

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 8, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**The Totalitarian Joker in the
Stalinist Constitutions**

... page 6

**Manifesto of the Medicine-Men:
Koestler, Rousset & Co. on Stalinism**

... page 7

J. E. Hoover and the Palmer Raids

... page 5

MacArthur Plans to Dump Japan's Ban on Rearmament

By MARY BELL

Little demonstrates so well the machine-like manner in which the great powers move willy-nilly toward war as does the search for alliances and military partners by the Western bloc headed by the United States, partnerships which are sought irrespective of principle and clearly along the lines of the strategy of meeting force with force.

The latest country to be tagged for involvement into the "concert of peace-loving, anti-aggressor" nations is Japan. The attempts to formulate a general peace treaty with Japan having bogged down on account of unbridgeable differences between Russia and the United States, the latter has adopted the policy of concluding a series of individual peace treaties to be drawn up between Japan and the countries who were formerly at war with her.

It should be noted that of the thirteen nations who together with the U. S. played a major part in the late war with Japan and who are on the United Nations Far Eastern Commission—Russia, Britain, France, China, Australia, Burma, Canada, India, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan and the Philippines—a majority have either recognized Stalinist China or are in favor of doing so. Thus, aside from the threat of the Rus-

sian veto on a Japanese peace treaty, the U. S. would risk recognition of Mao's government in any general peace treaty through the UN Commission.

Of utmost significance in the separate peace proposals of the United States is the report from Lake Success that the bilateral agreements would impose no restrictions upon the rearmament of Japan. This report is buttressed by the report of General Douglas MacArthur's New Year's message to the Japanese people to the effect that if "international lawlessness" continued, "it will become your duty within the principles of the United Nations in concert with others who cherish freedom to mount force to repel force."

"ENEMIES" INTO "ALLIES"

The constitution of Japan drawn up after her defeat renounces war as an instrument of national policy, and the Far Eastern Commission forbade an army, navy or air force on the part of Japan. But the power machine moves relentlessly. The erstwhile Axis power, author of the attack on Pearl Harbor, the land of "dangerous thoughts," is needed as a part of the Western bloc which is formed ostensibly to stem the tide of lawlessness and aggression.

(Continued on page 3)

A Review of the Economic Trends of 1950 and the Prospects for '51 Show:

Cold-War Boom Hiked Profits But Will Hit Living Standards

By GORDON HASKELL

Production in almost all sectors of American industry reached record peacetime figures during 1950, and in some cases exceeded the heights attained in World War II.

The propagandists of capitalism are beating their chests with pride and self-satisfaction at the tremendous wealth turned out by the workers of the country. They are giving voice to unrestrained victory yells at the unprecedented profits this production has enabled them to make. And if it were not for the uncomfortable fact that this vast wealth was turned out as a result of the spur put to industry by the threat of war, their somewhat immodest boasting might seem to have a point to it.

In reviewing the American economy during the past year, it should be borne in mind that military spending, although it was on a large scale, cannot account for the vast magnitude of the figures. Direct military purchases formed a relatively unimportant item on the order books of most industries.

The economy was headed toward a boom phase before the "police action" started in Korea, and although military

Debate over Hoover Policy Offers No Road to Stop Either Stalinism or War

By PHILIP COBEN

The speech by Herbert Hoover advocating the retreat of American imperialism into a "Western Hemisphere Gibraltar" has opened up a new and important debate in U. S. ruling circles on foreign policy, which is still going on at this writing.

Given the fact that the Dewey-Dulles wing of the Republican Party has unequivocally come out against Hoover's line and in support of the Truman-Acheson program, it does not appear that it will be a crucial debate, as far as its effect on going U. S. policy is concerned. But there is little doubt about one thing: Hoover's program has had an echo, not only in many circles of the Republican Party but, more important, among the people.

The volume of mail delivered in Washington testifies to this fact. The press reports that the "Hoover mail" is still pouring into senators and congressmen in the capital, while the response to John Foster Dulles' counterblast speech has been "meager," "insignificant" and "disappointing."

This writer can testify to the fact that, on the morning after Hoover's speech—and in New York City too, which is referred to increasingly as the center of the "internationalist East," presumably in contrast with the more "isolationist West"; where moreover Hoover's name is practically synonymous with depression, breadlines and reaction, after all these years since the '30s—virtually every casual conversation overheard in buses, elevators, restaurants and other suitable places for eavesdropping revolved around the favorable thought that "Hoover has something there."

Leaving aside for the moment the real meaning and consequences of Hoover's program for American imperialism, this reaction testifies to—and has in its own way partially crystallized—what has hitherto been a muted fact: the deep-going unpopularity of Washington's Korean adventure. The people not only want peace in general, they have absolutely no enthusiasm for the fact that American troops are dying in far corners of the globe.

It is not, of course, that this sentiment is founded upon our own socialist considerations; it is founded on the fact that the government has been completely unable to inspire them with its own war aims. The result is not so much apathy in face of the threat of all-out war; it would be hard for anyone to be apathetic when air-raid instructions are already being given out over many radios. There is rather a political vacuum, and it is this vacuum that Hoover's words served to fill in large part and that measurably accounts for the popular attractiveness of his speech.

During 1950 the workers of the United States turned out a truly fabulous amount of goods. The number of shoes produced were between 486 and 488 million pairs. The automobile industry beat its 1949 record by 26 per cent and produced almost eight million vehicles, 6,550,000 of which were passenger cars. The payroll of the industry rose 22 per cent during the year to a record of over two and a half

(Continued on page 3)

(Turn to last page)

Is There a Break In Tresca Case?

NEW YORK, Dec. 29—Reason for fresh hope that there may be an early solution of the Carlo Tresca murder mystery is seen by the Tresca Memorial Committee in recent action by the district attorney's office and the city Police Department, which involved Carmine Galante, first suspect in that case.

Certain curious and possibly significant circumstances attached to that action were pointed out by Norman Thomas, the committee's chairman, in announcing plans for honoring Tresca, courageous editor of the Italian anti-totalitarian journal *Il Martello* (The Hammer) on the eighth anniversary of his death.

Galante was brought by detectives from his Brooklyn home to Manhattan on December 15 at 5 a. m. and was questioned for hours in District Attorney Frank Hogan's office, in connection with two dice-game raids.

"But," Thomas observes, "he was questioned by members of the Homicide Bureau. Why? And here are three notable facts which, on their face, might have special meaning in relation to the Tresca case:

(1) One of the raids took place at 235 West 18th Street, a stone's throw from where (in the same street) the escape-car used by Tresca's killers was found on the night of the crime.

Correspondents, Contributors, Readers:

PLEASE NOTE!
LABOR ACTION and the INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE (National Office) HAVE MOVED from their offices at 4 Court Square, Long Island City, N. Y. to— New address: 114 West 14 St. New York 11, N. Y.

The national office will now be housed together with the New York local of the ISL, which has been located at 114 West 14 Street throughout.

As we reported a few months ago, the building at 4 Court Square was damaged by fire. We wish to thank our friends for donations received in answer to our request for help to defray the expenses which resulted.

The above change of address also applies to all other Independent Socialist institutions previously at 4 Court Square, including: Labor Action Book Service, The New International, Socialist Youth League (national office), Independent Socialist Press.

Available: BOUND VOLUMES of Labor Action 1945 to 1949 \$3.00 a volume Order from: Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

(2) One of the men arrested in that raid lives at 246 Elizabeth Street, only a few doors from the garage in which the murder-car was kept.

(3) That address is less than a block from where Galante originally was picked up on the night after the Tresca slaying in 1943.

MEMORIAL PLANNED

Galante, it will be recalled, claimed that he was in a Broadway movie theatre at the time Tresca was shot. But two parole officers reported that on that evening, they saw Galante enter a northbound Ford sedan a block from the parole office at 80 Centre Street, "in undue haste," that they took the number of the car, and that this was the escape-car used by the Tresca assassins.

This year the memorial committee will honor Tresca at 1 p. m. on Thursday, January 11, at the spot where he was slain on that date in the wartime dim-out — the northeast corner of Fifth Avenue and 15th Street. Flowers will be laid where he fell, and close friends will speak briefly in both English and Italian. If the weather is unfavorable, the speaking will be held in Rand School Auditorium, 7 East 15th Street.

"Whatever the outcome of the present activities of the District Attorney's office," Thomas said in invitations now in the mails, "we need the presence on January 11 of every loyal friend of Carlo who can possibly attend the memorial ceremony, to demonstrate anew that we will not let his murder be forgotten."

An interesting fact in this dispute is that the same company owns the Exide Storage Battery plant in Philadelphia. Several months ago the workers at that plant, organized by the CIO electrical union, conducted a long and bitter strike for a new contract.

OHIO LABOR NOTES

UAW Strike Wins Gains at Willard; Auto Workers Get Escalator Dividend

By JOE HAUSER

After a strike of about two weeks, members of United Auto Workers Local 88 concluded an agreement with the Willard Storage Battery Company in Cleveland. The workers gained the escalator clause and 15 cents across the board, plus 3 cents extra for women and 5 cents extra for skilled workers, retroactive to November 1.

However, wages were not the primary issue in this strike, but rather a company demand for compulsory overtime. Willard wanted to write into the new contract an obligation for workers to put in 5 ten-hour days plus eight hours Saturday, for a total of 58 hours a week. On the other hand, the company would not guarantee a minimum work week of even 40 hours for the life of the contract.

Also at issue was the expiration date, with the union proposing July 1953 and the company December 1953. The new contract does not make the overtime work mandatory, which is a gain for the union; but the expiration date is October 1953, which is closer to the company's demand than to the union's.

There also seemed to be some confusion on whether cost-of-living bonuses were eliminated by the auto freeze, although reports from Washington would seem to halt such raises until March. Of course the important raises are

During the Exide shutdown, the Willard plant worked seven days a week. The UAW appealed to the Willard workers to refuse any overtime, so as not to harm in any way the effectiveness of the Exide strike. The international union sent Emil Mazey to speak to the Willard workers, but they would not agree then to give up their overtime.

The Exide workers won their strike anyway, and according to local reports had enough sense of union solidarity to refuse overtime when Willard was out. It is also important to note that the Willard local's desire for an earlier contract expiration was aimed at simultaneous contract negotiations at both factories.

UAW GETS RAISE

GM-type cost-of-living bonuses went to about 6,500 Cleveland auto workers this past week. Due to different contract wording, workers in four plants got 3-cent increases, while those in two others got 2 cents. All are covered by UAW contracts, but none are directly engaged in passenger automobile manufacturing, being mostly parts suppliers for that industry.

There also seemed to be some confusion on whether cost-of-living bonuses were eliminated by the auto freeze, although reports from Washington would seem to halt such raises until March. Of course the important raises are

due March 1, and it will be up to Washington to get off the fence on the wage freeze by then.

SALARY GRAB KILLED

Cleveland's city administration was put on a very embarrassing spot when the members of the City Council tried to vote themselves a 25 per cent raise (from \$4000 to \$5000 annually) while the mayor was holding unionized city employees down to a maximum 5 per cent wage increase. In action which showed their contempt for rank-and-file city workers, the councilmen voted almost unanimously to give themselves raises which they denied to those more deserving.

To make things worse, the council had given itself a 33 per cent raise in the previous session, going from three to four thousand dollars then. And this is for an admittedly "part time" job!

There was such a howl of protest over this attempted raise that the councilmen tried to disguise it by substituting a move to give themselves the thousand dollars as "expenses." They abandoned this subterfuge when the city law director said they would have to account for such expenses before drawing them. The mayor finally vetoed the raise and such heat was put on council members that they did not dare override the veto. Now it will be safe to limit the more lowly civil service employees to their 5 per cent.

Cold-War Boom Hiked Profits—

(Continued from page 1)

billion dollars. And General Motors Corporation alone made \$702,655,156 in profits after taxes during the first nine months of the year!

The steel industry achieved an all-time record in producing 97 million net tons of raw steel. Its spokesmen boast that the industry produced more steel than all the rest of the world combined. All indications are that this year the industry will top the hundred million ton mark.

The aluminum industry produced about one and a half billion pounds of metal, and a vast program for reopening wartime plants and building additional ones was commenced. Before the last war, it should be remembered, the American aluminum industry did not produce half a million pounds in a year.

The rubber industry produced 77 million passenger car tires during 1950, and the television industry built between six and a half and seven million receivers. This was almost twelve million more tires than were built during the previous year, and double the number of television sets.

How did the workers fare during this year? They made impressive gains in wage contracts as well as in pension and other demands. A number of large and dramatic strikes took place, particularly in the coal and railroad industries. But the total monetary position of the working class was increased more through a drastic drop in unemployment during the year, and through a tendency to lengthen the work week, than through specific wage increases. After the Korean war began, to be sure, a number of large employers granted wage increases without too much resistance.

Workers' Net Gain—51 Cents per Week

The unequalled profits to be reaped through uninterrupted production and the desire to hang on to their workers through a coming period of labor shortage no doubt accounted for their big-heartedness.

Organized workers won more than two billion dollars in wage increases during the year. According to the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, average weekly earnings of workers in manufacturing industries rose from \$56.29 in January of last year to \$61.99 in October, a total rise of \$5.60 a week. But after allowance had been made for increased income taxes and higher prices, the average single worker had only 51 cents a week more to spend in October than he had in January, despite the slightly longer work week.

On the profit side, things were much brighter. Although exact figures are not yet available, it is estimated that corporate profits after taxes amounted to twenty three and a half billion dollars for the year. Of this stockholders got some eight billion in dividends. And in reading profit figures one should always bear in mind the fact that executive bonuses, which skyrocket in lush years, are not counted as part of the profits of a corporation.

The year also marked an historic shift in American foreign trade which is of the greatest importance in the world economic picture.

Ever since the last war one of the chief problems of world capitalism has been the so-called "dollar shortage." This was a result of the fact that during and after the war the United States consistently exported more goods than it imported. One aspect of the Marshall Plan and the various other gift and lending programs, both military and non-military, was an attempt to soften or even overcome the impact of this export surplus on the weaker capitalist economies.

The economic boom in this country during 1950, coupled

with an expanded program of stockpiling strategic raw materials, led to a narrowing of the export-import gap, and to its virtual disappearance during the last quarter of the year. It is estimated that in 1951 the United States may actually import more than it exports. This has happened only three times during the past 75 years.

Imports during 1950 reached a figure of nine billion dollars, and increased 38 per cent over the previous year. Exports for the year amounted to ten billions, or a decrease of from 17 to 20 per cent. Actually, in considerable parts of the capitalist world a dollar surplus is beginning to replace the dollar shortage.

This might seem an excellent time for the United States to put some real steam behind its post-war program for the reduction of trade barriers throughout the capitalist world. The production boom here is so great that its price rises and high demand levels for both domestic and foreign production are bringing a feverish flush to the cheeks of European industry.

Free Trade—a Lost Cause

But as was to be expected, the moment a reduction of tariff barriers, import quotas and currency controls achieve a certain attractiveness for the capitalists of Europe, they tend to lose their allure for the businessmen and the government of this country. The talk in Washington is along the lines of setting quotas on the export of certain types of goods, and as the value of the dollar softens throughout the world and gold begins to reverse its flow from Fort Knox, very little if anything will be said about re-creating free trade throughout the world.

The economic prospect for 1951 is, of course, completely dependent on the speed of the march into World War III. Even if the present trends continue without a further great speedup in the militarization of the country, it is clear that this year will be one of tremendously increased production, a high demand for labor, rising prices, increasing shortages in consumer goods, higher taxes, and a constant increase of the pressure on the workers to work harder, longer hours and NOT to demand higher wages or better working conditions.

To date the government has been reluctant to put into effect the measures called for by its military plans. The military budget now stands at 42 billion dollars, as against thirteen and a half billions at the beginning of the year. It is quite clear that the addition of this gigantic sum to the boom economy will mean a sharp increase in the national debt and will build up a tremendous inflationary pressure which can only be controlled through some form of price freeze.

But the capitalists are against price control. Even though there are many ways of getting around such measures, both legally and illegally, they tend to limit profit-making severely.

And the workers are against the other side of the coin: wage controls. Even though the unions support the government's foreign policy and the armament program, they are most reluctant to be led into the trap of the wage freeze.

They know that prices go up before wages do, and that this is true even if the effect is softened by operative escalator clauses in wage contracts. Despite the big boost given to the idea of the escalator clauses by the United Auto Workers contracts, far too few workers enjoy the limited protection offered by them. Further, even the unions with escalator clauses cannot be sure that their political buddies in Washington won't try to lure these off if and when they impose a general wage freeze. Not to do so would invite a constant struggle on the part of workers without escalator contracts to get the

or less extended periods of unemployment during the year. In the process of reconversion to armament production this is inevitable in our kind of an economy.

This is just one of the frauds involved in the talk about "equality of sacrifice" that is bound to be let loose on the workers as the pressure mounts to undermine their standard of living in the interest of the war economy. Industry does not reconvert unless its owners are guaranteed IN ADVANCE that they will lose nothing by it, even temporarily. Thus, before the aluminum industry would agree to the tremendous expansion program now taking place it engaged in "discussions" for months with the government and moved only after it had been assured of vast tax benefits and government purchase of all it could produce. The workers who are thrown out of their jobs will get . . . unemployment compensation.

From the point of view of the capitalists and the military brass, 1951 will be a banner year. Their hold on the government will be strengthened, and the human, technical and financial resources over which they have command will be expanded. To a part of the working class this year will also return the "good old days" of the wartime boom. Many who were unemployed or had low-paying jobs will be at work in the higher-paying war industries. Others no doubt look forward to the prospect of exchanging their sweat and their brains for the fifteen-cent dimes of overtime pay.

But if one is concerned with an increase of the welfare of humanity, the prospects are not nearly so bright. The vast outpouring of natural resources and human effort which lies ahead will be channeled increasingly into the production of means of destruction. Once more American capitalism will demonstrate that mass-production techniques utilizing the bountiful natural wealth of the country and employing the great industrial skill of its workers can perform miracles of production . . . under one condition: that this production is ultimately destined for war.

MacArthur and Japan—

(Continued from page 1)

The Japanese peace proposals come on the heels of the diplomatic recognition of another erstwhile Axis partner, Franco Spain. The new U. S. ambassador to Madrid is expected to be confirmed soon after the 82nd Congress convenes. Again in this instance, the strategy of force prevailed. Any presumable opposition to fascism was thrown aside before the need of another ally on the European continent, the vital natural and military materials it might supply and the avoidance of any "chaos" stemming from a downfall of the tottering Franco regime.

France is already trying to make himself at home in the Western bloc. In a recent interview broadcast by CBS, he stated that Spain is ready to stand firm against any future invasion in

which "many millions of aggressors [sic] will die." The butcher of the Spanish people and the aggressor who destroyed the Spanish republic now seeks thanks from the Allies because Spain had kept Stalinism out of the western extremity of Europe. She should be entitled, he added, "to expect that the wrongs done us be corrected."

These two themes were played to the continuing obligato of the attempt at German rearmament. The leading Axis power, the Moloch-state which we were told was the evil responsible for World War II and which was to be so reduced that it could never make war again, is again to be rearmament for a new war against "aggression" with the same ruling class still in power and many elements of the same officer corps which served the Nazis.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

For Adequate A-Bomb Shelters

To the Editor:

Evidence of the approach of those in charge of civilian defense is contained in a statement by Major General W. M. Robertson, California's director of civilian defense. Addressing a meeting in San Francisco of civil-defense officials from 69 cities, General Robertson urged haste in setting up backyard shelters. The S. F. Chronicle quotes him as saying: "Such shelters have already been built in England. Within two weeks we shall make available plans and specifications for a backyard shelter that can be built for about \$100."

To emphasize the point the general adds: "It is astonishing how effective dirt can become in the right place."

For those who have their own backyard plus \$100 to spare, the suggestion would seem wise enough and perfectly in order. However, there is nothing in the statement to indicate where the hundreds of thousands of people

who do not have their own backyard are supposed to put their bomb shelters.

But just as important is the problem of raising \$100. Here we have a concrete example of how "equality of sacrifice" works. Everyone pays the same amount, \$100. Those who can't afford it as well as those who can, low-income groups, medium-income groups and high-income groups—all sacrifice \$100 for an admittedly necessary device.

Will the government help those who are unable to pay for their own protection? Will the government take the necessary steps to assure an equal and sufficient distribution of bomb shelters throughout the population? So far, nothing in the record indicates that such will be the case. For bomb shelters General Robertson recommends industrial buildings and underground garages—which proposal, by itself, leaves a good majority of the population unprotected.

This, then, with the addition of dog tags, first-aid training and priority of necessary materials, constitutes the program of California's director of civilian defense. To steer attention away from those responsible for such a miserably inadequate program, San Francisco's mayor is quoted as saying: "Our people are too apathetic. They think it can't happen here." It would be interesting to know where the mayor found people who are apathetic about the atomic bomb. Perhaps a more accurate statement would be: "Our civilian-defense directors are too apathetic. They think the problem can be solved in the backyard with hundred-dollar bills."

Congress is now considering an appropriation of \$3,100,000,000

for a civilian-defense program, 46 per cent to be paid by the states. As things stand, nobody seems to know just how the figure of \$3,100,000,000 was arrived at and in what way it is to be spent. But the above considerations make one thing clear: If the working people and their families are to have adequate protection in the event of war, the labor movement will have to intervene strenuously to guarantee a proper civilian-defense program. Without this meaning support of the war in any way, the unions on both a local and national level can see to it that the government, which is responsible for the war and its consequences, provides for the safety of the people.

W.

Oakland, Dec. 27

Next—A Labor Party! by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty, Simple Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party

25 cents a copy Order from: Independent Socialist Press, 114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Get it EVERY week! A sub to LABOR ACTION is only \$2 for 1 year

MURDER IN MEXICO The Assassination of Leon Trotsky

by General Sanchez Salazar in collaboration with Julian Gorkin

The story of the assassination of Trotsky written by the ex-Chief of the Secret Service of the Mexican police who was in charge of the investigation.

235 pages \$2.50 Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y. (Orders must be accompanied by payment)

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION Only \$2.00 a Year

THE NEW COURSE by LEON TROTSKY

The Struggle for the New Course by MAX SHACHTMAN

Both in one book—Trotsky's historic essay on the beginnings of Stalinism, and Shachtman's study of the development of Russian totalitarianism \$1.50

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS 114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

The BEST recent book on the labor movement— "The UAW and Walter Reuther" by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick \$3.00 Random House Order from: Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

"THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of Modern Russia by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00 Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____
State _____ Tel. _____

YOU and SCIENCE

WHO'S 300 YEARS BEHIND THE TIMES?

By PHILIP COBEN

The American Association for the Advancement of Science has held its 117th convention and, as usual, has heard reports and papers not only on the natural sciences but also on the relation between these sciences and social problems. The latter are pretty uniformly pitiful, also as usual, but it should not be concluded from such a comment that the scientists ought to be told to stick to their laboratories and keep their noses out of politics. On the contrary, as the columns in this space by Carl Darton have often emphasized, the growing social and political consciousness of scientists is unqualifiedly healthy—even when it takes bizarre forms, as it sometimes does.

Among the papers presented to the AAAS on social problems, as reported in the press, was one by a Princeton professor of astronomical physics, John Quincy Stewart. This fact itself symbolizes the most widespread fallacy of most scientists in their approach to social problems.

What are the qualifications which entitle the professor of astronomical physics to a hearing before a massed meeting of the engineering and social and economic science sections of the largest scientific organization in the world? The question should not be misunderstood. As a citizen he is bound to be at least as vitally interested and as vitally affected by social problems and their solutions as everyone else; as a matter of fact, more so precisely because the fate of science and scientists is so intimately bound up with the fate of society. Discussions of social problems in the ranks of the various scientists' groups which have sprung up is one of the more encouraging signs of the times. The question is aimed at the assumption, often made very explicitly by scientists, that their specific knowledge and training as physicists, biologists, chemists or engineers can be and should be directly transferred toward the solution of social problems by means of the same equipment.

The report by Professor Stewart was typical—among other reasons, because many of its individual comments were shrewd and all of its positive conclusions useless. His speech hit the theme that the men who are shaping U. S. foreign policy are lawyers trying to function as "social engineers," a task for which they are not fitted by training, since "lawyers are not trained to understand the complex quantitative situations which today's social engineers must handle." He added optimistically: "We shall make competent social engineers of them yet."

Is It an Engineering Problem?

He commented in the course of his remarks: "These men lawyers like Acheson, Warren Austin and Dulles love freedom without fully understanding her. They love her sincerely and unselfishly when she parades herself in American nylon, but when in Asia she slatterns herself in dirty rags they do not choose to speak to her."

It would be a shrewd remark if it came from a man in the street, perhaps, but coming from one who is berating the statesmen for not being "social engineers" it misses the mark. Behind it is the reality of the statesmen-lawyers' class-biased understanding of freedom, but this reality behind the observation is as invisible to Stewart as was the theory of gravitation to the zillions of men who observed the same phenomenon before the legendary apple hit Newton on the head.

The fundamental fallacy we referred to is epitomized by the professor's preoccupation with the "social engineer." In modern technology, the job of the engineer starts where that of the theoretical scientist ends. The engineer slide-rule cannot get to work until the basic theory has been developed.

By his sole stress on social engineering, the professor is assuming that the problem is that of scientifically applying known principles. But that is exactly what is lacking in bourgeois sociology. Its social theory, where it exists at all, is essentially an apology for capitalist preconceptions and interests, and not a scientific analysis of moving social forces. Marxism is today the only adequate basis for a real science of society.

For the 117th time no doubt, the report complained that sociology is 300 years behind physics. This is indeed true in a sense, but it is equally true that physicists and most other scientists are 300 years behind the times in their approach to sociology. The relationship of 300 years ago between natural science and other fields is stood on its head. Where three centuries ago, it was assumed that the metaphysical philosopher could with impunity pass judgments on questions of natural science, on the basis of his prestige as a philosopher, they assume today that the natural scientist qua natural scientist is peculiarly qualified to present solutions to social questions. They invert the pattern of the Russian Stalinist "scientific" conference where a hack of the government is likely to lay down the line on the laws of nature.

As we said, this is not a plea that Professor Stewart keep his eyes glued on his telescope. It is a plea that scientists like him rid themselves of the unscientific prejudice that modern sociology is a problem in "complex quantitative situations."

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
Vol. 15, No. 2 January 8, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL and L. G. SMITH
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Reading from Left to Right

FRANCO'S TIN SOLDIERS, by Basil Davidson. (The Nation, Dec. 30.)

The staff correspondent of the London *New Statesman and Nation* takes up the pro-Franco argument on the military plane, on the basis of a visit to Spain. His view of the claim that the Spanish army is "the strongest army in Europe" (as an MP claimed in the House of Commons) is a dim one.

"The consensus of reliable Allied opinion is that several years and mountainous expenditures would be required to make Franco's army strong and efficient in the purely technical sense, leaving aside all question of morale and loyalty. The navy can be dismissed. . . . It has only a few old hulks in service, and the maneuvers last month revealed that it was incapable of taking a convoy safely from Cadiz to the Canaries. . . . The government has almost no fighting aircraft of any kind. . . ."

"That Franco's army is large is almost proverbial. It has to remain large, not only to keep the rising generation under its thumb but also because it could only be demobilized into unemployment, and the regime cannot stand much more unpopularity. . . . As regards equipment, all authorities agree that the situation could hardly be worse. . . . Lacking all modern equipment—and indeed, mechanical equipment of any kind—the Spanish army has of course had no training in the use of new weapons. . . . Staffs are overweighted with elderly general officers.

Officers' pay is so low that the average officer does his work in the morning and goes to another job in the afternoon. . . .

"Franco's army, then, is today little more than a very large number of men who are trained in parade drill and carry rifles.

"If all the money needed for equipment, training and transport were made available by the United States, and could be spent efficiently in spite of the corruption of the Spanish administration, the question would still remain: Would Franco's army prove a useful ally? After the expenditure of two billion dollars and five years' time—the minimum requirement—would Franco's army be able to take the field in a third world war? Some might say that is, again, anybody's guess, but I do not think it is. The factor of morale is not really a doubtful one. Given the Spanish character and tradition, it may be argued, a Spanish army would always fight for Spain. But to fight for Spain today is to fight for Franco; and Franco's regime has certainly failed to capture the loyalty of more than a small minority of the Spanish people. That minority, moreover, is not made up of people who fight in the ranks of the army. There is overwhelming evidence that the great mass of the people—and therefore the great mass of soldiers, armed or unarmed, tanks or no tanks—see in the Franco dictatorship no more than the symbol of their desperate impoverishment. It is too much to expect that such an army would fight for its oppressors."

WORLD POLITICS

THE CURRENCY REFORM IN POLAND: PRICES AND WAGES

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The currency reform in Poland has surprised the people. It is an ordinary fraud perpetrated by the government on the population.

With respect to state claims and taxes, the zloty is exchanged at the rate of 3 units for 100 of the old currency; but with respect to bank deposits and private claims, the rate is 1 to 100. Thus the currency reform becomes a means of automatically expropriating savings of peasants, middle-class people and also workers.

Officially the new zloty is four to a U. S. dollar and 11.5 to a British pound sterling. This ratio is also a fraud because prices do not correspond to this level in the U. S. and Great Britain.

According to the *Dziennik Polski* of London, prices in Poland are from two to ten times higher than they are in England. For one pound (which now corresponds to 11.5 new zlotys) an Englishman can buy four times as much bread (40 kilograms in England as against 11 kilograms in Poland), twice as many potatoes (60 kilograms as against 30 kilograms), nine times as much of beef, and ten times as much of sugar (20 kilograms in England as against 2 kilograms in Poland).

THEIR REAL WAGES

Men's clothing of inferior quality costs 1200 zlotys in Poland, but only ten to twelve pounds in England—that is, ten times less than in Poland. A pair of shoes costs 250 zlotys, which would be 23 pounds at the official rate, but it would cost only three pounds in England. The Polish level of prices is from two to ten times (or more) higher than in England and the U. S.—let us say, on the average five times higher at the official rate of international exchange.

The real rate of exchange should be 55 zlotys for one pound and at least 20 zlotys for one dollar.

An egg (one) costs 9 zlotys; a kilogram (2.2 pounds) of butter 30 zlotys; a kilogram of bread 1.4 to 1.5 zlotys; a kilogram of beef 8.4 zlotys; a kilogram of pork 14.4 zlotys; a litre (about a quart) of vodka 39.6 zlotys; a litre of alcohol 90 zlotys. A dinner costs as much as 5 zlotys, and a litre of milk 1.55 zlotys.

Workers' wages are at the level of 500 to 600 zlotys per month—that is, at the official rate, \$120-150 or 55 British pounds—whereas the British worker earns on the average only 30 pounds. But in reality the wages are only one fifth or at most one third of this reckoning at the official rate, because of the price-level difference. Therefore the Polish worker earns only from \$20 to \$40 a month and even less.

SPLIT MILK

The new currency is an excellent means employed by the Stalinist bureaucracy to expropriate the masses, a means of exploitation and oppression. The value of the new zloty does not correspond to the real value of commodities but is based on the economic and political monopoly enjoyed by the bureaucracy as the sole owner of the means of production. Thus money loses its function as a measure of value. It is a medium of circulation decreed by the bureaucracy in accordance with the latter's interests. The arbitrary

value of the currency is, of course, backed up by the economic monopoly and political dictatorship of the bureaucratic regime. The possession of foreign currency is prohibited on pain of a 15-year jail sentence or death. Since the reform was introduced, the indignation of the people has been so great that in some cases peasants have poured their milk on the streets rather than sell it, since their return on it would be so small.

There is also a political import to the currency reform. It will be a good means of accelerating collectivization on the countryside, of annihilating the middle class in the cities and of increasing the exploitation of the working class. Not even in the capitalist countries is the rate of exploitation as high as in the lands of the Stalinist "paradise."

Finally, the value of the new zloty was made equal to that of the Russian ruble. It will thus also facilitate the aim of Russian imperialist policy in integrating Poland economically and politically with the master country.

Read About Socialism!

- THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISMpage \$1.00
by Max Shachtman cloth 2.00
- SOCIALISM: The Hope of Humanity 10¢
by Max Shachtman
- MARXISM IN THE U. S. 35¢
by Leon Trotsky
- PLENTY FOR ALL: The Meaning of Socialism..... 25¢
by Ernest Erber
- THE ROLE OF THE PARTY in the Fight for Socialism (mimeo'd) 25¢
- THE ROLE OF THE TRADE UNIONS: Economic Role under Capitalism (mimeo'd) 25¢
(Both mimeo'd pamphlets for 40¢)

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

BOOKS and Ideas THE NEW BOOK ON THE FBI—3

J. Edgar Hoover and the Palmer Raids

By SAM ADAMS

It is obviously impossible in this review to detail all the important matters contained in Lowenthal's book on the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but it will serve our purpose well enough to single out several of the most important periods in its development in order to sustain the views of our previous articles.

We have noted that the establishment of the bureau under Attorney General Bonaparte, assisted by President Theodore Roosevelt, was made without congressional authorization and against prevailing opinion. Once established, however, a fearful Congress did nothing to challenge the action of the Department of Justice, but sought to create activities for the new federal police agency.

The first activities of the Bureau of Investigation, desultory police matters at best, were enlarged with the passage of the Mann Act and its assignment to deal with interstate commerce matters of a criminal nature. But the First World War brought the bureau to real prominence when it began its hunt for pro-German Americans, spies and saboteurs.

In this same period, it began the first of its great raids, this time against "slackers." Here too, the organization set in motion its illegal methods, arresting thousands and thousands of people in mass raids in order to discover "slackers" and draft evaders, holding them incommunicado, refusing prisoners the right to see their families or consult legal advice, and giving them kangaroo-court hearings. In the New York area alone, 75,000 people were arrested, and much of the propaganda of the bureau was directed against the city as a hotbed of radicals, aliens and pro-Germans.

But the real measure of the bureau's intelligence work and its policy is found in the fact that out of every 200 arrested, 199, according to the bureau's own statistics, were a mistake. The bureau did not, however, state whether the one out of every 200 was in fact a draft evader. Actually, the figures showed that draft dodgers numbered one half of 1 per cent in New York, a figure lower than the low 1 per cent for other areas. To attain even this figure, the bureau had to commit tens of thousands of illegal arrests, without charge or warrant, and thus it established a precedent which it was to repeat in its later history.

However, we have to leave these relatively less important activities of the bureau and to refer to that development which ushered in its spectacular rise. This came with the establishment of the General Intelligence Division under no less a person than J. Edgar Hoover.

Pattern of FBI Scores

The post-war period reduced the real work of the bureau considerably. Certainly it had not enough to do to justify a huge department and the expenditure of large sums. One cannot say, however, that the Department of Justice and its Bureau of Investigation did not understand its interests and prepare for a prolongation of its life and an extension of its activities. What better way to do this than to concentrate on that field of activity which was bound to excite and scare Congress, and, through a venal press, the population at large?

Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer reported to Congress that "a wave of radicalism . . . swept over the country." Since the end of the war on November 11, 1918, the bureau's detectives were, as Lowenthal phrased it, full of "anxiety and frustration." An anti-radical division was established on August 1, 1919. At the end of the year, Hoover reported that even though this new body had improved matters, "The present organized world-wide class struggle threatens the foundations of society and civilization itself." More months of activities by the anti-radical division and Hoover still warned that the radicals "threaten the happiness of the community, the safety of every individual, and the continuance of every home and fireside. They would destroy the peace of the country and thrust it into a condition of anarchy and lawlessness and immorality that pass indignation."

Here was the regular pattern of bureau reports to and requests of Congress: exaggerations of the domestic situation, praise for the bureau's work, announcements of the achievements of its police work, then a warning that the dangers grow nevertheless, a request for congressional support to all its policies, and requests for more money.

In this particular case the bureau, without waiting for authorization from Congress, set up the anti-radical division. The one difficulty involved was money. Heretofore Congress had granted an appropriation for the "detection and prosecution of crimes." Yet, the bureau anticipated congressional assistance and on August 12, 1919, eleven days after the formation of the division, advised its agents to seek out sedition and secure "evidence which may be of use in prosecutions . . . under legislation . . . which may hereafter be enacted." Congress complied when it passed a peacetime sedition law, similar to the wartime sedition laws of 1917 and 1918.

The bureau selected J. Edgar Hoover as division chief. Remember at this point that the apologists for Hoover assert that he had nothing to do with the Palmer raids, and was (at least to Raymond Moley) merely a "clerk" under the attorney general. It was Hoover, too, who gave it the full and imposing title of "General Intelligence Division," in order to avoid the limitations that might be imposed on his office by the old name of Radical or Anti-Radical Division.

To gather some idea of the scope of the GID we note that the war on radicalism, which became a war against ideas and opinions, occupied the activity of one-third of the entire detective staff of the bureau. The GID declared that it was training its men to equip them for the special tasks of the war on radicalism and that it was "steadily training a group of its agents to take in account . . . larger factors."

Stoolpigeons and Spies

At first the GID took up the investigation of the "ultra-radical movement." But, again, characteristic of this new agency, it expanded its own work and undertook to cover more general activities "including not only ultra-radical activities but also the study of matters of an international nature, as well as economic and industrial disturbances incident thereto." Its detectives were to become experts in "understanding of the situation as a whole" with a knowledge of "social and economic conditions as a whole." Not only that, but they had to know conditions all over the world, to know them practically as well as theoretically, and they had to have, Lowenthal says, "a mastery of all such matters 'historically' as well."

If one thinks that the GID was turned into an immense school or study circle in the social, economic and political problems of mankind, he is immensely mistaken. We are dealing with a police agency, not a school, and all of Hoover's efforts to give it prestige by associating it with the field of ideas were merely a device he has employed again and again to remove the justifiable stigma that attaches to a police and spy agency. In its real life, the GID conformed to all which experience leads us to expect from such a body.

Accordingly, the GID directed its affairs centrally, requiring all agents to report to it regularly and to take no actions except those

authorized and directed by the Washington office. What should its agents do now in this war on radicalism? They were to send material—from informers, neighbors, anybody—on persons under investigation. The bureau decided that everything received by its agents and informers should be reported to headquarters, and by everything they meant "of every nature," even though such material might not be of any worth in a court of law.

The material that came into the bureau office was mountainous. Agents sent in anything and everything they could lay their hands on. Detectives sought out publishing houses and their books. They were to seek out private libraries and secure them; and this they did by raiding homes and lodgings and obtaining such libraries free. In search for literature, the bureau sent its stoolpigeons into radical organizations, to attend radical meetings and to obtain whatever literature they could. That almost all of this literature could have easily been bought meant nothing to the bureau and its detectives. Since they were dealing with a "conspiracy," they acted conspiratorially when they did not employ their police powers foolishly and dangerously against all radicals and non-conforming movements. Moreover, the bureau deliberately wanted to give Congress the feeling of a sense of extreme danger in order to obtain increased support and appropriations.

Card-Indexing Fever

The GID attended all kinds of meetings, with stenographers taking down speeches made in public. Organizations swarmed with GID agents and informers were constantly encountering each other at such meetings. These government agents were augmented by private detectives working for large corporations in the same manner as the GID, so that Senator Wheeler observed that some radical meetings were constituted 75 per cent of GID agents, private detectives, informers and lower forms of stoolpigeons, a breed given a new status and source of existence by Hoover's GID.

This was only a beginning for J. Edgar Hoover. He was interested, above all, in establishing his infamous card-index system of all radicals, or to keep a census of all persons or groups believed by his detectives to hold dangerous ideas. This was done in secret.

This is one of the most insidious practices of the FBI. With the exception of the chief and a few trusted subordinates, no one knows to this day who is on the list as originally drawn up and who has been added since; nor do they know the words, ideas, or events which led Hoover's detectives to "decide that a person had dangerous beliefs." There is absolutely no redress for any person so labeled and libeled, since it is a high principle of Hoover's organization that he cannot divulge the source of his information or his informers, otherwise his vicious spy organization would founder. Thus once on Hoover's list, you remain there, for even assuming that you know you are on the list, you cannot find out why, examine the evidence or cross-examine any informant.

Consider for a moment: In its first report, the GID advised Congress that its index of radicals totaled 100,000; it shortly reached the figure of 200,000; a year later, 450,000. Says Lowenthal, "Within the first two and a half years of indexing, the General Intelligence Division had approximately half a million persons catalogued, inventoried and secretly recorded in government records as dangerous men and women."

In 1923, the bureau succeeded in taking over the 750,000-name index of the older Bureau of Criminal Investigation. When in 1926 Hoover announced that his index total had 1,500,000 names it was not clear whether this included both lists or not, since complete secrecy surrounds the radical list. Hoover then directed that biographies of the more important radicals be written up. Within a few months "a more or less complete history of over 60,000 radically inclined individuals" was reported to the Senate, the list including persons "showing any connection with an ultra-radical body or movement," in particular "authors, publishers, editors, etc."

All of this was in preparation for the widespread activities of the Bureau of Investigation against all radical organizations, opening up the dirtiest period in the history of the FBI. It began with a vicious attack on the Industrial Workers of the World.

Down with Intellectuals!

The IWW was a native revolutionary syndicalist organization, but even this was not dangerous, said Palmer, until it became affiliated "with the greater social revolution in Europe. . . ."

In this persecution and prosecution of the IWW, the bureau acted in a common conspiracy with industry and the big landlords in agriculture. The attitude of the bureau was a simple one: It was defending the country. The well-being of the country was identified with the economic well-being of industry and agriculture. Therefore, anything that disturbed such enterprise was anti-American or radical, and had therefore to be controlled and defeated by the police powers of the government. The FBI thus became a pure-and-simple strikebreaking agency, a role it continued for many years, and as was to be expected, given the social views of its directors, had to go beyond the radical social and political organizations to violate even the rights of the conservative AFL.

From the drive against the IWW, the bureau went on to its raids, arrests and attacks upon the anarchist movements, of which there were many small organizations, and thence, to the early Communist organizations—long before the rise of Stalinism.

The bureau was not without its critics, for anyone familiar with the law and the democratic process was outraged by the activities of its detectives acting under directives of the various heads of the department and its bureau. The critics were answered in the stereotyped police manner: they were parlor pinks, and—perish forbid—"intellectuals." According to the GID these people included "these educated men and women who from the advantage or the pinch of their position of life have been seriously thinking, with none too commendable logic, about the incongruities and injustices of the times, and, catching the revolutionary thought, have turned to it both their feelings and interests."

The GID said of the intellectuals, "Among them are the 'parlor Bolsheviks' . . . the Philistines of our social period." These people were "enveloped in cigarette smoke and airs of superiority." And, alas, "they had lost touch of just proportion in their measurements of 'the good and the bad in modernism.'" [sic]

It would be nauseating to continue these quotations from the police minds passing themselves off as learned men, trying to cover their devious activities with an ideological rationale. But it is necessary to bear in mind all the time that behind this rationale, which is often disarming, especially when Hoover talks about legal process, Bill of Rights and the Constitution, the activities of the bureau are more prosaic and violate all the precepts which it declares inviolate.

The Palmer raids epitomized the real FBI and the apologies for it remain lame—as Lowenthal proceeds not to charge but to prove, (Continued next week)

The Totalitarian Joker In the Stalinist Constitutions

By HAL DRAPER

It is a not uncommon misconception, even among anti-Stalinists, that the satellite countries of the Russian empire give lip service to democratic rights on paper while they deny them completely in practice. This is untrue.

What is untrue is that democratic rights are guaranteed to the people even on paper.

Naturally, this point, however true, is of lesser significance than the far more important fact that not a vestige of democratic freedom exists in these countries in reality, in practice. Theoretically, for that matter, the branch-office dictators who rule these lands for the Kremlin could have written impeccably democratic constitutions and just as easily have ignored them while their secret police acted on its own constitution. If they did not choose to do so, it is perhaps because the very existence of such constitutional guarantees would be a constant reminder to the people of the liberties they lack.

At any rate, the totalitarian joker is already written into their state constitutions.

There is an added interest in taking a look at how this is done in view of another fact. The specific means employed to dress up an essentially totalitarian constitution to make it look and sound "democratic" is based on a conception which is widely held today by American liberals! That it is also widely enunciated by others to the right goes without saying.

The central problem involved was explicitly raised from the liberal side by, for example, a magazine article by Professor Horace Kallen (noted under "Reading from Left to Right" in LABOR ACTION of July 24 last). It was entitled "The Predicament of the Tolerant," and the predicament was this: Shall believers in democracy accord democratic rights to those who do not believe in democratic rights? Professor Kallen had the Stalinists in mind, of course, and he himself refrained from giving any definite answer to his own poser. The traditional liberal answer in this country has revolved around the "clear and present danger" doctrine of Justice Holmes, and it is a sign of the times that even "liberal" judges (like Justice Learned Hand) have gone far in sacrificing that doctrine on the altar of the cold war—by "reinterpreting" it into innocuous desuetude, as the wielders of juridical English might prefer to put it.

The Stalinist constitutions do nothing more than give a resounding No to Kallen's question. That is sufficient for their totalitarian purposes. The fact might conceivably give pause even to Professor Sidney Hook.

The concept we shall point to is contained in the constitutions of all the Stalinist states founded since the war, but it does not appear in the constitution of Russia itself, which dates back to 1936.

The joker in the USSR constitution (and that of its constituent "republics," like the Ukrainian SSR and Byelorussian SSR which are represented independently in the UN, as well as the Mongol People's Republic) is of an entirely different kind. It is notorious enough, but as a matter of fact appreciably milder as an explicit restriction on democratic rights. It is contained in two articles, the first of which is better known and more important. [Italic emphasis in all quotations is mine, not in the original.]

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
can help you build your own labor and socialist library. . . . Write for free book list.
And remember: we also supply books of ALL publishers. Get ALL your books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

Article 126: ". . . citizens of the USSR are guaranteed the right to unite in public organizations. . . and the most active and politically conscious citizens in the ranks of the working class and other sections of the working people unite in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), which is the vanguard of the working people in their struggle to strengthen and develop the socialist system and is the leading core of all organizations of the working people, both public and state."

Article 133: ". . . Treason to the motherland—violation of the oath of allegiance, desertion to the enemy, impairing the military power of the state, espionage—is punishable with all the severity of the law as the most heinous of crimes."

This constitutional guarantee that the ruling party must remain the ruling party is in a sense a more brazen and obvious violation of elementary democratic concepts, but it does not directly limit the "guarantees" of civil liberties which are elsewhere contained among the innumerable articles. It "merely" provides the legal basis whereby these civil liberties are made a dead letter in practice. And of course the GPU could do without this legal basis also.

Nothing like these two paragraphs is contained in any of the constitutions of the East European satrapies of Moscow. (Exception: Rumania, which has its own version of Article 133 only.) The East European constitutions do not even mention the Communist Party or its role.

With (considering their origins) a surprising amount of variation in language and form, the East European satellites uniformly hinge their constitutions on the simple proposition that one who disagrees with the "democratic principles" of the existing state has no democratic right to enjoy the democratic rights "guaranteed" by the constitution.

Here is how they do it:

BULGARIA

Article 87: "Bulgarian citizens have the right to form societies, associations and organizations provided they are not contrary to the State and the public order established by the present constitution."

"The law forbids and punishes the formation of and participation in organizations the aim of which is to deprive the Bulgarian people of the rights and liberties gained with the national uprising of September 9, 1944, and guaranteed by the present constitution, or to encroach on these rights and liberties, or to imperil the national independence and state sovereignty of the country; or organizations which openly or secretly propagate fascist and anti-democratic ideology or facilitate imperialist aggression."

The term "anti-democratic ideology" in this article is, of course, in the lexicon used by the ruling power, equivalent to "anti-Stalinist ideology"—just as, according to our totalitarian liberals in this country, the expression used in the Bill of Rights, "Congress shall make no law . . ." means: "Congress shall make no law, except when circumstances make it necessary. . . ."

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Section 2: "Personal freedom is guaranteed. It may be restricted or withheld only on the basis of the law."

Which, to be sure, means that personal freedom is not guaranteed at all. The qualification "only on the basis of the law" has a meaning indeed—it means, if only on paper, that a police officer or agency cannot arbitrarily deprive a citizen of personal freedom; and with this meaning, the phrase plays a role in many constitutions of states all over the world, not only in the Stalinist sphere; but the only constitutional guarantee of a liberty is one which is worded like the Bill of Rights: "Congress shall make no law. . . ."

The worth of even constitutional guarantees is shown by the U. S. experience, but the Czech constitution proceeds to follow the basic Stalinist pattern:

Section 21: "(1) Freedom of the press is guaranteed. It shall therefore not be permitted, as a rule, to subject the press to preliminary censorship."

Section 24: "(1) The right to assembly and to form associations is guaranteed provided that the People's Democratic Order, or public law and order, are not threatened thereby."

Section 37: "(1) Statements and acts that constitute a threat to the independence, integrity and unity of the State, the constitution, the republican form of govern-

ment and the People's Democratic Order are punishable according to law.

"(2) The misuse of civil rights and liberties to such ends is inadmissible."

POLAND

In a "Declaration of Rights and Liberties" associated with the constitution but not a formal part of it, 14 democratic rights of the people are enumerated, and then:

"At the same time, the [Constituent] Diet goes on record in stating that the abuse of the civil rights and liberties for the purpose of overthrowing the democratic form of government of the Republic of Poland shall be prevented by law."

This wording should not be identified with the language even of the notorious Smith Act or McCarran Act in the U. S., which cover disembowelment of civil liberties with phrases such as "overthrow by force and violence," etc. With one exception, the Stalinist constitutions forbid change of the government *per se*, and any use of democratic rights which has the "purpose" of changing the government. The exception is —

ALBANIA

—but the exception is meaningless, since it hinges on the Stalinist chameleon-word "undemocratic":

Article 32: ". . . Treachery against the people is the greatest crime."

Article 34: "Citizens cannot use the rights given them by this constitution in order to change the constitutional regime of the People's Republic of Albania in an undemocratic manner. Any act of this kind is illegal and carries with it punishment as prescribed by law."

RUMANIA

Article 32: "The citizens have the right of association and organization, if the aims pursued are not directed against the democratic order established by the constitution. Any association of fascist or anti-democratic character is forbidden and punishable by law."

As noted above, Article 36 is in addition modeled after the Russian constitution's Article 133.

YUGOSLAVIA

Article 43: "With a view to safeguarding the civic liberties and democratic organization of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, established by this constitution, it is declared illegal and punishable to make use of civic rights in order to change or undermine the constitutional order for anti-democratic purposes."

We commented further on this in LABOR ACTION of October 2 last.

The remaining Russian satellite, Hungary, has no formal constitution nor any document presenting a "bill of rights," and therefore needs no joker.

The protean meaning of the word "democracy" when embodied in a constitution for the purpose of prohibiting "undemocratic" or "anti-democratic" ideas is highlighted by another pair of constitutions which should not be left out of this study. For the Stalinist constitutions are not the only documents drawn up to serve as basic law for a totalitarian state. Outstanding among the non-Stalinist totalitarians are Franco and Peron.

Both Spain and Argentina adopted new constitutions after their present dictators came to power, Spain in 1945 and Argentina in 1949. Are the Franco and Peron constitutions democratic even on paper?—to ask the same question as we did above in the case of the Stalinists.

It is interesting and enlightening, but scarcely surprising, that both these totalitarian regimes have used the very same concept, based on "the predicament of the tolerant," for their constitutional purposes. Whether they adapted it straight from East Europe or thought it up themselves is another question.

Like the Stalinist constitutions, those of Spain and Argentina are radiant with all kinds of "guarantees" of democratic rights and liberties. But:

(Continued bottom of next page)

The Manifesto of the Medicine-Men Koestler, Rousset, Silone, Schmidt and Brown Describe Stalinism as a 'Phantom Ideology'

By LARRY O'CONNOR

On June 25, 1950 a group of writers, artists, scholars and scientists from France, Italy, Great Britain, West Germany and North and South America met to found the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

The assembly represented shadings of political opinion ranging from the British Labor Party through a dozen varieties of liberalism and conservatism, to the French semi-fascists of the party of De Gaulle.

What united them was supposedly a common devotion to human freedom, and a common determination to fight . . . not against the enemies of freedom in general . . . but against one of them only: Stalinism.

Among those assembled were Sidney Hook, James Burnham, David Rousset, Arthur Koestler, Ignazio Silone, James T. Farrell, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., and Carlo Schmid. Judging by the manifesto issued by the intelligentsia thus gathered, and by a declaration "We Put Freedom First" issued by the new organization's executive committee and carried with unmeasured praise by the New Leader for November 13, we can predict, not without a touch of nostalgia for what some of these men at one time represented, that the future of this committee will be one of both sterility and impotence.

Before commenting on the proclamations of the CCF (Congress for Cultural Freedom) it should be made clear that socialists are in favor of joining forces with people who do not share their full program or ideology to combat Stalinism or other forms of totalitarianism. The whole experience of two and a half decades of the anti-Stalinist struggle demonstrates, however, that the reactionary economic, social and political movement of Stalinism can only be combated successfully by offering to the common people of the world a superior social, political and economic program and being willing to fight for it with at least the same energy and indeed "fanaticism" with which the Stalinists contend for their reactionary system.

The Congress for Cultural Freedom, however, had not gathered for the purpose of working out a series of concrete proposals for the anti-Stalinist struggle. They were not interested in forming a program to unite the anti-Stalinist trade unions of Europe, nor in the organization of defense guards against Stalinist kidnapping and terrorism, nor in any other program of action to be undertaken independently by the masses of Western Europe or the world in general.

They were interested in uniting all anti-Stalinists in a crusade for freedom in general . . . and hence in the manifesto and declaration issued by the congress and its executive, "freedom" becomes something utterly divorced from property relations or economic exploitation, in fact, from the relations between social and economic classes in either capitalist or Stalinist society.

There is, in the manifesto, one line which states: "We hold that freedom cannot be secure as long as men remain divided into haves and have-nots." But this phrase is completely unconnected with any other idea in the whole document.

The Stalinist Constitutions — —

(Continued from page 6)

ARGENTINA

Article 15: "The State does not recognize the liberty to attack liberty. This principle is without prejudice to the individual right to express thought in the field of speculation, subject only to the provisions of law."

"The State does not recognize national or international organizations, whatever their aims, which maintain principles opposed to the individual liberties recognized in this constitution, or contrary to the democratic system on which the constitution is based."

SPAIN

Franco's "Charter of the Spanish People" has a number of gimmicks:

Article 2: "Spaniards owe faithful service to their country, loyalty to the Chief of State [Franco] and obedience to its laws."

Article 12: "All Spaniards may freely express their ideas as long as they do not advocate the overthrow of the fundamental principles of government."

Article 16: "Spaniards may unite and associate themselves freely for lawful ends and according to what is established by law."

Article 33: "The exercise of the rights that are recognized in this Charter may not prejudice the spiritual, national and social unity of the community." [The "spiritual" refers to the Catholic Church, and is a fitting counterpart to Russia's Article 126.]

Article 35: "The enforcement of Articles 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18 [which guarantee democratic rights] may temporarily be suspended in part or in whole by the government by means of a decree which must define and limit the scope and duration of this measure."

Of all the provisions we have cited, it would be hard to pick out the one which most blatantly expresses the spirit of the Orwellian 1984, but Franco's Article 16 is a powerful contender. It says in so many words that all are free . . . to obey the law. It is easy to see that freedom is slavery, war is peace, imperialism is a self-defense, and Sidney Hook is a liberal.

We have been dealing with the states which have embodied this concept in their constitutions. It is the openly totalitarian countries which have done this. So-called "leaders of public opinion" in this country, including a good section of the liberals, have no reason to point the finger. They are in the process of accepting the same theory, where they have not yet done so indeed.

So determined were the intellectuals assembled in Berlin to keep away from any suggestion of a social or economic program, however limited (for this would have divided them immediately) that they were constrained by the "logic" of their whole approach to portray Stalinism in unworldly terms. They would have us believe that Stalinism is not a powerful social, political and economic movement, strongly rooted in the failure of capitalist society to satisfy the elementary economic and social needs of the masses, and fertilized by the increasing decay of the capitalist system.

To them Stalinism is, rather, a mass insanity. It is a "phantom ideology," a "morbid obsession," a "mental aberration." And the way to fight it is, therefore, to form a new "intellectual climate" and to help the peoples of the world to a "return to moral and intellectual sanity." "To bring about this return to sanity," the statement of the executive committee concludes, "is the aim of the Congress of Cultural Freedom."

Just when did a large portion of humanity go mad . . . and why? At least one might expect these world psycho-therapists to go into such questions. But the fact of the matter is that they have not adopted this terminology because they mean it, literally or otherwise, but rather because their own internal divisions and their lack of a political, social and economic alternative to Stalinism which can hope to have any appeal to masses of people forces them to adopt a conception of both their enemy and of themselves which has no relation to social reality.

As they are uniting only against Stalinist totalitarianism, and not against all suppression of human liberty, they are also

forced to explain this to their potential audience. They achieve their aim by completely misstating, in demagogic terms to boot, the position of those who are convinced that the struggle against Stalinism can only be successful if it is combined with a struggle against the social order the decay of which has given rise to the new totalitarianism.

What about Franco? What about discrimination against Negroes in the United States? What about the continued colonial rule of the Western European countries over millions of African and Asiatic subject peoples?

The Stalinists and their apologists have been using the trick of diverting discussion from the evils of Stalinism by pointing to the evils of capitalism for a long time, and anyone interested in fighting for freedom must avoid falling into this trap. But it is evident that except when a reply to Stalinist demagoguery is involved, the attitude of those who would really fight for freedom toward these questions is of the utmost importance in itself.

The congress answers: Let us not be diverted by these questions. Fifteen million Spaniards under Franco do not threaten to conquer the world. Discrimination against Negroes is bad, but their lot has been improving slowly. And we can hope that in due course colonial rule will come to a happy end.

In each case their reply is an evasion. They do not say whether they are for loans to Franco, for a determined struggle against all forms of discrimination and segregation of Negroes, for immediate colonial freedom. They do not even point out that Stalinism has power beyond the Iron Curtain precisely because on these and other social questions the Stalinists present a positive program, however cynic-

ally it may be put forward.

The distortion of the Third Camp position lies in the fact that the congress pretends that those who advocate a policy of combating both capitalism and Stalinism refuse to strike a blow at the latter while the evils of the former continue to exist. This is the old trick of creating a straw man and then tearing him to pieces in order to make your own position look good in comparison.

In actuality the advocates of the struggle against both capitalism and Stalinism, of the formation of a Third Camp of the common people of the world to struggle for a socialist order of democracy and economic equality, have been much more determined opponents of Stalinism than many of those who are now adopting the "crazy man" theory of Stalinism.

The cold fact is that along with their proclamation of an undying devotion to freedom, the intellectuals of the Congress for Cultural Freedom are stating, in concealed terms, that they will defend the present social order in the West. They state: "To the totalitarian threat and its fanatical creed we oppose an absolute and unconditional 'NO.' But our 'YES' to the civilization which we are defending leaves full scope for nuances, divergent opinions, social theories and experiments."

This traditional ritualistic replacement of the term "capitalism" with the term "civilization" is modified only by a sentence which discusses the relationship of long and short-term aims of the various participants in the congress. "By long-term aims, we mean," says the statement of the Executive, "the age-old struggle for reform, for social justice for a more equitable form of government." And in the next sentence it is clearly implied that even this vague program of reform, which is so vague that everyone from the British Labor Party to the clerical fascists can sign it without a qualm . . . that even this is to be put aside in the interest of the united, immediate struggle against Stalinism.

The gentlemen think they are fighting a psychopathic phenomenon. To oppose it they have neither a method of psychological treatment nor a social program. They have reverted to the pre-scientific era when all the ills of humanity were exorcised by the incantations of medicinemen.

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER!

Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

The Permanent Revolution	\$3.50
The Lesson of Spain	.25
Marxism in the U. S.	.35
The New Course	1.50
Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay	.25
Fascism, What It Is, How to Fight It	.35

ALL FOR ONLY \$5.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 W. 14th St.
New York 11, N. Y.

Subscribers — Attention!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one. If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

15-2

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue. **RENEW NOW!**

Debate over Hoover Program—

(Continued from page 1)

But Hoover's program does not to the least degree offer any progressive alternative to the Truman-Acheson-Dewey-Dulles line of aggressive preparation for war. Its role in tapping anti-war feeling among the American people does not in the least reflect any content on its part that can really stop the outbreak of a new imperialist war or safeguard our liberties and security, any more than can the administration line.

Hoover proposes that—

"The foundation of our national policies must be to preserve for the world this Western Hemisphere Gibraltar of Western civilization. We can, without any measure of doubt, with our own air and naval forces, hold the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with one frontier on Britain (if she wishes to cooperate); the other, on Japan, Formosa and the Philippines."

For the rest, he advocates that the U. S. pull out of Asia and Europe.

'Capitalism in a Single Country'?

For one thing, Hoover's formulation of a "Western Hemisphere Gibraltar" is deceptively simple even in his own terms. For it turns out that he does not quite mean exactly that. As we see, this "Gibraltar" is not just a rocky island, is not even a mere hemisphere, for it includes flying buttresses lying on Britain in one direction, and on Japan, Formosa and the Philippines on the other! The picture which the man in the street got from his winged phrase about "Gibraltar"—Uncle Sam peacefully watching his television set behind his two oceans while the rest of the world goes to hell—is far from accurate. Perhaps Hoover does not have the courage of his convictions.

But that is the least of it. The consequences of the Hoover program would be more than the abandonment of Europe and Asia to Stalinism. Its consequences would be more immediate at home. For Hoover proposes in effect a "capitalism in a single country," beleaguered in a world overrun by Russian power. This "capitalism in a single country," moreover, would be a dying ember of a system, the remnants of a capitalism which has gone under in the rest of the world.

What would such a "capitalism in a single country" look like? Socially, it would mean—it would have to mean—the construction of the "garrison state" to the nth degree. Here "garrison state" takes on close to literal meaning. If the Truman-Acheson program today means, as it does, a steady increase in anti-democratic controls, militarization and authoritarianism, a United States in the image of Hoover's speech would mean not only a beleaguered fortress of obsolescent capitalism but indeed the quicker flowering of every tendency in that capitalism, strong enough now, toward fascism.

What the American people want, what alone can fill the political vacuum in their thinking today, is a dynamic program which can counter the threat of war AND the threat of Stalinist expansion. Hoover offers the first; Truman-Acheson offer the second. In point of fact, Hoover's prescription for staving off war would not only mean opening wide the floodgates to Stalinist expansion but, in the not-too-long run, would ensure catastrophic war in the end. And the administration line, which bases itself on the aim of "containing" Russian imperialism THROUGH warmaking, has shown already in the very short run that it cannot even defeat Stalinism.

It is not true, therefore, that the two programs really offer two different choices, or that they ask us to choose between stopping war and stopping Stalinism. Neither can do either.

No Place to Hide

Stalinism can be stopped in Asia and Europe only to the extent that the people of those continents see an alternative to supporting either Stalinism or Western capitalism. They fear the first and have had their bellyful of the second. No plan based on countering the preservation of capitalism to the spread of Stalinism will move them any more than the Atlantic Pact, the Marshall Plan, the Truman Doctrine et al. have done.

The Independent Socialist program, basically opposed both to the current Washington line and the Hoover line, is indeed to wage the fight against Stalinism in every corner of the globe—but not in the name of capitalism, not in order to prop up the Chiang Kai-sheks, Bao Dais, Adenauers and Syngman Rhee's, but through building the anti-capitalist and anti-Stalinist Third Camp which can win the world away from both imperialist war blocs.

The outcries against Hoover in the section of the press supporting the Truman-Acheson-Dewey-Dulles policy have been howling that Hoover's proposal is "isolationist" and "pro-appeasement." It is clear enough, of course, that there is a point to this denunciation: certainly Hoover's conclusions would mean in practice both isolationism and appeasement. Certainly it is designed to appeal to, and will appeal

to and rally, whatever remains of these points of view, silent and apologetic up to now.

But Hoover is not a Chamberlain or even a Taft. He may well be perfectly sincere in disclaiming isolationism or appeasement, since the motivating reasons for his proposal are not the same as these.

These motivating reasons of his are rather based on open-eyed recognition of new realities in the world, particularly two:

(1) The U. S. cannot depend on its Western allies to fight Russia.

(2) U. S. economy, as now organized, would be unbearably strained by the exigencies of self-preparation for war plus the outpouring of billions to refurbish and sustain the shaky capitalist economies of the other Western countries.

And it is a reality that the European capitalisms and their peoples have no will to fight. We have often enough explained the reasons for this salient phenomenon. Hoover recognizes the fact. He has nothing to offer which will give the European or Asian people any will to fight against Stalinism. His only recourse is—to seek a hiding place. But there is no place to hide for states as there is none for people.

The Truman-Acheson line has a "remedy" for its allies' lack of will to fight. It is to dragoon them into the war line-up, through economic bribery and political pressure. It swings the Marshall Plan, Point 4 and all other instruments of its predominant economic strength as clubs to force its reluctant allies into the firing line. In the name of countering Russian imperialism, it wields its own imperialist dominance in the Western world more and more brazenly.

For it too has nothing to offer the European or Asian people which will give them a will to fight from within themselves, from the impulses of their own interests. It talks in terms of the fight of the "free world" against Stalinism, but it can organize the "free world" only by converting it more and more into U. S. satellites.

A Breathing-Spell Is Not Enough

It is also true that U. S. economy, as now organized even under a cold-war economy, would be terribly strained by its effort to extend itself over all of the Western world. This is, and increasingly will be, the source of the drive under the administration line toward a garrison state, economically and politically. The tempos might vary but the internal social evolution under either capitalist proposal has to be in the same direction, for it is only by going in this direction that capitalism can save itself.

The Hoover plan has one last characteristic that needs consideration. Whether it is simply appeasement or not, like the policy of appeasement it can boast that it can postpone war a little longer, lengthen the breathing-spell of "peace" (defined as absence of all-out atomic war). We do not dismiss this selling-point lightly. In itself a breathing-spell, even a breathing-spell, is a consummation devoutly to be wished. But any policy which orients itself decisively on the illusory advantages of breathing-spells, regardless of the consequences of such breathing-spells, is a blind short-sighted way of blundering into a swamp.

The need is to fight for a policy which can SOLVE the world crisis, not for one which seeks to hide from it. Only the Independent Socialist line can SOLVE it. We propose a program to fight Stalinism, not to flee from it, and to fight Stalinism in the only way it can effectively be fought and defeated in the world today: through building a movement of the peoples which is also anti-capitalist; which does NOT fight Stalinism in the name of maintaining the system which has brought the world to its present state of shambles, the system in which the overwhelming majority of the peoples of the world have no hope or confidence.

The Independent Socialists propose a fight against war and Stalinism through the struggle for a new world of socialist democracy. It is the democratic alternative to Hooverism and the anti-war alternative to Trumanism.

WITH THE ISL



You are invited to attend local branch activities of the ISL. For information or literature, address: Independent Socialist League, national office 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y. (tel. WATKINS 4-4222). Same address for Socialist Youth League.

AKRON

Write to Box 221.

BALTIMORE

Write to national office of ISL.

BUFFALO

Write to national office of ISL.

CHICAGO

333 West North Ave., Room 3. Tel.: MICHigan 9003. SYL: same.

CLEVELAND

Write to Box 1190, Station E.

DETROIT

Meets Thursday evenings at Labor Action Hall, 8212 Twelfth St. (near Seward), Room 25. Educational program for evening begins at 8:30.

LOS ANGELES

221 W. 2nd St., Room 218.

NEWARK

248 Market Street.

NEW YORK CITY

City Center and Labor Action Hall: 114 West 14 Street, third floor. Tel.: WATKINS 4-4222, CHelsea 2-9681.

Open meetings at Labor Action Hall on Thursday nights at 8:45 o'clock. Admission free. SYL: for all information on New York SYL, address 114 West 14 Street.

PHILADELPHIA

1139 W. Girard Ave., third floor. Meetings Mondays at 8 p.m. Open house, Sundays 8:30-10 p.m.

PITTSBURGH

Write to national office of ISL.

READING

Write to P. O. Box 1671.

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND

Labor Action Hall, 466 Tenth St., Room 218, Oakland 7.

Office hours: Tues. and Thurs., 7:30-10 p.m.; Wed., 1-4 p.m.

Labor Action and The New International on sale at The Golden Gate News Agency, 66 Third St., off Market St.

SEATTLE

Write to Box 358, 905 Third Avenue, Seattle 4.

ST. LOUIS

Write to national office of ISL.

WEST VIRGINIA

Write to national office of ISL.

YOUNGSTOWN

Write to national office of ISL.

The FIGHT for SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00

Cloth-bound \$2.00

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.

WEEK by WEEK...

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism.

A sub is only \$2 a year!