devoted to discussing the new organization.

Boston YPSL, in a leaflet and mailing to all friends, members and sympathizers hailed the unity convention and held two major meetings with Michael Harrington, one of the leading members of the YPSL NEC, as speaker. Comrade Harrington spoke on "Pacifism and Marxism" and on the Young Socialist League.

YPSL members scattered throughout the Midwest wrote in to the national organization announcing their preparation of meetings and activities to push the new youth organization.

The New York sections of the SYL and YPSL, in a joint membership meeting, discussed the program and form of the new organization. The optimism and comradely sentiments pervading the meeting were outstanding, with such differences as did come to light being discussed in a frank and open fashion.

Friends and contacts of both youth organizations show an increasing interest in organized socialist activity, and the dominant comment seems to be "Why did you wait so long!" The overdue unity of anti-war socialist youth is finally imminent.



LABOR ACTION

February 15, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 7

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: GORDON HASKELL,
BEN HALL, MARY BELL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Discussion:

To Build the Young Socialist Press

By BOGDAN DENITCH

The socialist youth unity convention taking place on February 12-14 will find one of the major items for its consideration to be the role and form socialist youth press should play in the new socialist youth organization.

The role of a socialist press today, when our youth organization is weak and when perforce the local organizations are forced to function more or less on their own, the press can play a major role as the organizer, unifier and consolidating factor for the new organization.

A regular weekly organ available for mass distribution, supplemented by an occasional (preferably monthly) youth paper, not only speaks with the same "line" from California to New England but provides a readily accessible source of socialist propaganda and education for local groups which would otherwise be unable to support printed distribution material. With proper coordination—and this means articles from out-of-town sections in increasing quantities—the youth paper can become more than the organ of the national center; it can be a real mirror of the national life of the new organization.

This is why one of the first and major responsibilities of the new organization, and particularly its local sections, should be to support and distribute the projected *Young Socialist Challenge*.

But a socialist youth organization needs more than a newspaper—and it is well to point out that neither the SYL nor the YPSL have had a newspaper in the sense that I am discussing. It needs a theoretical press and some form of general, broad, radical anti-war organ.

The first can be met with a monthly theoretical discussion organ that should be one of the major responsibilities of the national office, while the second need can be met by more vigorous support of

Anvil, coupled with certain changes that should be suggested to the *Anvil* board.

First, it is essential in my opinion that *Anvil* be maintained as an anti-war organ. I think that *Anvil* should be run less as an academic discussion magazine primarily oriented toward the highly politicized graduate social-science students, and more as a lively, frankly partisan, radical anti-war magazine directed at a younger and less sophisticated audience, which should be the target of the efforts of the anti-war groups now on campuses.

The veteran and the older graduate student with a fairly broad background and frame of reference that used to be the main reader of *Anvil* on the campus has for most part graduated—and the less political new audience, to whom many of our ideas are new and should be explained in more basic terms, is not being reached. To reach them a "lighter" publication is needed.

WRITERS NEEDED

Of course, it is perfectly true that *Anvil's* problem is not only a question of the contents but also the desperate need of any student anti-war publication to seek and find constant new outlets on the campus. However, the unification of two of the main supporters of *Anvil* into one organization and the fairly recent endorsement by the Peacemakers should, if properly used, mean a wider support and circulation of the magazine.

A socialist youth organization, while always attempting to cultivate the largest possible of friends and allies, if it is to grow must come forth in its own name and with its own program to recruit and educate. Its own press gives it an initial advantage over most other youth political organizations, since even much larger groups like SDA are very weak when it comes to press and educational material. This must be recognized and used.

And that means work and a responsible attitude toward the press on the part of the new YSL. EVERY local section of the new organization should regularly write for the *Challenge*; every local section should have at least one member responsible for the ordering of bundles of the paper from the national office and the widest possible distribution of it. Local groups should prepare to go out on a *Challenge* sub drive immediately after the convention.

Our press is a weapon in the struggle to build a socialist youth organization—and it should be used to the fullest.

Debate — —

(Continued from page 3)

Forbes, after answering, informed the audience of the arrangement, suggested that discussion was not really in order, and requested that there be some motion forthcoming from the audience on what to do, after Denitch had answered the question which had already been asked.

After the latter's reply, an SYLer in the audience moved that a question and discussion period be held. Despite the earliness of the hour and the fact that a majority of those present seemed to want a discussion, an SWPer jumped up and countered with a motion for immediate adjournment. The next fifteen minutes saw some disorder and confusion; about a half dozen different procedural motions were made.

Harry Ring, a local SWP impresario, explained that although the arrangements called for neither questions nor discussion, the SWP would graciously agree that there be five brief questions. He ruled discussion out because, as he put it, "it couldn't be properly organized." The sordid situation came to an end only when Denitch and Ainsworth pointed out that the SWP had the formal right to insist upon following the arrangements agreed upon.

While making it clear that they favored a discussion, they both pointed to the fact that if one side refuses to discuss, you can't have a discussion. In accordance with Ring's proposal, a brief question period concluded the debate.

While there is no doubt that the SWP was formally correct in insisting they had the right to veto a discussion, their attitude, in this observer's opinion, reflected their estimate of who had fared well in the debate, as well as their general unwillingness to test their views in discussion with Third Camp socialists.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MORE

about the Young Socialist movement:

- Report on YPSL-SWP debatepage 3.
- Reply from West Coast SP youthpage 8.

BOOKS and Ideas

'The Struggle for Africa'

STRUGGLE FOR AFRICA, by Vernon Bartlett.—Frederick A. Praeger, \$3.95, 250 pp.

By GABRIEL GERSH

Witty, readable and amiable, Vernon Bartlett scans the African continent in 250 pages. He starts with South Africa, glances at Mozambique and Angola, sojourns in the Congo, looks at Nigeria and the Gold Coast, Liberia, Kenya—practically everywhere, in short, south of the Sahara.

Certainly, no one will want to criticize him for having failed to give more than a sketchy panorama of these African lands, for it is clear that he has attempted nothing else. With the skill and insight he commands, perhaps he would have done better to restrict himself to a smaller segment of the area he has tried to describe.

Yet there are several ways in which the author has not failed, for he manages to show that the problems of Africa add up to the same thing—to the people's desire for independence and racial equality. Bartlett never forgets that the diversities and contrasts do not destroy Africa's essential unity. He understands that events in Africa have been spinning at a very fast pace since the end of the war, and that during the next few years decisions

will have to be taken which may shape the continent's future for many years to come.

Even so, the book is marred by a desire to be fair to everybody—to the white racists as well as to the African masses. For example, the "white settlers of Kenya," we learn, "desire kinder things than are generally said about them." Holding this view, the author fails to show us why Mau Mau should have arisen among people who are not given to violence.

The chapters on South Africa give us no clear picture of the trade-union movement and the passive-resistance movement, the two pillars of anti-Malanism. And if the author had really probed the facts beneath the surface in Africa today, he would have seen the inroads which many American companies are making into African industries.

This is the sort of book which omits too much; but Bartlett, an honest reporter, has the virtue of not pretending that it is anything else.

Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

THE DJILAS CASE AND THE CRISIS OF TITOISM—III

HOW THE CRISIS GREW: A Reconstruction

By HAL DRAPER

"In the justified and necessary struggle against bureaucratic tendencies, by concentrating all our attention and political action solely on this struggle, we exposed our flank, and the enemy appeared at our back, the enemy who is equally dangerous, and now even more dangerous. . . ."

"We have somehow lulled ourselves, sometimes become hesitant and corruptly liberal. We have not been reacting in time and correctly. All this gave the impression that we were retreating. All this was interpreted by opportunists as our weakness, as a weakening of authority, and they immediately started to go over to the other side. . . ."

Such was the very perceptive explanation for the roots of the Djilas crisis out of the mouth of the Titoist party boss in Croatia, as he gave it recently (January 23) at a meeting of the Central Committee of the Croatian party. It is clear that the Titoist bureaucracy understands quite well what hit them.

As we have put it ourselves in previous articles, they found that they had allowed too much rein to free-wheeling talk about "democratization." Such demagoguery had been a great help to them in consolidating support against the Russian squeeze and in the midst of all their subsequent difficulties. They had never intended to let it go "too far," or "out of hand." They now tell themselves that they should have foreseen that, sooner or later, some people were going to get the idea that there should be "a real and not only a theoretical and oral fight against bureaucracy" (the italicized words are Djilas's).

In this article, we want to trace just how this crisis developed since 1952, as closely as that can, at present be done on the basis of the available material. (It goes without saying there are still big gaps in the story.)

This phase of the story begins in November 1952 with the 6th Congress of the Titoist party.

It may be that already by the time of this congress the ruling bureaucracy had realized that steps had to be taken against the new "enemy," the forces of democratic opposition that had germinated within the regime. If so, the bureaucracy only used the congress to lay the basis for its counterattack, not being ready for an open conflict. While taking measures which seemed to be concessions to this enemy, it also laid the groundwork for a crackdown.

In any case, in the following six months, its alarm certainly grew. At the second plenum of the Central Committee at Brioni in June 1953, it came out with its counterattack. The first critical article by Djilas which was referred to in the later showdown, is an article he wrote criticizing the decisions of this Brioni plenum (we do not know the exact date or content of this article or how clearly it expressed its criticism). Djilas later explained that he merely thought the Brioni plenum was making an unfortunate mistake. Be that as it may, he soon realized what was afoot. It was then that he reacted even more violently with his press campaign of December-January.

1952: The 6th Congress Changes Names

In the later crisis, each side (Djilas and the Titoists) claimed the decisions of the 6th Congress for its own side. How was that possible, and what had taken place there?

As far as the Djilasites' illusions about the congress were concerned, it is now clear that they rested simply on the fact that the congress decided to change some terminology. The name of the Communist Party was changed to Communist League; the name of the People's Front (the broad all-inclusive political instrument of the regime) was changed to Socialist Alliance of the Working People; the name of the party's Politbureau was changed to Executive Committee.

As we pointed out in our first article, Djilas and his tendency looked on the party's change of name as signifying more than a mere terminological tactic. He looked upon it as symbolizing the political change in the role of the party which he advocated.

At the congress itself, Djilas said in his speech that the change in the name of the party "points out the direction to be taken in the drafting of a new program." Tito had said nothing like this in proposing the change. Both in his report and in the congress resolution, the motivation is left very vague, though the resolution did throw in a reference to "more democratic forms of government."

What was the actual motivation? (1) Perhaps a formal concession, as aforementioned. (2) In an article following the congress, Mosa Pijade gave a more positive reason, though he presents it merely as a consequence: "the new name will formally mark the differences existing between our party and other Communist Parties including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the parties which Comrade Tito in his report quite correctly termed as the 'so-called Communist Parties.' And it is a good thing that the existing differences will thus be marked and stressed in the new name of our party." (*Yugoslav Review*, Dec. 1952.)

This reason corresponds with that for another change in name, the rechristening of the Politbureau as the "Ex-

ecutive Committee." The motivation for this can only be the desire to get away from Russian terminology.

Why did they want to drop the Russian terminology? In order to facilitate much-desired relations with the Western labor and socialist movements. This is even frankly stated when it came to motivating the name-change for the People's Front: "further cooperation with socialist and progressive movements have made these changes imperative," said Tito. (The Yugoslavs have been pressing to get their trade-unions affiliated to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, too.) The reports by both Tito and Kardelj devoted attention to the task of establishing closer relations between the People's Front and Western working-class organizations. The People's Front itself had been working hard at it, through its Commission on International Relations.

(The chairman and secretary of this commission were, respectively, Djilas and Vladimir Dedijer—the two who were, or turned out to be, the leaders of the democratic opposition!)

But while the Djilas tendency (in whatever form it existed then) may have looked on the party name-change as having a political meaning, and not merely a terminological-tactical one—that is, that it represented a change in the role to be played by the party in the organization of the country's political life—it is still true that Tito had warned in his report: "It goes without saying that this change will not affect the organizational structure of the party, its democratic centralism, etc." Later Djilas was going to propose basic changes in the organizational structure of the party in his article entitled "Party or League?" in spite of this reservation.

Warning to the Democratic "Enemy"

But there was an even bigger reason why the 6th Congress was no victory for the "Communist-Democrats" (to use the term Djilas later coined). The congress struck a new note that should have appeared ominous. This was: repeated warnings against "bourgeois-democratic" deviations. Tito plucked this string three times in his report; for example:

"In consequence of the extremely rapid changes made by us toward the democratization of our entire social life, various elements who have no love for socialism begin, it appears, to conceive our expansion of democracy wrongly and to raise their heads. Various theories began appearing on the freedom of this or that. This was felt in various fields of cultural and even political life. These conceptions even had an influence on some members of the party. . . ."

"The increasingly lively and stronger connections with the Western countries instead of becoming a means of acquainting the West with our reality became ever more a channel for transmission of various obsolete ideas, alien to socialism, into our social life. . . . [We must be] capable of suppressing such manifestations on time and correctly. . . ."

The congress resolution echoed the warning against "elements concealed behind the mask of bourgeois democracy." As a matter of fact, in his own speech Djilas also devoted a few words to this line, warning against "the elements of bourgeois democracy" in general.

One other point deserves mention. In an interesting passage in his report Tito presented a discussion which, more clearly than usual, counterposed "economic democracy" (the "workers' councils," decentralization, etc.) to political democracy. As our readers know, we have argued that none of these forms could be any essential step toward democratization as long as the ruling bureaucracy allowed no freedom of political opinion, organization and opposition; but what was made clearer than usual was that these highly touted forms were presented as deliberate substitutes for democratization of political life, to head off demands for the latter, to block them, to lull such aspirations with the claim that they had discovered a substitute that was just as good and better. We have already noted that Djilas was later accused of not "understanding" this.

Such was the inconclusive status of this question at the 6th Congress, where the elements of the crisis were mixed.

1953: The Brioni Plenum

Perhaps because of the illusions raised by the changes in name, at least as represented to the country by the "Communist-Democrats," or perhaps because the latter were heartened to open up, it seems to be a fact that in the next few months the democratic tendency became more rambunctious in unspecified ways. Here is how the situation of that time has been summarized by the same gentleman whose words opened this article, Brkic, the Croatia party boss, in his report of a couple of weeks ago:

"At this time, prior to the Brioni meeting of the Central Committee, some Communists could not find their footing while others thought that we were withdrawing. Many Communists relaxed. . . ."

"In this period, as in any pause, influences from the outside world strengthened and found their reflection in the Communist League itself. As stated by the Brioni plenary session. . . there were various views that the Communists were relieved of responsibility for further development, their tasks consist-

ing in the future merely in lecturing. It was held that the struggle against anti-socialist tendencies were no longer necessary, that the Communists were not bound by the attitudes taken by organizations and leadership on questions of political struggle. . . ."

The Brioni plenum, he goes on to say, saw "the emergence of the class enemy" and called for a fight against them. These enemies "were fighting against socialism under the pretext of a fight against bureaucracy." They were "endeavoring to turn our democracy into a formal, bourgeois democracy." Even "among Communists themselves," the "alien" view was arising "that it was questionable whether the line of the Communist League should be followed."

He links it up: "The importance of the Brioni session and of measures taken by the Communists to implement its decisions can be seen today when the Communist League has had to deal with the Djilas case."

The "Mistake" in the General Election

As mentioned, Djilas recognized the Brioni decisions as a challenge, and attacked them. Here there is a hiatus where we can fill in no details. (We can remark that in August, Aneurin Bevan visited Yugoslavia and stayed at Djilas's home, but of course it must also be remembered that Djilas was the official head of the commission—already mentioned—that had invited him. Perhaps this is the immediate reason why Djilas came to be kidded about being a "Bevanite.")

There are critical articles referred to as published by Djilas in October and November. In November, an event took place which deserves being reported, though its connection with our story may be only indirect. This was the nationwide general election that took place then.

In this election, the regime sought to make another demonstration of loosening up and democratization. It is clear that the attempt backfired.

The new rules permitted the putting up of more than one candidate, and in many places dual candidates were put up by some of the "social organizations." Of course, there was little pretense made that any candidate could be a personage unsatisfactory to the regime, but still some kind of choice was offered.

In a totalitarian setup, as soon as the tiniest crack appears every element of opposition rushes toward that crack like pent-up water under pressure. It is the classic pattern. In this situation, the Socialist Alliance made the "mistake" of endorsing one candidate where there was more than one. Sight unseen, the non-endorsed candidates became "legal" focal points for expressing some kind of opposition, even though there may not have been the slightest real difference among any of the candidates.

Burned Fingers

Listen to this criticism of what took place, as made by the official commentator on the Zagreb radio, particularly his complaint that sometimes "opportunist" candidates had the effrontery to regard the election "as a struggle for votes"—

"Reactionary elements, lacking the strength and support necessary for independent action, concealed themselves in some places behind the backs of some candidates of the Socialist Alliance, who, adopting in a few cases an attitude of opportunism and looking on the elections as a struggle for votes, did not reject or disavow them. . . ."

"In some districts there were several candidates and the Socialist Alliance supported only one of them. This, of course, was a mistake because there were not any candidates outside the Socialist Alliance. These so-called opposition candidates were in some places truly regarded as belonging to the 'opposition' and as being foreign to the Socialist Alliance. In some places they received a considerable number of votes and in others they won. This was not anything exceptional and did not mean a defeat of the Socialist Alliance. The votes cast for these candidates were not cast for the reaction, as some districts have explained it.

"It is wrong to look for a 'culprit' who could be blamed for the various irregularities which took place. Instead, People's Deputies should find a way to cooperate and eliminate the distrust and disunity which has been created in some places."

They burned their fingers, playing with fire. The radio analysis quoted above was given on December 10. NOW we find that this crypto-oppositionist movement in the election is linked with the Djilasite opposition by a spokesman for the regime, the same Brkic we have already quoted twice. He said:

"As regards the imposition of candidates for election in districts by various circles in Zagreb, some honest comrades believed that this was part of the fight for democracy. But in fact this was calculated to cause rifts among the Communists in the districts in question and the liquidation of the political leaders there."

He is accusing the Djilasites, somewhat gingerly as yet, of using the "opposition" candidates to vote down People's Deputies they didn't like, that is, as a factional instrument.

(Continued on page 6)

How the Djilas Crisis Grew — —

(Continued from page 5)

In any case, by this time Milovan Djilas decided that he could no longer hope to get anywhere by pressure within the regime, even though he was such a powerful figure in it; that he had to go outside, with an appeal to mobilize the ranks behind his ideas, in order to press his views.

Was He Naive?

This was the meaning of the press campaign which he started in December in high gear. This was the fundamental crime against the totalitarian structure of the regime.

The reader may well ask, as we have had to ask ourselves: Could he really have been naive enough to think that he could get away with it? Or was it a well-calculated, daring move of conscious defiance reckless of consequences?

Following is how he represented his frame of mind of this time when he later spoke at the CC plenum (in his introductory statement there, not in his concluding recantation):

"... in the course of the last few months of my activities as a publicist, I gradually began to feel that I was moving away ideologically on a number of basic issues from the accepted and customary theoretical views of our movement....

"I have been thinking, especially of late, that differences of opinion can be settled in a verbal discussion, preferably a public one. I was convinced that as a movement and as a society, we had already entered upon a stage where we might engage in such a discussion without any danger to the unity of the movement—within the limits, of course, of our obligatory unity on all practical, political, organizational, foreign-political and other conclusions. I was not entirely satisfied, and still am not, that this view is altogether practical and apt."

So he had simply been "thinking of late" that differences of opinion (in the leadership!) could be settled by public discussion.... To repeat: was he simply that naive?

An Impression

While the question is inevitable, the answer obviously would require knowing much more about Djilas's personality and mentality than we possibly can. His political colleague, Dedijer, speaking at the CC plenum, mentioned that everybody knew Djilas was hotheaded ("turbulent spirit") and this ought to be taken into account (Montenegrins are supposed to be firebrands, anyway.) What I would add, if I had to make an impressionistic comment on Djilas, is based particularly on a reading of his notorious article in *Nova Misao* about the case of the "young and beautiful actress" wife of a high functionary who was socially snubbed by the wives of the rest of the bureaucracy. This article is twice as incredible as it seemed even from the *N. Y. Times* report of it. I cannot conceive how it could have been written, in the given situation, by anyone with the slightest sensitivity to the demands of strategy and astute behavior. While it undoubtedly does justice to his heart, it seems to enforce inescapable conclusions about his head—specifically, about his lack of any sense of tactics.

This much has to be said at a minimum: Anyone who seeks to analyze Djilas's motivations by assuming that, whether cleverly or not so cleverly, he was behaving in a coolly planful, sober and deliberate manner with his feet on the ground... is making an assumption that needs proof.

Djilas Goes "Outside"

But these are matters we cannot resolve. To get back to facts:

Djilas went to the outside party public, over the heads of the leadership, and this was his unforgivable crime. At the CC plenum, Tito hinted that the leadership had been aware of his tendencies but that they figured on "taking care" of him inside the circle. (If he persisted in his ways, he could always be gradually and tactfully pushed down till he was no longer capable of being a nuisance.) No doubt Djilas knew that too. But, Tito went on to say, they were forced to call the plenum—and make an open scandal out of it—when Djilas's views "were submitted for public discussion, that is, to a non-party audience."

They could not put personal pressure on Djilas any more. He had in fact, for months before the blowup, cut out close personal relations with the rest of the leadership. He himself referred at the CC plenum to his "personal estrangement from my closest comrades in the Executive Committee," ascribing it to his political differences. His friend Dedijer likewise acknowledged that "Djilas divorced himself recently from the members of the Secretariat." Tito said:

"Why did Djilas separate himself from his old comrades, with whom he had been collaborating for 17 years? Comrade Djilas had every chance to say all he wanted about our crisis, and even more than what he had written. We knew him and we had discussed among ourselves and joked with him, and in jokes everything can be said. But these questions had not been discussed in the way they are printed [that is, Djilas never told them how far he was going to go in his articles—H. D.] He found it necessary later to give notice at a meeting of the Executive Committee and of the Secretariat about his intention

to write in this way. It is certain that we should not have permitted him to write in this way, because these questions could only be solved by the congress [of the party] and no public discussion of these matters could have been permitted."

If they had known what he was going to write they would have stopped it, says Tito. Undoubtedly that was just the reason why Djilas (as he admitted) "violated the effective and accepted rule" of consultation with the leadership before writing in such a vein. He was certainly NOT naive enough to believe that he would have been permitted to publish if they knew what he was going to say—that much is certain!

But much as the leadership would have preferred to deal with Djilas in the privacy of the inner circle, his open press campaign forced their hand. Said Tito: "One must see that we have come to the extreme limit, and when we reached this we had to say: Stop."

How the Articles Got Printed

How did Djilas manage to get his heretical stuff into the press, into *Borba*?

This is one of the clearest aspects of the whole affair, thanks to the fact that the Titoists were just as anxious to explore the answer as so many people who ask the question here!

(1) Djilas's initial articles, up to December 27, obviously made many leading comrades uneasy, wondering just what was up, but it was not until his article entitled "Subjective Forces" of that date that more than a couple began to be sure it was not just a more vigorous repetition of the same old salaams before democracy. The reason this article jerked them to attention was that it was the first to make clear Djilas's ideas on the role of the party, his "liquidationism." One could talk about freedom of discussion all one wished, but when the party was touched....

With that article they began to understand that Djilas was presenting a brand-new line, not merely some extreme exercises in democratic verbiage.

Well, why didn't the *Borba* editors react at this point?

(2) It has to be remembered that Djilas's party authority was topped only by Tito, and that even if Kardelj outranked him it was not by enough to permit him to step in on his own authority. Tito was not around; he was away from Belgrade, vacationing in Slovenia and apparently out of immediate touch with the capital. (This was noted more than once at the CC plenum as a dark count against Djilas.)

How could the other bureaucrats know that the strange things Djilas was writing weren't a new line of some puzzling kind that was being broached by the top leadership? The procedure was well-known. (Kardelj knew it wasn't and argued with Djilas, as we have described in a previous article, but he had to mobilize Tito before a crackdown could be effected.)

So this new stuff by Djilas was startling, but as we all know, comrades, the leaders know what they're doing. As a matter of fact, most of the top stratum of bureaucrats assumed it was a new line and hastened to "yes" it.

Dedijer had the guts to fling this into their faces at the CC plenum, in the most courageous words spoken there by anyone:

"Until a few days ago, Djilas's views expressed in *Borba* were more or less accepted by the majority of us sitting here. We cannot deny this or find excuses by saying that we read the articles too quickly. All of us by placing our hands to our hearts would admit this. There is no doubt that those who read Djilas's articles were convinced that he had discussed the problems with members of the Secretariat and that the Executive Committee was behind him.

"What does this mean? This means that these people liked the articles, not because of their contents, but because of the authority behind them. Now there is a new situation. The Executive Committee has stated that it disagrees with the articles. Now people who approved Djilas earlier have started throwing stones at him. Those who agreed with Djilas's articles because of their contents are now keeping their mouths shut.... I think that people will say that we are men who say one thing in the morning and change our ideas overnight."

Dedijer as Key Man

(3) All that would be enough, but there is a third piece of information to be given.

The political editor of *Borba* was—Vladimir Dedijer himself, who was not only Djilas's co-"conspirator" but the man who behaved in a more courageous and principled manner at the CC plenum than did Djilas.

One of the other editors of *Borba*, Vlahovic, also spoke at the CC plenum, mainly to exculpate himself: "I was worried somewhat at the time of the publication of the articles by Comrade Djilas. I received no remarks from the members of the Central Committee on these articles; with the sole exception of Comrade Zihel [Zihel] was the "cultural policeman" we mentioned last week who seems to have known the "right" line "instinctively"—H. D.]... I was on sick leave until December 12, and Comrade Tito was in Slovenia, and a talk on this subject was postponed...."

So, said Vlahovic, "I should like to raise the problem of the editorship of *Borba* and *Nova Misao*...."

Which reminds us: how did Djilas get that fantastic article into the magazine *Nova Misao*?

It was the ubiquitous journalist Dedijer, again, who took the responsibility for this at the CC plenum: "My name also appears on the titlepage of the magazine.... Accordingly, all blows which are hitting his [Djilas's] head just now I also feel are directed toward me."

But, as our article last week made clear, don't think of this Dedijer as a one-man conspiracy. The attack at the CC plenum was also directed against the "Nova Misao group" as a focal point of the Djilasite deviation.

"Journalistic Putsch"

In fact, one of the things which has caused Titoists the greatest worry is precisely the extent to which it was revealed that the party press was in the hands of the Djilas tendency. We have already commented on the extent to which support to Djilas came from intellectual elements and writers, etc. Much of this support was grouped around the party press institutions.

It would seem that this was also (perhaps even especially) true in Croatia. The report by Brkic which we have been quoting in this article was, above all, a call for a purge of the Croatian public organs. Names are named. The editor of *Narodni List*, Milan Despot, was put in the rack. Dusan Diminic, the editor of *Naprijed*, is made into a leading devil of the piece. The newspaper *Vjesnik* is hauled over the coals. A whole series of writers for these organs are included in a rollcall of enemies of socialism—with quotations from their articles which reinforce the material we adduced in last week's article.

In a sense, it almost appears as if the Djilasite campaign of December-January was a purely journalistic putsch on their part!

Thus it was, as Pijade complained at the CC plenum, that "Djilas was able to publish 19 articles in *Borba* in the past three months without anybody knowing that nobody from the Central Committee was in agreement with these articles"—that is, to put it honestly, without anybody knowing that the program which Djilas unveiled after December 27 was not a Tito-approved new line.

Outbreak in Parliament

An accidental and ironic circumstance, which can now be understood in the light of this situation: It was in the middle of Djilas's press campaign, in the middle of December, that he was elected as president of the Federal Assembly, which happened to be scheduled for this time. As the Yugoslav press itself had frankly reported in advance, Djilas's election had of course long been decided on, and it automatically went through as planned. How was anyone to know that the man was shortly to be purged?

So it was that Dedijer was able to bait the CC plenum by pointing out that Dedijer had been elected after 14 of his articles had already appeared. Pijade replied for the hatchmen: "He [Dedijer] did not say it was wrong to make Djilas president of the assembly, but I say it was a mistake although I bear a share of the responsibility." (But Pijade, honest man, did not explain how the "mistake" could happen, even while denying Dedijer's "spiteful and vile remarks" about how CC members changed their views under pressure.)

At the parliament session in January, something else happened that was less accidental. A muted fight broke out on the floor between Dedijer and Pijade—over minor rules of procedure for the house. Dedijer wanted to amend the rules to require that items be placed on the agenda in the order of receipt; Pijade wanted the Assembly (that is, the leadership) to decide the order. A "lively debate" broke out that apparently got out of hand, and the question was shoved off the floor till a new draft could be prepared. Dedijer also demanded that the "deputies be informed before a meeting on the possible contents of the agenda." Pijade was defeated on a proposal that "a deputy who wants to speak... should declare himself, whether he wants to speak for or against."

One cannot help feeling that a tip of the iceberg was showing itself above the water—especially when, at the CC plenum, one hack (Stojnic) spoke about "Dedijer's efforts to arrange a conflict with Mosa Pijade during the debate on the rules of procedure in the Assembly."

Defiance to Tito

Then, as we know, at sometime in the few days before January 10, Tito was apprised that Djilas was running amuck, and intervened. According to Vikmanovic-Tempo's speech at the CC plenum, when Djilas was informed that Tito wanted him to stop, Djilas's reaction was to demand that the decision be made by the full CC, not just by Tito. This was out-and-out *lése-majesté*!

More than that, according to Tito's charges, it was just at this point, after he knew about Tito's "negative opinion," that Djilas hastened to publish "that last article in *Nova Misao*." Why did Djilas hurry this into print, attacking the bureaucratic atmosphere in the clique of the inner "higher circles" with heavy moral and personal overtones? Because, Tito charged, he wanted to prevent us from being morally able to crack down on him... that is, Djilas figured that a crack-down now would seem to be a spiteful personal punishment and revenge.

We cannot say that this explanation is valid or invalid; but we admit that we are ready to believe it, even though it is Tito who makes the accusation.

In any case, Djilas's fate was settled by that time.

"Perspectives U.S.A."

'FORDIZING' THE COLD WAR FOR INTELLECTUALS

By J. M. FENWICK

By 1939, when Europe waited, helpless and afraid, for the onslaught of the Nazi war machine, belief in capitalism had reached a very low ebb indeed

World War II deepened the pre-war tendencies. Immediately upon the liberation of Western Europe mass socialist or Stalinist parties sprang up, not only in countries which had previously been bourgeois-democratic in character but in countries which had previously been fascist as well. Even England, with a long tradition of the most pedestrian type of political conservatism, swept the Labor Party into power and proceeded to nationalize key sectors of industry.

Only the economic, political, and military support of United States capitalism, the only major capitalism to emerge from the war with its structure not only unimpaired but greatly strengthened, prevented a more precipitous deterioration of the capitalist structure and idea.

More obviously portentous was the total disappearance from the capitalist roster of whole countries in Eastern Europe and their absorption in to the Stalinist empire. In the East, China repaid the capitalist West and its own comprador bourgeoisie for a century of exploitation by razing the capitalist structure and laying the foundations of a Stalinist order.

For anyone whose life transcends crude ego satisfactions these are stunning phenomena in the continuum of history. How explain them?

There are two major approaches.

The first is to regard the Stalinist movement as a rationally explainable response to fundamental needs universally felt by the workers, peasants, and large sections of the petty bourgeoisie of a world in which capitalism, taken as a whole, has shown itself to be not only incapable of playing a progressive role in the development of the forces of production but even of maintaining the status quo by force.

The second approach is to regard Stalinism as essentially a conspiracy by a relatively few determined men who impose their will upon whole nations. It is the dominant theory held by the United States government. Given this concept the basic character of the counter-attack is obvious: police action at home and military operations abroad.

This latter theory, of course, is one which explains precisely nothing. One of the most obvious questions which this theory provokes is why the United States with all its resources has been so consistently unsuccessful in subverting Stalinist propaganda and regimes and the Stalinists so relatively successful.

Stumbling-Block

The fact is that the United States does not have a shred of a program which can appeal in any serious way to the exploited masses of the globe.

Rather, this country appears variously as the backer or associate of brutal colonial regimes such as those in Indo-China, Korea, and Kenya, as a meddler in the internal affairs of sovereign nations like France and England, as a supporter of the most conservative class strata in such countries, as a dominant capitalist power which threatens to drive other capitalist nations from the world market, and as an inciter of atomic war.

The rejection of capitalist ideology is basic to the Stalinist program. It is this which provides Stalinist policy, despite its totalitarian features, with its dynamism, for however authoritarian it may appear to even some of its supporters it is at least thoroughly anti-capitalist.

Stalinism cannot be defeated exclusively by military means. The small-scale Korean war was an ominous warning on that score. Only a socialist program, which is as anti-capitalist as the Stalinist one and as thoroughly democratic as the Stalinist is totalitarian, has the slightest possible chance of defeating the Russian barbarism.

There are elements in the ruling stratum of this country, of course, that recognize in varying degrees that Stalinism is a phenomenon which has to be met by other than military measures. The most conscious of these are proponents, for example, of economic and technical assistance to foreign countries. The more superficial see the problem as one of reorganizing the Central Intelligence Agency or of building more powerful transmitters for the Voice of America.

In the long run, however, any program directed abroad which takes as its basic datum the retention of capitalism as it is commonly construed in this country is destined to fail.

It is this blunt fact over which the publication of *Perspectives, U. S. A.* stumbles.

Intellectuals in Uniform

Perspectives, U. S. A., which also appears in British, French, German, and Italian editions, is a magazine designed to combat anti-Americanism in the cultural sphere. It is a quarterly, handsomely printed, with fine-screen

halftones and colored plates, every one of whose two hundred pages affluently affirms its subsidization by the Ford Foundation, which established the magazine. It has a press run of 17,000 in England, 14,000 in Germany, 7,500 in Italy, 7,000 in France, and 5,000 in the United States. The price is \$1.50 in the United States, which is scaled down to around thirty-five cents for readers abroad.

The contents are primarily, though not entirely, devoted to the fine-arts. Most of the articles are reprints of material which has appeared elsewhere in recent years. Seventy per cent of the articles in the first five issues of *Perspectives, U. S. A.* which were previously published in other magazines were taken from *Partisan Review, The New Yorker, Commentary*, four of the university quarterlies, and three of the smaller, independent, more or less avant-garde magazines.

The Ford Foundation subsidy of course determines more than the physical aspect of the magazine—it sets its general orientation as well. "If anyone uses the funds of the Ford Foundation for un-American activities," said Henry Ford II before a congressional committee in November 1952, "we will never give them another dime."

The particulars are determined by the staff and the contributors, most of whom belong to what is somewhat elastically referred to as the literary intelligentsia. Politically most of them may be even more elastically defined as liberals, though politics is not of major concern to them. They are social deviants only to the degree that a serious or professional interest in art and ideas sets them apart from the predominant capitalist mores.

Esthetics in Red, White and Blue

The intent of the magazine—to defend United States culture from chauvinist attacks abroad—is not without justification. This is especially true in respect to the cultural vandalism of the Stalinists, who in the name of anti-capitalism are prepared to pull down the cultural conquests of the bourgeois enlightenment which have permanent, human value.

As a cultural weapon against anti-Americanism the publication of *Perspectives, U. S. A.* has only limited possibilities. It is self-indulgence and literary snobbism to think that the products of the literary intelligentsia are in any sense prime movers in history. The fate of French existentialism is a useful reminder on this score. It effectively disintegrated when confronted with political realities.

James Laughlin, the publisher, states in the initial issue: "Appreciation of the arts can act as a solvent for ideological differences of opinion. The arts can provide a meeting ground where men of conflicting political allegiances can learn to know and respect others as human beings." This is esthetic messianism and, needless to say, complete drivel.

Jacques Barzun shares this delusion, but gives it an authoritarian cast. We need, he says, a new mentality, a new man. "He may be a businessman still, or an administrator of private or state concerns, but he must learn the new lesson of effectiveness by stripping every purpose bare and seeking the minimum means to attain it—an austerity program not simply for economy but for revivifying enthusiasm and faith in work. This lesson he can and must learn from the only type of man who is and has ever been an incorruptible pragmatist—the artist."

As never before in history, politics is crucial for the development of humanity. The Stalinists know this. They are, of course, interested in capturing the intelligentsia. But their major effort is directed toward the masses of the globe. In this they are completely correct.

This limitation noted, however, how well does *Perspectives, U. S. A.* serve in recruiting European intellectuals for what used to be referred to so confidently as The American Century?

Not very well. This is especially clear in articles touching on the political and social scene.

Full Stomachs and Wagging Tongues

Lionel Trilling's article, "The Situation of the American Intellectual at the Present Time," is a good example. It is a warmed-over version of his article in the scandalous symposium "Our Country and Our Culture" which appeared in *Partisan Review* in 1952. The symposium as a whole will be remembered as a memo on academic arrivisme, vulgar anti-Stalinism, absence of social sympathy, nationalism, blindness concerning the future, and, in general, the anesthetizing effect of a war economy upon the critical faculty.

Trilling's ideas may be summarized as follows:

(1) "It is no longer the case, as it once used to be, that an avowed aloofness from national feeling is the young intellectual's first ceremonial step into the life of thought. . . . He has become aware of the virtual uniqueness of American security and well-being, and, at the same time, of the dangers in which they stand. Perhaps for the first time in his life, he has associated his native land with the not inconsiderable advantages of a whole skin, a full stomach, and the right to wag his tongue as he pleases." At the same time—

(2) ". . . the needs of our society have brought close

to the top of the social hierarchy a large class of people of considerable force and complexity of mind. . . . Intellect has associated itself with power, perhaps as never before in history, and is now conceded to be in itself a kind of power." Though there is—

(3) ". . . no longer any foreign cultural ideal to which he can possibly fly . . ." the American artist and intellectual

(4) can now find "the basis of strength, renewal and recognition, now that they can't depend on Europe as a cultural example" in studying (a) the curricula of the school systems, which are turning out future intellectuals, so as to find out what is going on, and (b) psychoanalytic theory.

What more would any European, educated or not, need to be convinced of the truth of the Stalinist indictment of United States intellectuals—that they are insular, shallow, materialistic, tied to big business, completely uninterested in the value or fate of European culture, and without a vital perspective?

An article by the fashionable conservative sociologist of loneliness, David Riesman, can only reinforce this stereotype of the American intellectual which the Stalinists seek to impress upon the European mind. "Some Observations on Changes in Leisure Attitudes" deals with the problem of leisure under conditions of relative material abundance.

It takes no profound social insight to suggest that the Italian intellectual or worker, for example, would be much more interested if the agile Riesman would propose a method of achieving a level of productivity at which this problem would become actualized in Italy itself. The old *Soviet Russia Today* put out by the Stalinists did much better in this respect. In describing life in the Stalinist "utopia" it at least had a concrete proposal for achieving a similar state of bliss—the Stalinist revolution in the reader's own country.

This same inability to translate the American example into a program of action for use abroad is revealed in an article by Learned Hand, "one of the most distinguished jurists in the United States." The article, "Democracy: Its Presumptions and Realities" is completely hollow, echoing with typical legal abstractions and pulpit rhetoric the usual ignorant gibes at the "Hegelian Absolute" and judicial sententiae.

The article, which endorses the American system with all its defects—as opposed to "heathen gods"—typically concludes: "Nor be cast down; for it is always dawn. Day breaks forever, and above the eastern horizon the sun is now about to peep. Full light of day? No, perhaps not ever. But yet it grows lighter, and the paths that were so blind will, if one watches sharply enough, become hourly plainer. We shall learn to walk straighter. Yes, it is always dawn."

Nobody can be opposed to sunrise—but dawn is neither news to the European intellectual nor a political program.

Uncle Toms with a College Education

Almost every negative aspect of American society, commonly criticized by intellectuals here and abroad, is glossed over.

If E. B. White's portrait of New York City is gentle, nostalgic and untrue, and Mary McCarthy's portrait of America critical, she can yet triumphantly conclude her piece by asking: "The ugliness of American decoration, American entertainment, American literature—is not this the visible expression of the impoverishment of the European masses, a manifestation of all the backwardness, deprivation, and want that arrived here in boatloads from Europe?"

The problem of racial discrimination, one of the most telling propaganda weapons of the Stalinists in Europe and in the Orient, is disposed of in really startling fashion by two young Negro writers, both of whom are noted as having spent considerable time outside the United States in the recent past.

In one of the two articles collectively titled "Two Protests against Protest," Richard Gibson advises "the still uncorrupted youth with an itch to write that he become not another Negro writer, that he become instead a writer who happens also to be a Negro. . . ." He attacks Negro writers of "sensationalistic race fiction" such as Richard Wright, Ann Petry, and William Gardner Smith, and white liberals. "The Professional Liberal needs the Problem, he needs a cause, a people to defend. And, in defending, he finds some satisfaction for his own neuroses. He becomes the Great White Father, the 'Marse' protecting his darkies. He will not any more than will the ghetto-masters allow a Negro the right to be human, to become a man and walk with his own strength his own way."

James Baldwin's thesis is that "it is only this void, our unknown selves, demanding, forever, a new act of creation, which can save us—from the evil that is in the world" . . . it is romantic, more, meaningless, to speak of a 'new' society as the desire of the oppressed, for that shivering dependence on the props of reality which he shares with the *Herrenvolk* makes a truly 'new' society impossible to conceive."

The objection to these two positions is not only that they are, as this writer believes them to be, wrong. It is that they are in no wise representative of the opinion of

(Turn to last page)

Fordizing the Cold War — —

(Continued from page 7)

leading members of the American intelligentsia, Negro or white, who are writing on the Negro question.

In essence, the position of the two writers is that the Negro problem is actually not a problem suitable for literary treatment, that it is really not so serious as some inflammatory types would have Europeans believe, and that it should by and large be solved on an individual basis, preferably without white collaboration.

There are other dissonant notes. To a Europe and Asia suspicious of American imperialism, Edmund Wilson, long since fallen apart at the seams intellectually, contributes a long drooping review of Theodore Roosevelt's letters. He finds Roosevelt "attractive and even inspiring." This about a leading jingo, advocate of the seizure and subjugation of the Philippines, and a virulent Anglophobe. Wilson can even "sympathize to some extent with Roosevelt in his doctrine of 'practical politics'" in fighting reformers like Godkin and Villard.

German intellectuals will be glad to know via an oily piece by Perry Miller (of Harvard) that the United States High Commissioner at Bonn, Dr. James Conant (also, curiously enough, of Harvard) is backed not only by American ground and air forces but by a "pluralistic, relativistic mentality" which disowns "monistic and systematic accounts of the cosmos."

All of this makes the title of Peter F. Drucker's article—"The American Genius is Political"—seem a little ironic, especially since he himself concludes his article by noting that "foreign policy is the one department of political action in which this country has failed so far."

Of course, he may be operating on the basis of that part of the American credo which prescribes that a nice try is practically as good as a successful achievement—the coloratura who is consistently flat in the upper registers, the fielder who just misses spearing the fly into the right-field stands, the generals who take a fling at the presidency.

Despite disclaimers that *Perspectives, U. S. A.* would not "engage in current political controversy" the magazine has, as we have just seen, obviously been so engaged. That it has not been more overtly engaged can only be considered a defect from the point of view of its intended European readership, for whom the centrality of the political problem is more generally understood than it is among the American literary intelligentsia and who would like to hear something from the United States other than the official Washington ultimata.

But even from the point of view that the exchange of artistic and literary productions is "one of the most promising methods of fostering a sense of moral and cultural community among the peoples of the world," how does *Perspectives, U. S. A.* fare?

The situation in the United States, which is also

reflected in the pages of *Perspectives, U. S. A.*, is well summed up in one of the better pieces, Malcom Cowley's "The Literary Situation, 1953."

Fiction he finds to be at a standstill, in an interregnum. In recent years there has been a general recession from the social and political to a cultivation of inwardness. No big names have arisen to stamp their impress upon the epoch. Criticism has become a central form. But even criticism has become a sort of exercise in Talmudic scholarship. And the range of subject matter (Melville, Henry James, Faulkner, etc.) is extremely narrow. "Mere talent is relatively common; it is conviction and character that are needed:

All this is true, but it is not much with which to minister to the European malaise.

For a European who has witnessed and experienced the torment of totalitarianism, modern war, and the concentration camp, what is there in *Perspectives, U. S. A.* which will strike a responsive note? William Saroyan's pure fairy tale and pure hokum, "The Oyster and the Pearl"? The excerpts from Augie March's "The Adventures of Saul Bellow," a work completely without dignity of intention? The poetic *disjecta membra* of E. E. Cummings? Otis Ferguson's "Young Man with a Horn," a synthetic attempt to create a tragic folk hero out of Bix Beiderbecke? Thomas Merton's "St. John of the Cross"—"the patron and the protector and Master of contemplative prayer"? John Cheever's "Torch Song," one of his typical low-intensity short stories of the Greenwich Village zombicosmos?

There are a few pieces of greater interest among the highly selective list that got into print. Robert Warshaw's "The Movie and the American," William Barrett's review of John W. Aldridge's *After the Lost Generation*, Meyer Schapiro's "On A Painting of Van Gogh," Henry Steiner's "Rice," or Wallace Stegner's "The Traveler" are examples, but they are in a distinct minority.

The Ex-Avantgardists

In defense of writing in America it should be noted, parenthetically, that the current literary production is much more vital than the selections in *Perspectives, U. S. A.* would indicate.

Taken as a whole the articles represent avant-gardism in its senility. What started out a hundred years ago as an individual protest against the vulgarity of bourgeois society has tattered into an institutionalized defense of that society. It has long since ceased to be the instrument of young rebels. With the great battles more and more receding into the haze of history the avant-garde movement has become acceptable, fit material for academic scholarship.

Divorced from the real world, from that "pluralism"

of American life about which Lionel Trilling talks so much and knows so little, provincial in an epoch of internationalism, the American avant-garde cult offers slim pickings for the young intellectual aware of the world drama which opened up in mid-century with the Korean war.

Perspectives, U. S. A. can publish articles like those contained in the first five issues until the last radioactive cows come home to the last radio-active barns—without having the slightest perceptible progressive effect upon world history.

They can have no such effect because the world problem is in the first instance a political one and will be solved by political means. What secondary effect they could exert on the level of their intention is nullified for the more politically sophisticated European by the immanent and unquestioned assumptions of the writing in *Perspectives, U. S. A.*: that the preservation of capitalism in general and in the United States in particular is both desirable and possible.

To gain a serious following in Europe—not simply retain those persons already committed to United States capitalism through the intermediary of their own capitalist regime—the basic point of departure must be that for inescapable economic, social, political, and military reasons capitalism is in its declining phase.

Unfortunately, the American intelligentsia, is almost in its entirety committed to no such idea. If *Perspectives, U. S. A.* is any criterion it is not even seriously interested in the growing police-state atmosphere in this country, with all that it implies for its own freedom of inquiry and expression.

With a unanimity which is a product alike of its material well-being, a lack of historical insight, social callousness, and plain cowardice the members of this intelligentsia are catastrophically failing to rise to the level of the historic tasks which confront them as intellectual leaders resident in a world power like the United States, which today stands as one of the arbiters of this century's fate.

Of course, we would like to see them writing as all the contradictions of our terrible epoch mandate—as partisans of a democratic socialist movement in opposition to capitalism and Stalinists alike. But given the intellectual and moral retrogression which likewise characterize the epoch, we would settle for a simple voice of protest against the more basic, and not simply the peripheral, iniquities of the times.

For the person for whom the future is also a present fact and for whom each present fact exists to be transcended, the absence of such voices is sufficient evidence that a big section of the current literary intelligentsia is washed up.

This, if nothing else, *Perspectives, U. S. A.* makes painfully clear.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

HOW TO DISCUSS POLITICS—ANTI-BOLSHEVIK DEPT.

To the Editor:

If you are trying to introduce the journalism of William Randolph Hearst into the radical press, your January 18 issue was a model. We noted with interest the letter you carried, addressed to us and our Berkeley comrades, from the "National Organization Committee, YPSL." We assume this is the new pen name for Bogdan Denitch, for it is written in his inimitable style and with his usual charming disregard for facts.

We hold LABOR ACTION directly responsible for running, without comment, the material Denitch has been submitting. The material carried in the January 18 article was filled with so many factual errors that we cannot take the time here to reply to them in detail. However, we state flatly that we did keep in touch with the national YPSL office while Denitch was secretary, that we are fully informed on events in the East and have made every effort to hear both sides, and that we do most definitely challenge the type of democracy practiced by Bogdan Denitch.

It is clear by now that those who split from YPSL are in serious trouble and would like some company as they merge into the SYL. After all, it wasn't long ago that those who split wrote off the California section as being so few in number that it didn't matter if we stayed with the Socialist Party. Now the situation has grown so desperate that after weeks of Denitch's obvious and one-sided courtship in LABOR ACTION, we are publicly propositioned! We are not only flattered at such attention, but amused that the SYL and Bogdan Denitch, so noisily trumpeting the demise of YPSL, are at the same time so concerned over developments in YPSL and so eager to point out, issue after issue, that we are no more. Just as Denitch's public appeal to us is a clear sign of his present weakness, so the SYL's embrace of Denitch is symptomatic of their own desperate need for members.

The forthcoming "unity" conference is nothing but a formality to cover the dissolution of the Denitch group into the SYL. But, after all the noise, such a formality is a necessity to cover, as best it can, the ignominious end to the latest attempt by SYL to break up YPSL. Because of its Leninist-Bolshevik attitudes we ourselves have no interest now or in the future in organic unity or close federation with the SYL—LABOR ACTION can save a good deal of space if they make that clear to Denitch.

Despite the differences which exist between ourselves and the national party office, the rank and file of the SP have proven themselves in convention assembled as anti-war, democratic socialists. The differences that exist will be worked out in the democratic manner that has always been open to members of the Socialist Party. The very fact that we in California have never been threatened with suspension or expulsion, despite our unequivocal Third Camp position, should give the lie to Denitch's claim that the party is trying to smash its Third Camp youth groups.

It seems tragic to us that at a time when all democratic socialists have their hands full trying to organize resistance to war and totalitarianism, and trying to educate people to socialism, that anyone should seek to spread bitterness and confusion among comrades. Is LABOR ACTION short of news or so weak on constructive projects of its own, that it must spend time attacking the Socialist Party? Does it feel that such attacks—as distinct from objective criticism—contribute to united effort by radicals?

We have neither the time nor the interest to carry on an extended debate in the pages of LABOR ACTION. Those who would like to receive the regular bulletins issued by the California YPSL may follow our activities by writing the office of the California section of YPSL at 152½ Kinney, Ocean Park, Calif. We have in the past been willing to consider the SYL

as a rival organization with which, however, certain fraternal relations were possible, and on that basis to cooperate with them from time to time on specific projects, such as *Anvil*. Limited as this cooperation has been, it seems to us that such an attitude is better than one of open hostility, which can be the only result of the present policy of LABOR ACTION in permitting Denitch the free run of its columns to attack YPSL and the Socialist Party.

Los Angeles YPSL
January 24, 1954

[The "Los Angeles YPSL" is a branch of the Socialist Party's youth group which stayed with the SP when the national YPSL disaffiliated.—Ed.]

It is with a great deal of regret that we publish the above reply of the California SP youth. It is presumably a comment on the very serious and amiable *Open Letter* of the YPSL national committee, which devoted itself entirely to political considerations.

To this the California comrades react with vituperation about "the journalism of William Randolph Hearst."

This is quite a demonstration, on the part of these comrades, of how not to behave like those bogeymen the "Leninist-Bolsheviks."

It is really too bad that these young comrades could not "take the time" to take up any of the political points which constituted the entire content of the *Open Letter* to them. It is a sad thing that they did find the time, and 14 column-inches of space, mainly to substitute personalities for politics.

Their "flat" denial on one point of fact mentioned in the *Open Letter* is at least relevant, that is, at least it is not mere invective. On this point, the YPSL office points to the documentary evidence provided by the convention journal published in 1953 following the organization's convention of that year. There it was reported in permanent print that the

California group had sent no delegates, no proxies, no resolutions. The YSL files show: no dues receipts from Los Angeles, no official communications from the LA circle (outside of personal communications from one comrade), and no response to the convention call. The report in the convention journal and to subsequent NEC meetings has never been disputed by the California people.

Of course, either way, this point is minor. The *Open Letter* was a political document, which invited a political response. The lack of any such approach to the problem is the most melancholy feature of the California comrades' displayed attitude.

Two other peripheral points:

It is great news to hear that "the rank and file of the SP have proven themselves in convention assembled as anti-war democratic socialists." The impact of the news is adulterated somewhat by wonderment why this anti-war sentiment of the "rank and file" finds no reflection in the SP national office and in the pages of the SP's *Call*. It sounds kind of undemocratic, and an aspersion on the SP. Perhaps the California comrades are merely kidding themselves.

Secondly, LABOR ACTION is quite proud of the opportunity which we afforded the YPSL of presenting its point of view, as well as our willingness even to print the above California letter. It's really too bad that the California comrades who stayed with the SP do not have the same opportunities even in their very own organization's press, the *Call*, to express their anti-war point of view. This is quite a difference between the policy of LABOR ACTION on the one hand and, on the other, the political censorship practiced by the staunch anti-"Leninist-Bolsheviks" of the SP.

We hope that as soon as possible the climate will become more favorable for succeeding in engaging the California comrades in a political discussion on points raised, rather than in hair-pulling. That's really the only thing we're interested in.—Ed.