

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

India:

THE NEW SOCIALIST PARTY MOVEMENT

... page 6

South America:

DICTATORSHIP AND STATE-CAPITALISM

... page 7

Britain:

BEVANITES PLAN TO EXPAND ACTIVITIES

... page 3

JANUARY 2, 1956

FIVE CENTS

Looking Back on 1955's Headlines

By GORDON HASKELL

If one were to plot the state of the world's political fevers on a chart, as is done for patients in hospitals, it appears safe to say that the year 1955 would show some improvement or ease-up. This would certainly be true for the United States.

Such an ease-up can be the beginning of a change in the patient's condition, or can merely represent a temporary stay or breathing-spell in the progress of his disease. Without trying to appear too profound, or to pretend that on the basis of such a short perspective the real place of 1955 in the world's history can be established, here are some of the year's more important events as they were reflected in LABOR ACTION's headlines, and their trend-wise significance.

Democratic Party Liberals Collapse as Congress Opens

(Jan. 17)

Not too bright a beginning for the year, it would appear. But if there was one area in which nothing at all has improved in this country it is in the area of ~~the party politics~~.

The Democratic Party appeared intent on establishing a record as the least oppositional of all oppositions in the country's history.

As the year wore on, there were some rumblings from the ADA wing of the party; and at least one of the would-be presidential candidates sought to give himself an air of fighting liberalism (once he had become convinced that the front-running horse in the race had pretty well corralled all the more conservative elements in the organization.)

Nevertheless, the bulk of the liberals still hung on to the coattails of Stevenson, while we wrote about—

A Puzzle for Liberals: Demo Right Wing Is Coalescing Around Adlai Stevenson

(Oct. 24)

The Republicans have been so clearly *the* party of big business that the Democratic leaders appear to believe they can win with very little of a positive program of their own. That is how things stood at the end of the year.

But it would take a foolhardy man indeed to predict that, with all else that is happening in the country, this same mood can be counted on to prevail through the coming electoral campaign.

U.S. War Line on Formosa Can Lead Only To New Victories for the Stalinist Regime

(Feb. 7)

That headline looks like something left over from 1954 . . . and in a way, it is. Though the official American policy on the Formosa-Stalinist China situation did not change during the year, the tendency to shift from saber-rattling to other forms of political warfare was evident in the Far East as well as elsewhere.

Chiang Kai-shek was rapidly expending the remnants of his political capital, and at year's end he threw a big wad of it out the window when his representative in the UN almost blocked a deal to let a number of countries into that organization by vetoing the admission of Outer Mongolia.

BEHIND YALTA: THE TRUTH ABOUT THE WAR

(April 4)

While cleaning up some odds and ends from the past . . . one of them turned up in the publication by the American government of the Yalta papers which swept back the curtain on the imperialist character of World War II.

Anyone with eyes to read was given a chance to understand the basic drives which animated the allied powers during that conflict, and from that the inevitability of the cold war among them which followed it.

But now we turn to the real business of 1955. That is the famous *détente* in the cold war abroad, and the definite turn-away from rampant McCarthyism at home.

Moscow Plays its Austrian Treaty Card—

A 'Peace' Finesse in Vienna:

Gloom in Washington and Bonn

(April 25)

It all began (more or less) when the Stalinist rulers in Russia announced that they were willing to terminate the occupation of Austria and sign an Austrian peace treaty; and when they then proceeded to actually doing so.

(Continued on page 2)

Third Kutcher Case Introduces New Police-State Theory

By BERNARD CRAMER

In a third round of hounding and persecution of the "legless veteran," James Kutcher, the government has introduced a new and most sinister element which gives the whole witchhunt an added dimension.

For a first time an official government body proposed to make the holding of a radical viewpoint the equivalent of "giving aid and comfort to the enemy"—which is the language used for treason.

This is straight out of the arsenal of the Stalinist despots themselves and an undiluted steal from the scenario of the Moscow purge trials—~~it is being done~~ by the U. S. government, which purports to detest police states.

There are now three "Kutcher cases." Our readers are most familiar with the first one, which arose in 1948 under Truman and the Democrats when the Veterans Administration fired Kutcher from his job as a file clerk in Newark on the ground that he is a member of the Socialist Workers Party, which is on the attorney general's "subversive list." Kutcher had lost both legs as an infantry man in Italy in 1943.

When the Kutcher case, with Joseph

L. Rauh Jr. as attorney, reached the Supreme Court in 1952, a victory was won with the decision that membership alone was an insufficient criterion for the VA firing and lower echelons of justice. But Kutcher has still not regained his job.

Not satisfied with this, another government agency tried to oust Kutcher's parents, with whom he lives, from their apartment in a Newark housing project, because he could not sign the required "loyalty oath." On Dec. 19, the New Jersey Supreme Court upheld a lower court ruling that a tenant's refusal to deny membership in a "listed" group was not sufficient ground for eviction. So the Kutchers are still living in their home,

(Turn to last page)

The Auto Economy: Its Engine Is Knocking

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Dec. 23

In all the optimistic forecasts about business conditions in 1956, and the painting of bright economic horizons in the next period, one dark cloud is being completely ignored; yet it keeps casting a bigger shadow every month.

That cloud is the alarming and growing gap between auto production and auto sales.

So many investors are so excited over the Ford stock offering, and so many financial writers are lost in fascination over a study of Ford history as revealed in the report filed with the Security Exchange Commission this week, that a far more important fact is being overlooked.

On December 1, *Automotive News* reports, new-car inventories reached the huge total of 709,000. This compares with 500,000 a month before, and with 265,153 one year ago.

The astonishing trend shows every indication of continuing. Cars are being produced now at a rate of 50,000 weekly over actual sales. Unless a Christmas miracle occurs, and nobody expects it, new-car inventories will climb to the 900,000 mark by January 1, 1956. This is a completely new and high figure for all time in auto industry history.

In the context of the auto industry's record for 1955, the only conclusion one could draw for 1956, if the auto industry were truly the bellwether of American in-

dustry, is that another 1954 recession is looming. This may well be true, but it seems more likely that other factors, including government spending on a higher scale in 1956, will prevail, and keep the economic situation more or less in control.

But for the auto workers, 1956 spells a poor year.

Those who have followed the hearings in Washington on General Motors practices with car dealers, and on the sales pressures it used to make 1955 a big year, know that every possible trick in the bag was employed: threats, charter withdrawals, winking at car bootlegging, alarming credit extensions, etc. No doubt, the other major car manufacturers did likewise. Yet the industry finds itself with 900,000 unsold cars on the first of 1956.

Increasingly, in the trade and business journals, the articles on the auto industry have voiced concern over the events of 1955. Were 1955 sales borrowed from the future—that is, were 1956 sales made in 1955? How can the public be expected to buy 1956s in huge quantities, when they are only warmed-over 55s? Why do we have to give July discounts in December? Questions like these permeate every discussion on the auto industry.

A whiff of the future might be detected in Detroit this past week when Chrysler laid off 1,400 automotive body workers just before Christmas. Pat Caruso, presi-

(Continued on page 4)

Are you reading this on

New Year's Eve?

Come to the ISL-YSL Party, at Labor Action Hall, N. Y. C.

Looking Back on 1955's Headlines — —

(Continued from page 1)

This opened the door to the "summit" conference at Geneva. All kinds of rumors were released to the effect that the Stalinists were willing to make some kind of a deal for the unification of Germany. Hopes were raised high all over the world that the terrible danger of the cold war turning into a hot one was finally at an end.

Behind the Deadlock on German Unity: Geneva Confab Preparing for New Forms of Cold-War Conflict (July 25)

The deadlock on Germany was, or should have been, the tip-off that no end to the cold war was really in sight, that the imperialist powers were indeed imperialist, and that even though it might be possible for them to draw back from the kind of sharp, recurring crises which seemed capable of setting off the nuclear war at any moment, they would not give up the booty and/or positions of power which they had gained in World War II without a struggle.

What Moscow Gained and Adenauer Lost (Sept. 26)

After the "friendly" and "sunny" and "affable" conference at the summit came Adenauer's visit to Moscow, and the bloom was definitely off the peach of the new era of "peace."

Geneva—From Spirit to Flesh: Political Warfare as Usual (Nov. 7)

Geneva Flop Leaves State Department Groping For a New Policy (Nov. 21)

By the end of November, the second Geneva conference (of the prime ministers) had come and gone, and with it the "Geneva Spirit" had changed into a new stage of the cold war.

The Russian Stalinists had patched up their fight with Tito's national-Stalinism in Yugoslavia; they had penetrated the French-English-American area of the Middle East through an arms deal with Egypt and offers of all kinds of trade and economic-aid programs to other countries in the region; and Khrushchev and Bulganin had started on a tour of Southeast Asia which they were to use as a massive sounding-board for their attack on capitalist imperialism. At the same time they sought to woo the ruling classes and masses alike of this vast and vital area by a policy of identifying with their local political and economic problems and conflicts.

What fruit they would eventually reap from all these maneuvers only time can tell. But it took no political crystal ball to see that they were opening up new opportunities for themselves, while their capitalist opponents were at a loss either to exploit the cold-war "thaw" for their own purposes, or to stop the Stalinist effort to exploit it for theirs.

Victory in Shachtman Passport Case! (June 27)

This headline can stand as a symbol for a series of victories for civil liberties in all fields which marked the year 1955.

In the Shachtman passport case the Court of Appeals ruled that travel abroad is a "natural right," and cannot be arbitrarily restricted by the State Department on the basis of its political prejudices or convenience. In other cases the courts ruled that the State Department must give people to whom they would deny passports a "quasi-judicial" hearing; that "defendants" in such proceedings are entitled to face and cross-examine their accusers, and use their own attorneys.

WDL Forms Committee to Fight ISL Case As Hearing Recesses Over Issue of Bias (Aug. 8)

Of course, as this headline shows, the fight to roll back the ravages of the cold war on the civil liberties of the American people was far from won during the year. The Attorney General's List of subversive organizations still exists, and along with it the threat to and persecution of hundreds of thousands, even millions, of people in the government services, industry, the schools, professions and the armed forces.

The Independent Socialist League was trying to attack the infamous "loyalty-security" system head-on by attacking its inclusion on the "subversive list." After years of effort, it had finally succeeded in commencing the first formal hearing given any organization on the list by the Department of Justice. At year's end, however, the hearing was in a state of suspension after having hardly begun.

This is further evidence that if the "loyalty" hysteria was reversed in 1955, it would still take hard and tenacious work to restore civil liberties even to the point at which they had been when President Truman issued his "loyalty-security" executive order in 1948.

Watts Report Reveals Military Reaching Out to Impose Controls on All Youth (Aug. 15)

Army Retreats Under Attack on 'Loyalty' System for Draftees (Nov. 28)

These two headlines show another area in which the fight for civil liberties was being waged hotly during the year, and not without results. But despite the army's retreat, there were still thousands and tens of thousands of men in the armed services or in the reserve who were threatened, solely because of past political activities, with less than honorable discharges. Here again it is clear that until the fight on the subversive list—on the whole concept of administrative reprisals for political beliefs and associations—is successful, its abuses will continue.

In another area of the fight for democracy, the struggle was not only hotly joined in 1955, but literally joined in blood.

Ballots and Bullets in Mississippi (Sept. 5)

The Supreme Court decision for desegregation of the schools, which was handed down in May of 1954, touched off a stepped-up fight on the part of the Negro people and their allies to break down all Jim Crow barriers in the South, and at the same time, of the Southern white supremacists to resist the democratization of their area by every means at their disposal, including murder and terror.

READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM!

In six special pamphlet-issues of LABOR ACTION, the basic ideas of Independent Socialism are vividly and simply explained.

- No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism
- No. 2—Independent Socialism and the Third World War
- No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis
- No. 4—Socialism and Democracy
- No. 5—What is Stalinism?
- No. 6—Socialism and the Working Class

To Stop the Racist Terror on the South, Now Is the Time to Organize a MARCH ON WASHINGTON (Dec. 12)

As has happened so often in history, the public pressure which had built up on both sides in the struggle for Negro rights exploded over a single event: the murder of Emmet Till, a fifteen-year-old Negro from Chicago who was visiting relatives in Mississippi. This murder, and the subsequent farce-trial in which the white murderers were acquitted, was the occasion for unprecedented mass demonstrations by Negroes all over the North, and for demands for action by wide sections of the labor movement.

While the white-supremacist Citizens Councils and their like in the South seemed to have things pretty much their way in 1955, the storm brewing over their heads made it clear to everyone, themselves included, that their day is drawing to a close.

The struggle for racial equality in America, while proceeding at a tempo determined by national conditions, was part of the struggle for equality by all the downtrodden and oppressed nations and peoples of the world.

The Moroccan Struggle for Freedom: While French Repression Continues the People Fight for Self-Determination (Sept. 5)

This struggle for equality reached its sharpest point in North Africa where France was fighting, arms in hand, to save the last remnants of her old empire.

Throughout the summer and fall the fighting raged in Morocco and Algeria. France herself was torn by a major strike wave.

In this struggle against the will of a people for the elementary right of self-determination, the French imperialists found a staunch, if shame-faced, ally in the United States—and even among the American liberals whose democratic feelings usually tend to give way when they conflict with the imperatives of American foreign policy.

Gaitskell Vs. Morrison: The Battle in the BLP Over Attlee's Mantle (Oct. 31)

The struggle over Attlee's mantle was simply a symbol of the restless attempt of the British Labor Party and the working class of Britain to find a new line of political orientation.

Aneurin Bevan, around whom the left wing of the BLP had been crystallized for several years, was increasingly showing his inability to give such a movement a coherent and consistent political program.

The party remained full of ferment at year's end, but with few indications of what direction the search for a new program might take in the future.

Power-Politics Behind the Israel-Arab Crisis (Nov. 14)

The headline speaks for itself. Both sides in the struggle were seeking to line up big-power support.

The only thing which seemed to prevent the possibility of this struggle blowing up into a really big war was the evident determination of both Stalinist and capitalist imperialist powers to avoid such a war at this time.

Back in the United States, the labor movement fought many a major battle in a hard struggle in which the corporations had the backing of a sympathetic administration in Washington and a sturdy weapon in the Taft-Hartley Law which labor had been unable to get repealed or amended.

Statesmanship or Class Struggle? 'Feet to the Fire,' Both GM and Ford Yielded in Face of Militant Strike Threat (June 20)

In the middle of the year the United Auto Workers won a great victory in the automobile industry when they established the principle of the Guaranteed Annual Wage for the first time in a significant section of American industry.

Although the giant corporations yielded without prolonged strikes, it was clear that the union was willing and ready to close the shops down unless they got a reasonable amount of what they wanted.

War in Indiana: Armed Scabs, Martial Law Turned to Strikebreaking (Oct. 17)

The Perfect Circle strike in Indiana, the Kohler strike in Wisconsin, and others elsewhere (especially in the South) were fought with a violence and bitterness which tested the mettle of union men and leaders, and demonstrated that even the crudest forms of the class struggle are far from strangers to this country, despite the mighty power of the labor movement which deters most employers from trying open union-busting tactics.

IUE's Westinghouse Strike Is First Big Challenge to Speedup (Oct. 24)

At the end of the year this strike was going on just as bitterly as in October. The International Union of Electrical Workers was in a do-or-die struggle with Westinghouse. The outcome of this fight would determine whether the electrical workers have finally succeeded in forming a union which can take on and beat one of the giants in the industry, or whether they have still to complete the job of establishing a real fighting union.

The IUE's fight, like that of the workers in all industries in America, was helped by what may well prove to have been the single most significant event in America and perhaps in the world during 1955.

That was the unification of the American labor movement.

AFL-CIO Merger Will Advance The Progressive Forces in Labor (Feb. 21)

LABOR ACTION began to give the unity negotiations its closest attention back last winter when it was still a big question whether the leaderships of both federations would actually be able to overcome all the obstacles to unity.

But the obstacles were overcome.

HISTORY WAS MADE: Merger Stirs Labor to Hope, NAM to Fear (Dec. 19)

That was the closing note of the year. Though all kinds of problems remained to be solved, the labor movement was united for the first time since it achieved its present stature in America.

The unity was accompanied by solemn declarations by the leaders of the new movement that they are opposed to the class struggle, and above all to the formation by labor of its own political party in this country. The more solemn and earnest the declarations, the more glaring was the fact which sets the stage for developments during the year and years ahead:

American labor is united. It is in a position from which it can meet its enemies on their own ground up and down the line in industry and in politics.

What it still needs for this is an outlook and a policy which can cope effectively with the problems of the American people in 1956 and after.

LONDON LETTER

As Gaitskell Takes Over the Helm—

Bevanites to Expand Activities

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, Dec. 20

There has been no shortage of copy for journalists in Britain in the past few days. The election of a new leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party has filled to overflowing the columns of every newspaper in the country and bears adequate witness to the importance of the Labor Party in British politics in spite of its defeat at the polls earlier in the year.

The election of Hugh Gaitskell as the new leader evoked little surprise. It had been forecast by most of the political commentators who make an honest endeavor to portray things as they are.

What did perhaps cause some surprise was the size of Gaitskell's majority and the fact that Aneurin Bevan managed to beat Herbert Morrison for the second place. (The figures were Gaitskell 157; Bevan 70; Morrison 40). For Gaitskell it was glorious victory, for Bevan encouragement, and for Morrison humiliating defeat.

Labor's *Daily Herald*, which has expressed no preference as to who should fill the leader's place, welcomed Gaitskell's election as a choice from a list of men with impressive qualities.

But it then gave a warning that the party had only settled the question of leadership and there still remained the important task of formulating "the right policy" and backing it with an efficient machine. "The party cannot sit back and expect any leader to do its job for it," said the editorial. What the policy should be the *Daily Herald* gave no indication.

The right-wing Laborite *Daily Mirror* appeared much more enthusiastic than the *Herald*. With screaming headlines it announced to its four and a half million daily purchasers that this was "The Great Revival." It said that the Labor Party had been reborn with the election of Gaitskell: "... it is no longer satisfied with the cautious advice of old men, or with the ideas of the last half-century."

Morrison, according to the *Mirror*, had been "discarded with affection" because of his age, while Bevan had been discarded as a penalty for "years of disruptive work as a Labor Party member."

But the *Mirror* recognized that it could not completely discount Bevan, and much less the party left wing. "Gaitskell must never forget, in the flush of victory, that it is from the left wing that the Labor Party has always gained its thrust and inspiration. The fact that Bevan received seventy votes last night was less a tribute to the wayward Welshman than a warning to Gaitskell that he must not ignore Labor's forceful left wing."

ATTACK ON "MIRROR"

On the same day the *Mirror* "elected" Gaitskell as "The Politician of the Year," and its political editor Sydney Jacobson put his finger on a very important point in a feature article on Gaitskell. "It would be foolish," he said, "to ignore the truth that many Labor supporters in the local parties—especially rank-and-file workers—would have preferred Bevan as leader. To them, Gaitskell is still a man totally wedded to the right-wing policies they distrust." (Original italics.)

The important task for Gaitskell, said Jacobson, was to convince the whole movement that he can maintain the balance between the left and right wings—and this could best be done by starting at once on "a fighting campaign of big speeches up and down the country." Jacobson did not suggest what the speeches should be about so one must assume that they are still to be on the policy which, to use his own word, the rank-and-file workers "distrust."

The Bevanite weekly *Tribune* had gone to press before Attlee's successor was known. But in a feature article Bevan slashed out at what he called the "unworthy conspiracy" which had forced Attlee to quit at the time and in the fashion which he had. By which Bevan implied: at the time when Gaitskell's stock was at its highest peak.

"The Labor Party," said Bevan, "will come to rue the day it permitted the least reputable among newspapers to fill the role of king maker." No newspaper was named but the cap seemed to fit the *Daily Mirror* for the next day it screamed forth that Bevan had made a "bitter attack on *Mirror*," and in a front-page lead story told its readers that Bevan had chosen to

attack the newspaper for which he wrote a series of six articles last year.

The *Mirror* also gave prominence to another attack upon it which appeared in the same issue of *Tribune* under the by-line John Marullus. This really was, said the *Mirror*, the ex-member of Parliament Michael Foot who has recently taken over the editor's chair in the *Tribune* offices.

An interesting feature of the article by John Marullus was the attack on Laborite MP Dick Crossman, who writes a regular political column in the *Mirror*. Once a prominent Bevanite Crossman has shown several signs of right-wing wandering recently. It may be remembered that an earlier article in *LABOR ACTION* reported that Crossman supported the manufacture of a British H-bomb and voted with the right wing in the Parliamentary debate which resulted in Bevan's expulsion from the Parliamentary Party.

John Marullus said that "the loudest bagpipe in the squeaking train" of those anxious to oust Attlee was the *Daily Mirror* and its columnist R. H. S. Crossman (note the formal method by which Crossman is addressed).

GAITSKELL'S RISK

From the Tory press Gaitskell met with well wishes (purely a formality) coupled with warnings and not a few sneers at the Labor Party in general. Said the ultra-right wing *Daily Mail* "Mr. Gaitskell has taken on the toughest job in politics. Before long the knives will be out and he will have to fight hard for party unity—and his own leadership."

The weekly which provides the theoretical food for the Tories, *The Economist*, carried a very interesting and enlightening editorial feature on Gaitskell's election. With a douche of cold water it warned that "the decision to elevate Mr. Gaitskell to the leadership is also a risky one," because it may be the start "of an unprofitable slide of Labor to the left."

The Economist hastened to add that in making this statement it did not imply any sinister interpretation of the character of Gaitskell who is "what he appears to be on the surface; a moderate, sensible and agreeable man." The danger came, said *The Economist*, from the fact that Gaitskell was a right-winger and not a middle-of-the-roader as have been previous leaders of the Labor Party.

The leader of the party, said the article, is primarily concerned with maintaining stability between the right and left, and this task was best suited for a middle-of-the-roader. A right-winger is difficultly paced when it comes to controlling the "wild men."

Some prominent right-wingers in the past, acknowledged *The Economist*, were able to do this, and it instanced the late Ernest Bevan. But this was due to the fact that he could always dig his toes in, refuse to make concessions, and "whistle up his faithful trade-union bodyguard" if the situation became too sticky. Gaitskell has no trade-union bodyguard and therefore, as *The Economist* sees it, he will be under "peculiar compulsions" to make concessions to the left wing in order to maintain his position as leader. Gaitskell, it said, "can rule only by persuasion, and persuasion means conciliation."

BEVANITE PLANS

While Tory readers of *The Economist* were brooding on this fearful thought the supporters of *Tribune* were reading of the plans now being made by the editorial board of the Bevanite weekly to warm up the political atmosphere and demonstrate that from the start Gaitskell has a vigorous left wing with which to attempt conciliation.

In a front-page feature it announced a series of plans which, if brought to fruition, may provide some of the important elements which the Bevanites have lacked in the past.

First and probably most important point in the *Tribune* article was the announcement that it intends to publish a series of

policy statements early next year. These will be under the same heading as those chosen by the National Executive Committee of the party to appear within the next three years.

Says the article: "*Tribune* proposes to conduct its business more swiftly. Early in the year we shall start publishing our policy statements."

This is news which will be welcomed by all left-wingers in the Labor Party, for it presents a first-rate opportunity to hammer out a constructive policy to pose as an alternative to the right wing.

Secondly, and perhaps no less important, the *Tribune* intends to start a series of regional conferences. In the past *Tribune* has organized "Brains Trusts" and the normal type of public meeting; it has not held conferences. Conferences mean conferring, conferring means exchanging ideas, exchanging ideas means the gradual evolution of a coherent opin-

LABOR SCOPE

After a Half-Century of Bitter Struggle

By BEN HALL

An auto worker who joined the UAW at the age of 30 in 1937 is now 49 years old. He may be mulling over his chances of retiring under the union's pension plan. He may have a son of 19 just entering the shop with him, a union man from the day of maturity.

The automobile industry has been organized for a generation, with a new working class born and reared under the sign of unionism.

Working-class organization on a broad scale is now a permanent and continuing aspect of American life for the first time.

Class-consciousness is not created overnight; it arises out of the life experience of men, passed down to their children and passed on from one generation to the next. The auto worker who brings his son into the union perpetuates a union-consciousness, a realization by the American working class that it must remain organized or be reduced to second-class citizenship. And this realization is the first step toward class-consciousness.

In all innocence, our labor officials abjure the class struggle, pledging to remain simple citizens; and for this they are complimented and congratulated by other citizens: editors, politicians and employers who are grateful that the united labor movement does not intend to tinker with its official philosophy of classlessness. Yet, the AFL-CIO merger is the biggest step toward class-consciousness yet recorded in this land of officially equal citizens.

Fifteen million are united under a single leadership. But even this impressive arithmetical sum hardly does justice to the social reality. If in the United States, 30 per cent of the nation's total non-farm workers are organized, this percentage is exceeded in Italy, Britain, France, Austria—in virtually all modern democratic nations. But let us look behind the figures.

THE NEW FACT

Merger means more than the establishment of a big union movement. It symbolizes the final victory of the labor movement within present-day American capitalism and the definitive entrance upon the political arena of a working class which is organized in its decisive sections. And this is new in American history.

Everyone went to the unity convention to address it with respect, even reverence. One might imagine that the roster of well-wishers pointed to a long-standing and deep-seated sympathy for organized labor in all sections of American life. But this labor movement, to which everyone doffs his hat, was finally and permanently established only a short while ago, in fact only about ten years ago, the culmination of a half-century of bitter struggle.

Industrial unionism won its first big victories in the mid-thirties but was it to be permanent? Ten years were needed to answer that question. When the United States entered the war in 1941, a period of relative class truce prevailed; in return for their no-strike pledge, unions received a certain official governmental protection and toleration. Unionism rose

ion—which all leads to a strengthening of the left in the Labor Party.

Tribune also promises its supporters a series of articles, of a searching and controversial character, on the structure and theory of the trade unions. For, it says, "Labor's recovery will depend partly on the speed with which the great trade-union movement puts its house in order to face the new age." A special pamphlet is also promised dealing with democracy in the Labor movement—stating the case for an overhaul of the party's constitution.

All of these promised endeavors will be warmly supported by the left of the Labor Party for they seem to indicate that the Bevanites are about to make a serious effort to climb out of the rut in which they have rested for too long in the past.

Whether they have been embarked upon as a consequence of Gaitskell's election as leader, or Mike Foot's taking over the editorship of *Tribune*, or as a result of serious political thought by the Bevanite leadership, is not clear. Probably all three factors have influenced this promised change of outlook—but if the cards are played correctly the Labor left wing will grow immeasurably stronger as a result.

from about 8 million in 1940 to nearly 13 million in 1945.

But this was not the first spectacular rise in union membership that had ever taken place. During the First World War, union membership rose from 3 million to 5 million. But with peace, the employers' open-shop counter-offensive began. Unions were driven back; they dropped to 3½ million by 1923 and were reduced to less than 3 million by 1933 when the labor movement was down to rock-bottom as an organization of the working class. Unionism was bottled up in the crafts and the vast majority of American workers remained unorganized. The turning point, of course, came with the CIO upsurge.

The decisive battles of the period after the Second World War saw a nation-wide wave of strikes in which every industrial union was pitted against its monopoly employer. The unions emerged victorious from these struggles; it was not a retreat but a new period of advance; this was another turning-point in the story of unionism and class relations in America.

REMEMBER HISTORY

The employers were compelled to reconcile themselves to unionism. From this point on, it was clear, the working class would be organized not only in its skilled trades but in its main industrial sectors. In the united labor movement today, industrially organized workers outnumber those organized by craft by two to one. Ten million are organized by industry, only five million by craft.

It should be remembered that many a time, in U. S. labor's history, every effort to organize the industrial working class in permanence has been smashed.

As early as 1892, the incipient trusts in steel had demolished the most powerful union labor had yet created, the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel workers, when its strike against the open shop was smashed by state troops who occupied Homestead, Pa. for 95 days to protect scabs. A few years later, the U. S. Steel Company finished off the union in an open-shop drive and proceeded to wipe out unions organizing the ore-carrying boats on the Great Lakes.

In 1894 the first attempt to organize railway workers industrially was smashed during the great Pullman strike of 1894 by federal troops and injunctions. In 1900 the attempt of packinghouse workers to organize the Meat Trust was broken. In the next few years, unions were driven out of the metal manufacturing industries. It was only by long hard strikes that industrial unionism held on to a few strong points in mining and clothing.

It is against this background of bitter struggles and many defeats that the successes of 1945-6 must be measured.

The American working class has a long history of class struggle; unionism has a rich tradition. Yet the labor movement has established itself only recently, relatively speaking. The history of the American working class as a permanently organized class has only just begun. The merger is its official birthday.

Reading from Left to Right

Auto Economy —

WHAT SAY THE McCARTHYITE EGGHEADS?

By CHARLES CALVIN

If it is true that it is nice to have your opponents out where you can see what they're up to, we should rejoice at the publication of a new weekly called *National Review*.

Published by William F. Buckley Jr., whose main claim to fame as a young reactionary is his book *God and Man at Yale*, it has now been coming out for about a month. And it is a very curious magazine indeed, with people like James Burnham, Max Eastman, Russell Kirk and Freda Uteley on its editorial board.

The "tone" is not, so far, blindly reactionary, except perhaps on Formosa and the "subversives" in Washington; and there is an undeniable fascination in reading outright reactionary views expressed with no hesitancy or qualification.

So powerful is the symbolic value, at least, of the "liberal" tradition that most American right-wingers spend most of their rhetorical energy tiresomely making themselves out as democrats. Some of the people writing for *National Review* cannot yet bear to give up the name of liberal, and claim to be defending the true liberal position from which the self-styled variety have backslid.

Indeed, to those who enjoy the triumph of suavity over sense which so often characterizes the *Reporter* these days, *National Review* may not seem so bad at all. Buckley may, of course, set up a roar loud and determined enough to scare them a bit.

In the long run *National Review*, if it manages to get read by any noticeable portion of the American intelligentsia, can only help to pulverize the liberals further. This task, judging from the first few issues, is about as easy from the right as from the left.

However, it is not very likely that the magazine can, in spite of what must be considerable cash backing, become much of a force even in these limited terms. It depends upon a delicate coalition of forces: the active reactionaries who control policy and find the money, and the reflective conservatives who are supposed to give a High Tone to the proceedings. On the same conclusion, if they do, by different routes, or put different stresses on ambiguous policies.

One side damns the UN for being a dangerous world government likely to control nations; the other damns it because it is not a satisfactory instrument of U. S. military policy. One side opposes government activities (from price supports, scientific scholarships, big dam building) because of its conviction that laissez-faire is the only way to reach the good society; the other opposes because it would rather see government activities directed the opposite way.

This is a problem faced by all right-wing groups, of course; their internal politics are sometimes just as volatile as those of left-wing groups. Unless Buckley's editorial management is exceptionally astute, there may be quite a procession of what we might call honest conservatives through the pages of *National Review*.

It may appear to them, at first, as their long-awaited channel to a sizeable audience. Then they may perceive that their quietly conservative position has been amalgamated into something rather more vehement. Finally they may realize that they have been had, and will either resign themselves to their position or get out.

GOING SLOW

At the moment, however, Buckley is moving softly in all things, and we must wait to see.

On labor, where we might expect a major economic effort, we have had things like "Big Labor will choose the Democratic presidential nominee next year"—which any genuine and informed reactionary *Realpolitiker* would regard as childish spookery. Someone named Jonathan Mitchell wrote a meandering piece about the AFL-CIO merger, talking about Reuther's "secure place in the Democratic Party left wing" and making some remarkable observations to the effect that the coming organizing drive in the South will meet a major obstacle in—plushy conditions brought about by automatic production techniques!

What *National Review* will work out as the proper American policy vis-a-vis Stalinism, which is, after all, the touchstone of political sanity these days, is not yet clear. Negotiation, the white hope of liberals and their neutralist friends, is regarded as a snare and a delusion; co-

existence, whatever that means, is neither feasible nor desirable. Atomic war, however, is a dangerous thing, though military opposition to the Stalinists is the main card. On preventive war and massive retaliation, we may expect that with any renewal of tension in the Formosa Strait the bombardiers of the China Lobby will exercise their trigger fingers in *National Review*. The presence of Burnham may also lend a somewhat apocalyptic air to the depiction of Stalinist successes.

On domestic economic policy, there will doubtless in time be hidden battles between the opportunists (among whom Joe McCarthy will likely be found) and the diehard principled reactionaries, like Knowland, whose voting record Buckley finds almost faultless. Keynes, whose admonitions have not exactly gone unheeded by the current administration, comes in for some hard knocks on the ground that "there is no science of human action"; we may even be treated to some honest-to-God neo-classical economics in time, which ought to prove amusing.

DOUBLE THINK

On civil rights, at least one real corker has been produced—by Brent Bozell, possibly the softest-headed of the editorial crew. He writes that, in inducing the Defense Department to stop persecuting draftees for pre-induction activities, the Hennings Committee forced it to "undo vital security precautions that we instituted on the heels of the celebrated Peers case." This, referring to the giving of less-than-honorable discharges to men with satisfactory service records because of civilian political associations, is a type of doublethink which bears watching.

On colonialism, one J. Dervin writes a noncommittal piece on Franco's prospects for "holding" North Africa, in which he merely says that French policies have been ineffectual because of instability in the government in Paris.

On desegregation, a crucial question for Republican inside-dopesters, because of the loss of strength it has entailed in the South, the magazine has so far said little; we might expect, in time, a fairly *cautiously states rights* line, especially as the election approaches; for whatever else Buckley is interested in, he is not interested in sentiments of or about anybody who thinks himself oppressed.

And what of the place of *National Review* in the larger world of non-intellectual American political writing? Well, it's pretty far out. Far out, that is, from what passes for politics with most Americans—the comfortable generalities of the *Saturday Evening Post*, the intent searching for the middle-of-the-road in *Life*, and—perhaps most notable of all—from the matter-of-fact grubbiness of the *Wall Street Journal* or *Business Week*.

Conservatism right now is pretty quiet in America, or has been until the advent of Facts Forum and other manifestations of the McCarthy-oilmen combination. It is doubtful if most of the big boys would exactly welcome a magazine which systematically and unashamedly presents a rationale for what they are doing.

Subsidiaries of the NAM are always welcome, who may criticize the New Deal, oppose unions and welfare legislation, and defame the poor Democrats to their hearts' content. A positive program for reaction, which is what Buckley intends to develop, is another matter. It might give the game away.

(Continued from page 1)

dent of Local 212 of the Auto Workers union, blasted this policy in terms seldom used these days by labor leaders in criticizing corporations. Unquestionably, this was a sign of the concern shown by the UAW over coming events.

NOBODY'S BRAGGING

Mercury announced a slight cutback, Ford and General Motors plants cut out all overtime, and every auto corporation found it expedient to announce long holiday week-ends for Christmas and New Years. Even with these measures, car production is climbing above sales, as we indicated before.

Now an interesting feature of projections for auto industry production and sales for 1956 is the difference between those made late in 1954 and those made now. In 1954 there was no argument but that the over-all industry figure would be higher for 1955 than it was in the current year. Today, not one single important source of information or analysis makes that claim for 1956—quite the contrary.

Independent university surveys—and those of Paul McCracken at the University of Michigan have been quite accurate—suggest at least a 10 per cent reduction in 1956 sales. The top industry survey, published yearly, states that

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

From an ABC radio broadcast by Edward P. Morgan:

"Seventy-three per cent of the adults Dr. Gallup polled had not read a book in the last month. Sixty-one per cent had not read a book in the last year. Presumably, this did not include comic books.

"This, of course, is wonderful news. It removes the bothersome necessity of book-burning, or of book-branding. Since nobody reads anything anyway, these safeguards against allegedly subversive literature can be abandoned and the time and effort and money saved can be diverted to something more useful, like research in thought control. . . . The Gallup Poll reveals a chronic condition rather than a suddenly acquired quirk in the often cock-eyed way we Americans do things. For instance, another survey shows that in Great Britain, where the typical citizen has far less formal schooling than the typical citizen here, three times as many people read books as do here. . . .

"...How many bookstores would you guess there are in this country, that is not counting drugstores, or gift shops, but bookstores with a reasonably adequate stock and equipped to order your book if they haven't got it? In the entire nation, according to Lacy, there are a mere 1,500 such bookshops. . . .

"How many Americans would you guess had no access to a library? Thirty million, says the Publishers Council—mostly in rural areas. This is a fifth of the country's total population. Another two-fifths, Lacy estimates, have woefully inadequate library service. Three-fifths of the population of the most powerful nation in the world without adequate access to a book! A bill to finance library service programs in rural areas has been kicking around in Congress for years without decision. . . .

"We're a great nation. We've come a long way as we are. But who knows what would happen if we read a book?"

there are fewer than 6,000,000 potential customers in 1956. (The 1955 figure should be over 7,000,000.) Even the corporations have been talking about their own potential gains, but on one that has claimed that 1956 will even equal 1955 for the industry as a whole. Perhaps Harlow Curtice will make that claim in his annual forecast due in January. It remains to be seen.

The facts are that every possible indication suggests that 1956 for the auto industry will not equal 1955. Last year, auto industry economists spoke frequently about auto paving the way for economic gains in 1956; and they were partly right. Housing did its share too. Now the tenor of the remarks is different.

Now the story is that the health of the economy assures prosperity for the auto industry. Research resources far greater than those at the disposal of this writer are needed to determine exactly the relationship between the two forces. At the moment it seems somewhat like answering the problem of which came first, the chicken or the egg.

Take a 10 to 15 per cent reduction in auto production in 1956, compared to this year; mix it well with the great strides being made in automation in this industry, which will be accelerated when the 1957 models are introduced next fall; and make your own guess as to the employment situation confronting the auto workers.

THE PINCH IS COMING

The headache will be eased, of course, by the application of the unemployment-insurance supplement plans that go into effect next summer or fall. But, like most other people, the auto workers are living now from week to week with credit payments keeping them hopping. Any cutback in wages, and that is assured by the elimination of overtime, puts economic pressures on them immediately.

An interesting side statistic on the auto workers is this: In 1955, the best year most of them ever had, under 5 per cent purchased new cars, in spite of all kinds of special deals by the corporations, etc., for their employees. (The 5 per cent figure is somewhat high, by the way.)

For the auto corporations, the profit picture is not so bright. They are making only face-lifting changes in the 1956 models, the corporations saved millions in tool-and-die and remodeling work. So even a cutback in sales won't hurt them very much. The major changes coming this early fall for the 1957 models are expected to be paid for by a gold rush of sales at that time. In fact, the hope of the auto industry for 1956 rests on selling the 1957s so much earlier than usual to keep the car market moving.

In our opinion, a stepping up of the cold war becomes an increasing economic necessity to keep American economy on its uneasy "prosperity" basis. And the forthcoming presidential election puts additional pressures on the Eisenhower business administration to keep the rest of American industry from facing the prospect before the auto industry.

It is these political factors that make hedging on the economic outlook a necessity. Left to itself, industry's growing inventories (and this is true not only in auto) plus the farm crisis would play havoc with the economy. Even with more pump-priming the pinch is going to be felt, notably in the auto industry.

"SONGS OF THE WOBBLIES"

The new LABOR ARTS recording of famous IWW songs, sung by Joe Glazer and Bill Friedland. On 33-1/3 LPs, unbreakable.

\$4.00

Now available on 33-1/3 LPs—

"BALLADS FOR SECTARIANS"

Song satires on the twists and turns of the American Stalinist movement

\$4.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Mail orders will receive prompt attention. All orders must be accompanied by payment.



LABOR ACTION

January 2, 1956 Vol. 20, No. 1

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: MAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Shachtman, CPer Debate at Swarthmore

By S. T.

An audience of 250 students and faculty members of "Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, heard a debate between Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, and H. Weiss, former state treasurer of the Pennsylvania Communist Party, on "Are Negotiations the Way to Peace?" The debate was sponsored by the Free Speech Forum of the college.

This was a rare occasion since it was the first time a public representative of the Communist Party had agreed to debate an Independent Socialist spokesman. There is a lively political interest among the students at Swarthmore, much of it liberal and pacifist, and the CP probably believes that its present line would enable it to gain a foothold.

To a student audience, most of whom had never seen a Stalinist hack in action before, the Stalinist's "peaceful negotiations" presentation must have had a man-from-Mars quality about it. No discussion of politics, nor of the reasons for the cold war—nothing but "peace" and "peaceful negotiations." No criticism of United States imperialism; no defense of Russia even under the most persistent criticism—just "peace."

While Max Shachtman discussed the issues of the cold war and the nature of the imperialist rivalry between the U. S. and Russian blocs, the Stalinist Weiss talked about "negotiating" the differences. While Shachtman asked how there could be peace in the world when millions of people were being oppressed in Eastern Europe and North Africa, the Stalinist asked who wants war. While Shachtman tried to educate the audience to the nature and reasons for the cold war and the need for a democratic foreign policy which granted self-determination to all peoples, the Stalinist tried to lull them into a coma by talk about coexistence.

The performance by the Stalinist had to be seen in order to really be believable. He didn't come to the meeting to discuss imperialism, he said—just to talk about peace and negotiations.

Now, of course (he went on) negotiations won't solve anything and no one says they would; but, after all, isn't Peace better than war? aren't 11 or 22 Geneva conferences which you call failures better than one atomic war? All we

need are men of good will, desirous of Peace, and little by little we can work out the differences . . . etc., etc., *ad nauseam*.

One point at which both speakers did manage to make contact was on the result of the two Geneva conferences. To the Stalinist, of course, Geneva showed the wonderful possibilities of negotiations since both sides agreed not to use atomic weapons.

Shachtman wanted to know where was the document which signified or implied such an agreement. If such an agreement was reached, it was not the result of Geneva for it existed before Geneva. But such an agreement does not exist; for hardly had the second conference ended when the Russians exploded an H-bomb and the British announced their intention to do likewise; nor has the U. S. ever renounced the use of atomic weapons. However, if we are to believe that such an agreement exists, then we must conclude that the Stalinists are preparing to use the bomb on the Russian people, and that Attorney General Brownell is preparing to drop it on Mississippi.

Opposed to the vagaries and frustrations of illusory demands for Big Power negotiations and "peace" between the oppressor and the oppressed people, Max Shachtman proposed the granting of self-determination to all peoples subjugated on both sides of the Iron Curtain as the first step toward peace.

Compromise in Case of The Truant Guardsman

By CHARLES WALKER

Berkeley, Dec. 20

Private Henry Burns, the 17-year-old truant National Guardsman from Redwood City, Cal. [see story in Dec. 19 Challenge] has obtained his release from the San Mateo juvenile home on a writ of habeas corpus, after serving one day of a ten-day sentence for missing National Guard meetings. He went to court yesterday, and results are not yet known. If the court refuses to send him back to jail—as directed by the National Guard court-martial officer Major D. A. Rascon, under the California Military and Veterans Code—the Guard will either have to find a different punishment or at worst threaten him with dishonorable discharge from the National Guard.

The court-martial officer was backed up by Major General R. A. Green, commanding general of the 49th Infantry Division, California National Guard. General Green said that the punishment was justified because pre-draft-age young men (17-18½ years old) have it soft in being able to remain at home and take their military training, while draftees spend a minimum of 18 months at an army camp.

The private had missed four other consecutive drills and had previously been fined \$15 and given a suspended 10-day sentence. He claimed that transportation difficulties were the cause then and now, and wanted a transfer. The important question, however, is whether jail sentences will be given for disciplinary reasons to those who have served part of their military training in the army and are still enrolled in the National Guard through federal requirements. How heavy is the military hand going to be on the nation's youth during the compulsory reserve time they must put in by law?

According to the San Francisco Chronicle, Private Burns has withdrawn his objection to the court-martial decision sentencing him to 10 days imprisonment in the juvenile home. In return the National Guard cut his sentence to 5 days, two of which have already been served, and the other three to be finished this week.

The question raised by this case will not be aired legally at this time apparently, but will have to wait for a subsequent case.

Discrimination in Schools: Not Only in the South

By MAX MARTIN

The Negro people and all other opponents of Jim Crow have been focusing their attention on the South, as the struggle to end segregation in the schools and win other gains for the Negroes becomes more intense. That the spotlight should fall on the section of the country which lies below the Mason-Dixon line is quite natural. It is in the South, after all, that the most outrageous inequality, discrimination and segregation are to be found.

And likewise it is the Southern racists who openly announce their plans to flaunt the Supreme Court's historic decision and to continue to deny the Negro people their most elementary democratic rights. Above all, it is in the South that the efforts of the Negroes to obtain in actuality what the judiciary has "granted" on paper has been met with a reign of intimidation, violence and terror, both of the economic and physical varieties.

The more open, blatant and widespread Jim Crow system of the South has not prevented northern Negroes from feeling the extent of inequality and segregation in the North; they are its victims daily in all spheres of life. White liberals, however, are frequently easy prey to the illusion that Jim Crow, which they oppose, barely exists in the North, at least with respect to education.

Not that there aren't "Negro schools" and "white schools;" that is, schools with overwhelming Negro and Puerto Rican populations on the one hand and those with overwhelming enrollments of white students on the other.

That such segregation exists is obvious. The point made, however, is that such school segregation is an inevitable result of community racial patterns, of the ghetto in which Negroes are forced to live by housing discrimination. That, it is claimed, is something the school system can do nothing about, something that the city government can't remedy.

So run the arguments in countless textbooks on urban sociology. Leaving aside for purposes of this article the obvious fact that city officials could, if they wanted to, do a great deal about discrimination in housing, the facts are that the above views are wrong, even within their own framework of reasoning.

SECOND-CLASS CHILDREN

A recent study of the New York City school system in regard to this question proves this afresh, especially since there is good reason to believe that the situation is much worse in other Northern cities.

Not that the report concludes that the Board of Education segregates Negro and Puerto Rican children. On the contrary, it absolves school officials of that charge. This conclusion has been challenged by a number of outstanding fighters for Negro rights and been described as a "whitewash" by them. We will comment on this aspect of the question below.

What is so utterly revealing is the fact that even if one accepts this verdict of the report, one is still left with the obvious truth that Negro and Puerto Rican children are second-class pupils in the public schools of New York.

The report, entitled "The Status of the Public School Education of Negro and Puerto Rican Children in New York City," was prepared by the Public Education Association with the assistance of the New York University Research Center for Human Relations, at the request of the city's Board of Education.

The study is separated into two questions: (1) Do Negro and Puerto Rican children have equal educational opportunity? (2) Is there segregation?

The first question takes the existence of "Negro schools" and "white schools" for granted and compares the two groups of schools in regard to various criteria to see if there is equality between them. The second asks whether or not the existing segregation is the responsibility of the school officials.

A white school, denominated a "Group Y school" is defined as one in which Negro and Puerto Rican students form less than 10 per cent of the total. A Negro and Puerto Rican school, classified as belonging to "Group X," is one which contains a 90 per cent or more Negro and Puerto Rican enrollment, in the case of elementary schools, and 85 per cent in the case of junior high schools.

BIG DIFFERENCE

All of the "Group X" schools in the city (42 elementary schools and 9 junior high schools) were studied and 75 "Group Y" schools were selected at random for purposes of comparison. Seven different criteria were used in measuring the two groups of schools.

(1) Are physical facilities available to "Group X" as good or equal to those provided "Group Y"?

The differences are staggering. "Group X" schools are older than "Group Y" schools, by an average of 12 years in the case of elementary schools and an average of 20 years in the case of junior high schools. The average age of white elementary schools is 31 years as compared with 43 years for Negro and Puerto Rican schools; the figures for junior high schools are 15 and 35 respectively.

There is less square feet of floor space, site space, ground level space and playground space per child in "Group X" elementary schools than in "Group Y" elementary schools.

The same situation holds for junior high schools with the exception of floor space, in regard to which "Group X" schools exceed "Group Y" schools by a bit.

The differences between the two groups in regard to these criteria are not tiny ones, moreover; the average white elementary school has 103.1 square feet of site space per pupil as against 46.2 square feet per pupil in Negro schools.

(Continued next week)

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the Challenge or the YSL.

YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

FOR JANUARY Max Shachtman

leads three sessions on
THE THEORY OF BUREAUCRATIC COLLECTIVISM

TUESDAY EVENINGS at 8:15

- (1) Jan. 10—Development of Trotskyist views on Russia.
- (2) Jan. 17—The theories of "workers state" and "state-capitalism."
- (3) Jan. 24—Bureaucratic Collectivism.

COMING IN FEBRUARY

Three sessions by Hal Draper on "The Permanent Revolution"—on the first three Tuesdays of the month.

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

YSL FORUM • NEW YORK

ROLAND WATTS

National Secretary, Workers Defense League

speaks on

The Army 'Security' System & Civil Liberties

FRIDAY, Jan. 6 at 8:30 p.m.

Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

The New Socialist Party In India

By PHILIP COBEN

We are finally in a position to present some details on the split which took place this past year in the Praja Socialist Party of India, as contained in the published material of the left wing, which is forming a new Socialist Party under the leadership of Rammanohar Lohia.

The following informational article, it should be understood, is based entirely on this material, which consists of a file of two publications from last July to last October.

Since the left wing did not control the party press, its views were put forward in organs published by the young socialist organization (SYS) which went over to them in an overwhelming body. The SYS started a newspaper titled *Young World* and a mimeographed internal bulletin. Speeches, resolutions, press statements and other documents of the left wing are reprinted or summarized in these two publications.

The definitive split got under way in July, as described below, and through the next couple of months the left wing reorganized its forces (whether locally in the minority or majority) in the various states, provinces and cities, under the name "Socialist Party" of the given state. On November 2, delegates from six regional conferences of the left wing met at Bhopal and decided on the date and arrangements of the foundation conference of the nation-wide party. It will be held in Hyderabad from December 22-24, 1952, with a representation basis of one delegate for each 150 members. In the spring a new magazine will be launched, under the name of Mankind.

The left wing claimed to have taken with it a majority of the PSP members (60-65 per cent) and predicted that the old party would be left with an empty shell. In addition, as noted, the youth league seems to be wholeheartedly with the left-wing party; its Central Executive Committee voted its support unanimously.

Any important additions to, or corrections of, these facts will be carried as we receive them.

The pattern of the split in the Praja Socialist Party of India was a familiar one in its "mechanics"; while the left-wingers made it entirely clear that the causes of the split lay in basic political differences, the actual course of the split was determined and precipitated by crude violations of democracy by the party's right-wing leadership. Following are the outstanding facts about both aspects.

TWO ISSUES

As LABOR ACTION accounts have brought out in past articles, the underlying motive-force for the split was the drift of the right-wing leadership toward compromise with the ruling bourgeois party led by Nehru, the Congress Party, and refusal to carry on a real fight against it and its governmental regime.

The right-wing leaders are Asoka Mehta, the general secretary of the party; Jayaprakash Narayan; and A. Kripalani, the leader of the group (KMPP) which in 1952 fused with the then SP to form the present Praja Socialist Party.

The left wing, on the other hand, wished above all to keep the party on its course as a militant opposition to the Nehru party, as well as to the Stalinists. (There is, incidentally, no indication of Stalinist influence in the left wing, as far as we can make out, but it is true that India is rife with the same kind of illusions about Stalinism that fill the British Bevanites.)

The direct political question was, therefore, what the left-wingers denounce as "cooperationism"—i.e., political collaboration with the Nehru party. The way this issue presented itself to the Indian socialists is more or less the same as the historic issue of colonialism, even though there was no immediate question involved

of SP entrance into Nehru's Cabinet (but it was in the background).

Associated with this, and perhaps concretizing it, was the left-wingers' insistence on militant class-struggle activity.

Other than this, the left-wingers' material does not offer much in the way of concretizations of revolutionary socialist policy. In any case, extensive discussion on policy was left to the all-India conference and its preparations. Of course, the left-wing elements caught up in the Lohia revolt against the leadership are obviously quite disparate, uniting on the two points above, and naturally they face further political clarification.

"PARALYZED"

Coming back to the two clear points on which the split revolved (plus the associated issues of internal party democracy), here are some of the formulations, in left-wing articles and resolutions, of their political indictment against the PSP leadership:

"... the internal suffocation that has been in the PSP is tending to make it a party of no-socialism..."—Editorial in the SYS Bulletin.

An Article by Lohia emphasized the "militancy" issue: "My charge against the present Executive [of the PSP] is not alone that some of them are cooperationists or that the Executive, as a whole, tends knowingly or otherwise to strengthen the cooperationists, but more so that it is paralytic and guilty of inaction."

The initials PSP, according to the left-wingers, now stand for Paralyzed Socialist Party.

The *Free Press Journal* reported that behind the split was the desire of the right-wing leadership "to creep toward the Congress—and some of the plums, however small. Lohia, it appears, will not agree to trim the PSP's political ambitions to such a puny size."

The *Indian Nation* commented: "The PSP loves to bark; it does not like to bite the Congress Party. Dr. Lohia wanted to bark and bite."

The conservative *Times of India* interpreted: "The tactics adopted by Dr. Lohia may not be happy, but his charge that 'the party never had the confidence to stand on its own legs' and that 'it sometimes turned to the right and sometimes to the left' is not without justice. Before the PSP can rehabilitate itself it has to learn to stand on its own legs and discover its true identity."

"ARM-CHAIR REFORMISTS"

The SYS charged that the right-wing wanted to "reduce it [the party] into a group of fancy arm-chair reformists." The SYS national conference's resolution said:

"In the ideological sphere, a persistent attempt is being made to blur the separate and distinctive features of socialism evolved through years of struggle and sacrifice and make it subservient to a conservatism that mouths radical phrases in order to preserve the existing order [referring to the Nehru party—Ed.]. Incidentally, it is the same set of people who two decades back had become an instrument of Communist domination inside the socialist movement, and who are seeking today to make it [the PSP] a constituent of the emerging national front under the aegis of the party of the status quo."

In a winged phrase, Lohia referred to the right-wingers: "... their mind has become a jumble of ideas, frisking from one indecision to another..."

A hard-hitting SYS editorial said in October: "They have fast developed a psychosis of defeatism that has started the inevitable inertia. Parliamentarism has become an article of faith with them—nay, they are not even serious advocates of parliamentarism. For as against the party in power they are superlatively silent outside the parliament. There are no tensions, not even humble attempts at resisting injustice and oppressions that are being heaped upon the people... In putting forward pleas of cooperation [with Nehru] and in searching out areas of agreement with the ruling party, they deliberately confuse the masses. They take shelter behind theories of social adjustment like Bhoodan [the Gandhian movement for landowners to give land voluntarily to peasants—Ed.] and put forward fake theories of eschewing all sorts of social tensions..."

Lohia charged that the PSP leaders had systematically covered up for Nehru by attributing all his political offenses to his bad colleagues while painting him as an "idealistic progressive" who was being misled by crafty advisors.

The first issue of *Young World* summed up: "The issues in the main are: Internal democracy; militant and uncompromising opposition [to Nehru and the government]; and a broad-based party instead of a pyramidal hero-worshipping tool of the 'leaders.'"

A rally of the Madras left-wingers denounced in a resolution "these pseudo-Marxists and sterile Gandhians" who, furthermore, "have been deceiving the rank and file by pious platitudes and meaningless verbiage about their being an opposition party while actually confabulating with the Congress leaders for legislative seats and ministries and government patronage..."

MILITANT ACTION

As mentioned, the left-wingers counterposed "militant socialism" to all this. This was not merely talk.

On October 18 (by which time the new Socialist Party was already locally organized in many areas) they organized and led a "Demand Day"—a day of demonstrations and parades for five leading immediate demands and five issues: (1) unemployment allowances; (2) agricultural income tax; (3) displacement of labor by technology; (4) sharecroppers' shares; (5) police killings and brutality.

This, according to *Young World*, was "the first massive demonstration in the country in recent years" and also one of the most widespread in its geographical extent. The results were "very good."

The militancy of the Lohia supporters was directed particularly to action aimed at the government's policies. (It is amusing to record that an unsympathetic letter to *Young World* jibed that Lohia "has very correct Gandhian foundations, although his flair is Trotskyite; what a blend!"—thus referring hostilely to the undoubted fact that Lohia hangs on to Gandhian theory while striving "at a radical socialism.")

"To evoke courage, Dr. Lohia said [at a left-wing conference in Hyderabad], he expected his committeemen to spend two months a year in jail... 'Only men who habitually violate unjust laws when out of office, can frame good laws when in office,' declared Dr. Lohia..."—SYS Bulletin.

A left-wing spokesman explained: "Much effort [by his enemies] has gone toward creating the impression that Dr. Lohia likes going to jail. It is true that, unlike the overwhelming majority of National Executive members, the Congress regime has imprisoned the doctor eight times in the eight years since freedom. At the same time, nobody can question the record of Dr. Lohia and his associates on the constructive field..."

Also, at the same Hyderabad conference, "Dr. Lohia wanted socialists to

make approaches to what he called the submerged sections of the population and he particularly mentioned women, Muslims, and artisans in this connection. With reference to women, he said that there was no half-way house between the liberated woman and the domestic woman and he denounced all efforts to evolve such a half-way house."

TRIGGERED BY COPS

How did the split actually develop? We have not seen, in the left-wing publications, any systematic account, but it seems to have been like this:

In the first place, it was difficult for the left-wingers to crystallize the political dispute because the leadership (Mehta, Kripalani, et al.) refused to meet the issue head-on; the latter insisted on pretending that they too were for a policy of opposition to the Congress (the so-called "Allahabad policy," after the resolutions of the party at its conference in that city). The difference in policy was covered over with wordy protestations.

But in the first half of last year, the smouldering conflict broke out over the issue of "police-firings." This does not refer to the firing of policemen from their jobs, but to the firing by police on unarmed demonstrators.

"The whole controversy and the consequent split in the PSP was the outcome of the police-firing in Travancore-Cochin. Dr. Lohia tramped up and down the country demanding that certain rules be laid down for the resort to police-firings and that human beings should not be treated like lies. However, to our own shame, some of the erstwhile leaders of the PSP defended the police-firing in T.C."—*Young World*.

There had been a rash of such cases of "trigger-happy cops" in India, permitted by a prime minister who poses as an heir of Gandhi, who led demonstrations against police.

A bitter controversy raged over it in the PSP leadership. Besides Lohia, a blistering attack against the right-wingers' attitude on the police atrocities was made also by a former secretary of the party, Madhu Limaye. Lohia and Limaye were, in turn, "severely censured" by Kripalani and Narayan.

About the same time, after Nehru's return from his "triumphal" trip to China (where, some think, he was thoroughly impressed in his opportunistic way by what passes for "progress" in Stalinist China), the Nehru party held a conference at Avadi where it adopted a program including demagogic references to a "socialistic pattern of society." Secretary Asoka Mehta seized on this to renew his unavowed drive for playing footsie with Nehru.

"I welcome the Congress Party's adoption of new social objectives," he said. "I feel happy that between the two parties a few new points of contact have emerged and the area of agreement has become clearer... We now press not against locked doors but those that are opening. To burst them open for change demands of us a new strategy."

MEHTA'S IRON FIST

Madhu Limaye blasted this. The National Executive cracked down on him by suspending him from the party on the ground of outlawing any public criticism. When the SYS asked Limaye to act as chairman at its forthcoming conference, the party leadership proceeded to swing the club against the youth league too, prohibiting any party members from helping them.

Lohia also defied these interdictions of the Mehta-Kripalani leadership, and was suspended. Wholesale suspensions of his supporters took place, so that any possibility of an appeal became farcical. The National Executive, in its raging fury, even went so far as to dissolve (from above) the whole State Executive of the party in the state of Uttar Pradesh, appointing a new committee in its place! The whole state conference was likewise put under the ban of excommunication.

It became clear that the right wing had determined to take no chances whatsoever on allowing Lohia's supporters to contest their actions within the framework of the party machinery. Apparently with some reluctance the latter finally decided that they had no alternative but to form a new party.

The critical month was July, when all this came to a head. Reported the *Times of India* (conservative-bourgeois):

"That the party is already sorely divided is apparent from the spate of expulsions in the last few weeks. But more ominous than the expulsions is the manner in which grave doubts continue to be expressed in the ranks of the various state units [of the PSP] about the wisdom of official policies. Not long ago two

(Continued on next page)

The Permanent Crisis in Argentina and Brazil: Dictatorship and State-Capitalism in South America

By JUAN REY

Santiago

Recent events in Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia and other countries illuminate the important economic, social and political changes that are taking place in South America.

The background goes back to the fact that the economic structure of the continent is the heritage of the Spanish conquest, which replaced the old Inca economy of patriarchal collectivism with European feudalism, reducing the Indian natives to the status of feudal serfs.

On the Pacific coast this feudal economy of the Spanish landowners lasted through the period of the wars of independence against the Spanish crown and also the period of the "republic"—the peculiar South American republic which remained semi-feudal and semi-colonial, the *república*.

Even today there are still remains of *socage* [a form of feudal tenure] and unpaid labor and services by peasants to the land "lord," in Peru, in Colombia, in Ecuador and even to an extent in Bolivia, in spite of the agrarian reforms that have been decreed. The basic element in this economy is the big landed estate, the hacienda, cultivated by the feudal Indian peasants.

In the urban centers, of course, there are the rudiments of commercial capitalism—exporting and importing, and incipient industry. The only large industry of this region is mining, which takes on a "nonproductive" character: tin in Bolivia, nitrates in Chile, ore production in Peru.

But even this incipient industry and commerce is transforming the economies of these countries into a semi-colonial capitalism, which sets up a pressure for urgent economic and social reforms (agrarian reforms in the first place) in order to open the door wider for serious industrial development.

Thus, the "national revolution" of the MNR-Paz regime in Bolivia is the attempt of the political reformers to adapt the country to the new requirements of capitalism; so also with the current processes

of ferment in Chile, Peru, Colombia, and Ecuador.

On the Atlantic coast, the situation is quite different, for here we have the great republics of Brazil and Argentina and the progressive state of Uruguay, which are exposed to the continual infiltration of European emigration. In this region the economy is different from the Pacific coast.

GROWING CAPITALISM

It is already a capitalist economy, though with strong feudal hangovers, e.g., the big landed estates in Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay. But here the land establishments are cultivated by agricultural workers who are paid wages, and not by the unpaid labor of the feudal peasant. To all practical purposes there are no *socage* relationships, in spite of the fact that rural laborers, especially in the North of Brazil, still work under conditions of semi-feudal dependence on the *patron*.

The urban centers possess a substantial amount of industry that developed between the two world wars and (even more) since the Second World War. Thus, Brazil as well as Argentina has many industries today which are working for the internal market—including the beginnings of heavy industries like steel and iron, coal-mining, extraction of other minerals, etc., not to speak of light industry. Sao Paulo in Brazil is the biggest industrial center in South America.

This growing industrial development is stimulating change in the social and political structure of these countries, which used to be South American-style

imitations of European or U. S. "democracy."

After the wars of independence, the landowning ruling classes officially accepted democratic doctrines and set up a "democratic republic" based on the agrarian economy (sometimes helped out with military force). The landowning class or rural bourgeoisie had no rival in the economy and in politics. But now industrial development has created such a rival: the industrial bourgeoisie.

The latter is now in process of fighting for the economic and political upper hand. This period of social and economic change and political conflict is accompanied by the decay of the old South American brand of "democracy" and the rise of dictatorships like Peron's (under the demagogic sign of *Justicialismo*) or Getulio Vargas' (under the sign of *Estado Novo*).

WHAT CLASS AUSPICES?

What is the nature of these dictatorships? Are they fascist or bonapartist, progressive or revolutionary? Do they represent the "people"—the *descamisados* in Argentina, the "poor" in Brazil—or do they represent the bourgeoisie?

The dictators of course pretend to speak in the interest of the "People" or the "workers," for "social justice," for "the interests of the nation," for "economic independence" and "against imperialism."

The line of the Stalinists in South America evaluates them as the "progressive" representatives of the industrial petty-bourgeoisie, as the bearers of national independence and economic liberation from imperialism, or, even more, as the vanguard of the bourgeois revolution in Latin America. The Stalinist parties support all these dictatorships; they supported the dictatorship of Peron in Argentina, they supported the dictatorship of Getulio Vargas in Brazil, and they are now supporting the heirs of Vargas (Jango Goulart and Kubitschek).

This vulgarization of revolutionary Marxist thinking is nothing more than the usual Stalinist adaptation to the needs of the Russian bureaucracy in its

imperialist rivalry with Wall Street, leading to the capitulation of the Stalinists before South American nationalism.

While it is true that South America is passing through a profound economic and social change with the growth of industrial capitalism, it is also true—because of the backward, semi-colonial structure of these countries, their late historical development in a period when imperialism is predominant in the world—that the South American bourgeoisie is incapable of fulfilling its own historical role, as in Russia and in East Europe also; incapable of developing and leading the bourgeois-democratic revolution against the landowners. It is not an English, French or Yankee bourgeoisie; it is a Spanish semi-colonial bourgeoisie, backward, impotent socially and nationally.

Its struggle for political power and for "national liberation" does not take on the form of a revolutionary assault. In the conflict between the growing industrial capitalism and (in Brazil) the coffee economy or (in Argentina) the cattle barons, there arise semi-totalitarian dictatorships which can perhaps be labeled most adequately "bonapartist."

S. A. BONAPARTISM

But they are not copies of the classic (French) bonapartism in the sense which Marx discussed in his day apropos of Louis Napoleon; for in that case there was a struggle against the bourgeoisie by a conscious revolutionary proletariat which lay at the bottom of the peculiar social equilibrium of bonapartism and its "supra-class" government. In South America the main fight is between the traditional landed ruling class and the new industrial bourgeoisie (together with the petty-bourgeoisie) for economic domination and political power. The fight is not one for social revolution but between two different propertied classes over different roads to capitalist development.

In this struggle the weak petty-bourgeoisie and the industrial bourgeoisie appeal to the masses of "the people,"

(Turn to last page)

The New Socialist Party in India: A Report — —

(Continued from page 6)

members of the Maharashtra PSP executive resigned . . . In Madras Mr. Asoka Mehta was hooted down by the audience when he tried to address the Tamilnad Conference of the party. Though a majority of the State Executive committees have endorsed the official stand on the Lohia affair [this is the right-wing claim—Ed.], signs of disaffection and indecision continue to highlight the semi-paralysis of the party both organizationally and ideologically."

Then in every party organization over the country, the left-wingers organized their forces; in many cases through a majority vote of the State Executives, or through membership meetings, rallies and conferences.

"SAINTS IN POLITICS"

A peculiar role in the whole shady deal of the right-wing drive to purge the party of critics was played by a man whose name is somewhat known in socialist circles abroad. This is the former party chairman, Jayaprakash Narayan.

Some time ago Narayan resigned his post with the announcement that he was quitting active politics in order to devote himself to the Bhoodan movement, which was a movement by Gandhian disciples to replace the political and social struggle with an appeal to the landowners themselves to "solve" the peasant problem by voluntarily divesting themselves of their land in all charity. Time and again Narayan has called on socialists to abandon their work in order to throw themselves into this swamp.

Yet he remained on the closest terms with the SP right-wing leadership, who did not seem to regard his anti-political appeals as disruptive of everything that the party was trying to do in building a socialist movement.

Narayan has also been friendly with Congress circles, and it has been charged that he looks upon himself as the man who, replacing Nehru, can unite "broader" movements under himself—a perspective that naturally requires liquidation of the PSP first.

At the National Executive meeting at

Jaipur where Lohia was suspended, the left-wingers report, the "kingpin" in the attack on Lohia was this same Narayan—in spite of his announced withdrawal from "politics." It would seem that the kind of "politics" from which he withdrew was only class-struggle politics.

"A few days before the Jaipur conference, he dubbed as 'mischievous' the rumors that he was re-entering politics. And yet, at Jaipur, when most of even the decadent Executive wanted to go slow, he it was who forced the issue and got the Executive to pass the resolution suspending Dr. Lohia."

In a direct hit at Narayan and his fellow "saints" of the Bhoodan movement, *Young World* wrote bitterly about his double role:

"Then there are saints in politics who deprecate political power, proclaim that time is not a factor which is important,

and that it is necessary to change human nature even if it takes eternity. These saints, however, take good care to see that they are near the seats of political power and that their friends whom they can influence are safely in the seats of power."

DANGERS AHEAD

What the prospects are for the further development of the left-wing Socialist Party is to be seen. As far as numbers are concerned, it starts with a strong force.

As mentioned, Lohia claims a majority: "While the unusual events of the past five months have demonstrated the extraordinary robustness of the socialist movement in this country, I have no intention to pat ourselves on the back beyond stating that the unjustly expelled

have . . . immediately outnumbered the expellers. In many states, the Praja Socialist Party has ceased to exist constitutionally."

For both wings the question comes next of making connections with political co-thinkers. For the old PSP this means, in the first place, the growth of ever-stronger trends toward liquidation into the Congress Party or virtual liquidation.

Thus the periodical *Commerce and Industry* wrote: "Actually, there is reason for the belief that while the [left-wing] rebels move away from the Congress, some of the right-wingers of the PSP might as well rejoin the Congress."

And it also goes on to say: "Lohia has already issued feelers for the merger of his group in the PSP with such other left parties in the land as the Revolutionary Socialist Party, the Workers and Peasants Party, etc., which have recently agreed to form themselves into the Mazdoor-Kisan Party." What there is to this report we do not know; but some of the groups in the above-mentioned bloc are distinctly Stalinoid. It would, of course, be a tragedy if the left-wing socialists who have just been repelled by the right-wingers should be pushed into the arms of pro-Stalinists.

Another danger for the left wing is the growth of a political get-rich-quick trend in reaction against the do-nothingism of the reformists. There is some talk, for example, of winning political power in no more than seven years, as if this were a sort of deadline beyond which one would have to admit failure. It is obviously an exaggerated counter-reaction to the well-founded charge against the right-wingers that they did not seek socialist power at all.

In addition, of course, there is the deeply rooted tradition of Gandhianism in Indian socialism, which has been one of the forces sterilizing the right wing and which is also operative, at least as an ideology, among the disparate elements of the new Socialist Party. It is to be seen whether its bad effects can be overcome in the development of the militant class-struggle orientation of the party.

A Note on the Indonesian Socialist Movement

In a striking passage contained in a call for a founding conference of the new Socialist Party Dr. Rammanohar Lohia linked up the decay of the Indian socialist right-wing with the fate of the socialist movement in Indonesia, as indicated by the latter's spectacular failure in the first Indonesian general election held last year:

"We must track every disease [of the socialist movement] to its source, even if that leads to a hell of quarrels. A pointer is the recent fate of the socialist movement in Indonesia. It has just been wiped out and, whether its place is fifth, eighth or twentieth in the land no one seems to be bothered about. There may have been other reasons for this debacle but I should like particularly to note one of special relevance to socialism throughout the world and specially in Asia.

"Indonesian socialist leadership has always prided itself on its tactical abilities, on its influence over circles which matter, on clever coalitionist games it may pay, in particular with the Mas-

jumi. There was always a superficial justification for this way of thought. To change the mood of the masses from Islam, whether moderate or extremist, to socialism appeared far more difficult than to play between the moderate and extremist Muslims.

"But this particular snake in socialist reasoning must be uncovered for good. Mr. Sjahrir and other Asian socialist leaders may be exceedingly clever and refined and eminently realistic, but it would be well to learn that cleverness can be no substitute for mass work, summit talks and adjustments for grassroots action, change of leaders' hearts for a new people's mind.

"Asian socialism must finally stop trying to be clever, for middle parties like the Indonesian Nationalists or Masjumi and the Indian Congress can talk-socialism and act conservative far better than it can. India's socialists must learn to talk socialism, act socialism, and think socialism, not necessarily in the old way."

The Kutcher Case — —

(Continued from page 1)

but the government can now work up a more court-proof assault on their domicile.

On the same day that this temporary court victory was won, the U. S. government in all its majesty and power went to the wars against James Kutcher once again. Kutcher received a letter from the VA informing him that his disability pension was going to be suspended. This was designed to leave him not only legless but penniless.

TOTALITARIAN CHARGE

The only statute upon which this atrocity could be hung, they found, was a provision denying pensions to anyone "guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy of the U. S. or its allies." The petty police-minds of the VA plunged right in.

Their letter to Kutcher gave as grounds the charge that, because of his SWP membership, he "rendered aid and assistance to an enemy of the U. S. or of its allies by espousing and defending the Socialist Workers Party's cause and thereby giving aid and comfort to the enemy by your influence upon others in undermining public interest and cooperation and confidence in the U. S. government's administration of the war effort and hampering and obstructing such effort."

This is simon-pure totalitarian reasoning.

Kutcher is accused of "giving aid and comfort to the enemy" not because he gave any aid and comfort to any enemy state, and he is not even accused of doing so, but solely because of his views in political hostility to this government.

Unless the government repudiates not only the attack on Kutcher's pension but this accusation in particular, the witch-hunt will have received a new landmark.

The story of this attack on Kutcher's pension was broken as an exclusive story in the press by the N. Y. Post on Dec. 23, in an article by Murray Kempton (who, incidentally, had previously written stinging columns vigorously denouncing the withdrawal of social-security benefits to Communist Party leaders as part of the continuing government campaign of persecution). It was accompanied in the Post by an unusually forthright editorial, which among other things pointed out that the first Kutcher case started "in the time of Harry Truman."

The Post also added: "We would oppose what the VA has done [even] if Kutcher were a Communist or any other form of pro-Russian man. We oppose what it has done to Communists like Robert Thompson and Saul Wellman who, no matter how much we loathe their present politics, earned their disability pensions serving in the U. S. army." This statement, rare as a two-headed hen in the liberal press, deserves a cheer.

A FIRST VICTORY

The day after this story broke, a higher-level meeting of VA officials let it be known that they were reversing that part of the letter which said that the pension would be suspended immediately, prior to a hearing. Kutcher would continue getting the pension till the charge was heard.

This was a partial victory due en-

tirely to the publicity. But it should be noted, as Kutcher stressed, that this is only a reprieve. The test will come on what decision is made after the hearing, which is expected very soon, possibly in a week.

But this partial victory also cast a back-light on the first Kutcher case, when the legless vet was precipitately and unceremoniously fired. He was not then allowed to retain his job pending the outcome of his case.

Kutcher's attorney—the same Joseph L. Rauh who represents the ISL in its case against the attorney general's subversive list and who won the victory in the Shachtman passport case—blasted the VA's charges, writing to VA official Moss: "... under your own standards, you yourself are guilty of 'rendering assistance to an enemy' in the cold war. . . . Every Communist enemy will be comforted in the knowledge that our crippled veterans may no longer criticize the government or its leaders without being branded as traitors and forced to look for charity to stay alive."

If criticism of the government during the Korean war is the charge, he wrote, then "every major Republican leader who was active in the 1952 campaign is equally guilty."

In Washington, Chairman Teague (Dem., Tex.) of the White House Veterans Committee, said he would investigate the VA's actions. He said the government would have to prove a very serious offense before stopping a disabled veteran's pension.

In Washington, Chairman Teague (Dem., Tex.) of the White House Veterans Committee, said he would investigate the VA's actions. He said the government would have to prove a very serious offense before stopping a disabled veteran's pension.

STOOLIE AT WORK

One of the most malodorous aspects of the VA attack was its open use of a typical "faceless informer's" report. The government agency's letter to Kutcher quoted this anonymous stoolpigeon's version of what Kutcher was supposed to have said at a camp some time in 1950 or 1951. It appears that Kutcher's crime was saying that he liked the "red system of government" and that "the government of the U. S. is composed of people who are cheaters and crooks who oppress the working people."

This and other quotes are obviously garbled, but the general idea, of course,

is that Kutcher openly admits agreeing with the views of the SWP. For this he is to be hounded literally out of job, home, and the measly few dollars a month which the government gives disabled veterans out of the flowing billions which it expends for war preparations.

There is also some question whether, if it could, the VA wants to take back his artificial legs too, in addition to depriving him of the regular medical treatments required for the stumps.

The most massive protest possible is required to answer this latest atrocity in the government witchhunt.

CALL FOR OPEN HEARING

As we go to press, Senator Kefauver has courageously called on the Veterans Administration to throw open to the public and press the hearing which is now scheduled for James Kutcher on Friday, Dec. 30. The VA has been planning to keep it a star-chamber proceeding.

The following day, the VA conceded the open hearing, the first of its kind. "I think Kutcher," said Kefauver, "not only as a veteran with a gallant war record, but simply as an American citizen, is entitled to a public hearing and a full opportunity to confront his accusers. He has the right to defend himself and to tell his side of the story."

Not only is a public hearing in doubt, but it is also unlikely that Kutcher and his attorneys will be permitted to confront the stoolpigeons on whose unchecked reports the VA's letter was based.

Kutcher's attorney Joseph L. Rauh noted that the Constitution requires that charges of treason be backed up by "the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or on confession in open court," but that the VA is seeking to brand Kutcher in a star-chamber proceeding, with loss of pension as the punishment.

A press report said that Sen. Paul Douglas had urged the VA to "go slow" in withdrawing Kutcher's pension, and that Sen. Margaret Smith had expressed the hope that a Senate committee would look into the case.

Permanent Crisis in So. America — —

(Continued from page 7)

and to the workers, with a program of "social justice," "national liberation," and "economic emancipation from the yoke of imperialism." What is at stake here is only a change in economic and political domination from one bourgeois class group to another. The basis for the peculiar bonapartist dictatorships which arise, their function, is not only the conservation of the bourgeois power but also prevention of "excesses" by the people who might be led to take seriously the demagoguery about social justice, etc. and try to achieve it in a modern revolutionary fashion.

The weakness of industrial development and the immaturity of the industrial bourgeoisie is the explanation for the South American dictatorships, and also for the decisive role which is played by the army in Argentina and Brazil in moments of crisis.

ARGENTINE "DEMOCRACY"

Thus in Argentina, after Peron was pulled down by the people and the "street" openly repudiated the Leader, the army "decided" on the resignation of the dictator and installed the regime of General Lonardi. But the restoration of the old-style "democracy" in Argentina is being carried on in a peculiar form, under a military dictatorship which is supported by a Consultative Council of representatives of the various parties.

Is the Argentina bourgeoisie incapable of governing democratically, governing without a dictatorship?

After the fall of Peron, some first steps were taken in the direction of democratization, but Lonardi had to resign in favor of General Aramburu, under charges of weakness in the fight against Peronism and of friendship to "clerical-nationalist reaction." Is General Aramburu so "democratic" that he had to use tanks against striking workers, even though the latter were led by Peronist bureaucrats? Or is he organizing a reactionary counterblow against the workers, under cover of the anti-Peronist purge?

If the Argentina bourgeoisie is incapable of governing through democratic

forms, on the basis of elections; if the dictatorship is going to be the instrument of the right wing of the Radical party and the conservatives, then it will succeed only in preparing the restoration of Peronism in some form—just as in Bolivia the government of Urrutia paved the way for the MNR's "national revolution."

A strong bourgeois-democratic government in Argentina would be able to order free elections and guarantee the workers all their democratic rights. But up to now Aramburu's "democratic spirit" has been limited to returning the newspaper *La Prensa* to Gainza Paz. But intervention in the unions by army officers has no resemblance to democracy, even if this is directed against the Peronist "faction." There are sufficient independent union leaders in Argentina.

Socialists have cause to fear that the Aramburu dictatorship is to the right of Lonardi; that it is the instrument of the old conservatives and rightist Radicals against the workers. Furthermore it must be said that it is paving the way for the restoration of Peronism, as is proved by the arrests of officers which had to be made in Mendoza.

If the bourgeois Right uses the government for restoration of its own economic and political privileges at the expense of the working class, as was true in Bolivia, then the fate of its dictatorship will be the same as that of Bolivian "democracy," which was destroyed by the nationalist revolution with the aid of armed workers. Of course, the Argentine bourgeoisie may learn this only on its own flesh, because historical experiences cannot be freely imported and exported.

THE REAL STATE IN BRAZIL

Likewise, the "preventive coup" of General Teixeira Lott in Brazil and the imposition of a virtual military dictatorship illustrates our analysis.

An end has been put to the liberalistic "thaw" which followed the suicide of President Getulio Vargas, because the semi-liberal regime which succeeded to the power could not win the support of the masses for its rightist policy. Kubitschek won the presidential election,

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unremitting enemies of socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

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

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

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

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

N. Y. SYMPOSIUM ON THE MIDDLE-EAST CRISIS

FRI., JAN. 13 at 8:15 p.m.

WHICH WAY TO ISRAELI-ARAB PEACE?

DR. ARIEH L. PLOTKIN

Representing the Israeli Government; lecturer; former professor of political science at Princeton.

HAL DRAPER
Editor, *Labor Action*.

THE JEWISH BUND

is designating a representative of its point of view as the third participant.

ADELPHI HALL

70 Fifth Ave. (nr. 13 St.), N.Y.C.