

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 28, 1955

FIVE CENTS

## EFFECTS OF MALENKOV'S FALL

England: "Co-Existence" Suffers  
Poland: Ruling Clique Shaken

... page 2

Djilas and World Socialist Press

... page 7

Toynbee: The Politics of Sainthood

... page 6

## Reuther, Hollander and Some Lessons of History

By BEN HALL

There are little arguments and big ones. When he answered Quill at the CIO convention, Walter Reuther rolled up a monster. He rested his case against the formation of a "third" or labor party not on trivia but on history itself. Impressive indeed!

This is an apt moment for discussing history. The union movement will take an historic step when it unites, opening a new chapter in labor history just when the division of American politics into the Democratic and Republican Parties is proving obsolete. Hence all the talk about new alignments.

**Unity has already achieved at least one thing. Advocates of a labor party used to be confronted with a familiar objection: How can you have a labor party when the unions are divided? The AFL, it was said, would never go into any party set up by the CIO; etc., etc. But now there will be one united body of labor. It is at this juncture that Reuther appeals to history.**

"Everyone who knows anything about the elementary facts of political history in America," lectured historian Reuther, "knows that building third parties will get no one anywhere."

For the biographer, it is worth noting that this fundamental historical fact is a new acquisition to the CIO president's fund of knowledge. He went for decades without such enlightenment, thus demonstrating that the last few years of his busily crammed life has allowed at least a few moments of leisure for delving into history.

### REUTHER'S GRAND AIM

Without dipping too deeply into the past, or too far back, we recall that in March 1948 the UAW International Executive Board adopted a resolution for the formation of a new party after the 1948 elections, "a genuine progressive party." Reuther himself was so moved by this great objective that he addressed a special letter to the UAW membership explaining that the next granted aim of his life was to promote the new movement. Neither he, nor any of his board members paid attention to the lessons of history.

Even when this resolution was pigeon-holed and a leading UAW member tried to resurrect it at the 1949 convention, Emil Mazey replied that "the statements we made at the March 1948 Board meeting are still the political objectives of our union."

Still no history.

And history remained unplumbed as late as April 1951 when the 13th UAW convention met in Cleveland. At that time, a minority resolution favoring the formation of a labor party received the votes of one-third of the delegates. Yet Reuther failed to enlighten them about history.

Instead he rested his case on the tactical premises of "timing." He said:

"I think we can all agree both the majority and minority resolutions criticize the old political parties, and that criticism is justified. . . . But it is not a matter of principle that is being debated here in these two resolutions. On principle on the type of independent political organization we need and the needs of workers building political power, we are agreed. The division is not in principle, it is in strategy. In

tactics. . . . I say, fellows, your sentiment is fine but your judgment is bad. Your timing is bad. . . ."

Since his own historical insight is so recently acquired, Reuther doesn't make excessive demands: "Everyone who knows anything." He doesn't require us to know very much, certainly not everything. And in turn, in mutual tolerance, no one should put extreme demands upon him in the chosen field of history. If he doesn't know everything, he too must be excused. He knows the great fact, the broad generalization.

Still, though a UAW president need not be aware of minor eddies in the rushing stream of history, it is worth while to recall one incident in the history of new parties that escaped his studious attention. It was long ago and perhaps not worth his trouble.

In 1854, at a critical moment in political history, when the major parties were

(Continued on page 2)

SEATO and Afro-Asian Conferences Emphasize:

## Govt. Foreign Policy Traps U.S. in Asia

By GORDON HASKELL

Two conferences which will take place in Asia shortly once again throw into sharp relief the impossible dilemma which confronts supporters of American foreign policy. One is the forthcoming meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) at Bangkok, and the other the Afro-Asian conference scheduled for April in Indonesia.

The SEATO conference will be attended by the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan. Its composition alone guarantees that to the vast majority of Asians its purposes are suspect, and worse: three governments whose only claim to the status of "Asian" powers is that they have conquered and imposed one or another form of imperialist domination over Asian territory by force of arms. Two of them are the only countries in the area inhabited overwhelmingly by peoples of non-Asiatic origin, and the other three are either considered as bulwarks of reaction, or are fairly insignificant in Asian affairs.

The purposes of the conference are to erect a military barrier to Stalinist conquest, and a police barrier against the spread of Stalinism by political or other internal means. As an afterthought, the SEATO powers also propose to consult

on ways and means of fostering economic development in the area. The actual resources to be allocated for the first two purposes are vague enough at the present time, but where the last is concerned they become lost in the dense mists of sheer phrasemongering plus wishful thinking.

The Afro-Asian conference, on the other hand, is sponsored by the "Colombo powers": India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma and Indonesia. These are the five substantial non-Stalinist governments in Southeast Asia. They have invited governments scattered from the South Atlantic to the Western Pacific, including Stalinist China and the great industrial power of Asia, Japan.

Whatever else may be said of it, the conference at Bandung will embrace representatives of the bulk of the underdeveloped countries of the world, an overwhelming majority of the non-white peoples, and perhaps an actual majority of the human race. As the *New York Times* puts it, the conference "has been planned on the premise that Western, white man's colonialism or imperialism is the principal menace confronting Asia and Africa."

### STALINIST VICTORY

It is not necessary to have any illusions about the positive results which may be expected from such a conference to recognize that the invitation of Stalinist China represents another enormous political victory for the Stalinists in the cold-war struggle. The disparity among the types of governments and the social forces they represent and the conflicting national interests among many of them may well reduce the Bandung conference to little more than a talk-fest. Probably the only consequence will be some kind of broad vague statement of "common aspirations," and even this may prove impossible.

The invitation to the Chinese Stalinists emphasizes the illusions about the nature of Stalinism which are still so widespread in Asia, even among conservative, bourgeois governments. At best it can be hoped that some Burmese or other socialist delegate will express "misgivings" about Stalinist imperialism as a counterpoint to the hatred and hostility for Western imperialism which will inevitably be the dominant mood of the conference.

But the inclusion of the Chinese Stalinists detracts from the character of the Bandung conference as a rallying center of governments uncommitted to either war camp.

The Bandung conference is still a good two months off, and much could happen in the meantime to affect its outcome. But one needs no crystal ball to foresee that much of what is likely to happen will only tend to increase the political capital

(Turn to last page)

## Shachtman National Tour

Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, will leave New York on a national speaking tour on March 3. He will stop at the most important centers of the country to speak on the general subject of "Europe and Coexistence."

In choosing this subject for his lectures, Shachtman will be dealing with the most acute question of our time, since it touches not merely on the political situation on the Continent, but by the very nature of the problems involved, Asia, and the political policy of the leading nations, most important of all, the United States.

Whatever the local variations in the title, the basic speech of Shachtman will revolve around the over-all question indicated above.

The tour will begin in Newark on March 2 and will continue toward the west, winding up in Seattle. A glance at the schedule below shows that Shachtman will spend several days in each important city.

Thus branches will have an opportunity to meet with Shachtman and to discuss problems of the ISL as well as to consider the cases of the ISL arising out of the attorney general's list.

Readers of LABOR ACTION should watch the columns of the paper for notices of the Shachtman meetings which will be published in advance of his scheduled appearances in the various cities.

This is notice to the branches of the ISL: Send in your announcements in time for publication in LABOR ACTION.

The schedule of the tour is as follows:

Newark .....	March 2	Detroit .....	March 11-13
Philadelphia .....	March 4	Chicago .....	March 14-16
Reading .....	March 5	St. Louis .....	March 17
Pittsburgh .....	March 6-7	Los Angeles .....	March 23-26
Cleveland .....	March 8-9	Bay Area .....	March 27-30
Oberlin .....	March 10	Seattle .....	March 31-April 2

# South African Ruling Class Divides on Exploitation vs. Apartheid

By PRISCILLA CADY

The reactionary regime of Prime Minister Strijdom, successor to Malan in South Africa, has started to carry out its policy of complete separation of non-white (African, Indian and Colored populations) and white by wholesale moves of families from Sophiatown, a Johannesburg area populated by Africans, to new living quarters in Meadowlands, twelve miles outside the city.

This racist crime which is being committed in South Africa deserves to rank, in order of opprobrium, somewhere near the mass uprooting of whole peoples which has on occasion taken place in Stalinist Russia.

This measure may have set off a dispute in the African National Congress, involving the question of calling a twenty-four-hour general strike in protest against the move. The strike was set and then called off, presumably by the Gandhian leadership, who are anxious to prevent a premature demonstration which could become a pretext for massive retaliation by the government.

Large numbers of police stood guard during the evacuation of small groups; a few demonstrators allegedly banged on pipes, threw stones through store windows, etc.

On the whole, however, according to reports, things have been going according to schedule. The government has laid its plans carefully, switching the stated date for a move suddenly, moving only small groups at a time and at night, and, to date, moving only those who offered no resistance. It is a reasonable supposition that they plan to get as many moved as possible without trouble and then, having isolated the intransigents, move in on them with force.

Many professional and well-to-do Africans own their own land and homes in Sophiatown, and others are landlords to many who live in the shacks and holes-in-the-wall which comprise the dwellings of the majority of the population. The new site has been reported to contain nice new bungalows, but it has also been stated that the people would have to build their own homes; presumably these

bungalows are intended as homes for those who now own their own houses.

One thing is certain, however. No African will be allowed to own home or land in Meadowlands; thirty-year leases only are being granted to those who are now forced to give up their property.

**This fact sheds a light on the Apartheid move, which is usually presented as being solely motivated by race prejudice. That this exists to a shocking degree is the best-known fact about South Africa, but it is obvious that the interests of the landlords are in accord with segregation. This is not true in the same way of the mining and factory interests. Oppenheimer and Strauss, two of the major industrialists in the country, attacked the government this week in Parliament on the Apartheid measures on the realistic grounds that they need African labor. The Nationalist plan to permit only migrant labor in white areas would obviously be disruptive to the economy and hinder expansion.**

The Apartheid policies therefore have the problems of the modern world to contend with. The landowning Boers find in the program not only gratification for their primitive and vicious racist ideology but also material gains in their roles as city landlords. The farmers, who depend on native labor, seem to be bent on a suicidal policy, and it is difficult to see how they can continue it. But industry, which until recently has been completely controlled by the English but is now being permeated by Boers, in spite of its racist attitudes, cannot support a consistent Apartheid; they need the Africans to exploit.

The opposition United Party, therefore, while supporting all steps to keep the non-white majority repressed, as it has done, must draw back from the semi-civilized racism of the Nationalists, and it is not likely that the latter will actually push through such a separation of the races as will wreck the South African economy. Even virulent racism must give way before the class interests of exploitation. The white masters cannot do without their African slaves; they can only oppress them more and more cruelly until their power is overthrown.

# LONDON LETTER Opening of a New Era A-Power Stations Planned

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Feb. 16—The British government today announced the opening of a new era. The Atomic Energy Authority—a public body—published a White Paper giving details about 12 atomic-power stations which are to be built within the next 10 years, at a cost of \$840,000,000.

These power stations, to be built by private companies with the technical help of the Atomic Energy Authority, will provide electricity equivalent to six million tons of coal. It is not intended to replace other forms of fuel, but rather to supplement them.

The cost of the electricity will be about the same as that produced in the new coal-fired power stations. It will provide for the rapidly expanding use of electricity in this country.

Despite this, however, coal mining will still remain one of the major employing industries in this country. Soon after the minister of fuel and power had presented the White Paper to Parliament, a Labor MP arose to ask if the proposed atomic-power industry would threaten the jobs of the miners. The minister answered that it was unlikely that in his generation or even that of his children, the mining industry would be completely replaced.

The estimates for the cost of the nuclear energy are extremely unlikely to be accurate. It is fortunate, however, that the government intends to go ahead irrespective of the cost.

**Although they can build parts of the plant, private capitalists do not have enough capital to start up such an enormous industry. No Tory MPs were found to object to the government being such an important investor.**

I would mention in passing that the gas industry, as well as electricity and coal, has been nationalized since the time of Labor government and a coordinated fuel policy will thus be made possible.

Last week, by 93 votes to 70, a meeting of the Parliamentary Labor Party re-

jected a proposal by Bevan that the Labor Party should ask the government to call immediate four-power talks with Russia about the future of Germany.

Yesterday, Bevan made another attempt to capture the initiative of party leadership. Over his signature and those of Messrs. Strachey, Stewart, Crossmen, Robinson and Foot, a motion was put down regretting the government's "present refusal" to take part in talks with the Russian government on the future of Germany before the ratification of the Paris treaties. Furthermore, it wanted talks on the reduction and control of armaments and to "devise positive measures for the removal of fears from all the peoples of the world."

It called the government to account for not acting in the spirit of a resolution which it accepted last April. This was a Labor resolution asking the government to take all possible measures to reduce world tension. The government had agreed to it, but on the understanding that it was not committed to action at an unsuitable time.

But British neutralists had their nose put out of joint when, after months of anxious agitation, the United Nations invited Mao to its negotiations, and he smartly refused the invitation. He was sitting much too pretty. The *New Statesmen* crew, and those whom we might honestly call the "China Lobby (Mao variety)" in Parliament, found themselves at a peculiar loss for words, when the West's attempts at "being reasonable" were so harshly rebutted.

I do not know whether it is due to the change in dictators in Russia or not, that the "Anti-Fascist" students of Moscow recently wired to the British National Union of Students cancelling its proposed much publicized exchange of students.

Ever since a delegation of Russians came here in return for an NUS delegation last year, students had been looking

*(Continued bottom of next page)*

## ISL FUND DRIVE

# Keep It Rolling In!

By ALBERT GATES Fund Drive Director

The second week of the Fund Drive showed a contribution of \$921, which exceeded the income of the first week but failed to reach the goal of \$1000 a week required during the campaign.

A couple of changes in the quotas affected the standings slightly. The Chicago branch, which voluntarily raised its own quota from \$1800 to \$2000, sent in the largest payment this week—\$400—and increased its percentage to 31.2. On its original quota it would have pushed near to the top. But since the Pittsburgh quota was reduced on request of the YSL, Pittsburgh still remained ahead of the Chicago branch, a situation which will not last long unless Pittsburgh runs scared.

New branches to make a showing were Detroit, Cleveland and Newark. While Newark hasn't come in with a respectable sum, our experience in last year's campaign leads us to believe that before long the branch on the other side of the Hudson will be near the very top soon.

We must apologize to our St. Louis friends for last week's error in the box score. While the story indicated that St. Louis had already fulfilled its quota, the box score attributed it to Streator. The error was understandable since in almost every campaign we have had, the Streator comrades have jumped into the lead and remained there throughout most of the drive. The error was probably made automatically: 100 per cent—that means Streator!

While all of this is quite to the good, we still have a soft underbelly. From the National Office down, we are in bad shape. As the box score reveals, nothing has been received from those areas. Older readers will remember that our Fund Drives require an average weekly remittance of \$1000 to make possible a 100 per

cent achievement of the goal of \$10,000 in the 10-week period allotted to the campaign. Every week in which we come under the \$1000 mark means added pressure upon us in each subsequent week.

For the first two weeks, we have fallen below the \$1000 mark, once by more than \$250, and this current week by over \$75. At this rate, we must receive over \$1000 a week to keep pace with the arithmetic of the campaign.

It is obvious that we need a response from such places as Los Angeles, Bay Area, Buffalo, Seattle and the National Office. We know that mail takes a little longer from the West Coast, but that little longer time has already come and gone and our friends there are long overdue.

We are counting on their showing in the next week.

## BOX SCORE

Branch	Quota	Paid	%
Total	\$10,050	\$1658.50	16.2
St. Louis	25	25	100
Streator	25	10	40
Pittsburgh	125	40	32
Chicago	2,000	625	31.2
Detroit	200	55	27.5
N. Y. City	3,800	737.50	19.4
Cleveland	150	25	16.6
Philadelphia	250	32	12.8
Newark	400	11.50	2.8
Natl'l Office	1,500	10	0.6
Los Angeles	600	0	0
Bay Area	500	0	0
Buffalo	250	0	0
Seattle	150	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0
Akron	50	0	0
Reading	50	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0

*(Continued from page 1)*

permitting the expansion and spread of slavery in the United States, a new party was set up to fight against the extension of the South's system. It nominated a man whom only historians remember, to run for president in 1856. Like Reuther says, it didn't get anywhere, at least not that year. Its candidate polled only one-third of the votes; and every practical politician knows what a disaster that is. It would have remained an excellent example of the futility of forming third parties except for one thing. In 1860 it elected its candidate.

**That too was history. But then everyone can't know everything. Yet "everyone who knows anything" should be familiar with it. For that third party was the Republican Party. That victorious candidate was Abraham Lincoln. This is the same former "third" party that won the elections in 1952.**

Third parties are useless and futile: that was all straightened out . . . until we read about New York State CIO President Louis Hollander and his speech to the Transport Workers Union convention.

Mike Quill, TWU president, derided CIO political policy for its cringing docility to Democratic politicians and repeated what he had told the CIO convention: labor must form a new party. Hollander, a guest speaker, was against it. One comment, quoted by the *New York Times*, leaves us all confused on the third-party issue.

"I believe," he said, "we can force the reactionaries of both parties to form their own third party. Then labor can sit down and rebuild one of the two remaining parties, supporting liberals who stay on."

A few preliminary thoughts nag us: (1) How does he propose to "force" the reactionaries to form their own party? So far, he has been content to string along with the official nominees of the Democratic Party.

(2) Why should the reactionaries quit the Democratic Party when they are able to use labor's votes and turn control of Congress, its committees, its party caucuses and machinery to these same reactionaries?

But this is what bothers us: if a third party is futile, why do anything but rejoice if reactionaries take such a futile road? Yet Hollander thinks that it would be necessary to "rebuild" one of the two remaining parties. In other words, he estimates that either or both of the old parties would be shattered if reactionaries left tomorrow. And today? This same power within the old parties is turned against labor.

Hollander wants to get rid of the reactionaries. But the sad fact is that the so-called liberals in the Democratic Party show no signs of moving against its right wing. On the contrary, the right controls the party's machinery. But if this right wing were to move out, Hollander in rebuilding the party would do what? Support the remaining liberals who are too cowardly to raise a finger against reaction inside the party today?

In ten years, says Hollander, a united labor movement could organize 15-20 million new workers. Then "there will be no need for a labor party," because, "every politician will come to you and ask you to join his party." We wonder if Hollander is suggesting that the union movement would end all its political activities. If a new party would be unnecessary because everyone loves a powerful union movement, then why would labor politics be necessary at all?

But Hollander has everything upside down. The PAC was formed not because labor is weak but because it is strong. The more powerful the unions grow, the greater becomes their responsibility to lead the nation, the more intense becomes their political action and the more pressing the formation of a labor party. And, as labor's union power grows, the more insistent becomes the counter-struggle of reaction and big business to control the government and offset union power by government intervention. What is won on the picket line is stolen away in Washington.

Two arguments now make up the unshatterable arsenal of anti-labor-partyism: (1) Labor is too weak; it can't form its own party. (2) Labor is too strong, it doesn't need any party.

But this much should be said for Hollander: it is hard to believe that he knows why he is against the formation of a new party.

## BRITAIN **Malenkov's Fall and the Labor Left Wing**

# Co-Existence Mood Gets Strong Set-Back

By BERNARD DIX

LONDON, Feb. 16—The news from Moscow that Malenkov had taken the first steps along the path trodden out by the feet of many previous members of the Russian Communist Party leadership hit the Labor left wing in Britain at one of its weakest points. It exposed the infirmity which is ever present in any political force which lacks a positive and clearly defined understanding of the characteristics of Stalinism.

**Following the death of Stalin two years ago a vague belief began to gain currency among certain sections of the Labor left that Russia had undergone some fundamental change in its social structure. Stalin, it was said, had been the villain of the piece; he was an embittered, ruthless and repressive despot who had forced his personal characteristics into the composition of the Soviet state.**

With his death, it was claimed, the structure of Russian society began to change as the influences of Stalin slowly died. Manifestations of the alleged changes in Russia were said to be shown in the release of the Moscow doctors, the amnesty granted to certain classes of prisoners, the removal of the hated Beria, the emphasis placed upon the increased production of consumer goods, and the reduction in military expenditure.

But, most of all, it was to Russia's foreign policy that these exponents of a changed Russia pointed as indicative of the correctness of their new evaluation. All the tactical maneuvers, strategic vacillations and intentional aberrations of Russia's foreign policy were hailed as

positive signs of the new policies being pursued by the new leaders in the Kremlin.

It was on this empirical equation, that changes in domestic policy plus elasticity in foreign policy equals a change in the social character of Russia, that sections of the Labor left wing based itself. Many others, while not preparing to concede at this point that Russia had undergone fundamental changes, were prepared to agree that if the present movements continued it was possible that such changes would take place—the difference being one of timing.

### LARGE TRAPS

By adopting these positions, which in many cases were implied rather than expressed, it was easy for the unguarded to fall into the many large and deep traps which are constructed along the paths of politics. "Peaceful coexistence" came into fashion like a new style of spring dress and many half-baked theorists concocted the most weird and wonderful mixtures on the basis of this recipe.

But it was not only the half-baked theorist in the party backwoods who stumbled into this morass; so too did

many of the more seasoned politicians of the BLP and prolific writers for the labor press. Many who would not have dreamed of advancing the theory of "peaceful coexistence" while Stalin was alive suddenly blossomed out as its staunchest advocates on the basis that—because of Malenkov—the situation was different.

**Many of the errors of the British left can be traced back to this mistaken premise—the chauvinistic fashion in which many opposed German rearmament is an example. By seeking to resurrect memories of the Anglo-Russian alliance during the war and conjure up ideas of Britain and Russia as once more allied against "inherent German militarism," they fell straight into the trap of rabid nationalism coupled with "peaceful coexistence," directed against Germany!**

The evidence of such unrealistic attitudes led to a brief flicker of hope rising in the breasts of the British Communist Party, and all-out efforts were launched by the Stalinists to woo the Labor Party left wing. Appeals for united campaigns, joint discussions and common action were fed into the local organizations of the Labor Party. Great emphasis was placed upon the alleged common interests of the Stalinists and Labor left in defeating the plans for German rearmament. The Stalinist press carefully selected the extracts of speeches it printed of the leading Bevanites, so that any criticism of the CP or Russia was removed.

The morale of the Stalinists, which has undoubtedly taken a beating during the past few years, began to rise.

Alongside this wooing of the disoriented elements of the Labor Party left, the Stalinist leadership realized—if their task was to be successful—it was essential that any voices within the Labor Party which stood for a left wing independent of Stalinism be silenced as much as possible. Thus in March of last year the CP weekly *World News* featured two articles entitled "Origin of Trotskyism," in which they launched an attack upon the former members of the old Trotskyist RCP which had disbanded in 1949 when its members joined the Labor Party; they also devoted much space to attacking the left wing weekly *Socialist Outlook*.

It is by no means a coincidence that five months after this attack by the Stalinists the right wing of the Labor Party itself attacked the *Socialist Outlook* and succeeded in stopping the publication of the paper as well as expelling from the party many of those associated with its production—most of whom had been specifically named in the articles by the Stalinist *World News*. Of such episodes is "peaceful coexistence" created!

It is against this general background that the news of Malenkov's "resignation" arrived in London.

**A few hours after it had been received Isaac Deutscher appeared on the television screens to give his interpretation of the events in a brief five-minute interview. He saw the situation as a defeat for the "quasi-liberals and conciliators" headed by Malenkov and a victory for the "tough boys" headed by Khrushchev. A great deal of the responsibility for Malenkov's defeat, said Deutscher, rested with the leaders of the West who—through their failure to respond sufficiently to Malenkov's overtures—had provided the "tough boys" in the Kremlin with the arguments necessary for his removal.**

A somewhat similar line was taken by Aneurin Bevan in an article entitled "We Left Him with No Cards to Play" which appeared in the London *Daily Mirror*. He said that those who had ousted Malenkov had used the argument that his policy of conciliation had produced no results and had proved the impossibility of "peaceful coexistence." Malenkov was defeated, said Bevan, by the lunatic foolishness of Western diplomacy which had continued to pursue a tough policy with Russia and had ignored the conciliatory attitude adopted by Malenkov.

### QUESTION MARKS

The Bevanite weekly *Tribune* was in the process of being produced when the news arrived from Moscow and the article on the subject which appeared on its front page indicated this. A profusion of question marks indicated that time had not made it possible for a firm editorial policy to be framed. But this notwithstanding, it followed the pattern, "If Malenkov was the head of a party favoring a more conciliatory attitude toward the West," said *Tribune*, "the Western leaders can thank their own obstinately for his removal."

The Labor *Daily Herald* featured an article by the Bevanite Harold Wilson, who was one of the Labor ministers resigning with Bevan. He too followed the general line of thought when he said: "Those who wanted a deal with the West, especially Malenkov and Mikoyan, seem to have been thrown over by their colleagues—perhaps because their overtures have apparently been met with the negative measure of German rearmament. The tough guys, headed by Khrushchev, are in charge."

But, important as they are, these comments are only those from the higher realms of political and party thought; the important reaction for the left is what the average rank-and-file party worker thinks; and it was amongst this strata that the conception of a "new order" in Russia had gained most ground. From personal observation it appears that many workers in the party are feeling rather confused by the turn of events.

They had just become acclimatized to the idea of "peaceful coexistence" when its whole basis was suddenly knocked away. They seem to have less confidence in the changes which they imagined had taken place in Russia during the past two years and are more sympathetic to the view that Russia—like any other imperialist power—can blow hot or cold as the occasion demands without any alteration in its fundamental character.

It is, of course, too soon to form any definite conclusions; but if first promises are justified it would seem that fertile ground has been prepared for propaganda in favor of the Third Camp. If those who see the situation with sufficient clarity can but exert themselves, it is possible that a firm impression can be made upon the Labor left wing in the sphere of foreign policy. And this, as stated before, is one of the weakest points of the Left in Britain.

## POLAND **Malenkov's Fall Reflected in Ruling Clique**

# Satellite Regime Loses Mass Support

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The isolation of the Polish satellite regime from the masses of workers and peasants is growing from day to day. Gone is the enthusiasm which existed after the war for reconstructing the country; the faster heavy industry grows in Poland, the worse becomes the situation of the workers, they find.

In the first years of the Stalinist regime, a wave of strikes had to be bloodily repressed by the rulers, but subsequently the workers entered a course of offering passive resistance against the work-norms, i.e., general slowdown. This is a very serious problem for the regime, militating against its fulfillment of industrial plans and delivery of goods to Russia.

The resistance of the peasants represents another serious problem, indeed an insoluble obstacle to the totalitarian control of the country, as in Russia itself. Only eight per cent of the peasants'

farms belong to "collectives" and the progress of collectivization is very slow, in spite of the growing pressure of the government. It is difficult for the regime to strap the peasants into the totalitarian economy with "Russian" methods—or "Ukrainian" methods, i.e., Moscow's methods in the Ukraine—because of the internal situation in Russia and also because of the international situation.

In addition, the middle-class intelligentsia is hostile to the regime, not only because of its Polish-nationalist consciousness but also because of its low standard of living—lower than it was in the time of the Polish independent republic.

### INCREASING ISOLATION

So the regime is growing more and more isolated from the masses; the party is still losing the support of the workers and peasants, losing also its ideological attractive power for acquiring new valuable elements. The ruling strata of the government live in absolute isolation from the life of the nation, and degenerate into personal and internal clique groups.

The most important clique is that of the Stalinist militants of the "Russian" school, with a GPU past. This is the school of Bierut, Radkiewicz, Zambrowski, etc., whose sole criterion is loyalty and faithfulness to the Russian boss.

**Since the death of Stalin, the internal relations of the leading cliques have been dominated by fear and insecurity. According to the report of Swiatlo, the former high official of the secret police (UB), each one of the leaders nurses a private dossier directed against his rivals, and most particularly Bierut has built up dossiers against all his collaborators.**

According to Swiatlo, Radkiewicz, when he was arrested before the war by the police, signed a declaration renouncing the CP and political activity. Fearing the consequences, he wrote a letter to the then general secretary, Gomulka, confessing what he had done. Swiatlo says he gave this letter to Bierut, who has hidden it in his private archives, without presenting this important matter to the party Politburo. It is clear that Bierut, in imitation of his boss the master in the Kremlin, held this letter for blackmailing Radkiewicz and so used it in the fight against Gomulka which led to the latter's arrest as a "Titoist."

After Swiatlo's revelation, and after the fall of Beria, the position of Radkiewicz in the regime was weakened, and last December he lost his post in the Polish GPU and was replaced by a "com-

mittee of security" run by an old Stalinist, Dworakowski. Radkiewicz was not liquidated as was Beria; he is now minister of PGR, the *solkhozes*.

The crisis in Warsaw is only a reflection of the Moscow crisis, as the moon reflects the light of the sun. It does not seem to have the sharpness of the Russian fight; it is only a poor imitation.

**Bierut tried to imitate his boss Stalin, but after Stalin's death he lost stability and tried to imitate the new boss, Malenkov. But as Malenkov's fortunes decline, the position of Bierut becomes very difficult, and he will probably be replaced by an imitator of the latest new Russian boss. Bierut's plight is very uncertain in the working out of the "succession crisis" in Moscow.**

### IWW Anniversary

The New York branch of the IWW is holding a 50th Anniversary celebration to mark the foundation of the organization. It will be held at SIA Hall, 813 Broadway, on Saturday evening, Feb. 26.

The IWW announcement of the affair says that "old-timers in its ranks" are scheduled to speak.

## THE BENDING CROSS

A BIOGRAPHY OF  
EUGENE V. DEBS

by

Ray Ginger

Now, while they last  
only \$1.00

Order from:

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

## London — —

(Continued from page 2)

forward to "seeing for themselves" what student life in Russia was like.

The recent Stalinist line has been that of course students and others can travel in and out of Russia. It is believed that what troubled the Russians was that intelligent people like Fred Jarvis of NUS last year asked high officials such questions as why Trotsky's works could not be obtained in Russia, and what evidence they had that he was a counter-revolutionary, etc.

There was an anxious exchange in Parliament yesterday about the price of tea. Labor MPs pointed out that this basic beverage had gone up in price eight times since the Tories came to power and abolished its rationing.

How could old-age pensioners who earned \$4.50 a week pay for their 3½ ounces a week at the present price of \$1.12 a pound? Why was it that profits of the large tea companies were \$75,600,000 last year, but \$22,400,000 the year before, while the price was still rising.

The Labor MPs were told that the price rose because international demand rose, and unless the government was prepared to ration tea, it could not control the price of a commodity in increasing world demand. The MPs then protested at tea having been derationed at a time of an illusory glut in the world market.

## PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION

## Theories About Chinese Stalinism and Its Wars

To the Editor:

The letter of Comrade Barnes ("Chinese Stalinism and Formosa," *LA*, Feb. 7) and the editorial reply to it raise questions which merit further discussion. The most significant of these relate to the nature of the Chinese Stalinist regime, the perspective of the Chinese working class, and the war question in its concrete form—the struggle for the offshore islands.

In regard to a socio-economic characterization of the Chinese Stalinist regime, Comrade Barnes' reference to the "economic forms of state capitalism" is certainly inadequate. It is my contention not only that the present Chinese social system is one of state-capitalism, but that the "bureaucratic collectivist" system which the ruling bureaucracy desires to establish would also be capitalist in nature.

The editorial comments treated this theory as one held only by "many confused people." That may be as may be, but the article by M. Y. Wang to which Barnes referred upholds this thesis—and it is significant that not only has our press presented not a single attempt at an analysis of Chinese Stalinism from an alternative viewpoint, but there has not even been any effort made to refute Wang. Perhaps, after all, this sort of "confusion" turns out to be a necessary prerequisite to political thought.

## ABSURD ARGUMENT

The only argument adduced by the editorial comments against the state-capitalist theory is that it requires "inventing a 'capitalism' without any capitalist class whatsoever." This argument is absurd on its face, since, in a capitalist society, that class which, through its control of the means of production, disposes of the surplus value produced through exploitation of wage labor is a capitalist class, whatever the juridical property forms.

It can only be made meaningful if changed to read "without any bourgeoisie whatsoever": that is, relating the existence of capitalism to the dominance of a class defined by its ownership of private property in the means of production.

This argument can be met in three different ways.

(1) It is simply untrue to imply that in present-day China there is no bourgeoisie whatsoever. The reverse is the case—the immense preponderance of the Chinese economy—70 per cent of light industry and virtually all of the land—is privately owned.

(2) That notorious "confused person," Lenin, characterized the Russian economy as "state-capitalist" at a time (1921) when it was even more statified than today's China, and controlled by an indisputably proletarian state, to boot. (Incidentally, this last consideration made the Russia of that time far more a "capitalism without any capitalist class" than any Stalinist society. It illustrates the only circumstances that give real meaning to the above formula—a non-exploitive society, still far from the establishment of socialism, but having already eliminated the capitalists.)

(3) It begs the question to identify the bourgeoisie as the only possible capitalist class; the incompatibility of capitalism with statified economy is precisely what is in dispute.

It is not necessary to demonstrate the capitalist nature of a matured Stalinist economy to characterize China as state-capitalist. (Readers interested in such a demonstration are referred to the articles on the Russian Economy by F. Forrest, in the *New Internationalist* for December 1942, January and February 1943. In the 12 years since they were published, as far as I know, not a word has been published in the *NI* in refutation of her argument.)

To show the capitalist character of Stalinist China it should suffice to consider the portion of industry still in bourgeois hands—20 per cent of heavy industry and 70 per cent of light industry (the latter is particularly important in a country as huge and as backward as China); the thoroughness with which a new petty-bourgeois class of small peasant landholders has been established; and the striking similarity of economic development in other major Asian countries.

(Much interesting and provocative material on this point is to be found in the articles by David Miller in the *Fall 1954* and *Winter 1955* issues of the *Fourth Internationalist*.)

This last point should give pause to those who deny the existence of capitalism in China. In South Korea and Burma, India and Indonesia, large and growing sections of the economy are nationalized. And in the Formosa of Chiang Kai-shek, an immense proportion of industry is state-owned—at least as large a share as on the mainland. Is Formosa then a non-capitalist state and the Kuomintang a Stalinist party?

As to the perspectives of the Chinese proletariat, Comrade Barnes' formulation is somewhat inaccurate and misleading. This is so because it presents a specific Chinese experience in generalized form and because it underestimates the importance of China's international context.

## A SINGLE CHANCE

To state that, in China, "the proletariat had, so to speak, but a single chance to assume clear leadership of the national revolution" is to record a most regrettable historic truth. There existed a combination of a vast, irrepressible peasant revolution; a decrepit government and ruling class; a working class decimated by Chiang's massacres and exhausted by economic stagnation, war, foreign occupation and inflation; and a Stalinist party holding power in part of the country and basing itself on the peasant upsurge. These inevitably forced the solution of the basic tasks of the "national" (bourgeois-democratic) revolution on a capitalist basis.

But it does not follow that similar conditions exist in most other backward countries. Much more typical are such cases as those of most South American countries, and those of North Africa, whose "national revolutions" can succeed only if they have an international socialist perspective. (The question of why some countries can today solve the most pressing problems of the bourgeois-democratic revolution without recourse to proletarian dictatorship, and the theoretical implications of this fact, are subject for very extended discussion in themselves.)

The estimate of a generation as the time required for the proletariat to gain preponderance in Chinese society is a defensible extrapolation of the internal situation in China. Merely to assimilate the masses of peasants driven off the land by population pressure and proletarianized by the industrialization campaign will be a Herculean task.

However, this process can be short-circuited by a socialist development in the rest of Asia. An Asian Socialist Federation (let alone a European one!), based on Japanese industry, would exert such political, social, and economic gravitation upon China as could well tear the regime apart and open the way for a "premature" working-class offensive.

In conclusion on this point, it should be pointed out that the editorial reproach to Barnes of "abandoning faith and hope in the forces of socialist revolution in the world today" is a crude and transparent misrepresentation of what he actually said.

Some final remarks on the war question. *LA* has, up to this point, avoided taking a clear and unequivocal stand on the actual fighting that is threatened. The question should be put as bluntly as possible: if a military struggle should break out over the offshore islands which side would we support—China, Chiang and the U. S., or neither? These islands

## Reply: On Social Systems and Social-Patriotism

(1) On the nature of the Stalinist social system in China:

Definitive proof of Comrade Shane's reluctance to think through his theory of "state capitalism" in China is his assertion that "It is not necessary to demonstrate the capitalist nature of a matured Stalinist economy to characterize China as state-capitalist." This is precisely what is necessary, in order to come to any conclusion about the nature (first of all) of the state power in China—i.e., what class is in power.

Is the Chinese capitalist class (what there is of it, or this class's political representatives or agents or ideologists or supporters, in possession of the state power in China? Or is it, instead, true to say that the bureaucratic-collectivist regime of the Stalinist party, whatever it is forced to permit now, has as its direction the wiping out of the capitalist class and all capitalist elements in the society?

The Stalinist states of East Europe also went through a period in which they tolerated and even encouraged capitalist remnants, for both political and economic reasons. As a result the unfortunate Fourth Internationalists, stuck with a "workers state" theory of Russia which they hesitated to apply to East Europe, eagerly seized on the existence of these capitalist remnants—and even substantial capitalist sectors of the economy—to label the states as still "capitalist." It was, however, simply a transitional stage in their slide to their notorious theory of the "bureaucratic socialist revolution." Shane is still stuck at this point, in his own slide toward a form of pro-Stalinism.

We have already made clear (in our reply to Barnes) that it is perfectly legitimate to discuss the still-existing "economic forms of state-capitalism" (or state-capitalist elements) in this non-capitalist China. Nothing strange about this: there are feudal elements (forms) in many capitalist societies; capitalist elements in pre-capitalist societies; capitalist elements in a workers' state or even a socialist society, etc. But Shane obviously understands nothing about this old distinction.

He actually refers to Lenin's remarks about "state capitalism" in the Soviet economy. Lenin, of course, was quite forcefully referring to the state-capitalist elements still existing as a substantial part of the economy, especially strengthened by the NEP. But surely this reference itself should have reminded an educated comrade like Shane of the incongruity of what he is writing. For does he imagine that this Lenin, who freely spoke of the state-capitalist elements in the economic structure, concluded from such expressions that the Soviet social system was "capitalist"?

## A "SOCIAL SYSTEM"

We fear that Comrade Shane does not quite know what a "social system" is, at least to Marxists. We suspect he thinks it is simply synonymous with "economy" or, worse, "economic structure." Not at all; the total social complex (system) is inextricably bound up with the state power, with the question of what is the ruling class, with the class structure. Ordinarily the two jibe and there is little reason for distinction; but precisely not in revolutionary transitions, whether the revolution is socialist, Stalinist or bourgeois. The significance of a social revolution is precisely that the new state power can proceed to reshape the economy in its own class image, fast or slow.

All this should be ABC. Now Shane does not aver that the Chinese Stalinist regime is a capitalist state. He will have to think it through. When he does, he will run immediately into the "Russian" question.

In fact, Shane may think he is discussing China only, but of course he is not.

are indisputably Chinese territory; in the hands of Chiang they represent a base of military operations against the mainland and of naval blockade action against China's normal foreign trade. Their conquest by China would clearly be an act of national defense alone, and would have the highly progressive significance of effectively destroying the Nationalist blockade and thereby strengthening China's independence relative to Russia.

I therefore maintain that if they become the objects of a military struggle socialists should side with China in such a war.

SHANE

If he is to make any political sense (right or wrong) he is first going to have to decide whether the Russian social system is "capitalist" too. Chinese Stalinism is simply still in an earlier stage, as East Europe was.

Incidentally, the Wang article, which Shane recommends, makes this point perfectly clearly. Wang makes no argument whatsoever for calling Stalinist China "capitalist" in any sense which does not apply to Russia, and in fact he discusses both countries as bureaucratic-collectivist in a way which we quite agree with. The accompanying *NI* editorial note commented on his use of the "state capitalist" terminology at some points, and no "refutation" whatsoever was necessary. Wang's approach had nothing in common with Shane's.

## EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION

Shane is apparently not aware that in the early '40s an extensive discussion (and refutation) of the "state-capitalist" theory of Russia went on in our movement, directed then against the Johnson-Forrest tendency. Only thus can we account for his reference, as unrefuted, to the one Forrest article which he mentions, which added nothing important to her group's previous theoretical exertions.

It is common among would-be theorists of Stalinist "state-capitalism" to invent new "Marxist" principles at the drop of a hat, since only thus can the Stalinist phenomena be crowded into the "capitalist" framework. Shane contributes to the tradition by inventing a basic distinction between a "capitalist class" and a "bourgeoisie." We now have a non-bourgeois capitalist class, discovered under Stalinism to fit the theory. There are no "bourgeois" under this Stalinist "capitalism," but presumably there are capitalists (non-bourgeois variety).

Alas, this sleight of hand with words does not help any. For the Stalinist "capitalists" (new non-bourgeois variety) are very peculiar capitalists: they own no capital. This is as disconcerting as the vision of a "capitalism without a capitalist class."

Of course, Shane can ease out of this one by inventing a new definition of capital: for example, the state power (which the bureaucrats "own") is their "capital"... We suggest this *reductio ad absurdum* to Shane in advance out of simple kindness. He should not have to reinvent all the old mistakes all by himself.

The fact is (as would be shown if Shane ever seriously decides to argue the question of "capitalism" in Stalinist Russia) that this Russian social system, even if it is labeled "state-capitalism," is so basically different from all forms of capitalism that it is a different social system. And that is all that has to be said on the terminological aspect.

(2) If Shane is confused on the nature of the Chinese state, his views on war policy constitute a first-rate political disaster, for him. Since it is absolutely excluded that he can hold on for two more minutes to the policy he expounds in his letter, we can be brief.

## DEFEND CAPITALISM?

(a) After asserting that this Chinese Stalinist regime is "capitalist," Shane proposes to defend this "capitalism" in war! When, and how, has he discovered the right of a revolutionary Marxist to support war by one capitalist power against another capitalist power, in this era of ours, in the context of an imperialist world struggle?

(b) The amazing thing is that Shane explicitly draws the social-patriotic implications already present in this position. The reason he gives for supporting war by China over the offshore islands is the classic national-defensist position of social-patriotism: "they" have crossed "our" border. Nothing more!

(c) As against this completely social-patriotic rationale, the Independent Socialist position is that of the Third Camp: no support to either side in such a war. (As Comrade Shane knows just as well as all our other readers...)

(d) When Shane gets around to dumping his above theory of social-patriotism, as he has to, he will have to choose between (i) inventing a theory about how Stalinist "capitalism" is "progressive" even though it is presumably the very acme and culmination of the reactionary-imperialist stage of capitalism; or (ii) drop his attempt to work out transparent rationalizations for supporting Stalinism's wars.—Ed.



LABOR ACTION

February 28, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 9

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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## CCNY Clubs Challenge Membership Lists

By MEL BECKER

### Los Angeles YSL Educational Series

The Los Angeles YSL has announced its educational program for spring: a series of nine class sessions on the historical development of capitalism and the working class. They will be held on the Friday evenings listed below, at 8 p.m., at the new headquarters of the unit, 8939 1/2 Santa Monica Blvd. (Room 9).

Reading lists for the series can be obtained by writing to the above address. All young people are cordially invited. The subjects and dates of the sessions are:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Mar. 3—Feudalism and the Origins of Capitalism.                          | Apr. 15—Bonapartism.                       |
| Mar. 11—The Bourgeois Revolution in England.                             | Apr. 22—Utopian Socialism.                 |
| Mar. 18—The French Revolution.   | May 6—The First and Second Internationals. |
| Apr. 1—The 1848 Revolutions and the Rise of the Working Class in Europe. | May 13—The Paris Commune.                  |
|  | May 27—The 1905 Revolution in Russia.      |

To most people looking into the U. S. from the outside, witchhunts and monolithic reaction are the main things to be seen. To most within, the U. S. still seems the land of the free—all manifestations of suppression are just products of imagination or of fear on the part of the suppressed; or else it is just those "damn reds getting what they deserve." To convince our blind freedom-loving American chauvinists that those outsiders are very close to the truth is a difficult task indeed.

Little incidents which daily occur in all walks of life, especially seemingly minute infringements on academic freedom, do not make much impression on these realistic democrats. Day by day, we add up the blows against civil liberties, the particulars of the witchhunt, in the pages of *Challenge* and LABOR ACTION, so that at least the record is clear and unmistakable to those who are not yet completely blinded by

the glaring darkness fissioned by the Stalinist-capitalist world conflict.

Let us continue our account; this time bringing up to date the situation at CCNY, that former bastion of academic freedom, where academic freedom is reeling from one blow after another.

The last we heard of CCNY in *Challenge* was on last December 20. At that time Max Martin reported on the institution of forced membership lists; i.e., each club would be required to hand in their membership lists to the administration (in the person of the Student Life Department). Failure to comply with this ruling of the Student-Faculty Committee on Student Affairs would mean the elimination of the club from among chartered organizations on the campus.

Martin gave a full analysis of the meaning of such a ruling in terms of the witchhunt, the suppression of non-conformist thought, etc., including an interesting rebuttal to the stock-in-trade arguments in favor of this type of ruling. Let us now see what has since happened.

#### RULING STANDS

After granting the six clubs (Political Alternatives Club, a student group of radicals and socialists; Students for Democratic Action; Young Liberals; Young Democrats; and the Stalinist clubs, Young Progressives of America and Marxist Discussion Club) and faculty members who were opposed to the ruling a "hearing," at which time each speaker was allowed to present his arguments in all of three minutes, the SFCSA, on January 10, gave its final decision: the ruling will stand. It was perfect timing, for the week of January 10 was the closing week of the semester and thus prevented any further immediate steps to be organized by the opposition.

But the administration could not win this fight so easily. Seeing the opposition's determination, they began to confuse the issue. Privately, Dean Peace (Student Life Department) proposed a "compromise." The clubs would hand in the names of four officers which would be recorded on a master list. At the same time he would record the names of the other members as belonging to an unidentified "political or religious club," in the presence of the club representative, and then hand back the original list to that representative. This Dean Peace magnanimously offered to propose, as a "compromise," to the next meeting of SFCSA.

At an open meeting on February 10 of all students and clubs opposed to such membership lists, the obvious capitulation which Dean Peace's plan would entail caused virtually no voices to be raised in support of that "compromise." And the representatives of the six clubs vigorously assented to a showdown fight. All agreed to battle the ruling and all other similar rulings; none would hand in such a membership list to the Department of Student Life.

Furthermore they would engage in an educational program to enlighten the student body about this ruling, what it meant, its effects on academic freedom, on the rights of all students, etc. This led immediately into a discussion of the composition of any united front that would be formed. Nothing definite was concluded on this important topic; we will give our account and comments on this question later.

After the clubs' stand had been announced in the school newspapers, that well-known liberal president of CCNY, B. Gallagher, on February 15, blasted their stand. Calling the decision of the clubs "a violation of democratic processes," Gallagher asserted that "they should be pre-

### A Personal View on

## The YSL's First Anniversary

By WILLIAM SHIRLEY

The February 14 issue of the *Young Socialist Challenge* marked the end of the first year of the merger between the former Socialist Youth League and the former Young Peoples' Socialist League, which resulted in the present Young Socialist League. Anniversaries very often are the occasion for a great deal of ritualistic nonsense about past achievements and bright sugar-coated predictions about the future; but this first anniversary of the YSL seems to me to be a good time for a hard look at the first year of its existence.

This is an evaluation of that year from the standpoint of one of the members of the National Executive Committee of the old YPSL.

I was one of those who had no illusions about what the formation of the YSL was going to accomplish. But at the same time I was also one of those who strongly advocated the position in the YPSL which caused us to leave the Socialist Party because it forbade us to engage in active cooperation with the SYL. I was furthermore one of those who advocated unity but made no secret of my marked disagreement with a great deal of the traditional position of the Independent Socialist League and its youth section the SYL, at least as I understood it.

I advocated unity because I felt that—on the issues which meant something in the contemporary situation of socialism in the United States, for example, a militant anti-war and Third Camp position; an adequate, that is to say, a socialist analysis of the contemporary social, economic, and political situation in the U. S. and the world; and an unequivocal stand on civil liberties, even for Stalinists—the two youth organizations were virtually one.

This political agreement plus the actual organizational situation in the field of youth work for socialism, made it appear absolutely necessary that the union take place despite differences in historical background and disagreement on the minutiae of Russian history during the revolutionary period.

The organizational situation to which I refer was frankly one of survival for both of the merging organizations. Some of my comrades from the old SYL might disagree with my emphasis on that word "both," but I am convinced that, apart, both organizations would have shortly expired, and with them socialist youth organization in the U. S. would have also expired at least for the present.

Examination of the present organizational situation reveals for example that, with regard to the members of the old YPSL, with whom I am most familiar, the organizational disintegration has been checked. An example of this is indicated in the fact that of the members

of the NEC of the YPSL at the time of the merger, all but one alternate are still members of the YSL, and that that one departing member was already on the edges of "politica exotica," namely the *Contemporary Issues* group, at the time of the merger.

#### POLITICALLY RELEVANT

The problem remains: where those of us who might blind the "youth" with our balding pates, or trip over the grey beards of our adult responsibilities, are going organizationally in the near future. But we have been able to remain politically relevant for at least this one year more and perhaps a couple more. This would not have been the case without the arena provided by the merger into the YSL.

Speaking in terms of political issues, the best expectations of those of us in the YPSL NEC have been fulfilled. I think it is safe to say that what political differences there are within the YSL cut across the lines of the former organizations.

The YSL has maintained a militant anti-war Third Camp position; it has advocated a genuinely civil-libertarian program and in the field of its particular concern, academic freedom, it has combated both the subtleties of a position such as that of Sidney Hook and the bludgeoning of more primitive heresy-hunters in our schools and colleges.

In terms of a socialist analysis of the contemporary political situation both here in the U. S. and abroad, political discussion within the YSL has revealed that the expected agreement of the pre-merger period has been forthcoming. The differences which have developed here have also cut across the former organizational lines, and have been in general of the sort that brought forth healthy discussion rather than serious splits within the organization.

Considering a matter which is perhaps theoretically least important, but emotionally of the utmost importance, I am moved to make a few comments upon the matter of human and personal relations within the new organization.

To one who came out of the Socialist Party with its negative evaluation of "Trotskyites" of any denomination, and its horror-stories of rigid Bolshevik sectarianism, unprincipled organizational maneuver-

ing, file filching, and all the rest, this first year of political marriage with the comrades of the old SYL has dispelled any lingering reservations I may have carried into the merger in this regard.

In my experience on the NEC of the YSL and with the activities of the New York unit during my irregular periods in the New York area, I have observed a cordiality between members of the old organizations which belies fears which either side may have held at the time of merger. To be sure, there are a few comrades from the old SYL whose social company leaves me less than ecstatic, but then there are some from the old YPSL who affect me in the same way.

#### PROUD OF CONDUCT

Furthermore with regard to emotional and effective attachment to the principles of internal democracy and organizational honesty, it seems to me that the YSL can be proud of its conduct of internal affairs, with credit spread equally among members from both former organizations.

Taking up the question of the relations between the YSL and the Independent Socialist League, the expectations of those of us from the YPSL have been fulfilled. We had been led to expect that the ISL was interested in seeing an effective socialist youth organization regardless of whether such an organization would be affiliated to itself, and that it was prepared to aid the YSL by having our *Young Socialist Challenge* printed in its organ, LABOR ACTION, though the YSL was not to be formally affiliated with it.

This latter arrangement has been worked out, as those of you who have read *Challenge* know, and it has certainly been a satisfactory arrangement from the standpoint of the YSL. Of course, the comrades of the ISL expect and urge affiliation with their organization for individuals passing out of the age brackets of youth work, but that is only natural.

However, there has never been a hint of political censorship or dictation by the comrades of the ISL, nor has there been any adult patronizing of youth opinion or actions in the fraternal relationship which has been established. Furthermore, I say all of this as one former YPSLer who still does not feel that the ISL will be my political home when I pass from the youth field in the near future.

Finally I want to speak of something which is quite personal, but a matter which at the same time has some significance to certain comrades of the Southern California YPSL section, which was the only organized section of the old YPSL which did not leave the Socialist Party and enter into the merger which formed the YSL.

(Turn to last page)

(Turn to last page)

# TOYNBEE, STALINISM, and the POLITICS OF SAINTHOOD

By PHILIP COBEN

Few men who enjoy such intellectual prestige as attaches to the name of Arnold Toynbee have managed to be, consistently, so utterly trivial when it comes to pontificating on current politics. The historian, whose many-volumed *Study of History* overlays its theoretical emptiness with masses of erudition, has accepted his status as a modern oracle—for surely if his work shows any understanding of past crises, he must have something helpful to say about our present one?—but, alas, the oracle has so little to say.

Specifically, Toynbee, as oracle, has only one thing to say to the world: Get religion. In the current *N. Y. Times* magazine (Feb. 20) he says it all over again. We must return to true religiosity in order to be saved from Communism; only so can an effective alternative be offered. . . .

To those who venerate him as a sage, his prescription is an unusual confession of failure. Leaving aside any dispute over the value of religious revival itself, for anyone who may be religiously inclined, the important thing to note about Toynbee's view is not simply that it is so pro-religion but rather that it is so scornful of everything else in the West.

## NOTHING TO OFFER

The important thing that Toynbee is saying is that, *right now, the West has nothing to offer the world as against Stalinism—nothing.*

In a previous *Times* article (Dec. 26), Toynbee had said so in so many words (emphasis added):

"The Communists have a reasonable-looking case if the question between them and us about the true end of man is put in the form: What is the relative importance of the interests of the community and the interests of private individuals? When the question is put in these terms, our championship of individual human rights looks frivolous, wrong-headed and indeed positively immoral. We cannot meet the Communist challenge on this secular ground. And yet we find ourselves unshaken in our belief in individual human rights.

"The strength of a belief that cannot be upheld by secular arguments is an indication that there is some sure foundation, now buried below the threshold of consciousness, on which the belief still firmly rests. . . ." (and this, Toynbee goes on to say, derives from its religious basis).

**What a sweeping condemnation! Democracy—the vaunted higher standard of living—human values—secular morality—all of these things and everything else that Western propagandists speak of have not impressed Toynbee. They cannot uphold the argument against Stalinism. They cannot meet the Stalinist challenge.**

So says the sage. Anyone else who so roundly denounced Western society as against Stalinism would scarcely escape official wrath, certainly could not get his denunciations printed in the *Times*; but Toynbee gets by because of his poor little escape-clause, namely, the West can still demonstrate its superiority by going back to God, although he does not claim that this is very likely. It is to be feared that Toynbee's highly spiritual appeals for this outcome will not have much more effect than the Salvation Army's.

Meanwhile the significance of Toynbee's confession should not escape one. Let us push a point which may seem an exaggeration; indeed it may be an exaggeration; but if so, it is an exaggeration of something real.

Toynbee's whole approach to the intellectual case for democracy against Stalinism is that of the Stalinist-manqué.

## NO EFFECTIVE CASE

He confesses that he can make out no

effective case against totalitarianism except by going outside the whole framework of human criteria.

Belief in individual human rights, he states, is based on the "belief that individual human souls have been created by God and have supreme value in His eyes . . . [and that] God has demonstrated His love for human souls by redeeming them through a supreme act of self-sacrifice."

He goes on to assert that in this origin of the democratic ideology is also to be found "its lasting intellectual and emotional foundation"—in fact, its only foundation, as we have seen.

It follows from Toynbee that anyone who rejects this supernatural genesis of democratic values *must consistently, logically, necessarily and properly go over to the side of Stalinism*, which has all the rights on its side if the standards are secular.

As a matter of fact, it follows from Toynbee that the same is true even for people who do accept a supernatural basis for democratic beliefs but who do not counterpose their religious beliefs to secular considerations, like so many Italian and French Stalinist workers.

**Logically, Toynbee is saying that he would be a Stalinist too if he didn't happen to believe in God. (Incidentally, we doubt this, but it doesn't matter either way, since right now we are not at all interested in the strength of Toynbee's personal democratic prejudices but in the entirely objective meaning of his ideas.)**

And this, in turn, is significant in evaluating Toynbee's social ideology. He sees the world's choice between Stalinism and God; the alternative which has no appeal to him at all is that of a humanistic democracy.

Surely here we can see once again what many critics have pointed out: the deeply reactionary implications of Toynbee's 100 per cent idealistic approach to history.

There is another angle to such socio-religious appeals as Toynbee's which is now being tested, in a way, in Italy.

Toynbee exhorts men to reorient their "spiritual outlook," to go through a new "spiritual revolution," etc. Let us say, for the sake of argument, that this is fine, whatever it means. Let us say, furthermore, still for the sake of argument, that a regime of men who have gone through the required "spiritual reawakening" is in power in the West (U. S. or Britain or any other state).

What do these spiritually reawakened leaders do politically and socially? For of course, spiritual or no, they have to have a political and social program to counterpose to Stalinism's; for that matter, to counterpose to the program of socialism. What is such a program?

It would be an easy debaters' point to score off Toynbee by adding that if the famous historian had half a notion of what such an effective program would be, he would be better advised to write an article revealing it rather than a succession of mere exhortations and homilies about spirituality.

But of course the idea may be that Spiritual Reawakening may bring its own program in its train, and that the Spiritually Reawakened leadership will naturally do What Is Right. Or the idea may be that program is itself an irrelevant secular notion, and that administra-

tion by Men of Good Will will solve all problems.

**In any case, an interesting drama involving this is unfolding in the city of Florence. All we know about it comes from a meager press report in the *Times*, tantalizing but suggestive.**

The mayor of Florence, Prof. Giorgio La Pira, is "an ascetic who believes that all the world's problems can be solved by Christian love. He has set himself to governing Florence, Italy's seventh city in population, according to the rule of St. Francis.

"He lives a life of cloistered simplicity in a monastery cell. Often he arrives at his office without some article of clothing because he has given it to a beggar on the way. The mayor sometimes imitates St. Francis by talking to birds he keeps caged in his office."

## A NOBLE SOUL

Mayor La Pira, obviously, is a noble soul whom it would be a pleasure to know. Surely Toynbee would consider him spiritually reawakened, a leader who has returned to the true, pure religious spirit; and we have no doubt about that ourselves. Perhaps he is a saint; certainly we are ready to believe that he is sincerely doing his best to lead a saintly life.

In view of this aura of saintliness, it is with reluctance, but of necessity, that we must insist on pressing another version of our above-mentioned question:

*What is the political program of sainthood?*

What does a saint do when he is mayor of a great industrial city embattled by Stalinism?

In the Middle Ages, a real guaranteed-genuine saint might have been able to pass a miracle or two. Everyone knows that this would be very helpful, if not essential, in Italy today. However, medieval-type miracles are out-of-stock in our machine civilization; and for that matter, Prof. La Pira does not regard himself as a saint at all, but as simply a man

trying to adapt a revitalized Christian spirit to modern politics.

**What made the saintly mayor hit the *Times*' first page is that as mayor of the city, he expropriated a factory and handed it over to the workers.**

To be sure, this particular plant, an iron foundry, has gone through two bankruptcies, and currently is supposed to be liquidated; hardly an attack on profit. But the decree of expropriation threw a chill into the bones of the spiritually unawakened Italian bourgeoisie, bankruptcy or no.

## LEFT WINGERS APPLAUD

The mayor (reports the dispatch) "earned the applause only of Communists and other extreme left-wingers. Most newspapers criticized him sharply for infringing on the rights of private property in violation of the Italian law and Constitution. Certainly his action hardly seems designed to help the government attract capital investments from abroad."

It is something to give pause to burgeoning saints in the crassly materialistic world of capitalism. In his time St. Francis never had to worry unduly about the effect of his activities on the rate of capital investment. He could engage, for example, in mass bird-feeding without fearing massive protests from the National Association of Bird-Seed Manufacturers against such socialistic practices undercutting private enterprise.

**The world is more complicated today, and even saints must have political and social programs in order to be in business—if they insist on being mayor-type saints. Once St. Francis exercised his saintliness in feeding the birds of the wilderness; today a saintly soul in the mayors office exercises his saintliness by expropriating an industrial plant. Alas for the anti-Marxists: even hagiological forms are determined by the material bases of society, it seems. . . .**

Naturally, where Mayor La Pira goes from here is another matter. He has run headlong into a fact of life: capitalism. The next step, anti-capitalism or capitulation to capitalism, is not something that the example of St. Francis can teach him. Seeking to save the workers' souls from the clutches of Stalinism, no doubt, he has sought to show them that he is no captive of capitalism. This is indeed a great precept to keep in mind in the 20th century: only democratic anti-capitalism can offer an alternative to Stalinism. And the democratic alternative to capitalism already exists as a living movement and program, that of socialism.

Insofar as he will strive to follow through on what he has implied by the act which has so scandalized Italian capital, Prof. La Pira will naturally have to turn in the socialist direction. That goes without saying.

It is quite a contrast he offers to that other exponent of spirituality whom we have discussed, Toynbee. Where Toynbee retreats from his consideration of the secular world (in history) to highly spiritual sermons, La Pira has apparently tried to move from spirituality to social action in the real world. We may never hear about the professor again, but his finger is pointing.

## A Footnote: Is Ike Spiritual Enough?

Toynbee's prescription of religious revival as a cure for our political and social ills runs into at least one other problem not noted in the accompanying article.

Take, for example, some news items of the past week. On February 20 the American Legion ran its annual "Back to God" program at Grand Central Terminal. (The fact that, in America at least, religious-revivalism as a mass movement is so often associated with political reaction, rather than with liberating democratic ideals, is by itself no necessary refutation of Toynbee and we shall not make this argument here.) Highlight of the program was a broadcast by Eisenhower. Few presidents in U. S. history have been so overflowing with religious homilies at the drop of a gavel. In this case, it happens, Eisenhower even went to town on what is precisely the Toynbee thesis: God is the sole author of individual rights, and they can be preserved only by recognizing this fact. . . .

**Now it is doubtful whether Toynbee looks upon Eisenhower as the model of the Spiritually Reawakened leader on whom the fate of Western civilization depends; but on the other hand, there is certainly no reason to question the sincerity of Eisenhower's spiritual sermons. The question therefore asserts itself: How does one go about distinguishing the former type of Spiritual Reawakening (the kind that offers a real alternative to Stalinism) from**

**garden-variety God-mongering of the type which Toynbee himself would scorn? Toynbee's exhortations, even AS mere exhortations, leave something wanting.**

On the same day, a Fifth Avenue pastor, the Rev. Dr. Bonnell, attacked Edward Murrow's "This I Believe" radio program and books, which present the personal religious beliefs of 200 prominent persons. Dr. Bonnell complained that, of the 200, only half believe in God; 27 class themselves as humanists (presumably agnostics); 46 give God not the slightest mention; 6 deny the reality of God (atheists); only 11 affirm faith in immortality (4 deny immortality); less than 10 mention faith in Christ. He deplored the "vague, uncertain and indefinite beliefs" of the 200 especially as contrasted with "the passionate conviction of the Communists," and added: "The 200 whose beliefs have been published are all drawn from intellectual circles and 'big name' people. I am confident that the rank and file of people possess a firmer and more enduring faith."

Now if one contrasts the democratic spirit of the religiously-vague 200 with that of the "Back-to-God" American Legionnaires or even Eisenhower, the results are not in doubt. If democratic feelings are really based on religious belief, the contrast is most remarkable. Naturally, such a comparison is no scientific test, but it underlines the question asked above.

# Echoes of the Djilas Case In the World Socialist Press

By HAL DRAPER

To tie up some loose ends on the international repercussions of the Djilas-Dedijer case in Yugoslavia, we have to note a few developments of interest that have come to our knowledge since our last article.

As far as we can still gather from all available information, the international isolation of Djilas and Dedijer remained pretty close to complete as far as most of the world was concerned. The European or Asian socialist movement made no important outcry, such as we tried to evoke.

Of the two reasons which we have already assigned for this phenomenon — (a) disinclination to embarrass the Tito regime as an ally in the cold war; and (b) illusions about socialist democratization by the Tito regime, contrary to Djilas's accusations—we would say that the first was operative for the bourgeois democrats and liberals who remained shamefully silent on the affair, but that it was the second which was probably strongest for most of the socialist forces abroad, particularly the more leftist socialists.

**Our readers should be well aware of the strength of socialist pro-Titoism abroad, for we have often had to discuss it. The shameful silence of the world socialist movement in defense of Djilas and Dedijer was the payoff on this pro-Titoism.**

Theoretically, perhaps, the pro-Titoist illusions that have been so strong during the past six years should not have stopped genuinely militant and principled socialists from raising their voices on behalf of the rights of two Yugoslav leaders when the latter merely demanded freedom of criticism. Abstractly, perhaps, it should have been possible for pro-Titoist socialists to have defended the rights of a democratic opposition even while themselves refraining from attacking the regime.

## ILLUSIONS SHAKEN

In practice, however, not unexpectedly, the pro-Titoists' ability to overlook inconvenient facts in the course of convincing themselves about Titoist democracy was equally at work when it came to the Djilas case.

But there can be no doubt that these pro-Titoist illusions have been given a serious shakeup. This will be clear perhaps from the examples to be cited below from the Bevanite *Tribune* and the Spanish POUM.

We have awaited the Bevanites' reaction with some special interest. Because of Bevan's personal acquaintance and

## FRENCH SP LEFT HITS THE ISSUE

We are now glad to note that the left group in the French Socialist Party led by Marceau Pivert, in its organ *Correspondance Socialiste Internationale*, has made a very good statement on the case of Djilas and Dedijer:

"What the 'heretics' think [on various important questions] . . . is of interest to us, and we regret not finding their points of view expressed in the Yugoslav reviews. But what we are infinitely more interested in is that they should not be silenced. . . . This is all the more important since we see prevailing among our own 'mandarins' that monstrous resignation which would make us believe that free criticism serves the counter-revolution. The very contrary is true: the counter-revolution has everything to lose from free discussion among the workers—wherever they may be.

"We do not fear to repeat on this occasion: one must resist this religion of the single party, and above all resist the regimentation of thought which stems from Stalinism. This democratic development of the working-class organizations must be favored; it is the ultimate guarantee for united class action whenever the enemies of the working class attempt to use the facilities of democracy to corrupt or mislead the uneducated elements of the people. All victory other than this is fragile and at the mercy of unforeseeable factors."

friendship with Djilas (if for no other reason), they would hardly be deterred from protesting by doubts about the real tenor of his ideas. Indeed, Djilas was in effect denounced as a "Bevanite" by the hacks when he was purged a year ago. In a real sense, the Bevanites had the international obligation to lead a chorus of socialist voices in his defense, and not only for political reasons.

**Well, they were far from doing so, but they have not been so shamefully silent as the rest. The very cautious form in which they, even they, spoke up for Djilas is a measure of the strength of the pro-Titoist prejudices which Djilas and Dedijer are bucking.**

In an issue before criminal charges were brought against the heretics, the Bevanite *Tribune* discreetly referred to Bevan's friendship with Djilas and expressed questioning perturbation over his treatment. Then, after the regime had committed the enormity of putting the two men in the criminal dock, the *Tribune* remained silent for two issues—except for an indignant epistle in the letter column roundly reproving the editors even for this gentle hint of possible criticism of Belgrade.

But in its January 21 issue, we see, there is a front-page statement headed "A Nation on Trial." (Perhaps it would be captious to comment right off that this is already a mistake: it is the Titoist regime which is on trial, not the nation.)

As indicated by the title, the article raises a warning finger, in a context of placatory praises for the regime. According to the "cynics," it says, Yugoslavia is "now just a small-time police state, afraid to go forward, seeking to freeze into positions of permanent and unchallengeable power the present ruling clique." The cynics ask: "Is its heroic period over?" But "many" believe they found in Yugoslavia a Communist country seeking to advance to democratic socialism, etc.

## TOO IDEALISTIC

Now "two of the most daring and patriotic of Yugoslavia's sons are on trial. What for? Having too much faith in their fellow Yugoslavs, being too idealistic, seeking to loosen the bonds of bureaucracy faster than the majority of their colleagues believe it prudent to do?"

**In spite of the question-mark at the end, which is a deliberate means of avoiding commitment, the effect is no doubt pro-Djilas. The article also chides "one Yugoslav leader" who "so far forgot himself" as to call on the people to spit in the face of Djilas and Dedijer. (Of course, this unnamed leader who forgot himself happened to be Kardelj, who was speaking as the acting head of the regime.)**

The article winds up: "We note that the trial is public, that it promises to be fair, and can only hope that the outcome will confound the cynics and still further enhance the reputation of Marshal Tito and his countrymen among their true friends."

Since then, the Bevanites have found out that the trial was held in secret. There was no comment in the next issue (last we have seen). One can only hope that the suspended sentence which Djilas and Dedijer drew did not convince *Tribune* that the "cynics" are confounded.

## THE MILITANT

In this country, a vigorous declaration of support for Djilas came from the Socialist Party's monthly the *Call*. The SLP's *Weekly People* and *Dissent* also supported him against the regime.

But after some weeks of utter silence, the Socialist Workers Party's *Militant* finally decided to reiterate its last year's line about the Djilas tendency: it is "the

focal point of all capitalist hopes for a further reverse of the Yugoslav revolution," it is, it seems, the vanguard of the bourgeois counter-revolution; and what's wrong with Tito is that he himself has gone too far in Djilas's direction; etc. Furthermore, while no evidence has been submitted to prove the charge of "treason" against Djilas, "cases of treason are of course not unlikely. But such cases should be exposed before the eyes of the whole international working class and all shadow of suspicion of police frame-up removed." Whatever shadows of suspicion are retained by the *Militant*, these self-styled orthodox-Trotskyists continue to give political support to the totalitarian regime as against the democratic opposition.

## NEW LEADER

In the *New Leader*, a second article on the subject has sought to purge its pages of the offensive smell which still clings from the first article by Bogdan Raditsa (which we have discussed already). Written by Peter Meyer, it is devoted to calling for support to Djilas and Dedijer; and this one gets around to noting the issue of socialist democracy in the case.

About the lack of socialist protest, Meyer says: "At this writing, only Norman Thomas and the organ of the West German metal workers have protested." It is amusing that Meyer, writing in the *New Leader*, refuses to take note of the Socialist Party organ's official declaration, mentioning only Norman Thomas. It goes without saying that he is following S.O.P. in also ignoring LABOR ACTION'S campaign on the subject, to which he is no stranger.

It is with a heavier spirit that we turn to the views expressed by the organ of the Spanish POUM, *La Batalla* (Jan. 20).

The evaluation of Titoism has been a difference between us Independent Socialists and the comrades of the POUM, though the latter never went as far in the pro-Titoist euphoria as many other European socialists. One might have hoped that they would take an unambiguous stand in support of Djilas's proposals for internal democracy.

**However, a *Batalla* editorial, "From Tito to Djilas," does not do so. It begins with a very approving passage about Tito's Asian trip, and then says about Djilas:**

"What does Djilas represent at present? What does the former theoretician of Yugoslav communism want? The least that can be said is that his recent declarations, like those which brought about his dismissal from the leading posts which he held, are not clear. Revolutionary socialists are enemies of the single party and hold a conception of socialist democracy which is fundamentally different from that which the Belgrade leaders put forward. But the demand of the great democratic traditions of genuine socialism has nothing to do with the current demands of Djilas. The dominant impression is that the Yugoslav communist ex-leader is oriented toward a road which offers no way out for his country's proletariat, which does not aspire to return to the past but aspires rather to an effective socialist democracy."

## NO WORD OF SUPPORT

That is all; and coming from the comrades of the POUM, it is distressing. *Batalla* can find not a word of support for Djilas's fight for the right to criticize the government, on the ground that the "dominant impression" is that he is oriented toward a "return to the past," i.e., toward the restoration of capitalism.

**Where did this impression come from? *Batalla* does not say. Was it from Djilas's words or ideas, directly or indirectly, as expressed in the articles of a year ago for which he was purged? But this is impossible, since Djilas was not and is not the least bit ambiguous or unclear about his rejection of capitalism and devotion to the aim of socialist democracy.**

Does *Batalla* get this impression from the charges made by the Titoists? But why is it in a hurry to believe these practiced liars as against Djilas's protesta-

tions? Have the Belgrade totalitarians adduced the slightest scintilla of evidence to back up such slanders against Djilas? Do they even claim to have any evidence to show that Djilas is oriented toward a restoration of capitalism? Surprisingly perhaps, the answer is no, they do not claim to possess a shadow of a scrap of evidence.

No matter what genuine democratic oppositionist will arise in Yugoslavia, no matter how staunchly socialist, no matter how staunchly revolutionary, the inevitable and even automatic response of the Titoists (like any other Stalinist types) will be that the heretic is "oriented toward the restoration of capitalism." Surely this cannot be decisive in determining the dominant impression of the POUM comrades.

Is there anything in Djilas's (or Dedijer's!) personal character or past which should cause a reasonable person to doubt the sincerity of his insistence that he is interested in democratizing the regime on a socialist basis? Absolutely everything which is known about these men, and everything their enemies say about them too, goes to eliminate any idea that they can be bought or have been corrupted.

## FREEDOM OF CRITICISM

Surely, then, it is impermissible to shunt aside so cavalierly the courageous fight put by a man who, in a totalitarian state, raises his voice in the name of socialism and puts forth precisely that demand which the POUM comrades must agree is vital for the development of Yugoslavia—freedom of socialist criticism against the regime.

One does not have to agree with anything else that Djilas has said, but surely every genuine socialist must rise up in indignation when, because he so dares to raise his voice and for no other reason, he is tried on criminal charges by a police state!

Yet *Batalla* does not permit itself to say a word in approval of the actual democratic demands raised by Djilas, nor to defend his right to raise them. Instead it limits itself to categorically denying his good faith in raising them and in substituting the bogey of capitalist restoration.

**Now what accounts for such a distressing reaction from comrades like the excellent ones of the POUM? Of course, here again we would refer readers to the deleterious effects of past pro-Titoist illusions, which are not easily shaken off; but after one has gone through this again, something else would be necessary for the case of the POUM.**

Let us take a guess at the source of the "dominant impression" which is so decisive for *Batalla*, at the calculated risk of being all wrong. The guess is that the POUM comrades are influenced to the present conclusion by the feeling that Djilas has not only abandoned Titoist totalitarianism but is also in the process of drifting toward a reformist conception of democracy.

## SOCIALIST POLICY

Now (just to pinpoint the argument) this writer would agree that this element exists, though it may be a moot point. We have mentioned it in passing before, in its place. But it is precisely such agreement that raises clearly the essential question of socialist policy involved.

It would be easy enough to come out in support of a Djilas whose ideas were completely in agreement with our own on every question. This does not happen to be so; in any case it would be unrealistic to expect some kind of consistent and entirely clear democratic-socialist and Marxist ideology from a man who is just painfully emerging from the slough of Stalinism, and who was never a very thorough thinker anyway.

**To look askance at Djilas's fight, to be overcome by suspicions of Djilas, because of this natural and even inevitable fact would be sectarian and ultimistic.**

Democratic socialist oppositions will inescapably arise out of the tortures of the Stalinist world, not only in Yugoslavia but in the Stalinist world of Moscow's empire. But they will arise in their own way, in their own forms, and not necessarily with faces that will conform to our ideal models. It should be expected that in form they may be as tortured as the contexts from which they arise. It is the direction they point that counts.

Djilas has, in his own way, clearly pointed in the direction of a socialist democratization of the regime. That is the main impact of his fight. The Belgrade charge of "capitalist-restorationism" is a vile smear for which one should not fall. But even if one suspects that he has swallowed some social-democratic reformism along with the strong political purgatives which made him regurgitate Titoism, that suspicion has no bearing whatsoever on the socialist's duty to sup-

(Continued on page 7)

# U.S. Trapped in Asia — —

(Continued from page 1)

of the Stalinists while depressing that of the United States to new lows.

On leaving for the SATO gathering at Bangkok, British Foreign Minister Anthony Eden made it clear that he intends to use this meeting with Secretary of State Dulles to impress on him the British position on the offshore islands of the China coast. He will tell Dulles that if the United States decides to fight for Quemoy and the rest, it will have to go it alone as far as Britain is concerned. He will urge that these islands be turned over to the Chinese government, and that some attempt be made to get the Chinese to pledge not to try to conquer Formosa for the time being.

## VOICES OF CONCERN

Even if the British-American dispute on what to do in the Formosa Strait is kept within the family, so to speak, such a divergence between the two major allies cannot help become public knowledge. The British Labor Party will keep hammering the Tories for a clear statement of policy which they cannot refuse.

Even in America, the one country in the world where there appears to be no serious opposition to the government's policy, voices of concern and even dismay are beginning to be heard. One barometer: In the same issue of the New York

*Times* (Sunday, February 20) two correspondents, one writing from the United Nations and another from Washington, had this to say:

... the constantly increasing prestige of the Communists, supplemented by their mastery of the art of subversion, might enable them to take over Formosa in a few years without firing a shot—or giving the United States justification to intervene.

"Some delegates [to the UN] are convinced that... they [the Communists] will try probing actions against Quemoy and Matsu in the next few weeks to see whether the United States would react.

"If we do not, the islands will be theirs; if we do, they would count on the resultant protests in Britain and Asia to split the Free World. All in all, China may provide as eventual a spring as Indochina did a year ago."

That was Thomas J. Hamilton looking toward a lively future. A few pages later, James Reston is giving his version of an imaginary interview in "an ideal world in which government officials told the truth in response to questions about the Far East crisis...."

After making it clear that the defense of Quemoy and Matsu are not militarily essential to the defense of Formosa (let alone the United States), Reston's "ideal" official explains that what is really at stake in the Formosa Strait is convincing the Japanese that the Americans will fight for something in Asia. (Remember when that was said of Korea?) In passing, the official lets slip that "we're worried about the internal situation in Formosa."

"Q.—What's the matter in Formosa?"  
 "A.—Nothing, for the time being, but suppose we said we weren't going to defend Quemoy and Matsu under any circumstances. That would end the hope that we would help Chiang Kai-shek recover his position on the China mainland. The only way the Chinese Nationalists could then hope to return to China would be by making a deal with Peiping. And even if we left them to fight alone for Quemoy and Matsu it would probably come to the same thing. The Communists would almost cer-

tainly attack these offshore islands if we stood aside, and, while they would have a hard time, the defense of the islands might cost Chiang as much as a third of his army. Under those circumstances, too, there would be a real possibility of an armed revolt inside Formosa."

After some talk about what would happen if the Chinese attacked Quemoy and South Korea at the same time, the "interview" continues:

"Q.—So you think we're doing the right thing in planning to defend Quemoy and Matsu without committing ourselves specifically?"

"A.—It's a gamble, a very dangerous gamble, but we're trapped. We have encouraged Asia to think we were going to do things we were not prepared to do. The first thing the president did when he took office was to "unleash" Chiang Kai-shek. This increased our obligation to him and encouraged him and the world to believe that the United States was not only going to "contain" the Communists but roll them back. So, after several reverses, we have taken a moral commitment to defend the doormat on China's front stoop.

"Q.—Are you suggesting that maybe we talk too much?"

"A.—No comment."  
 That is the result of the whole of American post-World War II policy in Asia. "We are trapped." And on Quemoy and Matsu, at that.

## TRAPPED ON QUEMOY

How do we get out of the trap? Well, we can shoot our way out, or do what we did when we almost got trapped in Indochina: stand around with mouth agape and hands hanging helpless until the Stalinists have walked off with what they wanted at the moment. And if we retreat from the Quemoy trap, we will land squarely in the Formosa trap which is a bigger, stronger and better one all around, small consolation though this may be to him-who-is-trapped.

That is a gem of an "interview" if all its implications are thought through. Of course, a *Times* correspondent can only

go so far with it. Hence the lame ending. It all came from too much talk. But even if Eisenhower and his man Dulles were strong, silent types, how would things have been different?

The real issue is not what the American government promised, or boasted about, but the social forces which it can rally, on which it must depend politically in Asia. And these social forces are Chiang, the French imperialists in Indochina, the Rhee dictatorship in South Korea, the British imperialists in Malaya, the police state in Thailand... every one of them a trap, and a hopeless one at that.

All this did not start when Eisenhower "unleashed" Chiang Kai-shek. It started in the Truman and Roosevelt administrations, and farther back than that. Its true origin is not even the "mistakes" of American statesmen, but rather the fact that a government dominated by two parties committed to saving capitalism on a world scale is compelled to seek support in governments similarly committed in Asia.

Even the British, with their greater wisdom and flexibility gained through a century of experience and sharpened by the lessons of their own imperial decline, have basically no better solution. That is why they and their closest allies are going to be at Bangkok rather than at Bandung.

When even the *Times* recognizes that the United States is trapped on the doormat of China, it is time for the liberal and labor movements in this country to wake up from their political torpor. Nothing can be gained by supporting this policy while demanding that it be supplemented by more economic aid to the peoples of Asia. A clean break must be made from this vicious circle of self-entrapment before economic aid can have any real political significance. Such a break means: a popular campaign to end all support to and alliances with the agents of reaction in Asia. Instead, all support to the democratic forces which are struggling for national, political and economic emancipation against these agents.

# Djilas — —

(Continued from page 7)

port his fight and his rights of criticism against the regime.

We Marxist socialists are willing to fight alongside of, and defend the rights of, anti-capitalist reformists in the struggle against CAPITALISM—for as far as we can march together with them in any specific case. We declare categorically that it is twice as incumbent on genuine socialists to support the struggles of anti-capitalist reformists in the struggle under STALINISM against the totalitarian state.

As a matter of fact, the main difference between the two cases in this analogy is that, under Stalinism, anyone who fights for democratic rule while opposing the restoration of capitalism is objectively fighting for our aims and our socialist goal, no matter what other mistaken notions may jostle in his head.

Furthermore, anyone who fights for simple democracy, is a potential ally in any case. The real capitalist-restorationists, the real vanguard of the pro-capitalist reaction, will not likely be found fighting for genuine democracy (outside of demagogic lip-service to it). They will be too busy working to ensure armed intervention by Western imperialism (as the Yugoslav émigré right wing does), for they know that only capitalist armed conquest—not internal democratization—can restore capitalism, if capitalism can be restored at all.

Djilas has made his mistakes, tactical and political as well as theoretical. That is something to be discussed with Djilas (so to speak), even if in the international socialist press. But it would be a discussion with one who ought to be an ally, a discussion on how best to fight a common enemy. The sadness of the *Batalla* editorial is that it has words of praise only for the totalitarian leader and only words of suspicion for his courageous opponent who called for socialist democracy.

So strong has been the reinforcement that pro-Titoism has given to the malaise of socialism in our time. It is to be hoped that the outcome of the Djilas case has done more eye-opening than the world socialist press has permitted itself to reflect.

# CCNY Clubs Challenge — —

(Continued from page 5)

pared to take the consequences of such an action," meaning that non-compliance with the ruling would involve loss of a club's charter and fee appropriation, meaning they would no longer be recognized as a club of the college.

As if one hasn't the right, the obligation, to fight anti-democratic decrees even by civil disobedience if all other avenues are closed (as in this case)!

Following Gallagher's logic to the bitter—very bitter—end, we must conclude that the Jewish population would have been violating the democratic process if they rose against Hitler and his gas chambers; that Russian slave-laborers shouldn't rise against their Stalinist masters.

Granted these are the extreme cases, there is yet no logical difference, Mr. Gallagher; no qualitative difference whatsoever. When anti-democratic decrees are pushed down students' throats and they have no further recourse, they must fight with civil disobedience and you, Mr. Gallagher, as a liberal, should support their fight and not trail, or lead, the reactionary camp.

## WEAKENING EFFECT

Gallagher's statement has so far had a weakening effect on the opposition. At the next open meeting that same day, some of the clubs started to backtrack. Some were willing to see the really "compromise" spirit of Dean Peace's plan; some were even willing to hand in a list and fight afterwards in a "democratic" manner, whatever that fight would mean.

After much discussion, a meeting was planned with the president for February 2, at which time the representatives of the clubs will again talk and present their case. We hope for the best; but it is not assured.

Now let us get back to the united-front question. The liberals at CCNY are (1) infected with "anti-anti-Communism," and (2) are frighteningly naive. This "anti-anti-Communism" on the part of student liberals, produced to some extent by reaction to the witchhunt, is a healthy protest, but it becomes dangerous when extended to all anti-Stalinists, including those critically and politically opposed to the Stalinists.

The positive side, the healthy aspect, of

this attitude is, of course, willingness to fight for the civil liberties and democratic rights of Stalinists, where these are invaded, as of anyone else. This is very good. But it is important for such liberals to learn, as we Young Socialists have long learned, to make a sharp distinction between (a) fighting for the rights of Stalinists or any other non-conformists, and (b) making any organizational or political alliance with Stalinists in the course of such a fight or any other fight.

And they have no concept at all of the demagogic, reactionary nature of Stalinist youth groups. Forgetting all the Stalinist youth betrayals, such as the NAACP fight at Syracuse, the Brooklyn College academic freedom fight, last year's academic freedom fight at CCNY, the liberals say: "But they are our friends, and we're all opposed to the membership lists, and to isolate them will weaken the fight, etc.; we know the nature of adult Stalinist groups, but here let us fight with them."

In fact, there are only two reasons why they would be willing to dissociate themselves from the Stalinists: (1) because of the fear that the students will not listen to any statement by a group which includes the Stalinists; and (2) because they fear that the administration will get the impression that it is really only the Stalinists who are interested in the fight. Of course, these reasons are incorrect and should be combatted: they themselves are examples of witchhunt thinking.

## EXCLUDE STALINISTS

The Stalinists should be excluded from such a united front because of their anti-democratic nature and because it is only without them that one can make a consistent democratic stand on civil liberties. It is only without them that one can say: We are politically against the Stalinists and all other reactionary, totalitarian organizations, but we fight for everyone's civil liberties including theirs.

Exclusion from this united front at the same time does not prevent the Stalinists from fighting by themselves in any way they choose.

This is difficult to get into the heads of many of the liberal students at CCNY—but it must be done. It is part of the rough road that all socialists have to

travel when dealing with liberals who have Stalinist illusions.

The Political Alternatives Club has its work cut out. As an organization composed of socialists, pacifists, and other radical democrats, it must play a spearhead role in the fight against the administration's ruling. It must educate the student body about membership lists and academic freedom in general. It must educate the liberals in regard to Stalinists and be on guard at the same time against any capitulation to the administration.

The witchhunt pervades more and more of American society. Let us hope that PAC and the other liberal organizations at CCNY can do their small but significant share in combating political suppression, in safeguarding the rights of CCNY students, in upholding academic freedom.

# YSL Anniversary —

(Continued from page 5)

I consider myself to be a principled pacifist, basing my position upon deeply held religious convictions. My pacifism is one expression of those religious convictions, whereas my socialist politics are another, closely related but not identical, expression of those same convictions.

The experience of the first year of YSL organization and activity seems to indicate that, though the YSL is not a pacifist organization, the individual pacifist and the pacifist viewpoint are certainly welcome and given as respectful a hearing as they ever were in the old YPSL. Furthermore the politically minded pacifist is most certainly closer to the YSL position than that of the present-day SP.

In the light of all this I would suggest to the pacifist comrades of the Southern California YPSL, who now find themselves politically homeless after the performance of the last SP convention, and any other pacifists with a political bent, that the YSL is the political organization in which they belong. Its short one-year history and its modest expectations both add up to just this for you.

In short a one-year examination report on the infant should read "Small for its age, but considering the environment, healthy and capable of further growth and the reaching of adulthood."

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

## Leon Trotsky's 'STALIN'

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

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