

# LABOR ACTION

APRIL 7, 1958

TEN CENTS

**The "Monthly Review"**  
**The Evolution of a Tendency**

... page 7

**The Army Tries To Bull It Through**

... page 2

**What Next For Jews in Russia?**

... page 3

*Not in the  
Headlines*

## Minority Parties Lose

The American Civil Liberties Union's Southern California affiliate plans an appeal to the United States Supreme Court, as a test case affecting minority parties throughout the country, of the California State Supreme Court's decision that numerical tests of strength required of all political parties to qualify for a primary election are reasonable and valid.

The California court, in a 6 to 1 decision, rejected the claims of the Socialist Party and the Christian Nationalist Party that requirements of Section 2540 of the State Code are so stringent that minority parties cannot qualify. The majority held that the numerical restrictions "are reasonably designed to advance a vital purpose" and "are designed to establish a workable primary election system."

In a dissenting opinion, Justice Jesse Carter held that the numerical requirements for qualification in the 1958 primary, 123,000 votes in the 1954 election, and signatures of 41,000 registrants of the party, or a petition signed by 410,000 voters, are "unreasonable and impossible to satisfy and thus violate constitutional rights."

"The right being asserted by appellants is that of suffrage," Justice Carter said. "It has been well established," he pointed out, "that the direct primary is an integral part of the election process, and the right of the electorate to nomi-

(Continued on page 6)

## Moscow Nuclear Test Decision Puts U.S. Policy on the Spot

By SAM BOTTONE

Although it is probably too soon to say with great certainty, it appears that a decisive new stage is opening in the cold war struggle with the Kremlin's announcement that it is unilaterally ending, for an indeterminate period, the testing of atomic and nuclear weapons. If so, then it would represent another step in the slow alteration of the balance of power which overwhelmingly favored the United States after the end of the Second World War.

The industrial and military prerequisites—the expansion of the Russian industrial power, the development of the atomic and nuclear bombs, and finally the lead in the race to the ICBM and the launching of the Sputniks—have been developing for some time, and only in recent years and months have their full import become readily apparent. Although the U.S. and its allies still retain a substantial lead in almost all decisive military and economic areas, enough of the gap has been closed to throw Western leaders into jitters, if not into panic.

While the U.S. is still decisively powerful in this area, it is now in the process once again of suffering a defeat of major proportions in another—the political. By seizing the initiative in qualified unilateral suspension of tests, the Kremlin has played a trump card. This is what Adlai Stevenson was referring

to in his announcement that if Russia decided to suspend tests it "would deprive us . . . of any shred of moral leadership in the matter."

The single most important issue having world-wide influence is the testing of nuclear and atomic weapons, the danger of radioactive fallout resulting from the testing and the ultimate fear of a nuclear war. The Kremlin has understood this, and acted in a way to seize the initiative. Washington has not. It has acted with almost complete indifference to the political and moral consequences of its rigid affirmation of the policy of continued testing.

The statement which the State Department released within hours after the Russian announcement pointed to many of the obvious limitations in the Stalinist maneuver. What stamps the test to when he stated the day before the Krushchev move with the hallmark of Stalinist cynicism and manipulation of

public opinion is the fact that it takes place after the Russians have just completed an extensive series of tests themselves. Its immediate objective is to make the U.S. pay a terrible political price for carrying out its series of tests which are to be held this spring and summer.

But there was nothing, aside from the conservatism, if not stupidity, of the leadership in Washington which could have prevented the U.S. from putting the Kremlin in the same position just prior to the recent series of Russian tests.

The State Department and most of its editorialists throughout the country use a series of legalistic arguments about how the Russians have been bypassing the established U.N. procedures and the orderly processes of disarmament negotiations. But how many will remember or be moved by such arguments.

A further indication of manipulative nature of this maneuver is that the formal governmental text left a big door open by declaring that "if other powers possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons continue tests of these weapons, the U.S.S.R. will naturally be free to act in the question of the carrying out of atomic and hydrogen tests by the Soviet Union in accordance with the interests of its own security."

### LEGALISTIC ARGUMENTS

In Moscow as in Washington, there must have been sharp differences over the wisdom, from the military point of view, of such a step. Russia has only exploded about half as many bombs as the U.S.; and correspondingly there must be some lag in certain areas of knowledge. But the way in which the Kremlin put forth its proposal satisfies both the political and military necessities.

The rounds of tests usually takes place about a year apart. By announcing a cessation in this manner just after its own tests, and just before the U.S. series, a tremendous political victory is scored, no matter what the U.S. does. If the U.S. tests are carried out, as they will be; the Kremlin is freed, by the terms of its own announcement, to continue its tests if it wants. And to those who object about the continuation of tests, it will be able to say: it is not our fault. We wanted to stop them, but the U.S. refused to go along. And now we are forced to resume them for defensive purposes and the defense of the peace.

That this will be less effective than a clear-cut stand against any continuation of tests may be true. But it is at the same time many times more effective and popular than the U.S. position.

Aside from the general support that this will bring, the Russian action will have the effect of further bolstering the world Stalinist movement, and creating widespread illusions about the peaceful

(Continued on page 6)

**The Question Becomes More Urgent Every Day**

## What Program to Meet Recession?

By GORDON HASKELL

As the economic recession continues to grind along, its effects are murderous on the unemployed and their families, hard on workers who are on short hours and on small and marginal businessmen, and educational for economists, politicians, and the rest of the general public. With each passing week in which unemployment grows and no signs appear of the end of the decline once confidently predicted for March by the chief executive, there is a more urgent need for the formulation of a counter-recessionary program, and the rallying of popular support to it.

The program of the AFL-CIO for a tax cut from the bottom up, plus an extension of the duration and amount of unemployment compensation, plus a large expansion of public works is good enough as a starter. And if the imbalance in the economy which has brought on this recession turns out to be relatively superficial, such a program might well get the economic craft back on its keel, and stabilize it sufficiently for a run of another year or two at relatively high levels of economic activity and employment. Although the tax program would tend to adjust the general tax structure in a healthy manner, and the increased unemployment benefits would deepen the cushion

for the unemployed for the future, such a program alone could not really bring about a rectification of the built-in tendencies toward instability and decline which is the curse with which the capitalist system was stamped at its birth.

### CONFIDENCE

In discussing economic policy, we need concern ourselves only momentarily with the theories and ideas of the most conservative economists. As reflected in the thinking of the Eisenhower administration, this program has boiled down pretty much to talking about the need for confidence, and hoping that things will straighten out before the government is forced to take any measures which smack of "creeping socialism." As LABOR ACTION pointed out last January, even if no further measures were taken, the president's

budget would run into a big deficit given a declining economy, and hence would have a certain counter-recessionary effect. It is now estimated that even without a tax cut the deficit will amount to about five billion dollars, and with the kind of tax which has been urged most widely, it would rise to ten billion dollars. No pump-priming attempt of that magnitude was ever attempted during the '30s, but then in those days the whole economy was much smaller, and the dollar was worth much more.

Far more important, because they influence the thinking and the program of the liberals and the labor movement, are the views of an economist like Leon H. Keyserling, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under Truman and currently president of the Conference on Economic Progress. His analysis and program have been set forth at length in an article in the April issue of *The Progressive* entitled "The Road Back to Prosperity," which is well worth reading by anyone concerned with the politics and economics of the recession.

Keyserling's basic position is that what has been wrong with the economy in recent years has not been excessively fast

(Turn to last page)

## Army Still Claims Right to Censure Political Activities

# New Fight for GI Civil Liberties Begins

By MEL STACK

Now that the Supreme Court has ruled (in the Harmon and Abramowitz cases) that discharges from the Army must be based solely on the record of military service, you would expect the barometer of civil liberties in the United States to jump at least a few degrees. Yet only four days after the decision of the Supreme Court, the U. S. Army was again defending its right to surreptitiously issue less than honorable discharges.

This is the story in the new chapter of the Army's fight against civil liberties and the law of the land.

In June 1955, a young man was honorably separated from the Army and placed in the inactive reserve for six years. At the beginning of 1957 he filed the regular periodic Army questionnaire concerning his current political activities, a questionnaire which is given to all reserves. He informed the Army that he had joined the Independent Socialist League.

### ALLEGATIONS

A few months later he received a list of charges and allegations, which presumably would lead to a less than honorable discharge unless he cleared himself of them. The total sum and substance of the allegations was exactly what he had admitted in the questionnaire; that he had joined the ISL!

Then, towards the end of 1957, the Army mailed the young man two documents: (1) an application for a discharge under conditions less than honorable (which if he would kindly sign, the Army would gladly give him), and (2) a statement that if he refused to sign the application he would be permitted to appear before a Field Board of Inquiry, a Board which only has power to determine the facts, facts he had already voluntarily given the Army.

The Workers Defense League asked the Army to hold up its proceedings until the ISL case against the Attorney General's "subversive" listing was completed, or at least until the Supreme Court handed down its findings in the Harmon case.

The Army refused to wait. But the very next day the Supreme Court handed down its historic decision in the Harmon case, Harmon had to be granted an honorable discharge, all discharges to be based solely on a man's military record.

### A HARD JOB

You would imagine that at this point the Army would drop its case against the ISL reservist. In the light of the Harmon decision, how could the Army justify continuing an investigation into the civilian activities of this GI? By logic it wasn't easy.

But Colonel John L. Davids, president of the Army's Field Board of Inquiry, is not a man to be deterred by logical difficulties. In a letter to Albert Blumenthal, the WDL attorney who is defending the young man, Col. Davids wrote:

### Heaven and Hell

A Korean unionist died and started on his way to heaven, accompanied by an angel. On the way, he asked for a chance to look at hell, so that he could appreciate heaven more fully. The angel agreed.

On their brief visit below, they saw a long table laden with a sumptuous banquet, but the people seated around it were gaunt and emaciated—on the verge of starvation. Looking closely, they saw the reason. The chopsticks supplied all the guests were as long as their arms, making it impossible to eat.

Arriving in Heaven the Korean saw a similar table, with food and drink galore and the people well-fed, healthy and happy. As in hell, the people had chopsticks as long as their arms. But in heaven they were feeding each other.

From 'Let's be Human'

"You are informed that the ruling in the case of Harmon v. Brucker pertains only to characterization of the type of discharge based on pre-service activities, and leaves unaffected the right of the Army to separate members from the service as security risks based on all information, including pre-service conduct."

Thus the Army maintains that less than honorable discharge can be given on the basis of the totality of a man's career, on his pre-military, military, and post-military service. The Harmon case rules out grounds for discharge that are not based solely on the record of military service; the Army thereupon bases its discharges upon the totality of a man's life! You would think the Supreme Court had taught them a lesson in elementary civil liberties, but no—not only are they ingracious losers, they attempt to turn the rout into a victory for the witch-hunt!

### UNSUPPORTABLE

In the case of the ISLer, it seems fair to conclude that the man's service record was satisfactory, since the Army granted him an honorable separation in 1955. Now, even if we were to argue on the Army's grounds (that the Harmon case rules out pre-induction criteria alone), their case is unsupportable. By simple logic the Army must base this case on pre- and post-induction criteria, or on post-induction criteria alone. Either way it is an abridgment of citizen's rights.

Harry Fleishman (chairman of the Board of the Workers Defense League)

### ISL FUND DRIVE

# For the Future of the Socialist Movement!

By MAX SHACHTMAN

The socialist movement faces possibilities for growth and influence that it has not seen in years.

The blind alley into which the country has been driven by the foreign policy of the official administration, and the helplessness of the official opposition in proposing a serious alternative, is now apparent to millions who were smug or indifferent in the past. They are profoundly disturbed by the unarrested drift to atomic destruction, by what they regard as the failure—and what we socialists regard as the inability—of official American political leadership to offer effective leadership in the world struggle for peace. The socialist program for peace and progress, based on consistent and aggressive championing of the principles of democracy for all countries and peoples, can now command attention which it has been denied for two decades.

The blind alley into which the mighty labor movement has been led by the official trade-union leadership is also becoming apparent to countless workers, including many who left the "unrealistic" socialist movement. They are beginning to see, some of them for the second time, that capitalism, even the famous American capitalism, can adopt ever so many "built-in stabilizers" and still not rid itself from the built-in crises that are its very essence and from which millions are now suffering inhuman miseries with which capitalism accompanies its abundance. The voice of socialism now takes on a new confidence as the voice of the free-enterprisers speaks in confusion, apology and even panic.

In the schools and universities from which socialism has always drawn so much of its strength, fresh winds are beginning for the first time in years to blow away the deadening atmosphere of conformity, intimidation, indifference, cynicism, and all the other maladies that have stultified the intellectual and political development of a generation. There too the voice of socialism commands a new attention and interest. Not a single socialist who has been working or speaking among these young people in the past

and Carl Racklin (chairman of the WDL's Legal Committee) put it squarely in a letter to the N. Y. Times (March 3, 1958):

"... is the Army construing the Supreme Court's decision to mean that 'military service' includes the six years of inactive reserve? If the Army does so, are Americans prepared to accept eight years of Army surveillance over the lives of our young men during their most formative years?"

Remember that there are already 842,000 men in the inactive reserves today, with thousands more moving up into that category each year. All will have this possible burden, this stigma to be smeared with, as the Army wills.

### RESERVE STATUS

The inactive or Standby Reserve involves no training, no duty, no pay—it simply subjects the man to emergency call—thus these men are for all practical purposes private citizens—but all this the Army disregards. "Yet the Army policy subjects them to government security regulations with a severe penalty for non-compliance" (N. Y. Times, March 23, 1958).

But the Army is not yet completely immune from the pressures of civil society; it is aware that even the Justice Department wants it to review all the old discharges (as they argued before the Court in the Harmon case), it is aware that the Supreme Court holds the ultimate trump in this case. Dimly it perceives this is 1958, not 1953. Thus, increasingly they are forced to resort to outflanking maneuvers

on the discharge cases, instead of plunging forward with direct witchhunt tactics.

Even in the case of the ISLer they uncomfortably feel that a fiction of fairness must be maintained. And so they announce that a "special committee of Pentagon lawyers has just begun a study to determine whether a man's activities as an inactive Reservist should be continued to be considered as 'in-service behavior.'" If too much furor is created over the case, they have an accessible back door through which to escape.

But the damage the Army has done to the individuals involved in the discharge cases? For this there is no back door. For the hundreds who were ostracized, stigmatized, who lost their jobs and were blacklisted from the schools, who lost their GI benefits and even professions, for all those who received the less than honorable discharge there is no backdoor for the suffering already inflicted. And for the ISLer who voluntarily informed the Army he had joined the Independent Socialist League four and a half years after being inducted, two and a half years after being honorably separated from the Army, will he too be forced to suffer? He is a clinical psychologist: will his standing be jeopardized, his advancement irretrievably impaired, his studies curtailed?

The Harmon decision established the principle... discharges must be given solely on the record of service. All civil libertarians should give every possible assistance to the Workers Defense League in its continuing efforts to hold the Army to compliance with what is now the law of the land.

year has failed to notice the change and to be encouraged by it.

And corresponding to these favorable changes is the improvement in the prospects for the regroupment and reunification of all democratic socialists. To confront the big advantages we now have for the first time in years—advantages enormously accentuated by the complete disintegration of the Stalinist movement which warped and consumed so much of socialist progress in the past—to confront them with socialists scattered and separated by old and outlived divisions, would be a heavy blow.

We know as well as everyone else how difficult is the achievement of a reunion which would itself provide a new spur, new encouragement, and new advances. It is in order to concentrate the maximum energy upon utilizing the new opportunities to the utmost that we have worked and spoken in the past period for a bold and simple, and honorable and fruitful, unity of all democratic socialists. We are proud of the ideas and the labors in this field, the most urgent and important of all fields today, of the Independent Socialist League, the Young Socialist League, and of our clear, untiring voice, LABOR ACTION.

These ideas and labors are making their way with gratifying results. If they do not progress fast enough to suit

us all, or even if they do not result in a satisfying concretization of our present goal as early as desirable, that will not diminish their correctness or the need to pursue them further.

The effectiveness of our ideas and activities, in the field of urging a socialist foreign policy, in maintaining the voice of socialist clarity in the labor movement, in the fight for civil liberties and democracy in the country and in the trade unions, in the achievement of socialist unity and reorientation—that depends, no less now than ever before, upon our readers and friends. In the first place, it depends as always upon our loyal and stubborn band of members who have all these years resisted and scorned the great pressures to abandon the fight for the noblest human ideal.

To all of these we address again our annual appeal for financial aid. The very difficulties that capitalism creates among us by its crises and its madness, call for exceptional contributions to our fund drive to fortify the voice and hand of independent socialism.

Send in every dollar you can spare, and even a few that cannot easily be spared, and send it now!

### CONTRIBUTE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE

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

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE (Make checks out to Albert Gates)

### FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

	Quota	Paid	%
Cleveland .....	150	\$100	67
Bay Area .....	\$ 500	250	50
Chicago .....	2000	833	42
Seattle .....	150	60	40
New York .....	3800	1426	38
Pittsburgh .....	175	40	23
Buffalo .....	150	30	20
Newark .....	450	74	16
National Office .....	1150	95	9
Philadelphia .....	200	10	5
Los Angeles .....	650	0	0
Detroit .....	450	0	0
Oregon .....	50	0	0
Reading .....	50	0	0
Streator .....	25	0	0
Mass. ....	25	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>\$2818</b>	<b>20</b>

# Revival of Interest Among Young People Raises Question: What Next for Jews Under Khrushchev?

By PAUL MICHAELSON

Perhaps the most remarkable single fact that emerges from a study of present-day Jewry in the Soviet Union is the extent to which a Jewish revival has taken place among the youth.

Evidence from travellers, journalists and foreign delegations indicates that what is happening to young Jews in Russia can only adequately be described as a mass-conversion.

Religion plays only a small part in it. The dominating force is a new, sturdy pride in their nationality. Young men and girls in their early twenties, graduates of the Komsomol, who were born and educated under the Soviet regime, are eagerly studying their national history and tradition for the first time.

There are stories of groups meeting privately to learn Hebrew and Yiddish, of others who listen to the Israel radio, pass clandestine copies of Israeli newspapers from hand to hand, and look forward to the day when they will be free to settle in Israel.

This is, of course, partly a defensive attitude created by their resentment at official discrimination. It is also an inevitable reaction against local anti-Jewish prejudices and the widespread feeling of Jews that they are second-class citizens of the Soviet Union.

## THE BLACK YEARS

They have not forgotten what they call the "schwartze yoren," the black years, of 1948-1953, when Stalin subjected them to mass-arrest and butchered their intellectuals.

Indeed, for them Stalin will go down in history as the man who revived the Jewish problem in the Soviet Union to

This article is re-printed from the February 7 issue of Tribune, the independent labor weekly of London.

A couple of words of comment may be in order. First is to remind our readers that in the early days of the Russian Revolution Jews were given equal treatment with all others in Russia. That is, they had their own schools, theaters, and all other institutions required for a full cultural life. We know of no "Marxist dogma" which dictates any particular treatment of the Jews in Russia, unless that phrase be used as synonymous with Stalinist policy.

Finally, Paul Michaelson does not take up a question which appears to be of the greatest interest and importance. Is anti-Semitism in Russia a purely ideological question, or does it have roots in the social system of the country?—Ed.

a degree reminiscent of the worst days of the Tsarist regime.

But at least of equal importance in forming the attitude of young Jews has been the emergence of Israel. With an emotional fervor that alarmed the Kremlin, they welcomed the new State as a positive expression of future deliverance.

There was the famous occasion on October 16, 1948, when thousands of Jews

packed the streets round the Moscow Synagogue in a great spontaneous demonstration to greet the first Israeli Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Mrs. Golda Meirson.

And about the same time hundreds impetuously rushed to register for emigration to Israel.

The Soviet Government interpreted these developments as evidence that the Jews were unreliable elements, ready to give their loyalty to a country outside the Soviet frontiers. It opened a full-scale campaign against "Zionist imperialism" and treated any interest in Israel with exemplary severity.

Those unfortunates who had rashly applied for emigration permits were arrested and deported to remote prison camps.

Not only did the authorities frown on the "unhealthy" interest in Israel, they also decided that forcible suppression of separate Jewish preoccupations in any form was necessary.

It was in this period that they liquidated their own puppet Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, closed down on the Jewish press, publishing houses and theatres, and made "cosmopolitanism" (an almost exclusively Jewish aberration in their eyes) a heinous offense against the moral and physical integrity of the Soviet Union.

These measures did not "cure" the Jews of their nationalism. On the contrary, they drove it underground and reinforced it. People found ingenious ways to express their feelings.

Youngsters began to speak Yiddish, a language which they had almost forgotten or were learning for the first time. On important Jewish holidays, many

Jewish students were smitten with mysterious illnesses which kept them away from school.

Somebody would conveniently discover a birthday which coincided with Israel's Independence Day and so provide an opportunity for a quiet little celebration.

## CYNICAL PROPAGANDA

As Soviet support for Arab nationalism in the Middle East increasingly assumed an anti-Israel character and the Soviet press and radio were filled with accounts of Israel's so-called unscrupulous aggression against its neighbors, it became a matter of course for Russian Jews to dismiss these stories privately as cynical propaganda.

They were also keenly aware that such propaganda served to feed the latent anti-Semitism of many simple Russians who could not easily distinguish between the foreign Israeli and the Jew next door.

The problem is one that bedevils the Government, too, which is keenly aware that 40 years of Communism have failed to provide a solution.

Two recent events have served to rub this in. One emerged on the examination of the statistics of repatriation under the Russian-Polish agreement to allow Polish nationals in the Soviet Union to return to their motherland if they wished.

Of the first 4,500 Jews who were permitted to leave Russia for Poland, 4,000 immediately re-emigrated to Israel despite favorable inducements to persuade them to remain in the Communist world.

If this was any guide to the feelings of Russian Jews it indicated that the majority would act similarly given the opportunity. The other reminder that Jews are obstinately attached to Israel occurred last summer under the very noses of the leaders in the Kremlin.

It was the fantastic reception given to the Israeli delegation which attended the Youth Festival. Jews travelled from all parts of the Soviet Union to mob the young Israelis in the streets of Moscow, avid for news about Israel, begging for souvenirs and mementos, and, in the anonymity of the crowds, confessing that they were sustained by the hope that one day their Government would relent and permit them to settle in Israel.

## NO FUTURE

The plain fact is that many Jews have decided that they have no real future in the Soviet Union, and the more vigorous, independent and gifted they are, the more they incline to look towards Israel for a solution.

The dominant mood among them is discouragement in the face of present conditions. Better than anyone else they, who were educated in the principles of a Marxist society, know how badly the Soviet Union has failed in its pristine belief that it could show the capitalist world how to assimilate peacefully the Jewish problem out of existence.

Now it is conservatively estimated that if the Soviet Government announced that Jews would be permitted to emigrate to Israel, a half-million Jews would register immediately. And if these half-million were actually permitted to leave, another half-million, who had been held by caution, would rush to join them.

The Russian leaders have so far shown themselves to be less flexible in the face of this situation than one might have expected.

They still lean heavily on Marxist dogma and on the old Stalin formula minus the terror. Instead of seeking an effective policy, they deny that there is anything to formulate a policy about. At the same time they act inconsistently by trying to frighten the Jews away from Israel and by retaining the stigma of Jewish nationality while continuing to suppress its culture.

Alarmed by the ineffectiveness of these methods, they recently opened a full-scale campaign in the Soviet press and radio quoting alleged letters from Russian Jews who have settled in Israel, in which that country is depicted as a land of fear, famine and oppression.

This, of course, is too silly for words.

(Continued on page 6)

## "From Their Own Mouths . . ."

# Civil Liberties in Tito's Yugoslavia

The arrest and sentencing of Milovan Djilas for writing his book *The New Class* has aroused the indignation and protest of socialists and democrats all over the world. The recent trial of two old Yugoslav socialists has added fuel to the fire of this indignation. The Second International has protested formally, and petitions are being circulated demanding that Tito intervene personally in the matter.

How effective are such international protests? It is very difficult to say. But at least one Yugoslav reaction makes it clear that the international furor caused by these recent repressions has caused concern. This is the publication of an article on "Personal Freedoms and Rights of Citizens of Yugoslavia" in the January 16 issue of *Review of International Affairs*. The *Review* is published in English bi-weekly by the Federation for Yugoslav Journalists in Belgrade. It is a substantial 32-page magazine which contains articles of general interest by foreign writers as well as Yugoslavs. It is the Yugoslav government's chief English-language propaganda publication. And the article in question is written by none other than Dr. Josip Hrnecvic, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Yugoslavia.

A few passages from the article will indicate its character:

"Yugoslav socialist democracy guarantees its citizens all the freedoms and democratic rights laid down by the French Revolution, and which have become the permanent achievement of every democracy. These are: inviolability of personality, protection of marriage and the family, protection of personal and private property within the limits of the law, freedom of opinion and speech, right to elect and to be elected, and other democratic rights of citizens. This is completely comprehensible, as Yugoslavia forms an integral geographical part of Europe and its civilization."

After discussing the provisions for various forms of public health and other

social insurance measures, and the campaign against "bureaucratic self-determination" (that is, abuses), Hrnecvic continues:

"Yugoslav citizens enjoy all the democratic and political rights guaranteed by the constitution and the law. Besides this, they enjoy complete freedom of expression of opinion and of determination in all matters of political and social life. The whole system is based on the principle of social and workers' self-government and citizens have an almost daily opportunity of expressing their opinion and taking part in various communal and general matters. Yugoslav citizens also have a broad right of public criticism, and the authorities find no reason to restrict this criticism, but on the contrary, encourage it by their attitude and action. Criticism of an individual's political, social or other public activity, however sharp, is unpunished unless it constitutes an insult or other act liable to the Criminal Law."

Thus far, the description is pretty standard for a Communist type of regime. It is interesting that in the paragraph dealing with freedoms, freedom of the press is not mentioned. Freedom of political association and organization is also prominent by its absence. But it is clear that if this article is designed as an answer to the criticism from abroad, something more concrete will have to be said. Thus Hrnecvic continues directly after the last sentence quoted above:

"Subversive propaganda constitutes one of these criminal acts. Legally this is defined as propaganda which directly or implicitly calls for the overthrow or undermining of the existing state and social system. We may mention the fact that in 1956 only 187 persons were sentenced for such criminal acts. The average duration of sentences of deprivation of liberty for this act is about 18 months. If we take all this into account, it is obvious that such a small number of criminal acts cannot endanger the existing social system. These acts are, however, so harmful that

they must be suppressed according to the existing law. Otherwise, so-called political criminals have almost completely disappeared.

"Remarks and criticism from some foreign circles can be heard from time to time regarding the alleged restriction of free expression of opinion in Yugoslavia, the impossibility of forming more political parties, etc. These critics try to estimate the democratic value of our political system from the point of view of western bourgeois democracy. They refuse to realize that the Yugoslav democracy is fundamentally different from bourgeois democracy, and that the public and political life of our citizens is manifested in a completely different way. We do not need to react to this criticism by pointing to the methods that some regimes of western countries resort to in the suppression of various so-called 'anti-activities, or by pointing a finger at the persecutions to which, for example, the writer Arthur Miller and many other loyal citizens have been subjected because of their convictions. The only thing we can do in this respect is to indicate our socialist and democratic reality."

The rest of the article is then devoted to describing the legal safeguards for arrested persons, and the like. Much of it appears admirable, and quite in line with the legal provisions dealing with such matters in any democratic country. Not one line however describes the "completely different way" in which the political life of Yugoslav citizens is manifested.

In 1956 "only" 187 persons were sentenced for "directly or implicitly" propagandizing for the "overthrow or undermining" of the "existing state and social system" in Yugoslavia!

At the height of the witch-hunt in the United States, nothing near that number were ever convicted in one year, despite the difference in population of the two countries. The defense of civil liberties presented by the regime is actually its own severest indictment.

## A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

## On Socialist Consciousness

This article appears as part of the discussion "of all questions relating to the reconstruction and re-unification of the socialist movement in the United States" which was inaugurated in the columns of Labor Action in our February 10 issue. Articles submitted as part of this discussion must not exceed 1200 words.

While the LABOR ACTION staff is free to enter this discussion on the same basis as others, it will not be the policy of the editorial board to comment on or reply to articles, regardless of how much we may disagree with them.—Ed.

By WILLIAM STANLEY

In order to make a sane approach to the problem of the reconstruction of the socialist movement in the U. S. it is first necessary to determine the real reasons why the movement degenerated. In an article entitled "In the Spirit of Leninism" (LABOR ACTION Feb. 10, 1958) David Ross makes an attempt to come to grips with this problem.

Ross places the blame for the degeneration of the Russian Revolution and, consequently the world socialist movement, on Lenin and the Bolshevik Party. Lenin erred in two ways, he informs us. Firstly, his party contained an "authoritarian germ," it presided over an undemocratic one-party system which denied the people any control of, or participation in, the policies of the government. In the second place, we are told, Leninism failed to provide for a democratic national government to express the opinions of the people on vital issues. The Bolsheviks codified the neglect of formal national democracy and made a virtue of it.

## GIVES SOLUTION

Ross then gives as his solution a structural-institutional approach. This, he tells us, goes beyond any variety of Leninism.

In my opinion, Ross' organizational explanation fails to explain why the revolution degenerated. Original soviet democracy was far superior to any bourgeois democracy, it only subsequently eroded away due to various circumstances. Ross' organizational solution to the problem in no sense "goes beyond" Leninism.

Ross proposes national elections, national representation and a national assembly. He forgets, however, that the All-Russian Congress of Soviets performed these "ultra-democratic" functions. The Congress consisted of delegates representing various political parties. These delegates were elected from the local and regional soviets. No one can deny that the Bolsheviks and the

## Recession Blues?

Feeling gloomy about unemployment, poor job prospects, loss of overtime and other needed income? Take heart. Your worries are, in great part, due to the cold weather and the season of the year. At least, so says U. S. News and World Report (February 28), conservative businessmen's magazine.

"It is well right now to bear this in mind: Early months of any year are the year's poorest months, the least buoyant—often months of decline." After outlining the well-known reasons for seasonal slow-ups in business, the magazine's writer takes off:

"Then comes spring. Birds sing again. Grass gets green. Flowers bloom. Outdoor work opens up. People lose winter's pessimism and are hopeful.

"Auto sales begin to pick up. New Shopping revives. Taxpaying time fades houses attract more prospects. Jobs open gradually.

"The season just ahead is one in which people tend to be optimistic.

"Things are going to feel quite a bit better before long. . ."

The only thing lacking is a musical background of Mendelssohn's "Spring Song." Now, if you don't feel better the only thing which may help you, and the economy, is a nice, strong dose of "happy pills."

left S. R.'s had a majority in the soviets prior to the October Revolution. The soviet system makes possible the peaceful transference of power from one working class party to another.

If, then, the institutional factor was not the reason for the revolution's decline, what was? Firstly, the fact that Russia was a backward country, and in addition, the conditions produced by the civil war prevented the new order from bestowing any economic benefits on the people. The resultant demoralization and exhaustion of the workers and also the party rank-and-file made conditions ripe for careerism and bureaucratism in the state apparatus. Secondly, there is the fact that many of the important Bolsheviks such as Zinoviev, Stalin, Kamenev and Bukharin, instead of resisting the bureaucratic trend, to one degree or another consciously adapted themselves to it, fostered it, and became the beneficiaries of it. The Troika seized control of the state and intimidated the party membership. Lenin was preparing for a showdown, with Stalin when his death intervened. Trotsky, after Lenin's death, appealed to the ranks against the bureaucrats and fought vainly to restore party democracy. He failed. The cards were stacked against him. A new class was now ruling over the proletariat.

One of the most important factors leading to the decline of the Russian Revolution thus was the fact that key figures in the Bolshevik Party had not divested themselves of bourgeois psychology. People like Stalin, Molotov and Zinoviev, who vacillated before the revolution were the very ones who helped corrupt it afterwards. This was no accident and it was also no accident that countless Mensheviks who joined the Bolshevik Party after the revolution contributed greatly to its decline.

The corruption of the Social-Democratic movements over the years and the Stalinization of the Communist parties as well can be explained only by the same psychological factor—the bourgeois psychology of the leaders. To explain what has happened by citing objective conditions or alleged mistakes of party heads due to lack of experience, etc., is to explain nothing and to learn nothing. The fact is that there have been numerous revolutionary situations over the years but there have not been men of Lenin's calibre in a position to take advantage of them.

## CONSCIOUSNESS

A high level of socialist consciousness and revolutionary morality exists in only a very small number of individuals, yet such individuals are indispensable to the organization and guidance of the political party which is necessary to lead the working class to socialism. Unfortunately, socialism is not historically inevitable. Conditions do not produce great individuals and we do not have an unlimited amount of time to effect social transformation.

How then can the movement be reconstructed in the U.S.? Firstly by working for the establishment of an independent labor party in order to provide conditions for the development of a Leninist-type faction within it that has the right to propagandize inside and outside the party. To give up one's politics in order to establish or stay in a labor party (or a Social-Democratic party) would be a complete betrayal. It would be still worse to consider the labor or reform-socialist party itself as the vehicle for socialism. History shows that an amorphous, unorganized left-wing of such a party can only capitulate to the opportunism of the leadership.

We must, Secondly, maintain ideological clarity by refusing to melt into organizations with wrong ideas and bureaucratic leaderships. One must resist the pull toward either Washington or Moscow and preserve the Third Camp idea. Recently a group of socialists split from the YSL and went to the SWP. Most, but not all have accommodated their ideas to the SWP. The net result of their efforts will be, however, to build up a party that is both centrist and Stalinoid, cannot be changed, and will only mislead the workers.

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

## Changes Perspective On Gomulka Regime

To the Editors:

In an article published in LABOR ACTION for November 18, 1957, I appraised developments in Poland too darkly, and I believe that it is my duty to readers of the paper as well as to critical objectivity, to correct the impressions I may have given.

The article was written last August, under the impact of the Warsaw demonstrations against the dissolution of *Po Prostu*, and the brutality of the police in breaking them up.

The news from Poland since then, however, has not confirmed my dark forebodings. To be sure, the dissolution of *Po Prostu* was a defeat for the October movement, but it was more a product of Russian pressure on Warsaw than an expression of victorious reaction in Poland. Up to this moment, the role of Gomulka in these events has not been cleared up sufficiently. His majority in the Warsaw *poliburo* (top committee of the CP) is very uncertain, depending as it does on the support of the vacillating Cyrankiewicz and Rapacki, old Social Democrats. He is under the constant pressure and attack of the Natolin group, is surrounded by enemies and very uncertain friends, and he resists the powerful pressure of the Kremlin.

In spite of the dissolution of *Po Prostu*, probably a condition demanded by the Kremlin, the Polish masses have not yielded under the Stalinist pressure. The workers fight the old Stalinist methods in the factories, and the peasants defend their new-won advantages. The Polish masses are not defeated, they are very conscious of their October victory, and they firmly back Gomulka, in spite of the *Po Prostu* dissolution, because they understand that in the present world situation they cannot win a more democratic regime than that presided over by Gomulka.

The writers also firmly resist the Natolin and Russian pressure. They have repudiated the party's exponents, Kruczkowski and Putrament, and elected an old liberal Antinio Slonimski as their president. They have declared that the right to write freely is absolutely indispensable for writer's work. The writers' congress was a great defeat for Natolin.

Due to the firm position of the workers, peasants, writers and Catholics the party purge is not going according to the wishes of the Stalinists. Of course, it remains to be seen whether Gomulka will be able to eliminate the Stalinist majority in the Central Committee, and in the middle and

lower levels of party administration. But it is certain that though isolated in his own party he is backed by a majority of the Poles to this day, so that he represents a political force greater than that of Natolin and the Stalinist reaction.

As long as he preserves this support, he can resist the attacks of Natolin and the pressure of the Kremlin, as well as of French and German Stalinism. It appears that Gomulka is strengthening his regime despite all his enemies, the unfavorable circumstances, and his own weaknesses and mistakes.

The explanation of this fact lies in the objective validity of the October uprising. It represented not an isolated event, but the historical tendency of the defeat of the Stalinist tyranny; it is due also to the exhaustion, political and historical, of Stalinism in the twilight of its existence. It lies finally in the consciousness of the Polish masses, who won the great victory in October. They know it, and are disposed to defend it at all costs. For these masses, the rebellious Communist Gomulka, who spent over four years in a Stalinist prison in solitary confinement without receiving a single written word, is the symbol of their resistance and their victory over Stalinism.

Perhaps this explains the strange fact of the stability of "Gomulkaism," and will help American comrades to understand the Polish situation better than my previous article, published some months ago, now that the political situation in Poland has changed in favor of the masses.

January 25, 1958

A. Rudzienski

We regret very much that Comrade A. Rudzienski has found it necessary to "correct" the analysis of his previous article. Suffice it to say, at this point, that we profoundly disagree with the views expressed in his letter, and that nothing which has happened since last November, or since his letter was written, induces us to feel that the change in his opinion is justified. We particularly disagree with his contention that in the present world situation the Polish masses "cannot win a more democratic regime than that presided over by Gomulka." —Ed.

## YOU, DEAR READER

are in this too. The ISL Fund Drive needs your dollars. Send a contribution in now, even a small one, if that's all your poverty can afford. Make checks payable to Albert Gates.

## NINE DAY ANTI-TEST DRIVE SET

A nine-day campaign calling for immediate cessation of nuclear bomb tests and abolition of nuclear weapons will be launched Friday, April 11, by the New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the committee's chairman, Robert W. Gilmore, announced yesterday. Activities of the drive, to be known as "Appeal for Nuclear Sanity," will include public meetings in many parts of the city, circulation of petitions against H-bomb testing, delegations to members of Congress to urge their support, and visits to the United Nations representatives.

The Village Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy will join with the Lower East Side and Stuyvesant areas to hold a public rally at The Great Hall of Cooper Union, Third Ave. and E. 8th Street, April 18th at 8:30 P.M., as their part in the observance of the Appeal for Nuclear Sanity.

Speakers will include Norman Thomas, William Worthy Jr., reporter for *Afro-American*; Councilman Stanley Isaacs, New York City Council; Dr. Hugh Wolfe, chairman, Federation of American Scientists; and Dr. John Coleman Bennett, dean of faculty, Union Theological Seminary.

On Saturday, April 12th, the Committee will cooperate with the Women's In-

ternational League for Peace and Freedom in securing signatures on letters to Senators Irving Ives and Jacob K. Javits, asking their cooperation in the Anti-bomb Test Drive as a first step toward peace.

On Sunday, April 13th, 75 committee members will participate in a two-hour "Walk for Nuclear Sanity," calling on Villagers and asking them to support the committee's work by buying coupons and by attending the rally at Cooper Union on April 18th. Stewart Meacham, director of Labor-International Affairs Program of American Friends Service Committee and Chairman of the Lower East Side Sane Nuclear Policy Committee, will be chairman of the rally.

## LABOR ACTION • 18th YEAR

April 7, 1958

Vol. 22, No. 7

Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—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: GORDON HASKELL  
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON  
Business Manager: Mel Stack

Editorial Board:

GORDON HASKELL  
HERMAN BENSON

MAX MARTIN  
SAM BOTTONE

# Young Socialist CHALLENGE

April 7, 1958

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

TEN CENTS

## BROOKLYN COLLEGE

### "Kingsman" Editors Out Again

By M. S.

When you enter the campus of Brooklyn College, you are entering the domain of President Harry Gideonse, whose unwritten motto could very well read: "Youth Beware!" Especially youth who are interested in newspapers. . . .

For the second time within one year the Brooklyn College *Kingsman* editors are out of office. Last year President Gideonse suspended three editors; now four have resigned along with all faculty members of the Faculty-Student Committee on Publications (which is the first time in Brooklyn College history all faculty members resigned from such a committee).

#### PRESIDENTIAL DECREE

The issue, at first glance, seems to the outsider who has never entered Gideonse's domain not so important as to warrant the response. After all, it was only a presidential decree to publish two dissenting opinions, and another decree insisting upon a faculty member being present at all editorial board meetings. Wasn't it excessive for the editors and faculty to resign?

In the editors' statement of resignation they explain what was at stake. (1) President Gideonse decreed not only that an opposition editorial be printed, but an opposition sports column as well—and under the regular columnist's name to boot. (2) President Gideonse ordered that the faculty advisor be present at all editorial board meetings. The editors felt that a newspaper must have the right to publish—and accept responsibility for—any editorial without outside interference. That it must be allowed to publish what it considers newsworthy material.

The editors felt that the rulings not only contradicted the school regulations governing publications, but also denied *Kingsman* the attributes of a free press. Gideonse had gone over the heads of the Student-Faculty Committee and his procedure could lead to indirect censorship. Therefore the editors resigned.

#### HOW MANY GRIEVANCES?

How many grievances the editors, the students, the faculty must have had against Gideonse to take this action, jeopardizing school and professional careers! The simple fact of the response to this latest Gideonse decree indicates how many there must be. And isn't it often the case with authoritarianism that the revolt comes with the relatively minor issue, with the last unbearable ounce of repression that crumples the edifice, under which a decent person can no longer live? If you do not believe it, go visit Gideonse's domain yourself. Speak to the faculty (privately) and to the students.

If you do not believe what Gideonse has done to the students at Brooklyn College, listen to the young editors themselves.

• Paul Ringe, editor-in-chief, in his farewell column (*Kingsman*, March 18):

I was a lonely bulletin board reader

#### New York Readers . . .

Don't miss

### THE SPANISH EARTH

Spanish Civil War Film Classic

Gen. Jose Asension

Machinists Hall, 7 East 15 St.

Saturday 8 P.M. April 12

auspices

Young Peoples Socialist League  
303 Fourth Ave., N.Y.C.

before I joined *Kingsman*. I guess I was the objective student. The objective student is one who is not aware of the vagaries, ramifications and small-type-at-the-bottom-of-the-contract kind of set-up at Brooklyn College. The subjective student is one who knows. He is also one who is branded emotional, hot-headed, biased, ad nauseam. But he knows. In a short time, I became sports editor and then editor-in-chief. And now I know. . . .

. . . I am so confused and my thoughts so disjointed and amorphous. The sorrow, fear, hate, indecision—every emotion I have felt during this witchhunt—is beyond expression now. . . .

• Serena Turan, associate editor:

Before I came to Brooklyn, I imagined college as "the ivory tower," "the pure university," divorced from the scum of the outside world. But I have learned differently.

I learned that freedom of the press is as bad as the race for assistant vice-president on Madison Avenue.

I learned that freedom of the press is taught in classrooms only to be untaught in the President's office.

. . . I'm sorry it had to end this way but there are some things that one student newspaper just can't fight all alone. So this is it—this is my farewell.

• Herbert Schlagman, associate editor:

And this week, President Gideonse's new rules tore apart everything I have worked for. . . .

• Gerald Perkus, associate editor:

*Kingsman* has meant something far deeper than words to me for almost three years. It is not easy to give it up. But for me, conscience must be stronger than sentiment. I can only regret that the newspaper has been forced into such a position as to make my decision the only one I can honestly make.

• Ruth Siegel, ex-feature editor, staff member (who resigned with the editors):

This farewell is the last one for the road and it's not one to bolster my own morale, that's for sure. It is a last, almost impotent, cry against the ultimate weapon of suspension that the Administration holds.

. . . I leave with the deepest sorrow for the tragedy of those who follow . . . there's no promise that you'll ever see the sun again.

The faculty members did not explain their resignation. That is in the nature of being a member of the faculty at Brooklyn College; the announcement came from Gideonse's office. It would have been very interesting to see a free expression of what they think.

But unfortunately, freedom is only a word in Gideonse's domain.

#### THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

## Students from N. Y. Schools Form Committee for Sane Nuclear Policy

Students representing over 100 colleges and high schools in the metropolitan area have formed a New York City Students' Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

Calling on students and young people to exercise "their privilege and responsibility as thinking individuals to speak out," the Committee specifically states the anxieties caused by testing nuclear weapons and the genuine need for a meaningful peace.

"The Committee feels that because of their concern over the threat of nuclear war that would be catastrophic to all humanity, and over the possible dangers of radio-active fall out, students everywhere will want to speak out against continued testing of nuclear weapons and work in their own way towards the goal of world peace."

By adopting the main program of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy which calls for immediate cessation of tests through the UN, the student group felt that a simple, direct and broadbased appeal was the best way to attract as many students as possible to the overwhelming crisis society faces in the nuclear age—the possibility of slow mutilation and death through fallout or an explosive war that would mean the end of civilization.

#### TIMES AD

The protest over nuclear weapons testing started officially with the National Committee's New York *Times* ad which was subsequently reprinted in newspapers around the country. The ad, signed by many prominent political and civic leaders, including Norman Thomas, Eleanor Roosevelt and Norman Cousins, received such an unexpectedly enthusiastic response from individuals and groups throughout the nation, that the Committee is still trying to catch up with its initial inquiries on "what can we do." Many local groups have been formed and are conducting large public protest meetings, discussion groups, letter-writing and petition campaigns to the President, Congressmen, etc.

As the pressure mounts during the few weeks preceding the target date for the 1958 series of nuclear tests taking place in the Pacific in May, the Committee's work becomes more dramatic than ever. It is hoped by many that through public pressure the American government will call off its tests this spring. It would seem that in the light of the Russian's propaganda victory so far in announcing unilateral cessation of testing, that the American government would want to gain back some of its already weakened prestige, by

calling the Russian's bluff. But Secretary of State Dulles has already announced in no uncertain terms that the U.S. will go ahead with the May series of tests as scheduled.

Though the American reaction to the whole question of nuclear testing and manufacture of weapons has been sluggish until now, the possibilities of arousing sentiment of great numbers of people is unlimited. The range of views of those now participating is extremely diverse in nature, and includes many socialists, pacifists, liberals, Church leaders, journalists, and those citizens who are struck by the urgency of the crisis who have no previous political or social interests.

#### CANNOT LIE DORMANT

The issue of nuclear war and how to prevent it is one that cannot for long lie dormant in the public conscience and the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, along with other special activities groups such as "The Walk for Peace Movement" which held a "demonstration march" to the UN last Friday are the real beginnings of an organized movement towards some kind of nuclear weapons ban, which could spread into a national discussion of all aspects of the government's military and foreign policy.

Reflecting largely the adult protest campaign, the NY Student Committee which coordinates and services campus groups already formed and those in the process of being chartered, is planning a city-wide Student Institute to be held during the first few weeks of May on the question of peace and how it can best be achieved. Along with discussion on nuclear weapons test banning; such topics as general disarmament; peaceful uses of atomic energy; social, political and economic factors involved with attaining a stable peace and the role of youth in today's world are slated for the agenda.

The Student Committee is also sponsoring joint activities with local groups in New York during the "Appeal for Nuclear Sanity Week" such as a letter-writing campaign to Senator Ives and Javits to support Senator Humphrey's February 4 statement calling for an agreement between nuclear powers for suspension of tests.

#### NATIONAL GROUP

Hoping to enlarge the base of student participation and also to expand it to a nation-wide movement, the NY committee has set up a national subcommittee which is contacting students from many campuses outside of New York City to urge them to initiate SANE groups in their areas. A national conference of student representatives is being considered for the fall semester activities if response to the SANE campaign is good.

It is clear that all youths who are conscious of the world crisis today and who want to do their share to avert a cataclysmic war should join those forces who are working towards achieving peace. Students, whether living in New York City or in California can help form SANE groups on their campus which could well result in a national student protest movement that could reach the millions of youth untouched so far.

#### YSL FORUM • NEW YORK

### STYLES OF REVOLT

Sunday April 13

Why Are The Young Men Angry?

Speaker: Jules Sorel

Sunday April 20

The Myth of the Happy Worker

Speaker: Sam Bottone

Sunday April 27

Society and Its Discontents

Speaker: Manny Ghent

114 West 14th Street Third Floor

7:30 P.M.

Contribution: 25c

Refreshments

### Young Socialist CHALLENGE

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

# Moscow Nuclear Test Policy—

(Continued from page 1)

nature of Russia's intentions and the general progressive character of that society despite all of its deformations and aberrations.

It is worth while to remember that the Communist Parties and Stalinoids of various hues were generally opposed to any unilateral action on disarmament or testing. Their demands were for negotiations, not for unilateral action by the U.S. because it would put Russia on the spot. Their line was that we must meet the Russians half way. Now they will be singing a different tune.

## FULL RETREAT

Another consequence is that it makes more certain than ever before that the U.S. and its allies will be maneuvered into a summit meeting on substantially Moscow's terms. This finally nails down the full retreat, if not rout, of Washington's attempt to force the Kremlin to discuss the broader political issues such as Germany and East Europe at the now inevitable summit meeting.

It makes more difficult, if not impossible, to sustain the reasonableness of the State Department position that there be prior diplomatic meetings to discuss substantial questions before the heads of state meet at the summit. Khrushchev and the now deposed Bulganin maintained in their barrage of notes, letters and aide memos that such preliminary meetings were unnecessary and only served to delay, if not postpone, such a meeting. This was true enough if the assumption is that such a meeting has to take place on Moscow's terms.

Now the Kremlin can redouble the pressure for its kind of meeting. Yesterday Dulles demanded an indication that such a meeting can reach a fruitful agreement. Today, Khrushchev can say: here's the proof. Yesterday Dulles demanded deeds not words; today Khrushchev can say to the world: here are our deeds, now you live up to your words.

The foreign policy of the U.S. under the stewardship of Dulles with ample bipartisan support has been outmaneuvered at every turn and juncture by the dictators of the Kremlin. Even socialists who oppose this foreign policy, recognize that there is an element of national humiliation in this situation. How many more defeats will the U.S. have to experience before there is an awakening of the American people to the dead end into which the bipartisan foreign policy has led?

While the grounds for optimism are not excessive there are enough indications that a stirring is in process. One of the indications is that nobody is satisfied with the present situation. Disillusionment and disenchantment is setting in on many levels. On every side, from supporters and critics, there is the uneasy awareness that something must be basically wrong, that it extends far deeper than the peculiarities of John Foster Dulles who up to now has borne, not too unjustly, the major brunt of criticism. Perhaps these present developments will serve as a catalyst for a national reassessment of foreign policy. Certainly its is long overdue.

The most apparent reason for the developing uneasiness is the relative postures of the U.S. and Russia. Russia is always on the offensive, the U.S. on the defensive; Russia is making proposals and demands, the U.S. is always a step behind trying as best it can to counter the effect. Even at those times when the State Department outlines what seems to be a reasonable argument full of ample legal justification for its position, the arguments seem to fall on deaf ears, or convince only the most reactionary rulers in the so-called free world.

**BIPARTISANSHIP**

This state of affairs has been enough to convince most observers that whatever the degree of political ineptitude which characterizes the secretary of state, there are limits to what it can accomplish or undo. The next step is to recognize that the responsibility is bipartisan, that both the Democrats and Republicans have been pursuing essentially the same foreign policy whatever the nuances of difference.

## BIPARTISANSHIP

erhaps more than a straw in the wind is a combined review by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. of Dean Acheson's book *Power and Diplomacy* and George Kennan's *Russia, the Atom and the West* which appeared in the N.Y. Post for March 2. The interesting and important point which Schlesinger emphasizes is the similarity between Dulles and Acheson:

"Mr. Acheson's belief is that the solution [to the problems posed by today's situation] is to return to the policies which he expounded with such ability when he was secretary of state—policies designed to establish a secure non-Communist world system through the building of military and economic strength. . . .

"Though Mr. Acheson obviously has little use for the Dulles technique, he has paradoxically written by far the best defense of the substance of the Dulles foreign policy.

**DULLES MINUS N. V. PEALE**

"In a brilliant description of the Dulles method, Mr. Acheson expresses his contempt for "sanctimonious self-righteousness which beclouds the dangers and opportunities of our time with an unctuous film." But, all the same "Power and Diplomacy" is, so to speak, Dulles minus Norman Vincent Peale."

"Mr. Acheson, like Mr. Dulles, sees behind a nation's foreign policy only the firepower of its armies and the statistics of its industrial production. His perspective is of an unending race, in which each new contestant forever climbs new plateaus of military and economic strength.

"By his own argument, resolution will never be possible, because one side is always going to be behind the other. 'It is my conviction,' Mr. Acheson thus writes, 'that the only agreements which are possible now would be disadvantageous to us' because we have fallen behind. But if we should regain our lead, would not agreements then seem equally disadvantageous to the Russians? And how does humanity escape this trap?"

**SIDNEY HOOK**

Even though in this review Schlesinger does not explicitly endorse Kennan's proposal for disengagement from Germany, it is encouraging that he has brought forth in explicit fashion the basic military, and therefore conservative orientation, of U.S. foreign policy.

Another indication of the breaking away from old rigidities has been the endorsement Sidney Hook gave to the idea of disengagement in which while not in complete agreement with Kennan, he declared himself to be in the same quarter of the compass with Kennan and the British Labor Party on this question.

In a symposium on foreign policy sponsored by the Tamiment Institute on February 26 in N.Y.C., Hook related a meeting in Paris the previous month at which

he was going to speak in opposition to disengagement. After listening to Raymond Aron, he got up and announced that he was convinced. For Hook the key question was how to get the Russians off the backs of the desperate East European peoples. His answer said in effect that the policy followed for the past decade cannot do it, and therefore the U.S., under proper safeguards, has to be prepared to withdraw its troops from Europe.

Two examples do not make a tendency or a movement since other leading intellectuals could be cited in opposition. But it is a hopeful sign nevertheless that two leading intellectuals in and around the liberal and labor movement have taken these steps.

In many assessment of the reasons for the present state of affairs, one is bound to run head on into the central idea that anchors U.S. policy in its rigidities and military bias: that the U.S. must lead in foreign policy from a position of military strength. To reject this idea does not mean, of course, that we have to simply invert the formula. What is needed, rather, is the formulation of and action upon a democratic foreign policy (See Labor Action for January 27). In the context of such a policy military strength would find its natural place.

**THE WHOLE POINT**

That is the whole point. If any real progress is to be made toward peace and increased freedom, democracy, and economic wellbeing on a world scale, the United States must find a positive basis for its foreign policy. It must be in a position to make proposals which will appeal to the enlightened self-interest and kindle the imagination of mankind. Instead of covering in fear of top-level negotiations ("we would lose our shirts in the kind of meeting the Russians are proposing," Dulles), such a positive policy would make the United States eager to gain for itself the dramatic advantages of making its proposals at the summit.

The Russian announcement of their decision to suspend nuclear tests is an excellent example of political warfare at its best. The first step the American government should be forced to take by popular demand is to announce a decision to follow suite. As a matter of fact, the only way in which this Russian victory could be neutralized and even reversed would be for the United States to announce that it is suspending all tests for at least a decade, regardless of what anyone else does. It could be announced that this is being done both to hold the arms race and to give scientists a better chance to find out just what effect the radioactive materials already scattered through the atmosphere will have on life on our planet.

That would be a real political victory for the United States. And even more important, it would be a real victory for all of mankind.

## Not in the Headlines

(Continued from page 1)

nate candidates in the primary has become an essential attribute of the right of suffrage."

Maintaining that the California law goes beyond legitimate state regulations to maintain an efficient election system, the jurist said, the effect of the law is the exclusion of new political parties, not because of a paramount state interest, but because they lack the funds to enable them to qualify.

—From ACLU Bulletin

## Union Klansmen

A segregationist labor union has found that Ku Klux Klan meetings are not the ideal environment for fighting the AFL-CIO Textile Workers Union. When William Somersett, organizer of the "whites only" United Southern Employees Association, told a meeting of the Klan Klavern in Fort Mill, S. C., that any Klansman was automatically a member of USEA and could be sent through an AFL-CIO picket line, the announcement was met by a loud chorus of boos and a walkout of most of the masked Klansmen, who were themselves textile workers.

From ACLU Bulletin

## Horrors of Short Week

When it seemed as if the UAW would begin the fight for shorter hours, the General Electric Company devoted an issue of its magazine *The G-E Lamp-maker*, a publication issued at company expense solely for the edification of its employees, to warn readers of horrible things that would happen if they had a three-day weekend. The country would go swiftly to the dogs; prices would

soar until milk became 80 cents a quart and bread 75 a loaf; there would be a labor shortage; leisure would be accompanied by fewer comforts, no luxuries and a lower standard of living; profits would go down; bankruptcies would rise. Besides, workers don't want shorter hours; they'd simply look for an extra job anyhow. Conclusion: "Wouldn't it be simpler now just to keep a 40-hour week at 40 hours pay—and let the 32-hour week come by evolution rather than revolution."

Presumably, G-E would reconcile itself to "evolving" into the national catastrophe of a shorter week (so long as it never became necessary to reduce hours!) It is the typical horse-and-buggy economics of the businessman's mind. Sad to say, these arguments are sometimes heard inside the labor movement itself.

## New York Independent Socialist Forum

Friday, April 11  
RE-EXAMINATION  
of the  
SOCIALIST MOVEMENT  
A Symposium:

Herman Benson, Assoc. Editor, LA  
Julius Falk, Managing Editor, NI  
J. Jacobi

Friday, April 18  
THE ITU: A CASE STUDY  
IN TRADE UNION DEMOCRACY

Speaker: Emanuel Geltman  
Editorial Board, DISSENT

8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

## What Next for Jews?—

(Continued from page 3)

Directed as it is to Russians Jews it can only serve to convince them that their leaders are blindly prejudiced against the Jewish State.

However, there are now grounds for the belief that a new approach to the whole situation may yet be made.

## DISCREDITS REGIME

Intelligent Russians, some of them in the governmental hierarchy, believe that the paradox posed by Soviet Jewry must be solved in the interest of Russia's prestige in the West.

They know that any degree of persecution of Jews serves to discredit a regime, particularly in the eyes of Socialists. And they have not remained indifferent to the catastrophic effects of their treatment of Jews in the Communist Parties in America, Britain and France.

But although the existence of this group of opinion is known, no one yet seems in a position to say whether they have sufficient influence to command the ear of Khrushchev.

Many experts incline to lay responsibility for the existing policy on Suslov, a member of the Soviet Presidium and an expert on the nationality question.

In this matter, at least, Suslov is dogmatic to the degree of obstinacy. If so, it can only be a matter of time before he will be held responsible for its failure.

## NEW LINE

Should the Soviet Union wish to look for a new line that will immediately ease this critical internal problem and offer a ready solution, it is there at hand. They should give Jews a free choice of the following alternatives: (1) Repatriation to Israel; (2) total assimilation into the resident population of whichever republic they now live in; (3) the right to enjoy a full Jewish cultural life in the Soviet Union, with their own theatres, schools and religious institutions, a privilege accorded to all other Soviet nationalities.

It would mean jettisoning Stalin's nationality formula, but it would be worth it.

# The "Monthly Review"

## The Evolution of a Tendency

By SAM BOTTONE

It is now two years since the Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist Party when Khrushchev made his famous speech on the crimes of Stalin. The train of events, culminating in the uprising of the Hungarian people against Russian domination, delivered what should have been a mortal blow to Communism.

If it has not happened it has been due less to the inherent viability of Communist ideology than to the political incapacities of capitalist ideology and the weakness of independent working class politics. There is no disputing that the Kremlin has been able to recoup its set-back in the world-wide ideological and political struggle through a series of facile maneuvers in foreign policy and through the launching of the Sputniks. Once again it has been able to operate against a veritable vacuum in the political opposition.

But the moral crisis in the Communist movements in many countries is far from over. In the U.S., the Communist Party has been reduced to the level of an isolated and discredited political sect. The result has been to drive thousands out of the Communist Party and to impell them to re-thinking and re-evaluate many of the easy assumptions they held in the past. How many will successfully develop a democratic socialist ideology is still undetermined since the process is still going on.

Among the groups which we have in the past characterized as "independent Stalinist," pro-Communist or "Stalinoid,"

### Test Came With Hungarian Revolution

But even then an identity could not be made among the journals and often among the adherents of any particular one. The *National Guardian* was closest to the fairy tales about the idyllic life in the "socialist countries" which were usually associated with the *Daily Worker*; the *Monthly Review* provided the hard rock intellectual support for the totalitarian regimes by openly acknowledging the dictatorial nature of the regimes and the lack of democracy; while the *American Socialist* specialised in playing down as much as possible the politics, insofar as they relate to Stalinism, of the magazine's guiding spirits.

The test of the extent of the pro-Communism or of the commitment to democracy of these publications came with the Hungarian Revolution. By all odds the *American Socialist* was the only one to adopt an unambiguous position. The editors presented a clear-cut and vigorous defense of the Hungarian Revolution against all sorts of pro-Stalinist apologies.

While it is now more than a year since the suppression of Hungarian freedom, the crisis of these groupings remains: pro-Communist or pro-democratic socialist. Of the three, only the *National Guardian* has attempted to move back to the pro-Communism of the past. Among adherents or editors of the *Monthly Review* and the *American Socialist* on the other hand, there have been stirrings at a re-evaluation of the relationship between democracy and socialism.

It is not only a question of a ceremonial article extolling the desirability of democracy, or the "inevitability" of democracy once socialism is achieved. For these are at best meaningless, and such

### The "Monthly Review" Begins to Change

Using this criterion, it is worth while to look at the development which has taken place in the *Monthly Review* in the past several months.

Writing in the October 1957 issue, the editors—Paul Sweezy and Leo Huberman—speculated on the future course in Russia. In this statement, there is an expression of important elements of the Deutcherite theory of reform from above.

the process has been more visible since most of these groupings have been centered around publications. In the past, whatever differences in emphasis and in point of origin there has been, it was justified to group such tendencies around the *Monthly Review*, the *American Socialist* and the *National Guardian* together. All were pro-Communist, although independent of the Communist Party. Consequently they reserved for themselves the right to criticize one or another aspect of the regimes in the "socialist" one third of the world.

They were also differentiated from the CP in that they did not justify their politics in terms of illusions about the extent of democracy in Russia. Many of the group around these publications knew the nature of the totalitarian regimes in the lands where they were "building socialism." Regrettable as they found these "defects" and "shortcomings," they did not stand in the way of their pro-Communist ideology. Rather they justified and apologized their support for a brutal totalitarianism in the name of "building socialism." Thus, for the most part, they became an important appendage supporting Stalinism, both ideologically and politically.

ritualistic articles have been written in the past. The key is this: the extent to which democracy becomes the real content of their conception of socialism, and a guide to their politics.

But there is more to it than this. There is also the question of how this democracy is to be achieved. The pro-Communists of the past have tended to emphasize that it could come as a sort of automatic by-product of growing industrialization. Consequently they extolled and praised the efforts of Stalinist industrialization even though it was accompanied by the destruction of democracy and a brutal exploitation of the people. In general this point of view has been most closely associated with Isaac Deutcher, and in recent years this has formed the bed rock of a pernicious pro-Stalinist orientation.

Now, the industrial achievement of Russia is a matter of record, and in fact it is often point to as if it constituted a justification or vindication of this point of view. But where is the democracy? It is not sufficient to point to the loosening up of the most brutal exorcences of Stalin's rule; but to show that a genuine process of transferring political control to the people is taking place. It is at this point that the Deutcherites stub their toes for there is precious little evidence to back them up.

The test of the commitment to the democratic ideal has to be measured by either a willingness to rest upon the crude economic determinism that democracy will inevitably develop as industrialization proceeds, or by the demand for positive, verifiable proof that a real democratization is taking place, and by the willingness to draw the appropriate political conclusions.

Continuing the analysis they made following the wave of illusions resulting from the Twentieth Congress they say: "We believe that in a planned economy with no ruling class there is a strong tendency for an enlightened public opinion, representing the common interests of all groups and strata, to develop. And we believe that this enlightened public opinion can become the dominant stabilizing force

in society, mediating group conflicts and obviating the necessity for forcible repression." [The italics are in the original and they represent a hedge from the economic deterministic rule of thumb. S. B.]

"Are there any signs that recent developments in the Soviet Union have been moving toward the fulfillment of these conditions. Unfortunately not many. . . .

"Nor is there any evidence from any other source, so far as we are aware, that Khrushchev has abandoned the basic Stalinist view of the appropriate relation between the government and people. The theory is that the party is one with the people and necessarily reflects public opinion accurately and faithfully, (this theory was forcefully stated by Khrushchev in his famous CBS television interview last June), but the whole history of the Soviet Union shows that this theory bears about the same relation to the facts as the doctrine of the divine rights of kings. Actually, it is merely an ideological cover for a policy of government tutelage over the people."

Further on, the editorial discusses what was at the time, their conception of the reform of the regime. The Khrushchev regime after making the first steps toward reform—abolition of GPU

### The Problem of Socialism and Democracy

After briefly tipping their hats to the economic achievements of the past forty years, Sweezy and Huberman approach the important problem that Stalinism poses for the socialist movement.

"... if the triumph of economic planning were the inevitable prelude and guarantee of a good society to come, then we could say with gratitude in our hearts that this fortieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution marks the beginning of the truly human phase of mankind's evolution. Unfortunately, there are no such inevitabilities and guarantees in history, and what once looked like a strong probability now seems more doubtful and problematical."

"... the Soviet Union is a dictatorship, but not the dictatorship of the proletariat over the old exploiting classes of Marxian theory. Forty years after the Revolution, these classes have disappeared, and the proletariat obviously has no control over the government. The dictatorship is that of the Party over the people. . . ."

"This sad state of affairs will hardly be challenged by any serious student of Soviet affairs. What has been and will continue to be debated by well informed persons is the long-run implications of these facts. Is the dictatorship merely the other side of the centralized planning coin? Or is it, from a socialist standpoint, an aberration stemming from the Russian past and the ever-present threat and repeated actuality of foreign intervention?"

"As readers of MR know, we have consistently answered no to the first of these questions, and yes to the second. We do not believe that dictatorship and planning are Siamese twins, we do believe that the historical setting of the world's first socialist revolution inevitably gave rise to a ruthless dictatorship.

### Sweezy Takes a Long Step Forward

Shortly after this was written Sweezy went to Russia to attend the celebrations of the fortieth anniversary. Upon returning, he reported on his trip at a meeting in New York. His speech was reprinted in the February 1958 issue. In it he continues the line of development argued in the two cited articles, buttressed by his first-hand observations. But, most important of all, Sweezy appears to have "chucked the voluntary democratization theory completely."

"If one looks for what I would call socialist ideals, a socialist ethic, socialist motivation in the Soviet Union today, forty years after the world's first socialist revolution, one finds disappointingly little.

terror—has to democratize its rule.

"The terror was an integral part of the system; it kept the other parts in balance; without it the system is visibly beginning to fall apart. . . . Either some comparable authoritarian force will have to step in to take its place, or else the system will have to be overhauled to embody a new relation between the government and people. Events are driving along the first path; its destination is a military regime.

"The big question is whether the civilian leadership of the Communist Party will realize what is happening in time and will take steps to democratize its own rule. If it does so, it will not be out of any abstract love of democracy, but from elementary motives of self-defense. Therein, paradoxical as it may sound, lies the best hope for democracy in the Soviet Union."

Significantly enough, the filler at the end of the editorial is a long quote from Rosa Luxemburg's pamphlet, *The Russian Revolution*, pointing out the consequence of the suppression of political life and freedom in Russia.

The October statement is more or less a restatement of the Deutcherite thesis of reform from above. However it is sharper in the tone in which it characterizes the Kremlin regime.

In the next issue the editors return again to discuss the same problem in an editorial or review of the month on the fortieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution. The content of the *Monthly Review* statement has to be contrasted with the cool apologetics written by Isaac Deutcher on the same subject which first appeared in the *New Statesman and Nation* and were reprinted in the *American Socialist*.

"And in the past we have always tended to draw the conclusion that when the conditions which produced the dictatorship—economic backwardness and international insecurity had been overcome, the Soviet regime would, in some unspecified manner, democratize itself. The great question now is: will it, and how?"

"This question is no longer a purely theoretical one. The conditions which produced the dictatorship have been overcome. The Soviet Union is no longer a backward country and is rapidly overtaking the most advanced. Internationally, it is as secure as any nation in the world. Our theory is being put to the crucial test of practice. And so far—let us face it frankly—there is precious little evidence to confirm it."

"The time may not yet have come to chuck the voluntary democratization theory completely, but at any rate it is not too soon to be thinking in terms of alternative theories. And the most plausible would seem to be that forty years is too long for a dictatorship to remain temporary.

"The Soviet Communist Party has gotten used to its power and privileges; tenacious habits of mind have been acquired; a thoroughly anti-democratic ideology (the metaphysical doctrine of the unity between party and people) has had time to set. . . . In the meantime we had better get busy and study the implications of an entrenched dictatorship operating within the enormously dynamic framework of a socialist economy."

The long sections have been quoted in order to get a better picture of this development. There is the explicit questioning of the doctrine of the voluntary, inevitable democratization, although at this point it is not yet abandoned.

The trends I repeat, seem to be in another direction.

"I frankly do not understand all the reasons for this, still less all the implications. . . . The alienation between the leadership and the people is a terrible thing; as long as it exists it will block the development of meliorative trends which might otherwise operate and eventually transform the situation for the better.

"A society in which 'they' run the show and 'we' make the best we can of it will never achieve the goals of human brotherhood and solidarity. A society which muzzles its artists and writers

(Turn to last page)

# Program to Meet Recession

(Continued from page 1)

growth, too high wages, or too much government spending, but just the reverse. Despite the boom, the economy has been growing much too slowly in almost all vital respects, in his opinion, and specially in consumer incomes. "Inadequate wages for those employed, by affecting consumer purchasing power, have caused unemployment," he states. "It also appears," he writes at another point in his article, "that total wages and salaries in recent years have not grown nearly rapidly enough to consume the product of full employment and full production at actual price levels. . . . It appears, too, that money wage rates have advanced much too slowly relative to prices, and that real wage rates in general have advanced much too slowly relative to the need for consumption, and relative to the actual real volume of profits and investment, regardless of whether it is to the need for consumption, and relative productivity."

### DETAILED ANALYSIS

Much detailed analysis and many figures are adduced to demonstrate this point. In brief, Keyserling is dead set against the contention, in any of its various versions, that high wages are responsible for the rise in prices, or that wages have outrun productivity, and hence created an imbalance in the economy. He demonstrates the thesis that if the economy as a whole had grown at a reasonable rate since the Korean war, every sector, and every reasonable social as well as economic goal, and even some which may not appear to all quite so reasonable such as corporate profits and military expenditures, could have been expanded far beyond what has actually happened.

The goal of policy now, he contends, should not be simply to overcome the unemployment of the recession, but rather to aim by 1960 at "a level of total national production or economic activity about 81 billion dollars above the 1957 level, measured in uniform 1956 dollars. If we move year by year toward these practical goals, we shall have the means to fulfill amply all of our responsibilities at home and abroad."

But how is such a desirable goal to be achieved, and where are we to start? Keyserling does not propose that the government assume sole responsibility for such a drastic change in the direction of the economy. He insists that the businessmen who control the policies of their corporations must take a major part in the change, and he seeks to persuade them that this would be for their own good in the following passage:

### RESTORE MARKETS

"Measured in uniform 1956 dollars, total wages and salaries need to rise gradually but vigorously to a 1960 level about 41 billion dollars above the 1957 level. This progress should be commenced substantially at once. Wages and salaries, and consumer purchasing power, can be expanded both by higher rates of pay and by more employment. To this, both industry and government can contribute.

"Even if in some cases the needed wage and price adjustments involved temporary relinquishment of what would be regarded as an adequate level of profits for the long run, these adjustments

should nonetheless be made. There will be a more solid and sustainable economic improvement if business, rather than government, provides much of the initiative and momentum under current circumstances. Business has not hesitated to 'plow back' enormous funds into investment in the means of production, although this has had an effect upon dividend payments. Now that this kind of business investment has outrun consumption, it would be sound financial and economic policy for business leadership to plow funds into the consumption field, as a wise investment in the restoration and expansion of markets instead of plants and machines. Most key industries will need less funds than they have been using recently for new business investment in productive plant and equipment, until consumption catches up."

### ROUND OUT PICTURE

Just to round out the picture before commenting on it, the role assigned to government by Keyserling is to gradually increase per capita federal outlays "from less than \$150 in the 1959 budget to more than \$182 in calendar 1960, measured in 1956 dollars." This would make it possible for the government to enormously increase outlays for education, housing, social security, public health, armaments, foreign aid, and so forth. Since the whole economy would have expanded, such expenditures would be a smaller percentage of the total national economic activity than they were in 1957, and the national debt would be relatively smaller, too. By 1960 the budget would be balanced, even taking into account a needed tax adjustment to stimulate the consuming power of low-income groups.

It is, indeed, a stimulating and encouraging prospect. In fact, if everyone did exactly what Keyserling seeks to persuade them to do, it may be that the end result would be substantially as he describes it. From reading the article, however, it is impossible to tell whether he believes that it is actually possible to persuade the businessmen of the country to

do what he urges them to do by argumentation alone. He does not suggest, should efforts to enlighten them as to what they should do in the best long-run interests of the country prove ineffective, what alternative measures he would propose.

Now it is no small problem to convince thousands of capitalists, many of them in highly competitive fields, that in the long-run interest of the system they should cut their "net earnings" to the bone and endanger their competitive position by raising wages in the midst of a recession. Keyserling's analogy to investment in capital goods may sound persuasive to workers and consumers, but to talk of "investment" in higher wages will appear to many a businessman as unworthy semantic manipulation. After all, investment in plant and equipment increases the net worth of a concern, and is calculated to enhance its competitive position. Though stockholders may have to forego some dividends in the process, they hope to be compensated by a rise in the value of their stock.

In any event, there is little historic evidence for the efficacy of such appeals to the long-range interests of the business community. When World War II started, the attempt was made to channel investment into war production by means of patriotic appeals. This soon gave way to the more realistic measures to control investment by controls over materials, labor and prices. Even in the midst of a major war it turned out that men who were willing to risk their own lives and those of their sons in battle could not find it in themselves to forego investing their money where it would bring the highest legal return rather than where it would do the war effort the most good.

### CHANNELLING INVESTMENT

A good test of the ability of persuasion to show key businessmen their own best long-term interests (as well as those of the economy as a whole) is immediately forthcoming in the United Automobile Workers' negotiations with the General Motors Corporation, and other giants of the automobile industry. Walter Reuther's persuasive powers are widely recognized, and in these negotiations he will not have to rely on rhetoric alone. But while the UAW can be counted on to squeeze the maximum possible out of the employers in the way of "investment" in higher wages and the like, we sincerely doubt that it will come up to the levels required for the fulfillment of Keyserling's economic program.

But if this, and similar, or additional means of persuasion should fail, and if the various emergency proposals for tax cuts and public works should fall short of restoring the economy to full employment levels, or keeping it there, what then?

Leon Keyserling does not propose that government spending policies alone can

do the trick. (For an argument for such a theory see Abba P. Lerner's part of a debate with Harry Braverman in the April *American Socialist*.) Private economic investment must also be channeled, in his view, or the government's lone efforts will tend more toward monetary inflation than economic expansion.

It is possible that he, and the economists and political strategists generally associated with his point of view do not deem it wise or necessary to indicate, at this time, what measures would have to be resorted to in the event persuasion should fail. And even though it may be premature, from the viewpoint of political practicality or expediency, to sketch such a program, it may be desirable from an educational point of view to remind ourselves that there have been, historically, two methods by which the problem has been approached.

One has been the attempt to organize the capitalists into some form of self-administration on a national scale with greater or lesser degrees of government direction and pressure behind such self-administration. A mild example of this was the NRA in the early days of the New Deal, and an extreme example was the organization of industry under the Nazi regime in Germany. The general political contexts of these two examples were, of course, completely different, but so were their results. The NRA codes had pretty much collapsed without bringing the country out of the depression long before the Supreme Court put an end to the Blue Eagle's lingering misery. In Germany the "self administration" worked relatively better precisely because the country was put in a totalitarian strait-jacket (the vast rearmament program, as an additional stimulus, helped mightily too).

### SOCIALIST APPROACH

The other alternative is, of course, to decide that the allocation of the economic resources of a country is too important and delicate a matter to leave in the hands of private individuals, whether organized or unorganized, and must be made subject to democratic public decision. That is a very general way of describing the content of socialism.

At the moment, we are far from the point at which a choice between these two roads "back to prosperity" is a political issue. Right now the question is how much of the AFL-CIO's anti-recession program can be put over, and how quickly. Then we will see how effective the actual measures adopted will be in turning the economic tide, and what the political effect of the struggle over this program will be. But if the tide does not turn fully and strongly, the nature of the program adopted at that point by the labor movement could decisively effect the development of American society for a long time to come.

## The "Monthly Review"

(Continued from page 7)

stills the voice of its conscience and can never learn its own true values and aspirations. A society which refuses to treat its members as adult human beings will never realize the potentials of adult humanity.

"It goes without saying that the democratization of the Soviet Union will have to be the work of the Soviet people themselves. It will come, if at all, not as a gift from above but as the result of struggle from below. I for one believe that such a struggle will be undertaken, that it will be protracted and in the main nonviolent, and that it can succeed. And I want there to be no misunderstanding about which side I am on. . . ."

While this has been a fair sized sampling of these articles, it represents the best and most significant part of this evolution. Other sections of the same articles retain important elements of the old point of view. The important thing, however, is the fact that there is a clearly discernable reformulation of the problem of socialism and democracy in which Sweezy is trying to work toward what is,

in his mind at least, a consistent democratic position.

But this is not a straight-line development. While there is the increasing awareness of the reality as it concerns Russia, there is an attempt to place the Chinese Stalinist regime at the center of a new set of illusions. There does not seem to be any recognition that in China the Russian experience is repeating itself but in a different setting.

Nevertheless, despite this unfortunate development, there is a clear movement away from the fundamental Stalinoid rationalization for totalitarianism: the people can't be trusted to emancipate themselves; there is the need for rulers to do it for them, etc.

The evolution of the *Monthly Review's* outlook described above is a heartening example of the ideological impact of the struggles of the peoples under Stalinism for freedom. The ability to draw instruction from these struggles is a mark of a truly scientific attitude and intellectual integrity which are indispensable prerequisites to the reconstruction of the socialist movement of our time.

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* New Edition \*  
 \* Three Volumes in One \*  
 \*  
 \* History \*  
 \* of the \*  
 \* Russian Revolution \*  
 \* By \*  
 \* LEON TROTSKY \*  
 \*  
 \* Trotsky's great classic, now \*  
 \* available again for the first \*  
 \* time in years. \*  
 \*  
 \* List \$12.50      our price \$10.00 \*  
 \*  
 \* Labor Action Book Service \*  
 \* 114 West 14th St., N.Y.C. \*  
 \* \*\*\*\*\*

### READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM!

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

- No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism
- No. 4—Socialism and Democracy
- No. 5—What is Stalinism?
- No. 6—Socialism and the Working Class
- No. 7—Labor Politics in America
- No. 8—Revolt Behind the Iron Curtain