

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 9, 1956

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

## Official Hoodlum

The raids on the *Daily Worker* and the Communist Party headquarters have turned out to be, it seems, not drama but farce, since it seems established that the whole project was conceived and executed by the local government underling who has the position of Lower Manhattan director of the Internal Revenue division of the Treasury Department, and that this over-officious official hoodlum did not act with the knowledge of anyone in authority in Washington.

So it might appear that the episode should be classified under the head of the ridiculous rather than the portentous. To be sure, it makes this country a laughing-stock among the nations of the world.

But, at the risk of seeming to insist on being grimly serious, we cannot really convince ourselves to regard it as simply a comedy of errors, even if it is taken as certain that the initiative belonged solely to a little functionary named Moysey in a little corner of the government. Nor is it really just a farce.

In the first place, this Moysey is still where he was, just as if he were a responsible government official who had made some kind of booboo like filling out the wrong form. We have heard no demands for the discharge of this little peanut-Napoleon who sought to abuse the powers conferred upon him by his office to make an assault on democracy.

We know, of course, why this is so. The democratic rights which were assailed were those of a justly despised political minority, the Communist Party. If you're against 'em, anything goes: this is the implicit slogan in this country from all the way over on the extreme right to a point somewhere well within the ranks of so-called liberals. No one would have any doubts as to what would happen to Moysey if he had tried to use his two-bit police-state Junior G-man badge on "respectable" people.

## TIP-OFF

In the second place, the administration in Washington is even going out of its way to cover up Moysey by going through with the technicalities of the seizure (while apparently getting the incident over with), just as if it were all justified, however inadvisable. Far from slapping Moysey on the wrist, the surface appearances are being kept up as if he had acted with authority. The crime is condoned.

In the third place, the episode would be a vivid tip-off to a man from Mars as to what kind of atmosphere prevails in this country when a picayune government tin-horn with the instincts of a stormtrooper can pull the kind of job that Moysey did. It is the atmosphere of a lynching-bee, where the dominant majority has marked

(Turn to last page)

## IS NATO CRACKING UP? Iceland Wants Out... French Threaten U.S. ... Greece Is Hostile... The Military-Bloc System Is Shaking

By GORDON HASKELL

There can be little doubt that American foreign policy is rapidly heading into a crisis of major proportions. The developments in different parts of the world which are signalling this crisis have been well publicized, but their impact has been limited by preoccupation in political circles with the situation in the Stalinist part of the world and the political in-fighting of the presidential campaign in this country.

The foundation of American foreign policy since World War II has been the network of military alliances with which Democratic and Republican administrations alike have sought to ring and contain Stalinist Russia, China and their satellite areas. The biggest, sturdiest and most imposing of these has been the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This has been the base from which the United States has sought to control North Africa and the Middle East, and to which it has sought to attach its more precarious alliance in Southeast Asia.

It is true that NATO has never suc-

ceeded in bringing into being the military forces which its generals have claimed are an absolute minimum needed to defend Western Europe. But it is not from this failure that the current crisis of NATO stems. What is clearly taking place is a political disintegration which has already reached an advanced stage.

During March, the government of Iceland was overturned when a clear majority in that country's parliament passed a resolution requesting the early withdrawal of all NATO forces from their territory. This is now the official position of a government which was one of the original NATO signers.

## DEFLECTIONS

If NATO fails to heed the demand of Iceland's government, it will mean that from an ally that little country will have been transformed into an occupied colony of NATO.

If Iceland's demand is acceded to it will mean not only that the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been poured into air and naval bases there and living quarters for American troops will have been wasted, but that NATO loses a strategically important base and suffers an open political defeat.

At the other extreme of the NATO structure, Greece is not only wobbling in its allegiance to the common cause, but has almost oscillated clear out of its orbit. In the elections there on February 19 the pro-NATO government parties got fewer popular votes than their opposition.

Despite the fact that the United States has poured \$2.8 billion into this small country during the past ten years,

(Turn to last page)

## The Hard Fist Vs. Ideology

"How heartening it is for a world traveller to see the widespread distribution of American products. . . . Maybe it's a pack of Luckies, jealously hoarded by a Nile boatman at Cairo, or a Hershey bar held in the tight fist of a hungry little child in West Germany. . . . When we speak to a man in another country about democracy, he may or may not understand us. But when you give him a ride in your Buick, Ford, or Chrysler, or offer him a Chesterfield, Lucky Strike, Camel or Old Gold or a Coke, he can easily judge for himself. This is America with its hard fist in the eye of greedy ideology. This is the Lord, the image of man, spreading subsistence, comfort and joy."

—James A. Farley, chairman of the board, Coca Cola Export Corporation.

## Now They Gut the Right to Silence

By STAN GREY

Taking refuge behind an ancient and essentially irrelevant precedent, the Supreme Court dealt a tremendous blow to civil liberties when it validated the Immunity Act of 1954. This act enables the government to compel a witness to testify in exchange for immunity from prosecution, thus effectively removing the Fifth Amendment as a serious roadblock in the path of the ferrets of "subversion."

The gentle, almost indifferent disapproval of liberals notwithstanding, this decision is one of the major rulings of the cold war and marks a serious step in the contemporary decline of bourgeois democracy.

One of the hallmarks of the totalitarian form of justice—and there is a form of "justice" under totalitarianism in the guise of constitution, laws, courts, appeals and of course lawyers—is the power of the government to force confessions. Silence is guilt in a society where all must kneel and shout yea.

The right of silence, the right simply not to talk, the right to retain that ultimate individual privilege of being left

alone with one's thoughts has now been undercut by this decision.

As Douglas said in his magnificent dissent, concurred in by Black alone: "the critical point is that the Constitution places the right of silence beyond the reach of government. The Fifth Amendment stands between the citizen and his government."

If one had to capsule the lack of political rights in totalitarian societies, the capsule would consist of the denial of the free expression of dissident opinion and the lack of the freedom not to express any opinion. The constitutionalizing of the Smith Act, which crippled the right to advocate "subversive" ideas, coupled with the present decimation of the right to be silent, adds one of the significant

(Continued on page 4)

NEW YORK

Hear MAX SHACHTMAN on:

**Stalin Purged: The Meaning of the 20th Congress**

FRIDAY, April 13 at 8:30 p.m.—ADELPHI HALL, 74 Fifth Ave., at 13 St., Rm. 8-B

## The Upper Class

Fortune magazine, no apologist for the working class, asked a number of the nation's top executives how they arrived at major decisions. The answers are candid and revealing.

"I'm damned if I know"—Dwight Joyce (Glidden Paint).

"There are no rules."—Charles Dickey (J. P. Morgan & Co.).

"Whenever I think, I make a mistake."—Roger Stevens (New York real estate).

"You don't know how you do it; you just do it."—Benjamin Fairless, (U. S. Steel).

"I don't think businessmen know how they make decisions, I know I don't."—Charles Cox (Kennecott Copper).

Now, gentle reader, if the boss doesn't know why he's doing what he's doing—why should we let him continue?

—Reading Labor-Advocate

# Hoffa Takes Over AFL in Detroit Area, Facing UAW

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, March 25

It may well be that James B. Hoffa, vice-president of the Teamsters Union, can establish himself as the "Napoleon of the Teamsters" (as the N. Y. Times called him last week) but out here in Hoffa's home town, the dubious title of "Little Caesar" is more likely to remain his nickname. It fits better too.

Quietly and smoothly, Hoffa's slate took over complete control of the powerful Wayne County Federation of Labor, numbering 200,000, and thus put Hoffa in a strategic position for bargaining with Walter P. Reuther on the question of labor unity in Michigan.

This was the first piece of good news for Hoffa, who is in Honolulu at the meeting of the International Executive Board of the Teamsters Union; and how come that board has to meet there is something that no opponent of Hoffa's in the Teamsters Union leadership will ask, for there are some things that remain sacred in the labor bureaucracy no matter what other differences may come up.

The news that Martin Lacey, incumbent president of the Teamsters Joint Council of New York City, filed suit against Hoffa challenging the election results which put Hoffa's man John L. O'Rourke in office, wasn't unexpected by Hoffa. Some people, you know, are poor losers.

If Lacey had appealed to the International Executive Board, then that would have been a problem, for perhaps the boys were double-dealing Hoffa. They did, after all, agree with his opinion of the contested ballots in the New York election. Dave Beck's administrative assistant personally okayed them.

Now Hoffa has the board with him against Lacey, for Lacey "ran to the cops," and that isn't a very popular thing to do in the Teamsters Union, for their own reasons. Lacey not only called Hoffa a few names and talked about gangster associations but he also enjoined the IEB, which puts them right in Hoffa's corner.

## VITAL PROBLEMS

Besides, the IEB has other matters more pressing. Take for example, the stubborn refusal of John English, the secretary-treasurer, to sign a check for \$100,000 for Dave Beck to pay for the furniture in the home that Beck owned and sold to the Teamsters Union, which gave it back to him to live in.

The board by telephone poll had agreed to fix Dave up with the \$100,000, but for some darn reason or another the secretary-treasurer is holding out. No doubt, Hoffa will come to Beck's rescue or this crucial issue affecting the destiny of the labor movement, but the price will be interesting to watch.

In a union leadership permeated with that kind of attitude toward union funds, one thing is certain: Any protestation by Beck about wasting \$400,000 in a loan to the racket-ridden International Longshoreman's Association is sheer hypocrisy. Rather, what is bothering him and the board is the threat by George Meany and the top leadership of the AFL-CIO to expel the Teamsters Union, if that loan goes through as Hoffa plans it should.

Beck's threat of court action against the AFL-CIO if it expels the Teamsters Union speaks eloquently of the kind of unionism he stands for.

And the silence of the rest of the labor leaders of America over the public shenanigans in the Teamsters Union hardly does credit to them. Of course, if one recalls some of the methods which Joe Curran, (as one example) used to eliminate opposition in the National Maritime Union, or which Emil Reive of the Textile Workers Union used to defeat George Baldanzi a few years ago, it can be readily understood why silence is the bitter part of valor for many of the labor leaders, and why Hoffa honestly can't understand what all the shouting is about. Is he doing anything different from what has been done for years?

What he doesn't understand is that the new climate created by the unity of the AFL-CIO, and the policy decisions made at the first convention under the pressure of the progressive segment of the

labor movement, is challenging the old amoral ways of the labor leaders.

In another field of argument, Hoffa is way ahead of his opposition in the Teamsters Union, and stands to gain widespread support among all Teamsters Union officials. That is on the question of nation-wide agreements and standardization of wages and working conditions.

Here Hoffa has behind him some of the biggest trucking companies in America who want stability and a freezing-out of small fly-by-night operators, who exist by paying lower wages and otherwise cutting under conditions which the big operators are forced to put into effect by the Teamsters Union.

## HOFFA'S METHODS

The cry of "local autonomy" by some of Hoffa's opponents is not a cry for democracy within the Teamsters Union. Rather it is for their right to make their own deals, which in many cases would be below national standards.

Hoffa's plans give the greatest protection to the rank and file in terms of wages, hours and working conditions, even though it does signify squeezing out the marginal trucking concerns.

Two curious aspects of this phase of Hoffa's career are worth mention. In all the criticism of Hoffa within the union movement, there is little evidence that any of it rests on poor contracts or poor negotiation ability. Quite the contrary. More than any other Teamsters leader in America, Hoffa has hustled in winning concessions for the ranks!

Secondly, the dictatorial methods of Hoffa are so much a part of the tradition of the Teamsters Union, and the vast majority of other unions, too, that it never dawns on many other labor leaders to criticize Hoffa in that direction. Rather, we suspect, he is envied for his ability to do things so quickly and with so little argument.

Fortunately, the whole issue of democracy versus bureaucracy in the union movement comes to the forefront when a union like the Teamsters starts to display its dirty linen in public. Sooner or later the ranks of the Teamsters Union are going to demand a say in the control and operation of their own union. Let the ranks vote on Beck's \$100,000 check, on the New York election results, or the deal with the ILA: how quickly the tide would turn. There is no substitute for the cure of democracy in the union movement to defeat the disease of racketeering and raiding and bureaucracy.

A few investigations by the Ethical Fair Practices Committee of the AFL-CIO would do much to stimulate the ranks to assert themselves in the destiny of their unions. Why the delay? That would be a good question at a press conference with President Meany.

# The Unfrustrated Man

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, March 25

As befits any man who is an acknowledged success, Walter P. Reuther was interviewed by the Detroit Free Press writer Tom Nicholson on Reuther's 10th anniversary as president of the world's biggest union. Without going into a detailed analysis of the present-day Reuther, three important quotes from him in the course of this panegyric are worth comment.

"I see things much clearer now. I've been more aware that you can't make progress as a narrow economic pressure group."

Translated properly this means: (1) labor must have a social outlook, and (2) labor should not have a class outlook. The contradictory character of this observation is precisely the fence that Reuther has been straddling for ten years as president of the UAW.

"One really serious problem of labor and management is that we talk only in time of war. In the next decade, we must start learning how to talk in time of peace."

Comment: In a country in which there are no classes, why a plea for class collaboration is necessary is puzzling; or does the nightmare of the Kohler strike and the Westinghouse strike, not to mention the whole history of the auto workers union, still haunt Reuther?

"When I was younger, I, like many others, was frustrated by the contradic-

# LABOR SCOPE

## EVEN DAVE McDONALD JUMPS ON U. S. STEEL

Steel negotiations are getting ready, and in preparation Pres. David McDonald of the Steel union has issued a big blast against U. S. Steel. Subject: price increases.

U. S. Steel accused the union and the federal government of compelling it to increase steel prices. McDonald replies that the company is insulting the government and the union.

"The gains won by the workers in the steel industry through their union," said McDonald, "have not caused inflation." He pointed out that while wage increases theoretically cost \$30 million, price increases brought an additional 96 million into company coffers.

"Making a profit on a wage increase is nothing new for U. S. Steel," said McDonald.

Union officials and U. S. Steel have been effusive over labor-management harmony. Journalists who ordinarily view strikes with alarm took time off to be disconcerted when the union and the steel companies reached agreement last year for wage increases, it seemed to them that Big Labor and Big Business were in a conspiracy to milk the public. Whole theories have been spun around this theme: no class antagonisms in America; only the division of spoils among Big Power Blocs, like labor and business.

Not long ago, the UAW denounced the

major auto manufacturers for raising car prices; then, administration spokesmen accused the UAW of responsibility for the rise in prices of agricultural implements. Now, the Steel Union and the steel magnates cross swords over the same issue.

How elusive, this harmony of interests...

## HARASSMENT

Two Southern cities have set some kind of record in harassing unions.

In Marianna, a city of 5000 in northern Florida, a municipal ordinance requires unions to pay a fee of \$750 per year for every local or international organizer who practices within its sovereign borders.

In nearby Madison, the city government went a step further. It seems that the AFL-CIO had chartered a local in Live Oak, Florida, with jurisdiction over the territory of Madison and the city commission was not going to permit such a foreign invasion. It adopted an ordinance requiring an annual fee of \$300 for every labor organizer plus a charge of \$25 for each member signed up!

The union will appeal, to the U. S. Supreme Court if necessary, where in years to come it will win a brilliant legal victory, no doubt. Let us hope that the local union is still alive to enjoy it.

## ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

# To Defeat the Jim-Crowers, Organize the Farm Workers

By BEN HALL

"This is the South's dilemma—numbers of people, economically and educationally poor, who want to partake of the abundance America is producing. The awakening of many to demand their rights as Americans challenges the whole economic and social structure of the South."

So reads a report on "The Condition of Farm Workers in 1955" to the National Sharecroppers Fund.

It was the Fund that published the excellent pamphlet, "Down on the Farm—the Plight of Agricultural Labor," much of which was reprinted in LABOR ACTION last year. The NSF has been campaigning inside the labor movement steadily, but so far without success, for a drive to organize agricultural labor.

It is this challenge to the basic social rule of reaction in the South, the report explains, that has been met by the formation of so-called White Citizens Councils.

The Council movement began in Sunflower County, Mississippi, where Senator Eastland owns a large cotton plantation, and spread from there to other parts of the South.

The most effective weapon of the Councils, the reports indicate, is the power of plantation owners over their helpless tenants and sharecroppers. For every case of intimidation that becomes public, there are doubtless scores that remain unknown.

Yet, this report indicates, in only one county in South Carolina 30 families were evicted from their sharecropper homes in retaliation for their support of the Negro struggle; one family lost 30 acres and its home when an \$800 loan was suddenly called in and a mortgage foreclosed. All over South Carolina and Mississippi the threats of foreclosure, loss of jobs, boycott of stores are held over the heads of Negroes.

In Mississippi, 51.6 per cent of all farmers are tenants or croppers, and in South Carolina 45.3 per cent. These men are never out of debt to the plantation owner or to the local store, so that the threat of the loss of their homes and livelihood remains permanent.

It must be remembered, too, that farm tenants and farm laborers are totally unprotected by provisions of federal labor laws governing the right to organize. It is the Southerners in Congress together with the Republicans who have always sabotaged the extension of federal labor laws to agriculture. The National Sharecroppers Fund does what it can to give financial aid to farmers who are forced off their homes.

Last month, a small group of labor, religious and civic organizations formed a committee calling itself "In Friendship" to help Southern Negroes who suffer economic reprisals for exercising their rights. A. Philip Randolph is chairman. But the needs of the struggle are great. So far, what liberals and labor have done is small.

## NEW YORK

Reserve  
SAT, MAY 5  
for May Day

with the New York ISL and YSL

SKIT, SOCIAL, SPEECH  
Program and place  
to be announced

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

# 3 Chicago Teachers Lead Fight Against Broyles Oath

Chicago, March 27

A couple of weeks ago Judge Julius Miner of the Chicago Municipal Court ruled that Chicago teachers must sign the loyalty oath called for in the Broyles bills which were enacted last summer by the Illinois state legislature.

Three teachers, out of Chicago's 15,000, had refused flatly to sign the oath: Sarah Pickus, a Quaker; Shirley Lens, wife of AFL union official and author Sidney Lens; and Albert Soglin. None of the three have received any pay since the opening of the school term last September, although they have been allowed to continue teaching pending the outcome of the case.

No action has been taken against them since the Miner decision, as the case is being carried to higher courts by attorneys of the American Civil Liberties Union. One of the teachers, Al Soglin, has found it necessary to take a leave of absence and solicit private tutoring in order to support himself.

Judge Miner's decision held that the Board of Education is not a part of the municipal government, a ruling made necessary by virtue of the fact that municipal employees are excluded from the provisions of the Broyles bills.

He also ruled that the oath was not an undue infringement of the Bill of Rights, and that the state had a right to modify the First Amendment in order to protect itself against subversion.

After dealing with the legal points, he closed with a patriotic, flag-waving sermon extolling how the schools are the first line of defense for our way of life, that the teachers employed in it have a duty to promote loyalty to existing institutions, and those who are not loyal should be weeded out.

**A most distressing feature of the whole affair, which got front-page headlines in all the papers, was the lukewarm position of the Chicago Teachers Union.**

This organization, an AFL affiliate, with 8000 members, is the largest teachers' union in the country. It opposed the passage of the Broyles bills, but as soon as they became law, urged all teachers to sign the required oath. As a sop to liberalism, it added that "refusal to sign the oath should not necessarily be taken as proof of subversion."

As soon as Judge Miner's decision came out, the union went back on the case of the three teachers, two of whom are union members, by mimeographing the judge's decision and mailing it out to all union delegates and representatives, without comment and without sending out any part of the argument contained in the brief of the three teachers.

Shortly before this, the union attorney, John Ligtenberg, had prepared for

internal circulation a memorandum which doubted that the appealing teachers had a strong legal case, but added that "In view of the union's opposition to this type of oath I believe that it would be a good thing to offer a brief as a 'friend of the court' in the event of an appeal in this case. Such action would be relatively inexpensive and in line with its opposition to the oath as a legislative policy."

The union's house of representatives (one representative for each 50 teachers) met about a week after Judge Miner spoke. Here a violent floor battle broke out over the question whether or not the union should file a brief as a "friend of the court" (amicus curiae). Such action would of course serve to support the teachers.

**The three teachers were present, and the two who are union members asked permission to present their arguments to the house. This set off a fight, for a number of reactionaries got up and opposed their right to speak at all. After some bitter wrangling, the house voted 73 to 13 to hear them for ten minutes each.**

## UNION SHILLYSHALLIES

The reactionaries got the floor first with a motion "not to file a brief as a friend of the court." President John Fewkes announced that he had received several resolutions and letters denouncing the three teachers, but only five letters supporting them.

During the meeting, a delegate from Phillips High School, which is all-Negro, handed one of the three teachers a resolution from the union teachers of that school supporting her position. In the debates the teachers also received support from Turner Trimble, a vice president of the American Federation of Teachers, and a few lesser leaders.

The chief opposition seemed to come from a Catholic element among the teachers, who made much of an appeal to the dead boys in Korea. The meeting finally adjourned with no decision, and the issue was deferred to the next monthly meeting when it will be fought out again. Meanwhile the reactionary element will be very busy lining up its strength.

Chicago's big teacher union, which has a majority of the teachers in its ranks, is a product of the depression days when the teachers were paid in "scrip," or tax anticipation warrants, which could only be used in stores at a fraction of the face value. In those days, teachers had to be militant.

Today, however, the signs are that their edge has been dulled by years of comfortable living. As Sidney Lens stated to a group at the University of Chicago, "people are shining the chrome on their cars while their liberties rust."

# Cyprus: Enosis or Independence?

The following article, from the Socialist Review (London) for March-April, raises the question of independence for Cyprus as against union with Greece (enosis). While we think the discussion deserves our readers' interest, we want to make clear that socialist policy demands support of that solution which is favored by the free self-determination of the Cypriot people themselves; and this, as Comrade Kidron agrees in his article, is enosis. The Socialist Review is published by an independent socialist group in the Labor Party.—ED.

By MICHAEL KIDRON

British imperialism moved into Cyprus in 1878 "for two reasons: (a) as a prelude to the . . . extension of British control in the Near East, and (b) as a naval and military base . . . it was to be a British place d'armes in the Eastern Mediterranean." (Doros Alastros, *Cyprus: Past and Future*.) But Cyprus was not used for those purposes until very recently, for, in 1882, British imperialism occupied Egypt—a much better base, closer to the main shipping routes, more accessible to the centres of interest in the Middle East itself.

Following the occupation of Egypt, the imperialists lost much of their interest in Cyprus. The Under-Secretary for the Colonies, Winston Churchill, could thus afford to say in the Legislative Council in Cyprus (1907): "I think it is only natural that the Cypriot people who are of Greek descent should regard their incorporation with what may be called their mother-country as an ideal to be earnestly, devoutly and fervently cherished."

**In 1915 Cyprus was actually offered to Greece in an attempt to bribe her to enter the war. The offer was refused by the anti-war Zaimes government and Cyprus was retained in British hands. It was to be held in reserve as a possible supplement to the Egyptian base and, if the worst came to the worst for British imperialism, as an alternative to it.**

The inevitable happened. British colonialism was forced out of Egypt. The Egyptian base lost its value and once again Cyprus was the only base in the area.

As Colonial Secretary Oliver Lyttleton said (August 8, 1954), "Eastern Mediterranean security demands that we maintain sovereign power in Cyprus. . . I can imagine no more disastrous policy for Cyprus than to hand it over to a friendly but unstable power. It would have the effect of undermining the eastern bastion of NATO."

## CYPRIT CONDITIONS

Cyprus soon showed its usefulness. When British troops were involved in the oil companies' war in the Baraimi Oasis in Arabia last year, the garrison in Cyprus was held as the ultimate sanction.

When the Jordanian population upset Anglo-American plans to force Jordan into the Bagdad Pact (December 1955—January 1956), parachutists were flown from Britain to Cyprus in readiness for a showdown with the "ally."

Cyprus is definitely useful to British imperialism. But the advantages are not reciprocated. On the contrary, the half-million Cypriots, or at least the Greek majority which forms over four-fifth of the population, are determined to get rid of British rule immediately.

**The official Cyprus Annual Report for 1954, the last available, tells us why.**

Although, as can be expected in an economy dependent on imports for much of its food and most of its other essentials, prices in Cyprus are very much the same as in Britain, wages are far below.

Average weekly earnings, including overtime payments, bonuses, etc., range from \$5.97 in agriculture (the lowest) to \$12.34 in transport and communications (the highest) while mining averages \$11.95, engineering \$9.05, clothing \$7.90 and so on.

The Report shows that girls under 18 work as miners (averaging \$7.04 a week) while the relatively high take-home pay in transport and communications might have a lot to do with the 66-hour week worked by bus, lorry and taxi-drivers and by porters.

The Report states that education is not compulsory. The normal school-leaving age for the children that do attend school is 12, although "in the poorer rural communities children are sometimes taken away at the age of 9 or 10

to help their parents at home or in the fields." More than 50 per cent of the schools have only one teacher who thus handles all 6 classes while another 25 per cent have two teachers each of whom takes three classes.

## EMBITTERED STRUGGLE

The Housing Census of 1946 showed that more than one-third of the urban dwellings in the whole island consisted of one room only. One-third of these were occupied by seven or more persons while the average number of persons per room over the whole island was more than three-and-a-half. Only half the houses have piped water while less than one-fifth have water-flush sanitation (quoted in Thomas Anthem, *Enosis*.)

The transfer of the British base from Egypt only aggravates the situation. The Annual Report states that "House-building is taking place fast, but the emphasis is on the erection of high-value buildings. Impetus has been given to this trend by the hope of contracting leases at high rents from service personnel and others transferred from Egypt." As a result of this building boom "the prices asked [for land] are so high that the middle and lower-income groups have great difficulty in finding the means both to acquire sites and to build."

Finally, every protest against these conditions has led—ever since the emergency decrees of 1931—to ever-increasing autocracy on the part of the British governor. The worse the conditions become, the greater the protest; the greater the protest, the more do the dictatorial powers of the British governor increase; and the more that happens, the more embittered becomes the struggle for independence on the part of the Greek Cypriots.

## WHY ENOSIS?

**That the Cypriots want to unite with Greece is understandable. Eighty per cent of them speak Greek as their native tongue. But that is not the whole reason for their desire for unity, for the same reason that a common language is not enough for us [Britain] to demand recognition as the forty-ninth state of the U.S.A.**

The main reason for enosis—union with Greece—is the feeling of powerlessness when faced with the might of the British Empire. If the Greek Cypriots declare for independence—neither London nor Athens but an independent Cyprus—they cannot hope for support with arms supplies or through diplomatic channels from anywhere. If they, however, ally themselves with Greece—military dictatorship though it be—they need not fear isolation in their struggle with British imperialism. They would gain an interested ally—an expansionist Greece.

The Greek Orthodox Church in Cyprus has taken advantage of this desire to find allies at all costs and has taken charge of the movement for enosis. Like all organized religion, it has no objection to temporal dictatorship whether military or otherwise, and would prefer a Greek dictatorship in which the church has a recognized and privileged part to play to a British one in which it is not a highly prized part of the organs of government.

The Cypriot Communist Party has also jumped on the band-wagon of the popular mass movement, playing driver's mate to Archbishop Makarios. After all, enosis threatens to disrupt the relations between Britain, Greece and Turkey—all members of NATO. So it is although as recently as March 1952, AKEL (the Communist Party) led a demonstration "to protest against the executions of Beloyannis and other Greek patriots by the monarcho-fascist government in Greece." (*Daily Worker*, April 15, 1952.)

The monarcho-fascist regime has since been forgotten and the Political Committee of the Communist Party can "support the right of the Cypriot people to self-determination and union with Greece" (*Daily Worker*, August 6, 1954) without mentioning the fact that the Greece they desire to unite with still has not released the thousands of political prisoners, including their own comrades, from prison and concentration camps. Indeed, although the *Daily Worker* considered not so long ago (October 28, 1952) that "Greece today is an occupied country [and] . . . a monarcho-fascist regime," it has since compromised so

(Turn to last page)

# Saving Small Business

By H. W. BENSON

What makes this country so big is small business—or so we once heard.

It gives one a feeling of security to know that small businessmen, too, are organized . . . some of them anyhow. How small? It's hard to say. But anyway, the National Small Business Men's Association is conducting a big recruiting drive behind its watchword: "Eternal Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty."

Readers will be gratified to know that membership is on an individual basis and "dues are kept low so they will not be a hardship on anyone": just \$18 for the first year and \$15 thereafter. I was just about to make out a check for my first year's dues when I looked at my current bank balance and decided to scan its program a little more closely.

**Just as expected, the Association suggests various measures to annoy labor and make the life of employers a little more endurable. That seemed in order. But some of the planks are especially attractive.**

"Return to the Gold Standard": It would give every small employer (500 workers or less) a feeling of security (at least, solidity) if he could only take bills out of the till every pay day, go to the bank and get sacks of real gold coin for distribution to his men. What a clanging and clanking! America awake!

Small grocery stores could pile them up in discarded milk cans.

"Elimination of Double Taxation on Corporate Dividends." Also: "Amend the Constitution of the United States to provide a maximum rate for all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect." True, lots of us small men are way under the present maximum rate of taxes but a demand like this gives us a feeling of kinship with slightly larger small firms like General Motors.

"Stamp out Communism": let the "federal government be prohibited from engaging in any business in competition with private enterprise and . . . all government corporations be liquidated." This, after all, is only Americanism.

"Oppose all forms of government subsidies." Nothing but rugged and ragged individualism, independence, initiative, self-reliance.

But the last, and crowning, demand is a sure-fire killer.

"Postal rates not to be increased, if at all, until after review of reports of study made of the Post Office Department." Looks like the executioner's ax is not to be dropped on the Post Office, which is a good thing. I once sent a letter all the way from Vermont to California. Only cost me 3 cents. That's something a small businessman can appreciate.

## ISL Sends Greetings to the Paris Conference on Socialism

The Paris Conference on Socialism was scheduled to convene on March 23, under the sponsorship of a group of left-wing socialists from different countries, for general discussion on socialist perspectives and interchange of ideas. The sponsoring committee included Clovis Maksoud of the Lebanese socialists, who acted as secretary, and also G. D. H. Cole, Fenner Brockway, Claude Bourdet, Lelio Basso. The conference, therefore, would bring together independent socialist and Third Camp socialists as well as neutralists of various types. The ISL was invited to participate, but since it was unable to do so, accepted Comrade Maksoud's suggestion to send a message, which we publish below.—Ed.

### SOCIALIST GREETINGS:

A conference whose purpose is to bring internationalist socialists together to discuss the problems which beset the world socialist movement is a welcome event, and we regret that circumstances make it impossible for us to participate directly in your deliberations.

As American socialists, we live in the country which is the most powerful bastion of the capitalist system, and the leader of the camp of capitalist imperialism in the cold war struggle which divides the world. Such is the wealth, the power and the apparent stability of capitalism in this country, that of all the major nations of the earth we have the least socially inclined working class, and hence the weakest socialist movement.

It is the duty of American socialists to expose and oppose the military, economic and political imperialism by which both major political parties in this country seek to shore up the capitalist world as a whole and at the same time to assure American hegemony over it. Examples of the major line of the foreign policy of this country is its support to the reactionary regimes of Chiang Kai-shek, Franco, Syngman Rhee and Pibul Songram, and the fact that it averts its eyes while a "socialist" premier of France sends NATO-assigned troops to shoot down the fighters of the Algerian liberation movement.

We seek to influence the advanced sections of the labor movement and the public in general by our constant opposition to the military policy symbolized by NATO, and with special issues of LABOR ACTION such as that on the American imperialist rape of Guatemala, and the exposé in the current issue of our paper of the oppressive and barbaric practices of American imperialism on the island of Okinawa. We hope that the socialists assembled at this conference in Paris will find some way of publicizing and protesting in their own countries the continuing injustices in Okinawa.

As we see it, socialism in our period has got stuck between pallid ministerial reformism on the one hand, and Stalinist statism on the other. To disengage it from attachment to these two principles is the first prerequisite to any revival of socialism as a serious contender for the role of emancipator of mankind. The chief ideological problem for socialists today is, in our opinion, to find a way to effectively link the struggle against capitalism with the struggle against Stalinism so that they become organic parts of

a new movement which rejects both in the interest of the struggle for socialism itself.

Your conference meets at a time when socialists who understand this ideological problem can play an especially significant and vital role.

The 20th congress of the ruling state party of Russia has gone far in the direction of repudiating the personal role of Stalin as the unquestioned leader and dictator of that organization for 28 years. The clique which now dominates this totalitarian party and state has apparently decided that in the interest of normalizing the rule of the state bureaucratic class in Russia, it is necessary to rid the regime of some of the excesses and arbitrariness introduced by Stalin. They have no intention, it goes without saying, of making any changes in the regime in the direction of democracy.

Socialism stands for the emancipating struggle of the common people against all authoritarian domination and exploitation. Yet the fact remains that there is a considerable tendency among socialists (and specially among those who are not tied to support of their own capitalist institutions and alliances) to overlook the fundamentally anti-democratic, anti-working-class and hence anti-socialist character of the Russian Stalinist regime and of the world movement which it dominates. This tendency, however, is at least as fatal to the building of a truly independent democratic socialist movement as is that of adaptation to capitalism itself, or to its Atlantic war bloc under the banner of reformism.

To grapple honestly and courageously with the problems of socialism in our time, you have a golden opportunity at this juncture to deliver a real blow at the illusions which the 20th Congress of the CPSU is spreading among socialists. For you will be speaking not in the name of, or in the interest of support to or reconciliation with capitalism or any of the institutions, alliances and blocs which have been created to defend its imperialist interests in its struggle with Stalinism. You will be speaking only in the interest of the self-emancipation and democratic self-organization of mankind . . . in the name of socialism.

POLITICAL COMMITTEE  
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

March 20, 1956

## Coalition Vote Falls In Irish By-Election

By M. M.

Dublin, March 16

Hang together or hang separately: that is the axiom of the government coalition. In the North Kerry by-election, it was De Valera against the rest, namely, against the government coalition of the conservative Fine Gael, Labor Party, Farmers, and Republicans, all ganged up to present a facade of unity to the voters.

The government candidate was a nominee of the Republicans, the daughter of the late deputy whose place was being filled, following his death in a road accident. She had been press-ganged into the election by the wardheeling requirements of Irish politics. A girl of 21, her only political attributes were her father's name and his tragic death.

However, the combined government vote behind her was down by 2000, while De Valera's rose by 900, indicating a perceptible shift from the government parties.

Factors were the economic crisis, and the palpably demagogic line of De Valera's party, which was possible because there was no working class party independently in the running pledged to a program of radical economic and social change. The Labor Party is part of the coalition, unfortunately.

Confusion worse confounded characterizes the Stalinist parrots here on the line of the 20th Congress. Stalin, stripped of his diabolical divinity by his former lieutenants, has left the party followers floundering in an ideological morass. Years of automatic responses and monolithic concepts will stand them in good stead, however.

## Right to Silence — —

(Continued from page 1)

features of totalitarianism to capitalist society.

The case at hand was decided 7 to 2, with Frankfurter writing the court's decision. The majority used as a basis for its ruling the flimsiest and most discredited pretext in jurisprudence, namely, the existence of a precedent.

Where is there a precedent which does not have another precedent with a contrary principle which can be cited? Where is there a precedent that cannot be reinterpreted out of its skin, by determined judges, whose feats in this respect demonstrate the infinite subtlety of the human mind? Or if it came to it, where is there a precedent that can not simply be ignored or overruled if the method of casuistry was not indicated?

Only recently this same court struck a blow for human rights when it voted 9 to 0 for desegregation, square in the face of an unambiguous and contradictory precedent. On what grounds? On the "sociological" grounds that the times demanded it.

The same court now feels compelled to submit to a compelling precedent to give its decision more authority and consistency. But the only consistency resides in its unswerving subordination of basic civil liberties to the brutal necessities of the cold war. Since it is the duty of the government to defend "national security" (security from what—totalitarianism?) the good soldiers on the bench grant it whatever weapons it deems necessary, let freedom fall where it will.

### PRECEDENT

A glance at this precedent is illuminating.

In 1893 (when there was still a tsar in Russia and Lenin was a student) a Mr. Brown, auditor of a railroad company, was held in contempt for refusing to testify before a grand-jury investigation of charges that officials of the company had violated the Interstate Commerce Act. In *Brown v. Walker*, the court then decided that Brown must testify.

But all Brown had to testify about was a business violation of a government act regulating commerce. If it turned out that the railroad had actually committed the violation, what disabilities did Brown suffer? Granted immunity, he would not go to jail, and as for his public reputation, it would go down as the very skillful auditor of a railroad doing business like many other businesses do theirs, except that his company was caught in the act. Considering business ethics of that time (or this time too, perhaps) it might even enhance his prestige.

But what is the social meaning of the immunity granted to someone who is compelled to testify whether he is or was a Communist, whether his friends were Communists or whether his parents were exalted by Edward Bellamy or studied Henry George? Douglas noted that the Immunity Act did not protect the testifier from "disabilities created by federal law that attach to a person who is a Communist." He cited ineligibility for federal employment in defense facilities, disqualification for a passport, risk of internment as some of the penalties.

"Any forfeiture of rights as a result of compelled testimony is at war with the Fifth Amendment," he wrote.

"The guarantee against self-incrimination combined in the Fifth Amendment is not only a protection against conviction and prosecution but a safeguard of conscience and human dignity and freedom of expression as well. My view is that the framers [of the Constitution] put it beyond the power of Congress to compel anyone to confess his crimes."

### QUESTION OF "INFAMY"

The Fifth Amendment, Justice Douglas said, "was designed to protect the accused against infamy as well as against prosecution." The "concept of infamy," he asserted, was written into the amendment.

"There is great infamy involved in the present case," the justice said. "The disclosure that a person is a Communist practically excommunicates him from society."

Social ostracism and denial of specific important rights are the real content of the fraudulent immunity which is now forced upon the reluctant witness. A man is forced to admit to a fact which will make him, and the people he is forced to name, social and political pariahs.

This triumph of repression is almost

matched by the equanimity with which a liberal like Max Lerner deplores (if that word is not too harsh) the decision. Confining his indignation to one paragraph in one of his miscellaneous Wide World columns, Lerner, who has written extensively on legal matters and rarely hesitates to let drop a column on the slightest pretext, has no more to say than the following.

After commenting that he expected the decision but not the size of the majority, he writes: "The basic trouble with it is that, in practice, many witnesses have kept silent less to save their own skins than as a way of refusing to name their former associates. There ought to be some way of conserving the social value of such a view without getting into the self-incrimination problem at all..." And then off to the Middle East.

It is not even clear from this liberal what his opinion of the decision is. He does note its "basic trouble" but is it basic enough for him to condemn the decision? And does he not consider the social punishment of the person testifying, aside from the problem of having to inform, a basic mockery of the protection of immunity?

Had Lerner exercised his right to silence about this decision, interested people would have thought that he was mustering up his ideas for some future column; and had not such a column come forth, well, he is a very busy writer. But he commented, and considering his consistent capacity for being outraged by barbaric laws on abortion and divorce, his pitiful murmur on civil liberties measures the insensitivity of many liberals to the insidious dangers of repression when the goal is to snare a few "Communists."

### WIDE OPEN

A close examination of the Frankfurter decision reveals that there are no real safeguards in the decision. Since Congress has the right to preserve and defend "national security," the Immunity Act is one of the instrumentalities which it may use for this purpose. But in these matters, who is to decide when national security is at stake in any particular case and when the Immunity Act should be applied?

Since it would be the attorney general who would be directly interested in using it as often as possible, where would the restraining force be? Should it not be somebody other than the attorney general?

But Frankfurter characteristically, in his divided-soul approach to the courts, ever trying to keep them clean of non-judicial duties (which in the real world is impossible), specifically rules otherwise. Fearful that the district judges may be required to use discretion and that this "is not an exercise of judicial power," he says that the act is clear in that the district judge does not have discretion to deny an application for an order to compel a witness to testify. It follows that the attorney general can compel answers as he pleases.

Since his passion for testimony is somewhat more intense than his devotion to the Fifth Amendment, this act and its interpretation effectively shelve the Fifth Amendment as a defense against government prosecution. For the special few to whom it is important, there is some consolation in the fact that *Brown v. Walker* remains unimpaired and Frankfurter has not subversively extended judicial sovereignty.

### WARREN'S DEBUT

This decision is the first major constitutional question affecting civil liberties decided by Warren's court. In the Peters case, the court deliberately skirted the constitutional question.

Other important civil-liberties cases are pending but it seems clear that this court will tread the narrow subservient path of the Vinson court before it, a path marked out by the political requirements of the state in its struggle against another social system.

There have been some notable victories for civil liberties on the district court level in recent months and these have been duly hailed. But the spectacular neglect of this Supreme Court decision by the liberal press is almost as ominous as the decision itself.

If action cannot be expected, where at least is the stock-in-trade of indignation, so plentiful for so many other occasions? Small hope for our basic freedoms if they are merely left in the hands of this state, this court or our freedom-loving liberals!



**LABOR ACTION**

April 9, 1956

Vol. 20, No. 15

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 24 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

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

## 'Hookism' Is Challenged Before the AAUP

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

A critical fight on freedom is taking place this week at the St. Louis meeting of the American Association of University Professors. Although its outcome will be known by the time this article appears, it is important to understand the background and issues of the struggle.

The lines were drawn in a document prepared by a special committee of the AAUP under the direction of Professor Bentley Glass of Johns Hopkins University. The full report runs to 58 pages, only some of which have been published. But even with this limited information, the situation is obviously a crucial one.

The AAUP Committee:

—called for the return of the competence criterion in academic freedom cases;

—opposed the idea that membership in the Communist Party constitutes a prima facie case for expulsion from a faculty;

—came out against discharges based on a professor invoking the Fifth Amendment;

—denounced moves to legalize the Communist Party;

—called for the censure of five colleges and universities (California, Ohio State, Rutgers, Temple, Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia) because they dismissed faculty members for invoking the Fifth Amendment or refusing to cooperate with congressional committees;

—stated that the University of Washington case (1948) should have resulted in a censure of that school;

—called for a repeal of New York's Feinberg Law.

In other words, the AAUP Committee

has adopted a strong and militant program for academic freedom. In doing so, it has not only broken with the conservatives and right-wingers on the question—it has also clearly come into sharp conflict with the view put forth in Sidney Hook's *Heresy, Yes, Conspiracy No*. Seen in this perspective, the report is the most encouraging development in years; it marks an attempt to stem the tide of a decade of capitulation to reaction.

### MILITANT LIBERALS

To begin with, the AAUP Committee placed its report in the context of the cold war: "Like civil liberties in general, academic freedom and tenure in the United States have been more greatly imperiled since World War II than for many years before. The wide-reaching struggle with Soviet Communism, the resulting emphasis upon military security, the growing realization of the Communist strategy of infiltration, the readiness of political and economic groups to play upon the natural fears of the American people and to suppress legitimate opinions and activities have all combined to produce distrust of persons and

organizations thought to be even remotely dangerous, and to encourage extreme action against them."

This is a militant liberal analysis of the witchhunt, lacking from a socialist point of view, yet infinitely clearer than most statements in recent years. It is a sharp dissent from the thesis of Sidney Hook, restated not too long ago in the *New Leader*, that teachers have never had it so good. It is particularly encouraging that the AAUP Committee sees the attack on academic freedom as a function of the larger witchhunt in American society.

The Committee accepts security provisions in universities when classified information is being used, but it calls for a restriction of these limitations to the actual sensitive areas.

In one paragraph a somewhat ambiguous statement is made, calling on the academic community to defend itself against "subversion of the educational process by dishonest tactics, including political conspiracies to deceive students and lead them unwittingly into acceptance of dogmas or false causes." But later on, it is made clear that this is not a statement of Hook's position on the academic conspiracy (that is, belonging to the Communist Party).

### DEMOCRATIC CRITERION

Concerning dismissal of faculty members, the Committee holds, "No rule demanding removal for a specific reason not clearly determinative of professional fitness can validly be implemented by an institution, unless the rule is imposed by law or made necessary by the institution's particular religious coloration... Removal can be justified only on the ground, established by unfitness to teach because of incompetence, lack of scholarly objectivity or integrity, serious misuse of the classroom or of academic prestige, gross personal misconduct, or conscious participation in conspiracy against the government."

Two elements may seem questionable here: the criterion of "serious misuse of academic prestige"; and bringing in "conscious participation in conspiracy against the government" as a factor to be determined by a faculty.

But later on, the Committee clears up this difficulty by attacking the notion that Communist Party membership should be a criterion in any of this. Commenting on the capitulation of various universities to the party-membership criterion, the Committee comments, "It clearly would have been better for the health of higher education in this country if academic institutions had refused to be stampeded, and had insisted that competence and satisfactory performance in teaching or research, and good character in relation to these functions, are the matters to be judged when academic freedom is at stake."

This last statement is plain: the AAUP Committee is urging the reinstatement of the competence criterion in all academic freedom cases. It is impos-

sible to overstate the importance of this move in the colleges and universities of America. For it is only on the basis of such a position, as *Challenge* has pointed out many times in the past, that a militant and successful fight can be waged for academic freedom.

The opposition is, of course, at work. The president of Ohio State, Dr. Howard L. Bevis, was quoted by the *Times* as saying, "In our judgment, therefore, no party member is fit to become or to remain a professor in a state university. This is the basic issue. Upon it we take our stand."

The issue is indeed basic. For precisely because so many schools have adopted Bevis' attitude, anti-libertarian consequences have followed: It is a short step from such a position to firing a member of the faculty for invoking the Fifth Amendment or for refusing to cooperate with a congressional committee. And from there to the imposition of oaths (as at California), firing, because of opinions (as at Washington), and so on.

The AAUP Committee has cleared the air; it has stated the crucial question. We only hope that the convention of the full association will endorse its views.

## Wayne Witchhunts A Socialist Club

The Wayne University Young Socialist Club, a student group sponsored by the Cannonite Socialist Workers Party at that college—and which, incidentally, has no connection with the Young Socialist League—is facing a series of threats by the Wayne University administration which will drive it off the campus if they are put into effect. The new regulations would also deprive thousands of students of their rights to organize freely.

At Wayne all student political clubs are organized under the jurisdiction of the Political Science Department. To receive recognition, a club has to be sponsored by one of the political parties on the Wayne County, Michigan ballot. The other requirements up until now, however, appear to be reasonable and fair. Three clubs, the Young Democrats, the Young Republicans and the Young Socialist Club came into existence under these procedures.

In December 1954 a series of new procedures regulating political clubs was proposed which would have had the effect of destroying the YSC, but these were not put into operation.

At the beginning of this semester a new set of rules was proposed. These would make membership in political clubs open only to full-time or matriculated students, require club officers to have had a C average the previous semester, demand that all clubs bear the same title as the sponsoring political party—which would make the YSC change its name to the Young Socialist Workers Club—and place club publications under censorship.

As the officers of the Young Socialist Club point out, these changes would affect only the YSC and not other political groups. Thus they seem to be purely discriminatory, as well as impermissible from an academic-freedom point of view in general. In addition, they would deprive thousands of non-matriculated and part-time students of their right to join political groups.

The students of Wayne University must defeat this latest attack on academic freedom.

### Get The Challenge

every week — by subscribing to Labor Action. A student sub is only \$1 a year.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

### YSL FUND DRIVE

## Three-Quarters Still to Go

By MAX MARTIN

The Young Socialist League's 1956 drive to raise nearly \$1500 got off to an excellent start during the first three weeks of its existence.

The National Office received \$396, which is 26.8 per cent of the \$1475 total which the YSL has pledged itself to raise. This sum represents a weekly average better than the amount that should be raised every week if we are to reach our goal in full and on time, hence opening the possibility of the YSL over-subscribing its national quota.

As a look at the score column will show, however, the high degree of success registered during these early weeks of the drive is not evenly spread among the various units of the YSL.

Top honors to date have to be equally divided between Los Angeles and New York, each of which has approximately 40 per cent of its quota in, a figure well above the national average. The comrades in both of these localities are clearly doing an outstanding job.

On the other hand, Chicago and "At Large & N. O." are lagging, as are also the three units which have not yet remitted any money.

A middle group of three units, headed by Berkeley which stands in third place,

is sending funds in at approximately the same rate as the YSL as a whole.

While these first results are a source of gratification, it would be a mistake to become complacent because of them. Any slackening of effort will obviously wipe out the advantages achieved so far and create dangers for the campaign.

To assure a completely successful drive this year all units and members of the YSL must see to it that the weekly collections and remittances of Fund Drive money do not fall more than a bit behind what they have been up to now. Those units which are doing well must keep up their level of fund-raising; those which are behind should double their efforts in the attempt to catch up with the others. All in all, close attention has to be paid by all comrades and friends to the drive.

As a result of a number of recent developments on the political scene, the situation for socialists has taken a turn toward more favorable prospects than have existed for some time. The utilization of these opportunities does not alone, nor even in the first place, depend on the YSL having sufficient financial resources, but this is an important factor. All of our friends have to do their share in the effort to see to it that it is not lacking.

*Challenge* readers are invited to contribute to this effort. Make your checks or money orders payable to Max Martin, and send them to YSL, Third Floor, 114 West 14 Street, New York, N. Y.

### WHAT'S THE SCORE ?

City	Quota	Paid	%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1475</b>	<b>\$396</b>	<b>26.8</b>
New York	600	241	40.2
Los Angeles	150	60	40.0
Berkeley	75	20	26.7
Antioch	25	5	20.0
Cleveland Area	25	5	20.0
Chicago	350	55	15.7
At Lge. & N.O.	100	10	10.0
Albany	75	0	0.0
Pittsburgh	50	0	0.0
San Francisco	25	0	0.0

Young Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the YSL Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

(Make checks out to Max Martin)

# Anti-Semitism & Arab Propaganda

By HAL DRAPER

A new book published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith—*Cross-Currents*, by Forster and Epstein—has created a bit of a stir as an exposé of anti-Semitic propaganda in the United States, especially as connected with international "plots." A press conference to launch it rated prominent write-ups in most of the New York papers and a black front-page scream-head in the Scripps-Howard outlet New York *World-Telegram*.

I am concerned here with the last third of the book, entitled "Cross-Currents in the Middle East," which deals with Arab propaganda activities in this country and their connections with native anti-Semitic agitation. This part of the ADL book is an excellent example of a disturbing trend, with reference to the fight against anti-Semitism, about which some honest words need to be said but rarely are.

The background fact, of course, is the war of propaganda in this country to line up the government and public opinion on one side or the other of the Israel-Arab conflict in the Middle East. Given U. S. power in the world, the stakes are considerable for the rivals.

In this propaganda war, it is also not surprising that the Arabs are hopelessly outclassed, outpointed, out-thought and out-argued.

Sympathy for Israel is far from limited to the Jewish population. Leaving aside here the rights and wrongs of the Palestinian disputes: it is a fact that there is, or at any rate has been, a vast fund of sympathy for Israel which stems from vivid knowledge of the horrors and atrocities committed against the Jews by the Nazi regime's exterminationism, and a view of Israel as simply the place where the pitiful remnant of European Jewry found refuge.

There is also more than an element of a guilty conscience involved: if hundreds of thousands of Jewish DPs had to go to Israel, it was (among other reasons) because the gates of the United States and other virtuous democratic countries were closed against them. Outside of socialists like ourselves, there were few who shouted very loudly against this "democratic" compounding of the atrocities against the Jews. A few liberals took it to heart; there was not even a respectable-sized campaign to demand that the doors be opened.

## Propaganda Apparatus

There are other strands in the pattern of pro-Israel sentiment in this country, and there is a well-organized movement, with massive institutions of its own, to develop this sentiment to the full. This is the Zionist movement, plus its "non-Zionist" allies like the American Jewish Committee and the B'nai B'rith, who are ready to go down the line in defense of Israel's interests in spite of their ideological and in part muted disagreements with the Zionists' theories of Jewish nationalism.

The above description attempts to skirt the question of the comparative justice or injustice of Israel's case at various times in the last few years and its relative appeal, in order to put the spotlight on the constant factors behind the judgments of public opinion on an episode like the Kibya massacre (which had an anti-Israel effect) or like the Egyptian arms deal (which had an opposite effect).

For the apparatuses which are drawn up in such a propaganda war are not built by justice or injustice, though their effectiveness is conditioned by it. Certainly that is true in this case.

For comparison, think (say) of the wide American sympathy for the Irish struggle against Britain in the years especially before the First World War—a sympathy that lost nothing because of the large numbers of Irish in this country, and which was enhanced by combination with historical factors like traditional anti-Britishism here.

If anything, the advantages possessed by pro-Israel sentiment are even greater. Certainly, there are few impulses to sympathy with the case of the Arabs, about whom Americans in general know little and who have only a small number of their people among our population. Most Americans have never seen an Arab except in movies about the French Foreign Legion.

So in a propaganda war in the U. S., under the best of circumstances for them the Arab states have two strikes against them in every respect, not excluding the financial one.

## Professionals vs. Amateurs

In addition, they suffer from a self-created handicap: their propagandists are stupid, incompetent, understand little about this country, and would never be effective even if a couple of millions were put behind them (though, of course, with a bankroll that size, more knowledgeable agents could be purchased).

This is said on the basis of personal acquaintance with Arab propaganda material here, which I happen to be looking into particularly in connection with the question of Israel's Arab minority. Take the matter of falsification of facts, for example: this can be done by propagandists in either a professional or an amateurish way.

The Israel Government office in New York, for instance, puts out a pamphlet on "The Arabs in Israel" which is a slick, persuasive job, guaranteed to convince anyone who knows nothing at all on the subject that the Arab minority in Israel is a pampered group with completely equal rights and opportunities. It is a polished and professional job of combining half-truths with falsification.

Its opposite number is a pamphlet on the same subject distributed by the Arab Information Office in New York (run by the Arab League). It was not smart of the authors of this pamphlet to prove Zionist crimes by (say) quoting "the Zionist paper *Kol Ha'am*," as if they were citing an indictment out of the mouths of the Zionists themselves. Anyone who tries to use this ammunition would find out quickly enough that *Kol Ha'am* is the organ of the Israel Communist Party, not a "Zionist paper," and the real bullets in his ammunition would explode along with this dud.

Or take another bombshell put out in the war of propaganda which is our subject: a pamphlet published last year for English-language consumption by the Syrian government and distributed through the Syrian offices in this country. It is entitled *Tension, Terror and Blood in the Holy Land*, published in Damascus, prepared by one Musa Khuri of the Syrian University, under the imprimatur of the "Palestine Arab Refugees Institution."

## No Fu Manchu

From the purely technical point of view, this 253-page booklet is terribly written, terribly organized, wandering, a mass or mess of documentation, comment, quotations, side excursions, etc. But we were speaking not simply of garden-variety incompetence but of stupid-type falsification.

One of the sections of this compendium purports to be excerpts from the excellent article by Dr. Don Peretz on "The Arab Minority in Israel" in the *Middle East Journal* for Spring 1954. Naturally this article appeals to the Arabs because it tells a good part of the truth about the mistreatment of this minority. The writer, Peretz, is a sincere follower of the ideas of the Israeli *Ichud*, and believes in Jewish-Arab cooperation; therefore, simply by telling the truth and not by polemic, he indicts the government policy. It is natural that Arab propaganda should reprint it, just as Israeli propaganda likes to quote denunciations of authoritarianism in the Arab states. All this is fair game for the machines.

But the Damascus authors were not content simply to print it. Incredible as it may seem, they rewrote sentence after sentence in the quoted paragraphs to make it say not what Peretz wrote but what their own propaganda line demands.

Now this is the sort of crude falsification which shows lack of sophistication, unnecessary heavy-handedness. It has the *gaucherie* of the feudal reactionary who has never had to take account of how modern minds work, and therefore how to deceive them.

It is also typical of Arab propaganda. The stupidity to which we have referred is not individual but social. It reminds one of the fantastic degree of incompetence in modern methods of procedure which the Arab armies displayed in the Palestine war of 1948, and why the Israelis were able to plaster them in spite of numerical and material inferiority. It is the stupidity of a dinosaurian social organism that is socially obsolete.

Nothing could be more ridiculous than to paint these people as Middle Eastern Fu Manchus subtly weaving their oriental webs of intrigue and deceit around us poor unsuspecting fresh-faced upstanding Americans. The truth is exactly the opposite. When it comes to propaganda, these Arab propagandists are babes in our woods—and this is part of the reason they play with some of the animals in our woods rather than with the humans.

## Tell-Tale Passages

But we are not through with this Damascus pamphlet which is being circulated here, since our subject is anti-Semitic propaganda, and not simply the troubles of Arabs in a modern civilization.

The booklet opens with a disclaimer of anti-Semitism and recurs to this disclaimer in many ways; but this does not prevent it from falling into anti-Semitic ruts. It purports to be denouncing only Zionism, which it often and clearly differentiates from the Jews as a whole; but this does not prevent it in other sections from slipping into blatant anti-Jewish expressions.

On page 20, for example, there is a passage which may or may not be quoted from another book called *This Sword for Allah*, by one Lawrence Griswold, though the passage lacks quote marks. In any case, the following occurs:

"... Men who came [to Israel] from the United States with firm pro-Zionist convictions returned a few months later with bitter hatred toward all Jews, excepting perhaps, those whom they personally knew to be fair. One American Jew, a prominent man in his city, told me with a groan, after his visit to Israel: 'Why, those kikes aren't even human!'"

On page 4, the booklet refers to Protestant clergymen who are sympathetic to Zionism and, in a slip, calls them "Protestant Judaizers"—hardly making sense for people who claim to distinguish so insistently between Zionism and Judaism.

But the longest such passage occurs on pages 62-3,

in a section entitled "Zionist Organization in the United States," which has *nothing* on the subject of Zionist organization in the U. S. (a vulnerable subject even for Arab propagandists), but rather devotes itself exclusively to a certain obscure article in the *Brooklyn Jewish Examiner* which dealt with Jewish life in a typical American small town—Lorain, Ohio. The article, apparently, was (for its source) a more or less typical account in glowing terms of a strongly maintained Jewish community life.

The Syrian booklet peppers it with its interpretations: "... a remarkable example of the cohesiveness which has typified the Jew, not only in the U. S. but in every other country where he has settled... the Jews of Lorain, O. have set themselves apart from the American community in which they live... They stress Jewish culture [stated as an accusation]... In all this the Jews of Lorain, O. follow an age-old tradition. If you go to Cairo, or London, or Buenos Aires, or Casablanca you will find the Jews there practicing the same mode of racial exclusiveness as they do in Lorain. And if you check closely you will observe that the Jew of Cairo, no less than his brethren in London, regards himself as a Jew first and as an English or Egyptian citizen secondly. By the same token American Jews give a necessary allegiance to the U. S. while reserving their first loyalty for 'Israel.' That is the pattern which has been followed for centuries; it is the pattern they follow today."

## A Tip to the ADL

Whatever else may be said about this tirade, it is certainly clear at least that it is a harangue against Jews as such, all Jews, the Jewish people as a whole, and not against "Zionists" alone; and that the stereotypes implied or insinuated are derived from well-known anti-Semitic routines.

Since the Forster-Epstein book *Cross-Currents* devotes its last part precisely to trying to prove an anti-Semitic strain in Arab propaganda here, as we shall see, it is hard to see how they have overlooked this booklet, since nothing so far published by official Arab authorities in this field equals it in the brashness of its anti-Semitic thrusts. Certainly there is nothing in the ADL book which approaches it as public and documented evidence for the thesis. If the small army of espionage agents and undercover operators, not to speak of agent-provocateurs, employed by the Anti-Defamation League have not been able to turn it up for the reading of Messrs. Forster and Epstein, then I gladly contribute this bit of information: You can get a copy of the incriminating evidence by making a phone call to the Syrian Consulate in Manhattan.

But before we turn our attention to what is in the ADL book, let us now raise the question: what is this Arab "anti-Semitism"? Is it simply Machiavellian guile that the Syrian authors repudiate anti-Semitism on one page—on many pages—and practice it on others? A favorite Arab gambit, of course, is the well-worn bit about how Arabs cannot be anti-Semitic because they are Semites themselves. This remark is not completely pointless, to be sure, because it does illustrate the terminological inexactitude of the term Semitic as applied to world Jewry. Not all Jews are Semites and not all Semites are Jews, whatever meaning we assign to the term Semite; and it is even highly doubtful whether the term Semitic has any more scientific meaning than the term Aryan. But this is only a bit of *curiosa*.

## Another Stereotype

What is really involved, as the Arab authors know quite well when need be, is the difference between anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist, for one thing. When we cite derogatory stereotypes directed against the Jews as a whole, the Jews as such, then whether we call it anti-Semitism or no, it is the same thing, isn't it?

... Well, is it? There is a question that pops up once we start calling it anti-Jewishness, rather than the more trickily connotative term anti-Semitism.

Take, for example, the sentiment of anti-Britishism, or anti-foreignism in general, in the Middle East, especially backward portions of it. Legitimate nationalist feelings and aspirations have often, of course, taken the British imperialists as their butt, since the crimes of this imperialism are most immediate and best known there. A politically better educated populace, or section of the population, may be able to distinguish sharply between being anti-British-imperialism and being anti-British—between attacking a British imperialist cop, and denouncing British culture—between taking action against an occupation army, and xenophobia. The more advanced a nationalist movement the more likely such distinctions will be made; the more backward the social base of a nationalist movement, the more likely is the element of xenophobia.

But however regrettable it may be, however much one may condemn it, is it "racism," in the sense connoted by anti-Semitism, when nationalist sentiment spills over to a virulent anti-Britishism, or a bitter anti-Americanism in the course of a struggle against these states?

And is the Arabs' "anti-Jewishism" of the racist type or the nationalist type—given the fact that it is the state of Israel itself, and the whole world Zionist movement, that insists heatedly and inflexibly that "the Jews" not only of Israel itself (the immediate enemy seen by the Arabs) but of the whole world are a single nation indivisible?

There is reason to inquire whether or not the charge of anti-Semitism, as applied to the Arabs, is itself an unthinking stereotype, especially when we find that the charge is made in a fashion which has all the attributes of a smear. This is not an easy question, especially since one type can shade into or evoke the other.

Let us approach the ADL book with this question, and go from there to some other cases where the anti-Semitic label has been thrown about for purposes which can only harm the interests of the Jewish people and of the fight against anti-Semitism.

(Concluded next week)

# STALINISM WITHOUT STALIN:

## Part III—Political and Social Motives for the Repudiation of Stalin

By HAL DRAPER

The significance of the demonstrations reported in Georgia, and possibly in Soviet Armenia and Azerbaidjan, is closely tied up with the most speculative question of all that has been raised by the 20th Congress: why the debunking of Stalin myths at the congress, why the attack on Stalin.

In terms of the analysis so far expressed in this article: what are the motivations of this attack on Stalin within the framework of the bureaucratic-collectivist (Stalinist) system?

American readers, who are not used to thinking in general political or social terms at all, want their answers in personal, individual terms—or as the popular magazine editors like to put it, in human terms. This anti-theoretical predilection is almost as true for the *Reporter*, with its intellectual pretensions, as for *Woman's Day*.

The market for this "Russian expert" commodity is large, and the goods are brought to market. On the counter right now, these last few weeks, are a number of prefabricated models which will show you exactly what happened behind the scenes of the 20th Congress, in the corridors and smoke-filled backrooms, and in the Kremlin before it. What did Mikoyan say to Khrushchev after the Presidium meeting in February? Who lined up with Kaganovich at the caucus in-between two congress sessions? At what hour on Thursday did Khrushchev change his mind? What exactly is the sinister connection between the article by Kirichenko in the January 23 issue of *Pravda* and the fact that a photograph of Molotov is published on an inside page of the *Uzbek Liturnia Ivestia*, which is edited by a man who once met Malenkov at a cocktail party in Stalingorsk?

In *Newsweek*, the *Reporter*, the *New Leader*, and sundry other places, you can get the lowdown on what really happened at the congress in individual terms. The fact that these definitive explanations are all mostly different is only a testimonial to the variety in commodities which competition induces under free enterprise. Even the *New York Post's* European cafe correspondent got into the act with a brief but revelatory transcript of a secret conversation between Tito and Khrushchev which explained everything. As we mentioned in Part I, Isaac Deutscher got stung with his article in the *Reporter* because he rushed into the performance before his ouija board told him that Khrushchev had attacked, not defended, Stalin.

### FOUR VARIETIES

These popular Russian experts can be roughly divided into four schools: (1) the novelists; (2) the cryptographers; (3) the charlatans; and (4) the political idiots. There is a certain amount of overlapping and interpenetration which ruins the neat schema.

The first school start with a certain number of facts, as does any historical romance, and then improvise the "real story" around these with free-roving imagination. The second school laboriously work out "clues" by correlating disparate facts from the position of the top leaders on photographs to the inner-inner meaning of selected quotations from obscure speeches, à la Boris Nicolaevsky. The third report their inside knowledge, obviously obtained from an agent inside the Presidium, of the day-to-day struggles among the top leaders. The current invention in *Newsweek*, or Deutscher's in the *Reporter*, is a good example. The fourth need no further explanation except to mention the name of Harrison Salisbury.

I myself, unfortunately, have no idea whatsoever of whether Molotov is going to be purged by Khrushchev, or vice-versa; or whether Mikoyan is or is not in the same faction as Malenkov; or whether Kaganovich is or is not the real leader of the Presidium, etc., etc. I console myself ineffectually with the firm belief that no one else does: a proposition that can be proved to the hilt on the basis of past record.

Instead, the direction for either analysis or speculation—and speculation is in order too—is the question of the political and social forces and pressures that are at work pushing the Moscow bureaucracy in their present direction. To speak of "political and social forces" is disgust-

ingly abstract as compared with retailing the inside dope on the Kremlin leadership, but that is all you can get for your money.

### "INTERNALISM"

Let's take up three questions concerning the political and social pressures on the Kremlin, and under them express some opinions on the motivations of the current turn—some of them speculative, some of them necessarily tentative, all of them under the head of discussion, and in the knowledge that other writers for LABOR ACTION might well put it differently or with different emphasis.

The first question in order can be labeled: *internalism or externalism*? Since these terms have just been invented for the purpose of this article, they need explanation.

There have long been two different tendencies among serious students of Russian events as well as others: a tendency to interpret the motives of Russian policy in terms of foreign-policy needs or objectives; and a tendency to interpret them, rather, in terms of domestic, internal forces or conflicts or aims. At each Russian turn, both approaches have been in evidence among commentators. Naturally, one must add that they are not mutually exclusive; that one might apply in one case, and the second in another; that internal policy and foreign policy are closely related; etc. Yet the distinction exists.

This is being written by an inveterate "internalist"; but granting my prejudices on that score, it is still hard to see how even an inveterate "externalist" could interpret the 20th Congress in terms of foreign-policy considerations.

What is misleading, and tempting, is that usually the "externalist" has an easier row to hoe. To a greater degree than domestic policies, foreign policy is acted out in the eyes of the world; the considerations are more obvious and the effects easier to weigh. The given data is at hand. The "internalist," however, who believes (say) that the post-Stalin relaxation was due in the first place to the needs of the bureaucracy within Russia, and not to by-product advantages of a soft peaceful-coexistence line—he is immediately required to expound the internal dynamics of this social system which is veiled from the eyes of the world; and this is a difficult and risky thing to do.

### EYES INSIDE

So too, now, the repudiation of Stalin's crimes by the Stalinist bureaucracy has had a huge effect in gaining new sympathy and tolerance for the Kremlin among new circles, and in spreading the virus of neutralism, and so it is easy to reason backward and deduce that this consequence must have been the cause.

Yet, as a matter of fact, "internalism" has been dominant, at least since the news of the secret Khrushchev speech and the Georgia demonstrations. The internal impact of such an attack on Stalin has seen to that.

Thus, to take a piquant example, in the March 19 issue of the *New Leader*, their cryptographer Boris Nicolaevsky had no doubt that "The reason for this unexpected zigzag [the anti-Stalin operation] should be sought not in the correlation of forces at the Congress, but rather in the foreign policy being conducted by the Khrushchev-Bulganin bloc." In the April 2 issue, the same unhappy person announced, on the Presidium's motives in discrediting Stalin, "The answer must be sought in the struggle that raged within the party on the eve of the Congress."

At any rate this turns one's attention inside Russia, a very murky place, far less susceptible to clear vision than the spotlighted stages of world foreign policy.

### TO THE WOLVES

The second question that comes up, next, is: *From weakness or from strength?*

I suppose it is possible to argue that unless the Khrushchev leadership had felt that it was strong enough, and stable enough to get away with it, it would never have taken the risk of knocking down the tenpins with an attack on Stalin which was bound to knock down other tenpins in a chain reaction. But this is not the same as saying that the 20th Congress took the anti-Stalin line because the leadership was so strong, rather than the reverse.

If a union-busting company has to grant a wage increase in order to prevent unionization, i.e., make this concession to mass discontent in order to prevent something worse, then it is acting from weakness; even though it may also be correct that the company is still strong enough to get away with this limited concession.

In what other sense can this repudiation of Stalin possibly be interpreted as a mark of strength? Only on one condition: that one assumes that, ever since the death of the old butcher, his heirs have simply been aching to tell the truth about his crimes (which are also theirs) and have been so far barely restrained only by instability, but now they feel strong enough they give rein to their virtuous aspirations and make a clean breast of it. . . .

No, the current leadership of Stalin's heirs is not of this type, as we have already discussed; and if they have had to throw Stalin to the wolves it was in order to protect themselves.

### CONVULSION

This leaves plenty of room for internal disagreement in the Presidium over when to do this and how far to go; and anyone who wishes to give a certain amount of credence to the romancers, cryptographers, or cloak-and-dagger reporters, who tell us who argued with whom, is at liberty to do so within this framework.

For all I know, it may be true that Mikoyan was the most resolute and insistent upon purging Stalin, or upon repudiating him in the broadest terms; and at this point we could write our own historical romance detailing the pushes-and-pulls on the leadership to make the concession or crack down on it. The contribution of a Deutscher to this is to turn such a possible disagreement into a fundamental struggle over basic principles between "Stalinist die-hards" and "anti-Stalinists."

The Khrushchev leadership had nothing to gain by taking this upsetting course, which was guaranteed to cause an internal furor, if it was already so strong that it did not have to worry about discontent below.

Yes, it would indeed be strange if this drastic turn, which has all the symptoms of a convulsion and not at all of a confidently executed policy, should have its source in strength rather than in weakness.

### THREE YEARS

Only three years ago this leadership faced "panic and disarray" with the death of Stalin, in their own words. Since then their lives have not been placid ones.

Since then, of the presumed Big Three of 1953, every single one has been downgraded. Beria is a corpse. Malenkov was cashiered and humiliated. Molotov was publicly and openly censured, on the pretext of his notorious slip about "building the foundations of socialism."

At that time Khrushchev was considered to be such a nonentity that some Russian experts "deduced" that the influence of the party was at an end simply because a nonentity was put in as its secretary. (We, on the contrary, argued that he could not be a nonentity precisely for this reason.) Now, in the course of the same three years, this "nonentity" has become No. 1.

It would indeed be remarkable if so soon this conflict-ridden bureaucracy, and this former "nonentity," could feel so strong, so secure, so stable, so serene in their power, as to risk an operation like the Stalin purge—for any reason other than preventing something worse.

In these three years since that "panic and disarray," there has been the Vorkuta explosion; there was the revolt of

the East German workers. How serene can this leadership be?

In these three years, the leadership has had to divide before the eyes of the masses over the question of making concessions to them. This, not some economic-technical question, is the meaning of the controversy over heavy industry versus consumer-goods industry, which set Khrushchev against Malenkov.

In the course of these three years, at one point the Kremlin (then led by Malenkov) faced sufficient popular discontent to force it to make placatory steps: raising the ordinary workers' standard of living. At that time, readers with long memories may recall, this was hailed by the dupes and dupers as sure proof that the hearts of the new Russian leaders beat only for the people, whom they were bent on raising up from their oppression just as soon as they could get around to it.

But now, at the end of these three years, this philanthropic enterprise is in the dustbin of promises. Heavy industry is prime again, with Khrushchev. The people are still asked to sweat it out for the glory of the Kremlin. They are still told: Sacrifice, sacrifice. The carrot—of consumers' goods—has been removed. Does anyone really think that this Russia is more contented and tranquil than the Russia in which the Vorkuta strike was possible?

No, the anti-Stalin convulsion was a symptom of crisis—not a crisis of conscience on the part of idealistic despots, but crisis in the society, a kind of society more ridden by internal racking contradictions than capitalism ever was.

### THREE LEVELS

This does not mean that we are talking about a revolutionary crisis, or that revolution is or was on the order of the day, with the repudiation of Stalin as the only alternative. We don't know that. There can be a considerable distance between revolution and mounting discontent and ferment.

A third question remains of those we set ourselves: the location of this crisis in the social body.

It is common enough for the Russian experts to look for crises in the top Kremlin leadership, in the Presidium, in the summits of the bureaucracy. It is also common enough to look for crises in the opposite directions: among the broad masses of people, workers and peasants. And it is right to do so. But there is a third social strata where one should look too, and that is neither in the Kremlin nor among the ranks of the oppressed classes, but in the ranks of the ruling class as a class; the mass of the bureaucracy.

Next week—Part IV:  
The Crisis of Stalinist Society  
and the Bevanite Illusion

### Among the Experts

Speaking of Russian experts, we see by the papers, as *LA* heads for the press, that ex-President Harry Truman ripped off a bit of analysis on Tuesday in a speech to the Overseas Press Club, apropos of the question raised on this page: "from weakness or from strength?"

"I do not have any Central Intelligence Agency. I do not have any sources that can keep me fully informed about foreign affairs as I had when I was in the White House. But I can read . . ." he said.

This reminds us, sadly, that when Truman *did* have the CIA to keep him informed on the latest in Russia, plus a world-wide staff of ambassadorial reporters and analysts and all the Brains in the State Department, he came to his well-known conclusion that "good old Joe" was just a "prisoner of the Politburo."

Now, reduced to the ability to read as his only resource, Truman informed the gathering that "recent changes in Soviet tactics are not signs of 'failure' but evidence of growing economic power." Why growing economic power required the dethronement of good old Joe by the latter's former jailers was not explained.

# NATO Cracking Up? —

(Continued from page 11)

army officers and government officials in the pro-American party were compelled to avoid being seen in public in the company of Americans during the election campaign. The Stalinists made a strong come-back despite the fact that their party remains illegal and a good part of its leadership is still in exile.

In Iceland the Stalinists play a negligible role. In Greece the defection is not a result of a rapid growth of Stalinist ideology, but rather of the struggle with British imperialism over Cyprus, the friction with Turkey which also centers on the Cyprus struggle, and the fact that the American expenditures in Greece have bolstered not the democratic political and social aspirations of the people, but the hold over them of a small group of wealthy capitalists and government bureaucrats.

## INSOLUBLE

If the most dramatic collapses of the NATO structure are at its extremities, there is little health in its vitals.

The future of Germany remains an open question. Not even the most obtuse supporters of Dulles can claim that even Western Germany is really in the NATO bag for good and all. And as far as France is concerned, both it and its vital North African empire, each in a different way, are showing definite signs of a political falling-away from the alliance.

Here again what is at stake is not primarily the growth of Stalinism or of Stalinist influence or pressure. North Africa is fighting for its independence. France is stubbornly seeking to hold on to its empire by every means at its disposal. Every concession, wrung from France by the heaviest kind of pressure, becomes a prelude to further demands. Until the whole of North Africa is independent, the struggle will not cease, and anyone who fails to see this is living

outside the realities of this time and planet.

In its desperate fight to hold its empire, France needs and demands the support of the United States. The Russian military threat has now receded to such an extent that it cannot be used as a means of forcing reluctant allies into line by the State Department. So France says ever more clearly: if you want our continued adherence to your military system, you must stand loyally beside us in our hour of need in North Africa.

And anyway, they add, if we are finally ousted from North Africa, who will guarantee the vast air-base complex you have built up there as one of the chief launching-platforms of your massive-retaliation policy?

The United States is obviously caught in an insoluble political dilemma, insoluble on the basis of its policy. With the whole Moslem and ex-colonial world looking on, to openly support the French military suppression of the Algerian struggle for independence would be disastrous.

On the other hand, the French government (now led by the social-imperialist Guy Mollet) has made it amply clear that America's failure to support its position in North Africa can result, if not in a rupture of the alliance, in French recalcitrance and opposition to the American position within the alliance on a number of questions. And beyond that, it is quite clear that no one can guarantee that a free North Africa would remain tied to the American bloc.

## SHAKY STRUCTURE

The British are in the soup in Cyprus. Throughout the Middle East the British and Americans are pushing each other over oil interests. They support, not the aspirations of the peoples of this area for a better life, but the particular monarch or political grouping which seems

to promise them most immediate "stability" for their oil holdings. And the principle of supporting the ruling group in every country as long as it is willing to enter into some kind of a military alliance with America results in the same kind of political dead-end, sooner or later, in Asia as well.

The shakiness of the whole political-military system by which the United States has sought to exercise its imperialist position in the world gives rise to alarm in widening circles in this country. In this connection, Walter Reuther, head of the United Automobile Workers, has presented a ten-point program to the secretary of State.

This program was sent Dulles just before Reuther left on a trip to India. Thus it has the character of a program for American foreign policy with which Reuther will be able to appear before the labor movement of India on his trip.

Reuther proposes a 25-year program by which the United States would allot 2 per cent of its gross national product to foreign economic aid per year. This money would be given to a World Fund for Peace, Prosperity and Progress to be administered through the United Nations. Stalinist Russia and all other countries would be invited to participate in this fund. Further, some way should be found to send American food surpluses to countries which don't have enough food for their people, without wrecking the international market in agricultural products.

Reuther makes the point that the benefits of this World Fund would be available to "unaligned" as well as "aligned" nations. That is, since the funds would be administered by the United Nations, they could not be used simply to bolster America's military alliances, or as a means of applying political pressure on countries which desperately need funds for the development of their economies.

## BREAK WITH MEANY

Reuther wrote Dulles: "We need to speak out clearly and act courageously against all forms of colonialism. We need to make it unmistakably clear regardless of our military alliances that we are opposed to all forms of colonial domination on moral grounds and that we support the rights of all people to political independence and self-determination."

Finally, Reuther includes in his design for a new foreign policy, the United States must put an end to discrimination at home, so as to remove one of the chief sources of suspicion and hatred for

America by the majority of the non-white peoples of the world.

Reuther's anti-colonial and anti-discrimination statements are excellent. His intentions with regard to the World Fund are also of the best, and such a plan might, under certain circumstances, be a really practicable way in which to help the underdeveloped part of the world to help itself.

The most significant thing about Reuther's statement, however, is not that it is a finished or even adequate program for American foreign policy, but that it breaks clearly and decisively with the conceptions and attitudes on foreign policy voiced by George Meany and breaks in the right direction.

As the foreign policy of this government collapses in the months ahead, a new one will have to be proposed either during the present political campaign or shortly after it is over. The American labor movement can play a decisive role in the struggle for a new foreign policy... but only if it has come to grips with the reactionary thinking which still dominates in its own ranks. Reuther's declaration can be the beginning of a real discussion in the labor movement around this vital question.

## WHY NOT HERE?

In our opinion, such a discussion would show that the fine anti-colonial intentions expressed by Reuther could be implemented only by an open break on the part of the labor movement with the present foreign policies of the government, and that it will remain only words as long as the labor movement goes along in practice with the U. S. course which this article has discussed. And as long as it remains only fine words, then with the best of intentions Reuther's four of India will serve objectively as a classic kind of left-wing sugarcoating for the realities of U. S. policy.

It would be much better if Reuther were to stomp this country, instead of (or after) making speeches to the Indian people designed to reconcile them to the U. S.—stomp this country for his well-intentioned program. This would bring him in conflict with the State Department, to be sure, but how else does he suppose his nice proposals will make headway? It is not India that needs to be told about anti-colonialism and the evils of imperialism.

# SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 11)

out the victim for public contempt and anyone can feel free to knife him at will and with certain impunity.

So it cannot be dismissed as a farce, though it is better that it should turn out to be a local jape rather than an upper-level national turn to more open police-state tactics. Once it became clear that Washington was not involved in the action, even the American Committee for Cultural Freedom came out in criticism of Moysey, and that just about makes it official that Moysey was out of step even from the standpoint of the present level of witchhunting.

One of those Excesses which are the inevitable accompaniment of authoritarianism, as we can see from the case of more countries than one today.

## A Cheer

The other side of the picture was, however, represented last week by a different news item. In a move that is rare today, and therefore doubly welcome, a group of anti-Stalinist liberals took steps to act in defense of the rights of Stalinists.

On March 27 the press announced that "Norman Thomas, veteran anti-Communist and six-time Socialist Party candidate for president, has been raising funds to defend two Communists," namely, two CP leaders who are Smith Act defendants, Alexander Trachtenberg and George Blake Charney, who are to be retried April 9. They were convicted three years ago in the Smith Act trial but then their convictions were set aside last April on the basis of Harvey Matusow's revelations of false witness.

Thomas' efforts are in association with Roger Baldwin, Murray Kempton, and the Rev. Donald Harrington of the Community Church, and are being conducted entirely separately from the Stalinist-sponsored Charney-Trachtenberg defense committee.

He has sent out hundreds of letters, said Thomas, to solicit funds for the case as it will be argued by the prominent Newman Levy, whom Thomas was also helpful in convincing to take the case. His letter argued that the CPers should be assured a full defense. "Inquiry convinces me," he wrote, "that repeated trials have enormously reduced the ca-

capacity of Communists and their friends to finance by themselves repeated costly trials although they are still trying." He also advocated "judicial reinterpretation, repeal or drastic amendment of the Smith Act," and held that the Trachtenberg-Charney case has a vital "civil-liberties aspect."

After this news it is something of an anti-climax to add that, according to Thomas, his fund-raising epistles have netted only 20 contributions totaling \$479, plus one \$250 check he obtained in person. We were saying something, above, about the atmosphere in this country.

## Witchhunter

It was precisely this question of providing legal defense for attacked minorities that was involved in the recent scandal over a statement by Assistant Attorney General William Tompkins, who occupies a key post in the witchhunt and is not merely a clerk in Lower Manhattan.

In Cleveland, as in some other cities like Philadelphia, Denver and New Haven, the bar association took action to ensure an adequate lawyer staff for CP defendants on trial in a Smith Act proceeding. The association asked \$100 from each member in order to raise \$20,000 needed for such an adequate defense. When the verdict came out in the ensuing trial, four out of 10 of the defendants were actually acquitted—the nearest thing so far to a government setback.

Tompkins made the papers by viciously criticizing the bar association for raising the money and aid for the CPers on trial. In view of the respectability of his butt, his snarling statement was greeted with widespread displeasure. For a week or so neither Tompkins nor his boss Brownell responded to efforts to get a statement out of them; finally, Tompkins backtracked with one of those official falsehoods about being "misquoted."

In its comment, the Cleveland Press raised the question whether the Justice Department's prosecutions is a government attempt to break the CP by depleting its treasury. The paper denounced such tactics vigorously, as it asked if the government "indicts people not only for specific charges, but also as a means of forcing them to spend party cash on legal defense."

# Cyprus — —

(Continued from page 31)

much with enosis as even to appeal to support the present regime and to issue "a grave warning to beware the danger of a militarist fascist coup" (November 23, 1954) which most people thought had occurred a long time ago.

As socialists we cannot blind ourselves to the nature of the present regime in Greece nor to the danger for the organized workers of Cyprus implicit in enosis. We cannot subordinate the interests of the people of Cyprus to momentary expediency.

On the other hand we cannot ignore the obvious desire of the Greek population of Cyprus for enosis, union with Greece. However, we must realize that as long as the Cypriots feel isolated and without allies in their struggle against British imperialism, enosis, although it means union with a military dictatorship, although it means the growth in influence of an obscurantist church and an opportunist party (the CP), will appear as the only hope. Enosis is a slogan of weakness.

The Cypriot people can attain real independence only if they find an ally in their struggle against British imperialism, an ally without ulterior motive. That ally should be the British working class. By weakening capitalism at home we weaken imperialism abroad.

We can give the Cypriot people the help they need by demanding the withdrawal of British troops from the colonies, freedom for the colonies and the offer of technical and economic assistance to them.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION —  
\$1 a year for Student Subs

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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