

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 25, 1951

FIVE CENTS

Washington and the Russian Emigres

... page 6

Liberia: America's Ward in Africa

... page 3

The Israelis Debate Foreign Policy

... page 7

The Fourth International's
Capitulation to Stalinism

... page 4

French Middle-of-Roaders Shift Toward the Right

By PAUL ROBERTS

First returns in the French Assembly elections show a continued shift of the middle-of-the-road forces to the right.

The Catholic MRP lost over a third of its seats, mostly to the De Gaullist RPF, and many of the elements who formerly lined up with the mildly conservative Radical Party now lined up with the very conservative Independent Rightists.

Thanks to a specially rigged election law, the Radical Party, although its votes remained about the same, increased its seats by about 50 per cent, since the law favors coalition candidates and the Radicals made coalitions with almost everyone in sight (except the Stalinists and De Gaullists).

The Socialists, although evidently not gaining votes, gained several seats. The Stalinists' voting strength went down slightly, from 23.6 per cent in 1946 to about 26 per cent this time. Thanks to the election law, however, the Stalinists, who held 133 seats in the previous Assembly, will have only between 105 and 110 in the new one.

The De Gaullists, running candidates for the Assembly for the first time in a national election, met what amounted to a setback. Their pre-election claims—and the fears of others—gave them 150-200 seats. They entered the lists this time in order to demonstrate their power and force the formation of a government around their Fuehrer. They not only fell substantially short of their goal, but their popular vote fell as compared with the last municipal elections in which they had participated. But it cannot be thought that this relative failure at this time exorcizes the De Gaullist danger.

Incidentally, seven out of the successful De Gaulle candidates are also generals. But De Gaullist General Koenig, former military governor of the French Zone of Germany was defeated. Among other prominent candidates who failed to make the grade were Paul Ramadier, SPPer and former premier, and Jean Duclos, the brother of CP top leader Jacques

(Continued on page 2)

Would-Be Fuehrer Misses His Mark



The "Democracy" Washington Defends in Korea—

Reveal S. Korea Atrocities Against Own Drafted Men

By GORDON HASKELL

More than 50,000 South Korean draftees have died in training camps of starvation and disease since last December according to a report by Suh Min Ho, chairman of the Korean National Assembly's Interior Affairs and Security Committee. Of the fewer than 350,000 survivors, 80 per cent were "physical wrecks, incapable of labor." During the same period several hundred thousand soldiers deserted in order to escape the fate of their comrades.

This terrible atrocity was committed not by the Stalinist invaders from the North, but by officials of the South Korean government against their own people. These were not casualties of war, even in the sense that the uncounted numbers of civilians have been casualties of the bombing and napalming of villages, or of the mass flight before the armies surging up and down the peninsula. They are the direct, organized victims of the corruption and brutality of the South Korean government, of the specific "democracy" which the U. S.-UN troops are defending in Korea.

Suh Min Ho has stated that his committee has substantiated and made a matter of official record the details of a 300 mile "death march" that draftees had been forced to make last December. During the three weeks of forced marching through snow in the bitter cold of winter some 300,000 men deserted or died along the way. "At least that many men are not accounted for," he said.

In the schoolhouses, warehouses and rice mills requisitioned to quarter the troops no heat was provided. Neither bedding nor clothing was issued,

and the men bound themselves with rags and straw mats to keep from freezing. Survivors told the committee that they went for "days without food," and the food they did get was "worse than most armies put before their cattle."

True, an investigation is now being carried out by the government, and the direct culprits are being punished, or at least some of them are. Nine South Korean Defense Corps officers have been arrested on charges of embezzlement, forgery and neglect of duty. It is said that they are suspected of embezzling government funds totaling 24,000 million won, or nearly \$4,000,000. The former deputy commander of the Defense Corps, Col. Yoon Ik Ryon, is already serving a three and a half year prison term on embezzlement charges, which indicates that the fact of the embezzlement was known even before the present committee report opened up the whole scandal to public view.

ONLY PART OF THE STORY

Other government officials are denying the extent of the atrocity. Defense Minister Chang Kyung Keun has described the Interior Affairs and Security Committee's report as a "distorted fact," and claims that his records showed "only" 799 deaths through March, when the Health Ministry took over treatment of "ailing" draftees. On the desertion charge, he claims that 54 camps held 487,364 persons, and that "only" 7,702 had deserted. Whatever the exact figures may, in due course, turn out to be, it is significant that this is only one of a number of recent charges of graft in high places which have occasioned the resignation of several government officials.

(Continued on page 5)

Who's Halley and Where's His Program? Liberal Party Puts Up a 'Crime-Buster'

By PETER WHITNEY

NEW YORK—The Liberal Party opened its campaign to elect Rudolph Halley, chief counsel of the Kefauver Investigating Committee, as president of New York's City Council at its annual dinner on June 13 at the Hotel Commodore. At that time some 1000 members and party supporters had their first opportunity to size up the candidate previously named by the State Ex-

ecutive Committee.

Television viewers were already familiar with his face and manner. The New York stop of the Kefauver committee had aroused a terrific television audience, and Halley had been played up as a fearless crusader against the forces of crime and corruption in municipal government. The Liberal Party hoped to take advantage of this and reap the benefit of the publicity given the Kefauver committee and Halley—hence their nomination.

NO POLITICAL PAST

Halley was presented to the audience as a candidate of "clean government"—against fixes in government, against corruption, against gangsterism, against political bossism—all laudable aims, and one can grant his sincerity in desiring them. Since Halley has absolutely no political background—that is his particular boast—he is able to come into the arena at this time unscathed, untouched, and unmarked by even the slightest contact with any

politicians in the past.

Adolf Berle, Liberal Party chairman, introduced him by saying that he was an "independent Democrat" who had never ventured near any of the Democratic clubhouses. This purity enabled Halley to attack the local Democratic machine as "submerged up to its neck in the slime of corruption and gangster domination." This same Halley excoriated the apathy and passivity of the people as being responsible for the merchants of crime dominating the city government. And yet he had remained a member of the party—true a passive and apathetic one—which saddled New York City with fixes, corruption, and bribery in every department of government.

SOME QUESTIONS

Just what is Halley's political past? Didn't he vote after reaching the age of 21? It would be enlightening to know his attitude toward the various "clean-up candidates" run by the Liberal Party in the past. For instance, whom did he support for mayor in 1950,

assuming that his present burning interest in cleaning up New York is not of more recent origin? Was it Ferdinand Pecora, the joint candidate of the Liberal Party and the Democratic Party, which latter party, per Mr. Halley, is buried in the slime of graft and gangsterism—or could it have been Vincent Impellitteri, a product of this same school who wanted to be headmaster of patronage?

Adolf Berle, Liberal Party chairman, in presenting crime-buster Halley to the audience, sketched the meager facts known about him. Definitely known are his birth in New York State, his graduating from Columbia University, and his becoming a graduate lawyer at the age of 20. After some service in the offices of various judges, Talley landed on the Truman Senate Committee investigating war frauds, where he eventually became chief counsel. Although the case is usually to the contrary, we must assume that Halley received all these ap-

(Turn to last page)

THE VOTE IN FRANCE

Unofficial returns for 593 out of the 627 seats showed the following:

Seats	Voting percentage		
	1951	1946	
Socialists	103	17.9	14.3
MRP (Catholic moderates)	81	11.6	26
Radicals (Mild conservatives)	92	11.4	11.1
Total "third force"	276	37.3	55
Independent Rightists	99	12.9	16
Stalinists	103	26	28.3
RPF (De Gaullists)	115	21	0

'Trenton Six' Negroes Get Southern Style Frameup

Northern "justice," Southern style, was handed out at the trial of the "Trenton Six." In an amazingly contradictory verdict, the jury freed four and convicted two—Collis English and Ralph Cooper—of the Trenton Negroes accused of the murder of an aged white junk dealer, after a seven-week trial.

The trial of the Trenton Six, which received world-wide attention, was distinguished by the fact that it was a "confession" trial. The prosecution rested its case upon the "confessions" signed by the defendants after four days and five nights of steady police grilling.

These "confessions" were repudiated at the trial: the defense attorneys proved that they were obtained by the use of drugs, and the judge was forced to refuse to admit three of them as evidence.

The "crime" that these six Negroes were really guilty of was that of being born Negro. At stake in the case was whether a man could be pulled off the streets, dragged by the police into signing a confession, and then be placed on trial. The fact that two of the Negroes were convicted shows that it can be done in these United States today.

The six Negroes on trial—Collis English, Ralph Cooper, James Thorpe, Horace Wilson, McKinley Forrest, John McKenzie—were picked up by the police several days after the murder of William Horner, in February 1948. The public atmosphere at the time was charged by an anti-Negro campaign in the local newspapers. Although the judge refused to accept testimony on this anti-Negro atmosphere built up by the press, there is no question but that it was behind the frameup. With the Trenton Times running editorials calling upon the county prosecution to fill "the empty electric chair," the police went out and rounded up six Negroes.

After the murder, the police set up special "Crime Crusher" squads which patrolled the Negro neighborhoods with machine guns. Negro men were stopped on the streets and had to explain why they were there. At the trial the defense contended that this anti-Negro campaign was the reason the police went out and picked up the defendants, and accused them of the crime. Any Negroes would do, and they were placed on trial after the confessions were forced out of them.

The testimony of Collis English, one of the two who were convicted, illustrates the technique used by the police. Collis English was picked up on a motor violation on February 6, 1948. After some questioning about the motor violation, the police went on to accuse him of the Horner murder. One of the defense attorneys, Pelletieri, asked

Remember Truman's Election Promises?

A CIO statement lays the blame for the "housing fiasco" squarely on the administration, the construction industry and the real-estate lobby.

"The defense emergency has heaped a new housing crisis on top of an already existing one," the CIO said. "Almost all of the old unsolved problems of slums, high rents and the over-all shortage of decent, low-cost family housing . . . are still with us."

The situation is "fragic," it charges. The government, it says, has failed to do any real planning to meet the housing emergency and its regulation X, which calls for high down-payments on new housing, actually has resulted in channeling new housing to those families "with the fattest pocket-books."

the arresting cop why, without any apparent reason, he had accused English of the murder. The policeman replied, "Well, there were quite a number of holdups, and the Horner case seemed to be uppermost in my mind."

What was uppermost in his mind was that Negroes were accused of the murder, and he was determined to accuse the first Negro picked up, even on a minor violation. The distinguishing fact was the color of English's skin.

At the trial the defense brought out that all of the defendants were haphazardly picked up for the crime. So certain was the prosecution that it could push through the trial and get away with the frameup, that at the first trial (which was overturned because of insufficient evidence in obtaining the convictions) there was no effort to prove that the defendants even knew one another. The defendants asserted at the trial that they had just met each other for the first time when they were caught up in the anti-Negro campaign. The only thing that tied them together was the confessions.

CASE IS RIDDLED

The star witness introduced by the prosecution to prove that some of the witnesses knew each other was Charles English, Collis English's father. However, his testimony is such that they seriously undermine its validity. There was deep-rooted animosity between the father and son because of Collis English's role when his father went to jail, at about the time of the murder, for sex offenses. Then the father's sentence was mysteriously suspended, and he suddenly appeared at the trial to testify against his son. Also it was asserted by the defense that a larceny charge against Charles English was being dropped.

The defense was able to produce a witness who saw the hold-up escape, and who testified that there were only four Negro men in the holdup. She also stated that the get-away car was different in model and color from the one the prosecution claims was used; and in addition, she testified that the men she saw were not the ones who were on trial.

The case then rested on the "confessions." At the time of the signing of the "confessions," the police brought in a Negro politician and a Negro doctor to witness the signings and examine the defendants. Dr. Sullivan, who was given a county job a week after examining the witnesses in jail, was forced to make admissions that were damaging to the validity of the confessions and showed them to be the frameups that they were.

Dr. Sullivan testified that Collis English was under such "mental pressure" that he could not be acting under his own free will when he signed the confession. He further admitted that McKenzie and Cooper were under the influence of drugs, and Thorpe at first refused to sign the confession but later weakened under the promise of a reduced sentence.

The French know where the two and a quarter billion dollars of Marshall Plan money went, and they're not at all happy about it. What didn't go down the bloody drain of the Indo-Chinese war went to line the pockets of a few profiteers and little or nothing ever dribbled down to the workers.

It is therefore well-nigh certain

Judge Smalley ruled out the admission of the Thorpe, Cooper and McKenzie confessions on the grounds of the direct evidence of the use of drugs and promises made in return for signing. The rest of County Prosecutor Volpe's case rested on the testimony of the police that the confessions were "voluntary."

THE 13TH JUROR

In the light of the riddled stories of the "confessions," the refusal of the judge to admit some of the confessions and the direct testimony of dozens of witnesses proving that the defendants could not possibly have been at the scene of the crime, the jury decision is all the more monstrous. To free four of the defendants meant that all defendants had to go free, in view of the way in which the police constructed the case.

As a matter of fact, English and Cooper were not even charged with the actual murder, and this makes their convictions even more heinous.

In his summation, Defense Attorney Pelletieri warned the jury that "thirteen jurors, prejudice, enter the jury room." But Jim Crow was not merely in the jury room, it pervaded the entire trial of the Trenton Six. The frame-up of these six Negroes is so apparent elementary justice requires that an investigation be held of the Trenton police and county prosecutor's office in order to prosecute criminally the initiators of the atrocity.

DUCLIS

The coalition of "moderate" or "third force" parties that made up the previous French government, although diminished in strength, continues as the largest single group of deputies in the next Assembly.

(Continued from page 1)

The neo-fascist De Gaullist movement in some places was supported by some of the rightist groups and thus received more seats than the Stalinists, although in popular votes the Stalinists received some 5 per cent more than the De Gaullists.

The figures show that only two sorts of governmental alliance can come out of the new Assembly. One is an alliance between the "third force" parties and the "independent rightists" or so-called conservative "fourth force." The other would be an alliance between the De Gaullists, the "fourth force" and a "third force" from which the Socialists would be purged.

Unless the Socialists are thrown out, the De Gaullists would refuse to enter any combination. The chances for that are very small at the present time. The continued high vote of the Stalinists, as well as the fairly high Socialist vote, both indicative of the French workers' unrest and dissatisfaction with their low standard of living and with ever-rising prices (over 20 per cent increase since the Korean war started), make even the conservatives afraid to do without the cover of Socialist Party support.

The French know where the two and a quarter billion dollars of Marshall Plan money went, and they're not at all happy about it. What didn't go down the bloody drain of the Indo-Chinese war went to line the pockets of a few profiteers and little or nothing ever dribbled down to the workers.

It is therefore well-nigh certain

LABOR SCOPE

UAW Fights Case of Alleged Pro-Stalinist

By PHILIP COBEN

We're glad to read in the *Michigan CIO News* that the UAW-CIO has taken up the case of a worker who was fired by the company for taking a trip to visit Russia!

The Hayes Manufacturing Company in Grand Rapids, Michigan, had given William M. Glenn, a member of UAW Local 801, a six-months leave of absence to make the trip, and then revoked it as soon as he was gone.

Glenn said he was visiting Russia with a delegation of American workers as guests of the Federal Council of Soviet Trade Unions. Just for the sake of argument, let's assume that the man is a Stalinist—if only because an "innocent" would not dare nowadays to stick his neck out that far even for the sake of a junket. The ease of the assumption, as a matter of fact, is something of a commentary on the state of hysteria in the country.

Let's assume, besides, that Glenn will come back to buttress his (previously assumed) Stalinist propaganda with the "I was there and saw it with my own eyes" fakery. He has taken a trip through the Moscow subway and can therefore prove that Stalin's prisonland is the workers' paradise. But this assumption is a little weaker than the first.

For there's many a Stalinist who came to the end of his ideological rope after kissing the soil of the "socialist fatherland"—and finding that there was not a speck of socialism in sight.

In fact, we can suggest a more profitable use than they are getting now for the assorted moneys being collected by promoters of

various associations "against communism"—provided that said promoters have left any money in the till for any purpose. Offer a free six-months sojourn in Russia for Stalinists who want to see the Future With Their Own Eyes.

We don't mean that they will get to see the slave-labor camps or receive a guided tour of explanation on how political trials are framed up. Our expectation would be quite modest: even this limited experience would break more Stalinist dupes than all the propaganda and activities of the professional "anti-Communist" societies that whoop it up for American capitalism. The claim is purely relative.

The UAW, of course, is treating the Glenn case as a union matter and not as a political lesson. That's the way it has to be fought. We note that the news item mentions that the UAW international representative, Kenneth W. Robinson, "asked the Local 801 members . . . to take the case to arbitration." And "Robinson said Glenn's case must be fought in the same manner as any other firing because the union's constitution carries no restriction on political activities of its members."

It's a rather special procedure when an international representative has to appeal to the membership to enforce its contract. The "anti-red" virus has bitten deeply into the union movement, top and bottom, and in most cases with the enthusiastic aid of the tops.

It will take a lot of equally special efforts for the UAW to root it out of its own shops. It can do so only by fighting vigorously on every single case that crops up.

headed by veteran Trotskyist Michele Mestre and by a former Renault automobile worker and strike leader Daniel Renard. In most of France they told the workers to vote Stalinist.

In a few regions, mostly in the mining areas, the quasi-Titoist MCFP ("French Communist Movement") ran candidates. (For details on this group see last week's *LABOR ACTION*.)

In the Paris region the *Gauche Independant* also ran candidates. Its candidates included Charles d'Aragon (former MRP deputy who broke with the Catholic party), Jean Rous and Yves Dechezelle (who left the Socialist Party and tried to build the ill-fated RDR), Maurice Lacroix of the left Catholic Young Republic movement, and Claude Bourdet, editor of *L'Observateur* and a Tito supporter. [Late reports give d'Aragon and Bourdet 1 and 2 per cent of the vote respectively in their Paris districts.]

This group's electoral statement is forcefully opposed to the Atlantic Pact and is vaguely pacifist and socialist. Although the members, including the leaders, of the group are known anti-Stalinists, their statement does not carry a word of open condemnation of the Stalinists, either French or Russian. It is very doubtful if that helped them gain any support, but it is certain that such a cloudy attitude cannot help them achieve a real regrouping of independent revolutionary Third Camp forces.

Since then there has been a constant continuation of the process of undermining every social advance and a constant taking-in of additional conservative elements to the government. When the right moment comes, the Socialists too will be thrown out when they are no longer needed as window-dressing.

ON THE LEFT

The votes received by three independent leftist groups have not yet been reported. The "official" Trotskyist PCI ran candidates in one sector of Paris and in a sector of the Seine-et-Oise Parisian suburb. Their lists were

WHERE WE STAND

To get acquainted with the ideas of Independent Socialism, send for the special issues of *LABOR ACTION* listed below:

May Day Issue 1950

THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

May Day Issue 1951

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

Ten Cents Each

LABOR ACTION, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Final Results In Italian Vote Confirm Trend

By PAUL ROBERTS

Italy has at last finished this year's round of municipal and provincial council elections. The elections, held on three different weekends in the various parts of the country, confirmed the trend indicated by the first weekend of voting in 28 Northern and Central provinces.

The Stalinists and their fellow travelers, although they lost control of all the large cities of Italy, except Bologna which they held by the skin of their teeth, about 13 their own in the popular votes. They received 5,567,700 votes as against 5,700,000 votes in the 1948 elections. This gave them about 37 per cent of the total.

The Christian-Democrats of De Gasperi received 5,830,000 or 38.7 per cent. The Socialists or so-called Social-Democrats received 1,434,000 or 9.65 per cent. The conservative Liberal Party had 547,000 or 3.65 per cent. The neo-fascist MSI received 635,000 or 4.3 per cent of the votes.

All in all, the governmental coalition led by the Christian-Democrats and including the Social-Democrats, the Liberals and some smaller groups, received approximately 55 per cent of the votes. Since the election law was designed to give two-thirds of the seats on each council to a coalition getting a simple plurality, the governmental coalition took over almost all the cities of Italy. Among the cities where the Stalinists lost control were Genoa, Venice, Turin, Florence, Asti and Lusa.

SHIFT TO RIGHT

Of the total pro-Stalinist share of the vote, 3,341,000 or 22.3 per cent went to the Communist Party itself, 1,981,000 or 13.2 per cent went to the Stalinist-puppet Nenni, Socialists and the remaining 1½ per cent went to various front groups.

Since the elections the right wing of the Christian-Democrats has been calling for an extension of the governmental alliance toward the right, taking in the anarchist groups and perhaps even the neo-fascist MSI. The more "left" elements, mostly trade-unionists, led by Deputy Dossetti, are known to favor a closer alignment with the Social-Democrats.

Prime Minister DeGasperi tries to hold to a middle course of keeping things as they are. Being conservative, he would like to move even further to the right, but he fears the effect on the Italian people.

The over 46 per cent of the people who voted for the Stalinists or one of the socialist tickets are fed up with the failure of the government to carry through real land reform and with the way in which the billion and a quarter of Marshall Plan money has all gone to enrich the capitalists while the standard of living remains desperately low. That is why De Gasperi will try to remain friendly with the Social-Democrats and would like to see them back in his government.

By LEON TROTSKY

Marxism in the United States

35 Cents Order from Independent Socialist Press 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y.

THE CASE OF LIBERIA

The U. S.'s Own Semi-Colonial Ward in Africa

By RICHARD TROY

The situation in Liberia, one of the small countries on Africa's rich west coast, has edged into the U. S. press recently, but the background story of what is happening there deserves somewhat more attention than the newspapers have accorded it.

To be sure, to most Americans Liberia is an unimportant corner of the world, but the country and its development have a special relationship to U. S. imperialism. And in Africa as a whole, the new stirrings toward national consciousness and struggle to this continent as a new battleground of the native peoples' fight against foreign oppression, as Asia is today.

Liberia's story caught the eyes especially of American liberals recently when reports reached this country of the presidential elections held this May.

Historically, the country owes its existence to the would-be philanthropic efforts of a small group of Americans in the middle of the 19th century who hoped to solve the slavery problem by transporting freed slaves back to Africa. Formally, its government is modeled after the United States (two houses of the legislature, Supreme Court, etc.). This year, for the first time in its hundred-year history, an opposition candidate was put up for the election by a party basing itself mainly upon the huge native population which has been disfranchised up to now by the ruling Americo-Liberians. Many hoped that the enfranchisement of this long-exploited class would lead to democratic rule in the country.

However, as the election reports indicated, the ruling minority, under the semi-totalitarian leadership of the boss of the "True Whig Party," Tubman, had no thought whatever of relinquishing its complete control over the government and economy of Liberia. The "enfranchisement"—a concession to the growing strength of the native groups—was, for all practical purposes, merely window-dressing. The government intends to stay in power, and thus to retain its monopoly on Liberian economic life—until it gets thrown out.

Grew Up Under America's Wing

The ruling class of Liberia, descended chiefly from former American slaves, is not only one of the most corrupt and parasitical of all ruling classes in the world today, large or small, but decidedly one of the laziest (one of its members would never be seen carrying a package on the streets).

They have managed, over the long years, to build a relatively easy and secure life for themselves by plundering the native tribes, putting natives to work on their large farms at pitifully low wages, and forcing thousands of others to work for nothing. Although forced labor in Liberia was denounced by a League of Nations commission in 1931 there is hardly a doubt that it still exists.

The history of Liberia abounds with atrocities and hypocrisies, extreme even in our modern civilization with all its evils and inequalities. Descriptions given by an American engineer of the tax-collecting trips made into the interior by ex-President Edwin Barclay in the early '40s include barbarities usually ascribed these days only to forces behind the Iron Curtain.

The inhumanity and corruption of the Monrovia dictatorship is an endless story—the deals which the present president, Tubman, consummated to obtain his office, the role of the courts in Liberia, the decimation of whole native villages in order to terrorize others into paying tribute, the incredibly rigid system of discrimination between the native blacks and their "brothers" from the United States, etc.

When officials of the Liberian government come to the U. S., almost all Americo Negro organizations go out their way to repudiate them as representatives of their race. They are not, of course, any more than white totalitarians are "representatives" of the white race.

But one of the most important things to be remembered about this ghastly situation—from our point of view—is that Liberia is, if not by law then by tradition, a semi-official protectorate of the United States. During the first sixty years of its existence it was only American warships that prevented the overthrow of this regime by native forces.

It was the United States that paid the way for the Liberian delegation to attend the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919. It was the United States that loaned the "True Whig" government the money which it required for continued operations in the early '20s. The atrocities of Americo-Liberian rule are, in a real sense, a direct responsibility of the United States.

Cushioned on Firestone Rubber

For a long period of time the only apparent American interest in Liberia may have been sentimental, but at the turn of the century a number of statesmen began to think of Liberia as THE American outpost on the African mainland, to be treated as such. The U. S. refused to accept Liberia in 1920 as a mandate only because it did not want to get involved in the machinery of the League of Nations.

During the Second World War the U. S. used Liberia as a landing field for its extensive transatlantic air operations. It has thus developed a certain amount of strategic importance in global American thinking (although, since World War II, other spots nearer the Mediterranean have been developed).

However, since 1925, the chief American involvement with Liberia has been the huge investments of the Firestone Rubber Company. Firestone, sweeping aside a few dozen native villages, took over 85,000 acres of land for the cultivation of the plants which give rubber sap. It has grown into a tremendous enterprise, and, incidentally, an efficient one. The land has been extensively exploited and the 35,000 native workers paid and kept up, relatively speaking, better than many other sections of Africa—which isn't saying much.

But this has not meant any change whatsoever in the tight grip which the True Whig Party continues to hold on the country. Most of Liberia is still theirs to plunder at will. And, in fact, it is more than probable that the coming of Firestone has, in effect, propped up the old regime. The Firestone interests, as can easily be understood, have almost as much to fear from the awakening of the native majority as the Tubman rulers. And consequently the two forces tend to work together, if not openly, then in whispers and conclave in the American embassy.

Of course, in the long run and despite themselves the Firestone projects tend to raise the consciousness of the native population and stimulate coherent revolutionary thought. As a matter of fact, the only organized and well-run strike in Liberian history developed last

year when 25,000 Firestone employees quit their jobs in protest against insufficient wage increases. But nonetheless the general effect of increased American interest in Liberia has been to reinforce the Monrovia rule.

"United States quasi-guardianship has not restrained or reformed the one-party totalitarianism of Liberia," wrote a man familiar with the scene, ". . . but rather has led it to repeated actions of brazen cynicism and audacity."

And Raymond Leslie Buell, another American who has long studied the scene, writes that "with the right to maintain 'military facilities' at Monrovia, the American government will find it much more easy in the future . . . to underwrite the existing Liberian oligarchy with all of its weaknesses."

U. S. Money, U. S. Guns

In addition to Firestone several other American concerns, some of them governmental, have entered Liberia recently. The large modern docking facilities recently built in the capital, Monrovia, are under the control of a combine of American firms (although built with government money). The tremendous mineral resources are beginning to be tapped by an American concern.

Thus gradually the dominant economic power in Liberia is becoming the United States. The Liberian government, in return for the concessions, is given free reign with those natives not employed by American investors.

The U. S. has dispatched an economic commission to Liberia in order to coordinate these programs; and the head of the commission, Oscar Meir, evidently enthused by his work, has burred that Liberia is the "proving ground for Point Four." The *New York Times* commented editorially that "The little African republic may well show what can be done in raising standards and making people more prosperous and happy." Such claims, whether from ignorance or malice, are fantastic.

That the goal of the present rulers of the "republic" has nothing whatever to do with the "happiness" of its subjects is so obvious as to need no further elaboration. Point Four operations may build some magnificent docks, but as long as the seething native population has, in fact, no more rights than their rulers had many years ago in the United States, the industrial splendor of the waterfront has no real meaning so far as the "prosperity" of the Liberian masses is concerned.

During the great Firestone strike President Tubman (an unbearably pompous scoundrel), noting that Liberia was, as he put it, "vulnerable to foreign doctrines" (such as freedom and equality, no doubt!), asked the U. S. government for military advisers and arms. Assistant Secretary of State McGhee, then visiting in Monrovia, said he would work to get the arms sent from the United States when he returned to Washington. He agreed that the "communist agitation" could not be tolerated indefinitely.

Opposition Leader Jailed

Thus, the U. S. supports this thoroughly reactionary regime, on its own, without any help from the "old-style" imperialists such as France and England from whose experiences the U. S. is supposed to have benefited. To label the awakening of the natives "communist" is simply absurd. The anti-Monrovia sentiment in Liberia has flourished for almost a hundred years. Furthermore, the entire west coast of Africa is in ferment, and the colonial masters of these countries have been wise enough to recognize it and grant a measure of self-rule. But in Liberia the fight against self-rule continues to the bitter end, under the American aegis. Thus last April, when the opposition leader, an admirable man by the name of Diddho Twe, opened his election campaign, the Monrovia government cracked down. Strong-arm techniques were not employed alone; it was alleged that witch-doctors were imported to poison Twe himself. Twe then made an appeal to the UN to send observers to watch the elections (which were notoriously dishonest). Meanwhile the True Whigs, evidently deciding to take no chances and sensing that even a dishonest election might lead to their downfall, discovered an old law stating an election candidate must register two months before an election. Twe had not done this, of course, and the Whigs had the highest court order the People's Party off the ballot.

The May 1 elections, consequently, were no more than a typical totalitarian one-party show. The Tubman regime was returned to office without much trouble.

And immediately after the elections Twe was arrested and thrown into a prison where he now languishes at the mercy of his captors who, it is claimed, may now get their chance to poison him. His great following is demanding that he be set free, their hatred of the rulers mounting.

And so the situation now stands. The handsome docking facilities are completed. Firestone is doing a huge rubber business. The True Whigs are still living, lazy as ever, in their grand colonial homes, shuffling the lucrative government posts around among themselves. The People's Party is planning, even without their beloved leader, new attacks on the Monrovia oligarchy.

And the American government? The representatives of the country whose self-styled world mission is to protect liberty and freedom everywhere? It continues to negotiate for the continued reign of the co-operative True Whig Party, its well-fed collaborators in Monrovia.

In fact, last fall Washington raised the rank of its minister in Monrovia to that of an ambassador. What more secure token of American tacit approval could the Tubman government want? Arms? They'll get them too.

But we'll place our bets on the native masses.

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.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a 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.

The 4th International's Capitulation to Stalinism

'Official Trotskyists' See CP Power as Road to Socialism

By MAX SHACHTMAN

The declaration of Natalia Trotsky, in which she breaks with the Fourth International and with the Socialist Workers Party, is a stiff jolt to these pseudo-Trotskyist organizations.

Coming from this tireless veteran of the socialist fight against Stalinism, it will make it harder for the Cannonites to use the banner of Leon Trotsky for their march into the Stalinist camp.

Every socialist challenge against capitulation to Stalinism is good, coming from Natalia Trotsky it is doubly good. What she challenges is nothing less than capitulation to that totalitarian reaction which Trotskyism rose to combat more than a quarter of a century ago.

Capitulation to Stalinism—is that possible for the movement once led by Trotsky? It is not only possible, it is happening. For that you need little more evidence than is provided by the Cannonites themselves in their answer to Natalia Trotsky.

Let us understand what constitutes capitulation to Stalinism: ● The idea that Stalinism is a legitimate part of the working-class movement and therefore a legitimate class ally of the socialist wing of the working-class movement—that constitutes capitulation to Stalinism.

● The idea that the Stalinist state is a working-class state of any kind, that the Stalinist bureaucracy in some way defends the interests of a workers' state and thereby the interests of socialism—that constitutes capitulation to Stalinism.

● The idea that the working class all over the world is duty bound to defend the Stalinist state which is nowhere equaled for its outrages and crimes against the working class and socialism—that constitutes capitulation to Stalinism.

● The idea that socialists who refuse to defend the Stalinist state automatically or inevitably fall into the camp of capitalist reaction—that constitutes capitulation to Stalinism.

● The idea that Stalinism must be supported wherever it fights capitalism or the capitalist class, even though it simultaneously crushes the working class, democracy and socialism—that constitutes capitulation to Stalinism.

● The idea that the Stalinist bureaucracy is capable of establishing and has already established workers' states outside of Russia, and has done it without the working class and against the working class—that constitutes capitulation to Stalinism.

● The idea that Stalinism has an historically revolutionary or historically progressive role to play, and plays that role regardless of what the working class itself does in its own name and with its own independent movement—that constitutes capitulation to Stalinism.

● The idea that Stalinism must be supported wherever it nationalizes all property, even though this nationalization gives it the most exceptional opportunities to enslave workers and peasants as they were never before enslaved—that constitutes capitulation to Stalinism.

Trapped by Their Dogma

The last twenty-five years of world history have proved or disproved many things, but at least one thing they have proved incontrovertibly: every single socialist or Marxist inside or outside of Russia who capitulated to Stalinism did so on the basis of most if not all of the ideas cited. Ofhand, we cannot think of a single notable exception among the capitulators.

The iron rule, however, is represented by a huge number, ranging from the great and tragic cases of former Bolsheviks like Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Rakovsky, Preobrazhensky, Bukharin, down to Mensheviks like Dan and Social-Revisionists like Rubanovsky, non-Russian Social-Democrats like Zyromski in France, Nenni in Italy, the Webbs and Strachey in England, not excluding leaders of the Trotskyist movement in France, England, Germany and Poland.

On this outstandingly important fact, you will not find a single word or hint in the reply of the Cannonites to Natalia Trotsky. For good reason! Every single one of the ideas listed is held and defended, with different degrees of forthrightness and firmness, by virtually all the "authentic" spokesmen of the "authentic" Trotskyist movement, both here and abroad. Some of these ideas are not yet as fully developed as others, but those that are lagging behind are catching up with those that are still ahead.

The Cannonites are trapped by a dogma which is false to the core. To them, Stalinist Russia is still a workers' state. Trotsky wrote that long ago. That constitutes overwhelming proof to them and, in any case, more than enough. To Natalia Trotsky's contentions that Russia can no

longer be considered a workers' state in any sense, they have a crushing reply: multiple quotations from Leon Trotsky's writings in 1939-1940. What better proof do you need?

Ask the Cannonites to show you that the United States is a capitalist state. Without difficulty or hesitation, they will pile up unanswerable facts and figures to show that the capitalist class owns and controls the means of production and exchange, and therewith the means of life; that the state machinery and the government are controlled by the same capitalist class and are operated in its interests in every decisive and basic respect; that the same capitalist class basically determines the conditions of production; that the main beneficiary of the toil of the workers is not the working class but still the same capitalist class; that this class owns or controls or decisively influences virtually all of the press, the radio, the movies, the big political parties; and so on and so forth. You would be worn out before they exhausted a fraction of the factual material to prove the point.

Ask the same Cannonites to show you that Stalinist Russia is a workers' state. Instantaneous and sole proof: in Russia all property is owned by the state.

By what state? The state established by the Russian workers' revolution in 1917? No, that state has been destroyed root and branch and so have all those who established it.

Whose state, then? The state of a bureaucracy which is (the Cannonites concede) anti-working class, anti-democratic, anti-socialist, out-and-out counterrevolutionary, despotic, Bonapartist, totalitarian and similar to the fascist bureaucracy.

Restoration of Capitalism?

This bureaucracy is the main beneficiary of the toil of the workers and peasants. It runs the state, the government, the army, the police, the economic, political and cultural life of the country, and runs them exclusively and tyrannically. It runs the biggest slave camps in world history. Its factories and mines are penitentiaries to which the workers are sentenced for life. Its exploitation and oppression of the people has no equal anywhere. It tramples underfoot the right of self-determination of dozens of nations, nationalities and peoples. It punishes socialist ideas with imprisonment or a bullet in the base of the skull. It stimulates anti-Semitism and chauvinism in general. It tolerates no working-class or socialist organization of any kind. But—its state is a "workers' state!"

Do the workers own the property or have any control over it? No. Do they control the state, the army, the police, the government, nationally, or locally, or are they allowed to so much as try to control them? No, not in the minutest degree. Are they allowed to organize or strike? No. Do they have any rights of any kind? No. Are they allowed to determine, even to a tiny extent, the questions of their daily life, at work or at home, or the questions of peace or war? The Cannonites will continue to reply: No. Have they any power at all in this workers' state? No, none, none whatsoever.

But—Russia is a workers' state because all property is in the hands of the state which . . . which enslaves the workers. Proved to the hilt!

But, cry the Cannonites, it is a degenerated workers' state because the Stalinist bureaucracy is counterrevolutionary. Indeed it is! But what makes it that? At this point the nightmare becomes more nightmarish, and dogmatism reaches the point of insane—no, inane!—blindness.

Originally, and for years after the fight against the Stalinist bureaucracy was started, Trotsky designated it as counterrevolutionary because he insisted that it represented the tendency to undermine state property and restore private property, and therewith to restore capitalism in Russia. That view was then justified because it appeared for a time that this was the tendency actually represented by Stalinism. But only for a time. It very soon turned out that Stalinism represented nothing of the sort. The facts of life completely dashed this theory. But what do the Cannonites care about facts when they are trapped by a dogma? In reply to Natalia Trotsky, they write:

"You identify Stalinism with planned economy based on nationalized property in the Soviet Union. But from a dialectical point of view these are opposites. . . . We have defended planned economy inside the Soviet Union against the tendencies toward restoration of capitalism fostered by Stalinism."

What? Where? When? How? In what way are they "opposites," from the dialectical or any other point of view? Is it a fact or not that the Stalinist bureaucracy owes all its power, economic, political, and social, to maintaining ownership of all property by the state, which they completely control? What would this bureaucracy amount to if its state did not own all the property? Nothing or next to nothing. Trotsky himself wrote about this bureaucracy that state property is "the source of its power and its income." Why should it do anything but strengthen and expand this source, from the dialectical or any other point of view?

How They Oppose Stalinism

Where has Stalinism "fostered" the "tendencies toward restoration of capitalism"? By destroying the Nepman? The wholesale terroristic "liquidation of the kulak"? By its huge, unforeseen, unexpected expansion of state-owned industry beyond anything dreamed of in Lenin's day? By its rigid maintenance of the monopoly of foreign trade? By its crushing of the capitalist classes and abolition of capitalist property in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and everywhere else it took power?

Where are the facts to sustain this incredible fantasy in the year 1951? Where is even one good substantial fact? Do not waste precious time by even asking them for a fact. The Cannonites will produce one when duck eggs grow hair, not before.

It is not, of course, this superstitious fantasy about Stalinism which leads the Cannonites on the road to capitulation. On the contrary, it is the reality of Stalinism which leads them down this road.

On the days when it is perfectly obvious, even to the Cannonite fantasmagogians, that the Stalinist bureaucracy is defending and extending its state property, the Cannonites, who identify it with a workers' state, are obliged, willy-nilly, to support the bureaucracy. And since those days number exactly 365 in the year, the Cannonites not only cannot break away from their fundamental attachment to Stalinism but are inexorably drawn closer to it.

It is exactly as if a devout Catholic were to proclaim that he intends to fight to the death against the pope and the Church of Rome because, or rather, if, they "foster tendencies" toward atheism. In view of the real nature of the church and bishop of Rome, it is not hard to understand that in real life our devout (if unlikely) Catholic would do very little fighting against them. He would "capitulate" to them in practice.

So it has been with the Cannonites here and the Fourth International in general. They repeat with ritualistic regularity and hollowness that they "oppose the expansion of the Soviet Union under the Stalinist regime," as they say in reply to Natalia Trotsky. The statement is utterly valueless and politically fraudulent.

In these very countries, where they "oppose" the expansion of Stalinism, they propose to the people that in the event of war it is their duty to "defend unconditionally the Soviet Union" which has reduced them to vassalage and worse. What the Cannonites propose to these peoples is infinitely more important politically than what they claim to oppose.

The Stalinist bureaucracy has only to say: "Look, we are defending nationalized property, in our own miserable way, to be sure, but we are defending it nonetheless," and the Fourth Internationalists instantly snap to attention and proclaim, as they did in the last war, "We are the best soldiers in the 'Red' Army" (as they call this military instrument of Stalinist Bonapartism), and call upon the peoples of the oppressed satellite states and all the rest of the world, "Ally yourselves with the Soviet Union, defend it and its borders!" The Stalinists naturally demand more from these pseudo-Trotskyists, but they really have no right to—that is enough.

The Inevitable Happened

That is not all, and monstrous though it is, it is not the worst. Natalia Trotsky charges the Cannonites with the view that the satellite states of Eastern Europe conquered by Stalinism are also workers' states. "Permit us to make a correction as to fact," they reply. "The Socialist Workers Party has not yet taken a definitive position on this. The question as to the correct characterization of these countries is now under discussion."

The authors of this pious deception know, even better than we know, that every "authentic" leader of the Fourth International and of the SWP is already committed to the position that the satellite countries of Stalinism are workers' states. They know, even better than we know, that the political position they have already adopted and followed with regard to these countries could and would never be put forward unless they were regarded as workers' states.

The adoption of this standpoint is as simple as it was inevitable. I permit myself the reminder that I made this clear to the delegates of the Fourth International congress three years ago. The abolition of private capitalist property and its replacement by state property was inevitable, sooner or later, in the countries conquered by Stalinism. Only fantasmagogians who believe, or pretend to believe, that Stalinism exists to preserve or restore capitalism, could fail to see this.

When the inevitable happened, it was likewise inevitable that our pseudo-Trotskyists would again capitulate to Stalinism by conferring upon it the distinction of having converted the Polish and Hungarian and Czechoslovakian and Rumanian and Bulgarian capitalist states into workers' states. According to all the teachings of Marx and Lenin, this is nothing less than the carrying out of the first important step of the socialist revolution. All the twisting and squirming in the world, even when accompanied by phrases about the "dialectical point of view," cannot efface that conclusion.

By that very token, the Cannonites lose all fundamental ground and right to designate Stalinism as counterrevolutionary, and therefore to oppose it on the basis of fundamental principle. That is, unless they propose to commit themselves to the very novel, if not dialectical, idea that the counterrevolution can and does carry out the socialist revolution. The drawback to this novel idea is that it means the end of the fight for socialism and of socialism itself. In any case, it means concretely a capitulation to Stalinism.

The international Cannonites are not altogether unaware of the position they find themselves in and the prospects they face. To escape the trap of Stalinism requires a radical break with what Natalia Trotsky calls the old and outlived formulas that obsess them. But it appears that the "authentic" spokesmen of pseudo-Trotskyism are making the other choice of drawing the trap closer around their necks.

Stalin's 'Left Opposition'

In the latest issue of their international magazine, *Quatrième Internationale*, the head of the Fourth International, M. Pablo, presents his discussion article for the third world congress of the organization. It represents a first-class disaster for this movement, but at least it has a hundred times more value than the double-talk, evasiveness and dirty insinuations against critics contained in the SWP's reply to Natalia Trotsky. Better yet, it serves to confirm her charges against the Cannonites to the very end.

Pablo acknowledges that the members of the Fourth International are disturbed by the course of events and the dislocations of the theories and policies of his organization. To remedy all this, he sets forth the new ideas which, alas, have already been adopted in effect and for all practical political purposes by the pseudo-Trotskyist movement.

The coming war between the American bloc and the Stalinist bloc, he writes, will immediately assume the character of an "international civil war," with the revolutionary masses of Europe and Asia, at least, being on the side of Stalinist Russia and the Stalinist parties in their struggle against world capitalism. That is also the side Pablo, who is a man saturated with the profoundest pessimism toward the prospects of the proletarian socialist revolution, aims to be on.

It is necessary, he pursues, to "modify" the Fourth International's position toward Stalinism and the Stalinist parties (as if it has not already been modified enough). The idea that they cannot and will not take power (under the "revolutionary pressure of the masses!"), and thereby carry out the revolution, is incorrect.

"Both the Yugoslav affair and the course and victory of the Chinese revolution, as well as the other current colonial revolutions (Korea, Viet-Nam, Burma, Malaya, Philippines) have showed that the Communist Parties retain the possibility, in certain circumstances, of outlining a revolutionary orientation, that is, to find themselves obliged

to undertake a struggle for power."

Therefore, he continues, "Unexpected as this may appear at first blush, the new conditions in which the Communist Parties find themselves in the Asiatic countries which are now witnessing a revolution, dictates to us, as our general attitude toward them, by and large, that of a Left Opposition which accords it a critical support."

It is the end of the theory that the Stalinist parties are counter-revolutionary parties. In the context of Pablo's article, the words "in certain circumstances" are a purely literaristic safeguard which modifies nothing in the essentials. And these are: the Stalinist Parties are capable of carrying out the socialist revolution, they can be "pushed" to carry it out.

That finishes off all reason for irreconcilable opposition to Stalinism on the part of the Fourth International, and all reason for its independent existence. At most, the only role left to it is: Back to a Left Opposition, not against the Stalinist parties, but of the Stalinist parties.

It goes without saying that no thinking person will take seriously any attempt to confine this analysis and policy to the Stalinist parties of Asia. Not a single sound reason can be given for establishing a fundamental difference between the Stalinist parties of Asia and those of Europe, between those of Europe and those of the Americas. Pablo's attempt, in passing, to establish a difference is so patently clumsy and ludicrous as to guarantee its early demise.

This is underlined by the historical perspective outlined by him. It must be quoted, otherwise nobody would believe that it could have been written by a man who leads the movement founded by Leon Trotsky:

"People who despair of the fate of humanity because Stalinism continues to exist and even gains victories, are shortening history to their measure. They would have liked the whole process of the transformation of capitalist society into socialism to be accomplished within the period of their brief life, so that they might be recompensed for their efforts in behalf of the revolution. As for ourselves, we reaffirm what we wrote in the first article we devoted to the Yugoslav affair. This transformation, which will be filled in between times by transitional forms and regimes between capitalism and socialism, necessarily remote from 'pure' forms and from norms. We know that this affirmation has shocked certain comrades and has served others as springboard for attacking our 'revisionism.' But we are not disarming." (Our emphasis.)

Where Are Trotsky's Ideas?

Nor is it necessary. Pablo, and after him the international Cannonite movement, are already disarmed before Stalinism. I do not see Trotsky's ideas in your politics, writes Natalia Trotsky to the Cannonites. How right she is! There is as much resemblance between Trotsky's perspective and Pablo's as there is between a fighter against Stalinism and a capitulator to it. The triumph of Stalinism, wrote Trotsky toward the end of his life, is the beginning of the new barbarism, and he never wrote anything truer and sounder.

Pablo is committed, heel and crown, to the new barbarism and its triumph. Between present-day capitalism and the socialism to come, we will have many "transitional forms and regimes"; they will be "necessarily remote from 'pure' forms and from norms," which means, in plain English, they will be Stalinist "forms and regimes," which he will help the revolutionary masses "push into power" as the "Left Opposition" of Stalinism.

How long will this Stalinist "transition," this not-entirely-pure transition, last, before it flowers into the socialist society? No man can be sure, but Pablo estimates that this unique road to socialist freedom will unwind for "several centuries."

Patience, plus the policies of the Fourth International, will make the voyage less tedious. And the militant who is wretched enough to think of his life being too brief to last him the full length of the road can draw some solace from the thought that his newly acquired Stalinist comrades-in-arms may always be counted on to cut that life briefier while they lead humanity, through not-quite-pure transitions, to the socialist future.

"The Socialist Workers Party," says its Political Committee's reply to Natalia Trotsky, "has not yet taken a definitive position" on whether the Stalinist satellite states are workers' states. We record this again, recalling the mock indignation poured out upon our heads twelve years ago by these same Cannonites because we adopted a political position toward Russia in the war without deciding again the question of the character of the Stalinist state.

Anyway, we await the "definitive position" the SWP will adopt toward the perspectives, theories and policies recommended so philosophically by Pablo. Illusions about the outcome we have none.

So. Korea Atrocities — —

(Continued from page 1)

Graft, corruption, callousness about the warfare of their own people, these are certainly not monopolized by the South Korean government. They are the common characteristics of just about all the governments in Asia which are being supported by the Western Powers. They are widespread in the United States itself, the citadel of capitalism. But in the impoverished, near-starvation economies of Asia, they take on a particular political and economic significance. Here they are the expression of the inability of the ruling classes in Asia to develop their own capitalist economies in the midst of the decay and disintegration of capitalism on a world scale. They are another aspect of the fact that these ruling classes cannot carry through the democratic revolu-

tion which took place as a pre-requisite for the development of capitalism in Europe and America in the last two centuries. The triumph of Stalinism in Asia would not, of course, bring the rise to power of a social class which could carry through this revolution. Yet this triumph is made possible because the peoples of Asia have shaken off their ancient social lethargy, and are seeking a better life. The corrupt government cliques are the same people as their grasping landlords and users. They know them all too well, and they want no part of them. And the Stalinists appear precisely as the active enemies and destroyers of these economic blood-suckers. Stalinism brings in its wake another type of ruling class which is just as ruthless as the old one, just as callous, and if possible,

IT'S JUST A 'GOOD START' FOR THEM

One can get calloused to figures on war casualties and destruction, and one can get calloused to figures on the steadily mounting war profits of U. S. industry. Especially when they're going on side by side.

In other words, the profiteering statistics on the first quarter of 1951 are in.

"Industry Gets Off to Good '51 Start," chortled the financial pages of the N. Y. Times. Now what's a good start?

It turns out that a "good start"—for financial editors anyway, nowadays—means nothing less, than new record highs.

"Industrial manufacturers got off to a good start this year, with first-quarter profits up 2 per cent over a year ago, despite the higher tax rate and an excess-profits levy fully applicable to 1951. Before tax-deductions, earnings probably reached their peak."

Its war "prosperity" for the corporations, of course:

"Defense spending and its influence on business and consumer spending during the first three months sent the nation's production of goods and services up to an annual rate of \$313,900,000,000." This is \$14 billion above the first quarter of last year.

"Woolen-goods manufacturers showed a striking rise of 37 1/2 per cent, reflecting higher prices." It is clear, therefore, that the price rises were not justified by higher costs or wages, but went to swell profits more than fourfold.

The great profit gains were taken by the petroleum, smaller steel producers, machinery, railroad equipment, container makers and distillers. Way ahead of all of them were the apparel lines, with a jump of 421 per cent.

The small steel producers upped their profits 90 per cent. Nonferrous metal products went up 123 per cent; containers and seals 127 per cent; medical aids 195 per cent; gravel and limestone 338 per cent; paints and varnishes 121 per cent; hardware 106 per cent; household supplies 113 per cent; stoves and ranges 141 per cent; furniture 113 per cent.

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of L.A. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

The State Department Looks Around for Puppets —

Washington and the Russian Emigres

By HAL DRAPER

In a previous article two issues ago, ["Washington and the New Russian Revolution"] we discussed attitudes in U. S. ruling circles toward "fomenting revolution behind the Iron Curtain," in particular some indications of the administration's leanings.

What was indicated was that the State Department looked forward—if it looked forward to anything—to a reshuffling at the top of the Moscow regime, under pressure, in favor of those elements which putatively favored "peaceful coexistence" with Western capitalism. It hopes, in other words, to foster a "palace revolution" in the hierarchy of the Stalinist bureaucracy. This, it should be kept in mind, is its present outlook. War or other pressures or developments may push it to play closer to the fire of mass revolution but that is another matter.

Nor is it a hardened and systematic policy. As a matter of fact, steps by U. S. agencies in this field have been largely marked by improvisation and confusion. They have enough desire to foster subversive elements in Stalinland but little know-how, experience or understanding of such matters.

One other thing has marked their activities: in seeking elements to be utilized for their "fomenting" purposes, they have pretty consistently turned to the extreme rightist and reactionary wings of the Russian emigration.

This is of a piece with the kind of reactionary riffraff that the U. S. has had to pick up with in seeking allies in other parts of the world, notably Asia. In this case as in the others, it is in part due to the fact that only on such elements can the U. S. rely to follow its policies. But such elements also suit its own outlook.

In the Holes and Corners

As LABOR ACTION readers know, the Second World War gave rise to the first movement of resistance within Russia with some mass roots among the people—the underground forces of the UPA, the Ukrainian Insurrection Army. This movement directs its appeal to the masses at the bottom, and not primarily to dissident elements of the bureaucracy at the top. It does not fight for a changing of the guard in the Stalinist regime but for a mass democratic revolution of the people. It is vigorously opposed to the restoration of capitalism and to world capitalism; its social aim is a socialist democracy.

Such a movement does not suit U. S. policy. But unfortunately for Washington, it is the only kind of real resistance movement which has the undeniable merit of being in actual existence. Washington's agents have had to look in the holes and corners, and they found there what one might expect.

A summary of U. S. agencies' dealing with would-be "fomenters" among the Russian emigration was given last February by David J. Dallin, the well-known author of several books on Russia. It is an unsavory story, even without some details he omits. In general, Dallin ascribes the "dismal failure" up to now to "ignorance and ineptitude," the Americans concerned were "ill-informed or misguided" or "clumsy," etc. There can be little doubt that the adjectives are justified. What is difficult to believe is that the record is due to these unfortunate qualities primarily.

(1) General Glazenap

"The first post-war Russian organization in Germany," Dallin relates, referring to Frankfurt and Munich as the two unofficial capitals of émigré Russians, "to enjoy American support was one passing itself off as an 'Association of Russian War Veterans,' the so-called SAF. Its head was Peter Glazenap, a former White general in the Civil War [of intervention against the Russian Revolution—H. D.] and a monarchist, whose reputation in Russian circles, both politically and morally, was of the worst."

Most Russian émigrés, Dallin adds, reacted with "utter perplexity" that the Americans should pick up with this White trash at all. He opines that it was a group of U. S. Intelligence officers in Germany who thought up the scheme; he quotes General Clay, then U. S. proconsul in Germany, as denying giving any support to Glazenap. "Ultimately" Glazenap was dropped and "deprived of American backing and dollars, his SAF rapidly disintegrated."

It may be credible that the "American backing and dollars" went to Glazenap solely on the knowledge and say-so of some Intelligence officers, without the approval or at least tacit permission of higher-ups. It may also be, one has a right to suspect, that the responsible authorities were perfectly willing to let the officers go ahead unofficially to see what they could cook up without directly involving the American Military Government or Washington. If nothing came of it, the latter could always deny "giving any support." In Glazenap's case, nothing came of it, except some loose American change for the malodorous general.

(2) General Turkul

"The next American-sponsored undertaking was a projected 'congress' of Russians abroad," continued Dallin. "Once more everything was prearranged to give rightist groups the whip hand, with typical old-style Russian monarchist basking in American favor and reaping American financial support. The new figurehead was another Civil War general, Anton Turkul."

"The Wrong Russians Again," New Leader, February 12, 1951.

Here too Dallin claims that all was done by "American Intelligence operatives acting on their own." Yet these operatives conducted the preparations for a congress which "for a few months . . . attracted considerable attention in Germany." This time, Dallin does not claim ignorance for Clay, who after all was himself in Germany. He explains that "details filtered back to Washington and New York and the project was promptly broken off."

One has a right to ask whether the project was broken off—promptly or no, after a "few months"—because Turkul's fetid aroma was too strong for nostrils in Washington and New York, or because the "few months" of preparation for the "congress" showed that it would be a bust. It is clear that no substantial part of even the Russian emigration could be rallied behind the extreme-right tip of the right wing of Russian émigré reactionaries, such as Glazenap and Turkul. And the Russian emigration in Germany is as a whole no cross-section of the people behind the Iron Curtain!

(3) The NTS Crypto-Fascists

When we come to the third strike, however, the State Department is OPENLY involved. Its new protégé: the NTS. The Russian initials stand for National Workers Association. (The common translation "National Labor Union" is misleading.)

Here is Dallin's description of this outfit, not unrestrained in tone:

"Founded in Yugoslavia about 20 years ago by the sons of a number of old Russian rightist émigrés, the NTS embraced the type of anti-Communist ideology that was fashionable in the 1930s—a Russian version of Italian Fascism and German National Socialism. The group was frankly and violently anti-democratic and anti-Western; its program published in 1943 stressed as the chief point that the Russian people needed a Leader, not a parliament; there was no mention at all of political freedom; Russian Jews were to be given the choice of emigrating 'without their property' or living in ghettos.

"Numerically and politically insignificant before the war, the NTS grew in numbers and influence after the Nazi invasion of Russia in 1941. Its members succeeded in gaining entry into occupied Russia, where a number of Soviet citizens, knowing of no other Russian non-Communist organization, joined up. Some NTS members remained in Russia after the Soviet army returned, and tried to maintain contact with their associates abroad. As time went on, however, these links were broken off and the NTS abroad reverted to its pre-war status of a minor party headed by rightist and nationalist émigrés.

"After the war, the NTS tried to adapt itself to the changed situation. It adopted a new program from which some of the totalitarian features had been eliminated, and approached the British and Americans with luridly exaggerated tales of secret pipelines into Russia and a well-developed political network within the country. It also exaggerated the prospects for an anti-Soviet revolution, which it presented to the Westerners as an alternative to war: Give us the tools and we will solve the Russian problem for you."

The State Department took up the NTS with all its pretensions, and took it to its bosom. (Dallin puts it: "For a few months, the NTS became the white hope of the Americans, the sine qua non for all Russian political action.") An NTS man became virtually unofficial adviser to the State Department on the "Russian question," with the run of Washington's halls.

Dallin asserts that "And then, suddenly, the NTS was abandoned, too." This does not appear to be entirely true. It is reliably reported that the NTS still has the inside track with the State Department, though its prestige in those very democratic quarters may have declined. Certainly, at least, its pull with U. S. Intelligence in Germany has given way to a fourth infatuation by those gentlemen: with some groups of the "Vlasov movement," which was founded by the Russian World War II general who went over to the Nazis and headed a force of Russian prisoners of war who fought with Hitler's armies. (These Vlasovist groups have also gone through a process of democratic face-lifting.)

(4) The Cabal in Fuesen

The NTS was also very much around when the next fyer was taken by Americans, this time non-government "fomenters."

This started last January with a meeting at Fuesen, Germany (near Berchtesgaden) of four Russian émigré groups. One was the NTS. Another was a group associated with Alexander Kerensky ("League of Struggle for National Freedom"). The other two were Vlasovist groups "Association of Struggle of the Peoples of Russia" and "Association of Struggle for a Free Russia". This precious crew hoped to set themselves up as a united-front center for the Russian emigration and as leading candidate for the lap of the State Department.

Even in this assemblage, however, the NTS was on the extreme right. The issue was attitude toward the national minorities in Russia:

In fact, the NTS representative walked out of the meeting "in protest against the proposal that the united anti-Stalinist group include representatives of the non-Russian peoples of the USSR as well as of the Russians. They also dissented from the proposal that minority nations in the USSR have the right of full self-determination, including the right of secession, in a future non-Soviet Russia." (Report by Harry Schwartz in the N. Y. Times, April 18.)

But a little thing like the democratic right to self-

determination was not going to keep this "political center" from uniting at the trough. "The present outlook," reported the Schwartz article, is that the groups will make a deal in which the NTS will agree to work together with national-minority representatives while the program will merely call for "equality and substantial autonomy" for the non-Russian peoples.

While these sterling fighters for the liberation of Russia had their own differences to settle within the circuit of their rightist politics, life became truly miserable vis-à-vis their private Americans. The idea was in the first place that the new NTS-Vlasovist-Kerensky united front was going to be financed by the "American Committee for Freedom for the Peoples of the USSR." This outfit of the American angels is headed by Eugene Lyons and includes William Henry Chamberlain, W. L. White, Allen Grover, Professor William Yeandle Elliott among others.

American Commissars

At this point, one can return to Dallin to pick up the thread of the story. It seems that our American democrats took no pains to hide the fact that, as far as they were concerned, they viewed their role exactly as if they were hiring a cabal of Latin American colonels to "make a revolution" in Nicaragua. They treated the Fuesen Russians "as subordinates"—"We're paying the bill, aren't we?"—and "tried to give orders by cable on how to conduct the conference, what to do and what not to do, interfering in the smallest details . . . tried to prescribe what should be included in the program drawn up by the Russians and what should be thrown out; it [the Lyons group] 'categorically protested' against this, that and the other thing."

In other words, Lyons and his fellow democrats did their best to act exactly as they pictured a Russian commissar should, in the very image of the Com-form. Dallin sums up the end-result as "complete failure." (In recent articles in Novoye Russkoye Slovo, Kercasky's paper in New York, Dallin blasts the Fuesen group: even more bitterly. The deal to drop self-determination from the program has been made. He denounces the united front of Fuesen as an attempt simply to set up a gang of spies for the Americans.)

If the State Department's bumbling with Glazenap, Turkul, the NTS, et al., can be explained merely by "ignorance and ineptitude" and such, the same can hardly be said for such people as Lyons and Chamberlain, who are not supposed to be babes in the woods on the Russian question: Yet all the latter could pull off was a low comedy.

No Stooge for Washington

The fact is that, in both cases, all this politicking with right-wing Russian émigrés had as much to do with stirring and organizing revolt behind the Iron Curtain as a Barnum and Bailey circus.

Perhaps such a conclusion is in part what was behind the rather peculiar dispatch from Frankfort by N. Y. Times correspondent Drew Middleton (May 7). In an article openly purporting to be "inspired" by U. S. and British Intelligence "sources," Middleton goes virtually all-out in pooh-poohing the existence of any resistance or underground behind the Russian borders. He is as much as says that none can be expected unless and until the war is just about ready to break. He goes out of his way to stress that this is true also for the Ukraine.

One of the few ways of making sense of this dispatch is to assume that Middleton is plumping for those tendencies in the State Department and/or U. S. Intelligence agencies who want to cut entirely loose from the émigré groups that Washington has actually been playing with, and wait till war breaks out to do their "fomenting" with atom bombs. Certainly, what Middleton writes is perfectly true for the State Department's special protégé, the NTS, with its fantastic lies about its non-existent forces in Russia.

For a newspaper correspondent to write such an article without even mentioning the UPA, however, is quite a feat. The UPA is much better known in Germany, where Middleton filed his dispatch, than to the readers of the New York Times, and it is the only movement behind the Iron Curtain which has given material evidence of its work. The Intelligence "sources" who are speaking through the Times correspondent are, however, not interested in it: it is no candidate to become a stool of Washington.

But that is also why, unlike the NTS, it actually is able to exist and fight behind Stalin's borders.

CORRECTION

Our attention has been called to the error in the headline which appeared in our May 21 issue: "What Anti-Stalin Russians Think of Voice of America Propaganda."

The story beneath the headline, however, was about the reaction of the Ukrainian people specifically, and it is, of course, important to distinguish the non-Russian peoples within the borders of Russia, who are fighting for their national independence.

While there is every reason to believe that the main point of the article would also apply to the ethnically Russian population, the use of "Russians" in the headline could be misleading in this case.

THE CRISIS IN ISRAEL — 4

ISRAELI PARTIES DEBATE FOREIGN POLICY

By AL FINDLEY

The coming elections to the Israeli Knesset will be the first time that foreign policy will be a partisan political issue.

A few years ago the formal political platforms of all parties were fundamentally the same, although there were important nuances and tendencies to be noted. All parties without exception were for accepting support from whichever side offered it and for neutrality in the cold war.

A number of factors made this possible. The pride of a new state and a small state's natural fear of becoming a tail to the kite of the power blocs was strengthened by the fact that millions of Jews lived on both sides of the Iron Curtain. The fact that both the U. S. and Russia supported the new state of Israel led to the hope that Israel would stay out of the cold war by agreement of the principal contestants.

But the relations of the big powers to Israel have changed in the past years.

Between the Deep Blue Sea —

There has been a distinct rapprochement between Israel and Britain. While Britain still puts greater emphasis on friendship with the Arabs, it has (formally at least) placed Israel on an equal footing. The three-power declaration of the U. S., Britain and France in the spring of 1950 provided equality for all Near East states in acquisition of arms and guaranteed the existing borders. Britain is Israel's largest customer and the Foreign Office has moved to settle the outstanding question of Israeli frozen assets that remained after the partition of Palestine.

The U. S. continues its support of Israeli, despite some vacillations by the State Department. Of no small importance is, of course, the fact that five million Jews live in the U. S. and the greatest portion of Israeli foreign exchange comes from American Jews. Past loans and the hope for future loans play an important—though not overriding—role in the relations between Israel and Washington. The vacillations of the State Department have their positive side in that they helped prevent a policy of identification with the West.

The U. S. policy in the Near East today is to try to line up both Israel and the Arab states on its side of the struggle for the world. With characteristic arrogance the U. S. tells both that their differences are unimportant and should be submerged in the interests of the U. S. drive to build a front against Russia. While the U. S. prefers an Eastern Mediterranean alliance headed by Turkey and Israel, it demands peace and important concessions from both Jews and Arabs.

From Israel it wants admission of Arab refugees and a readiness to cede territory to placate the Arabs. While the U. S. gives modest aid to the Arab states it is not prepared completely to underwrite their existing unstable and reactionary social regimes with large-scale loans. The policy of the State Department in relation to the Arab states is somewhat similar to its policy in relation to Chiang Kai-shek in 1947. Substantial aid is promised but only if there is a "revolution from the top" that will ameliorate the condition of the people and give promise of stability.

Since the pashas and effendis will not change, the U. S. government looks to King Farouk in Egypt, army strong men in Syria, etc., to do the job. Washington's sponsorship of Turkey's entrance into the North Atlantic Pact may mean that it has temporarily given up hope for its preferred alliance.

— And the Devil

Russia's relations with Israel have deteriorated sharply. From a very friendly level, they are now distinctly cool.

The initiative, of course, came from Russia. Moscow started a violent anti-Zionist campaign and set up barriers to Jewish emigration in Eastern Europe. The extermination of Jewish culture and the growing policy of governmental anti-Semitism in Russia played a role. Israel asked for credits from Russia but received none. If this is explained on the ground that Russia had none to give, it is still true that the absolute refusal of Russia to supply Israel with technical assist-

The first three articles in this series on Israel have been: (1) Clericalism in Israel—May 28; (2) The split between Mapai and the religious bloc—June 4; (3) The dilemmas of Israeli economy—June 11.

ance was handled in a manner indicating hostility. When Israel requested that Russia send a few forestry experts, Moscow did not even have the courtesy to reply. Unlike its satellite countries Russia refused to buy from Israel; and while Israel makes purchases from Russia, such goods purchased had to be limited to those urgently needed, since the Russians demanded 20 to 30 per cent more than the prices on the world market.

Russia has expanded its double-pronged effort to win the Arabs over to its side. On one side is the diplomatic effort to woo the Arab ruling classes and on the other, at the same time, the Stalinist parties try to get popular support for Russia. Russian diplomatic agents and activities in the Near East are at a record high.

The CPs are now using the anti-Israeli feeling of the Arabs in their agitation to line the Arabs up with Moscow. The Syrian and Lebanese Stalinists have issued a joint proclamation that "true patriots" must unite against the U. S. since the U. S. is "seeking to force the Arabs to sign a peace treaty with Israel" and to join an alliance with that country.

Flight from 'Neutrality'

With the change of the position of Israel in world politics the positions of the various Israeli political parties on foreign policy have changed also; or rather, latent tendencies have been brought out into the open. Friendship with both East and West is still in the political programs but is now only a phrase.

The Mapai has departed from the policy of "neutrality" as between the two power blocs, to one of "no prior commitment." The policy of neutrality is interpreted to mean that nothing was to be done that would aid, or redound to the benefit of, either one of the cold-war rivals. "No prior commitment" is supposed to mean that Mapai will act in a given case on the "merits" of that case, regardless of the advantage one or the other camp may gain; but without any advance commitment to all-out support of either side. Thus, they support the U. S. in Korea and the Stalinists in China.

Even during their period of neutrality, the Mapai leaders did not hide their own personal feelings for the West. Now the interviews and private statements of Mapai leaders have grown more and more pro-West. David Ben Gurion went so far as to tell a U. S. reporter that in case of war Israel would be found on the "right" side.

Mapai does observe neutrality in one peculiar way. Its official organs refrain from criticizing the horrible social conditions of Russia and Stalinism. Despite the fact that the Stalinists and Stalinoids do not appreciate this attitude, it is part of the political atmosphere in Israel which contributes to the growing Stalinization of Mapai's rival in the Israeli working class, Mapam.

While Mapai still clings to an emasculated version of neutrality, the General Zionists (conservative bourgeois party) have been the first to drop all pretense and come out openly for a pro-U. S. orientation. Their arguments, of course, include all the usual lip service to "democracy vs. totalitarianism," etc. In addition, they emphasize the economic dependency of Israel on a great power in case of war. They point out that Palestine would have starved—literally—if not for the fact that, as a British territory, it received allocations of food and other necessities. In a future war, Russia will not have the food or the shipping to supply Israel.

Within the Mapam, the Stalinized Hashomer Hatzair has also dropped all pretense of neutrality and has come out for "Unity with the Soviet Union." Like all pro-Stalinists, they attempt to mask their allegiance to the Russian camp by labeling it the "peace camp" and such. The more moderate elements of Mapam want a position of "neutrality for the state—no neutrality for the party." Even for them, the party must "unite with the Soviet Union." The position of Hashomer Hatzair won a majority at the recent Mapam convention and is now the official policy of the party.

The parties of the extreme right—the semi-fascist Stern group and Heruth party (former Irgun group)—present an interesting picture on foreign policy. The Stern group is as pro-Stalinist in foreign policy as the Hashomer Hatzair. The only thing that can be said for them is that they had the forthrightness to declare their pro-Russianism long ago.

The Heruth party—the greatest single menace from the right—is falling apart and the main issue is foreign policy. Heruth was composed of different wings, from pure-and-simple nationalists to fascists and semi-fascists. The nationalist elements, led by Uri Jabotinsky (son of the founder of the Revisionists) and Peter Bergson, are in favor of a U. S. alliance. The fascistic and semi-fascistic elements of the party, led by Menachim Beigun, say: "Russia is not our enemy. Our enemies are the Arabs, the British and the Germans." They do not take a pro-Russian position but want to maintain a consistent neutrality.

It is true that there are many considerations which make foreign policy extremely important for Israel, including many which point to a policy of neutrality for the country. Israel needs world peace and if the world is plunged into war, it will not be able to build the country or receive the immigrants who want to enter; in a war Jews on both sides of the Iron Curtain would be killing each other needlessly in the interests of the opposing camps; etc. These considerations are important in Israeli thinking.

Peace in the Near East

In addition, however, Israel has another important issue of foreign policy which is unique to it. That is: How achieve peace with the Arabs?

In the preceding article on Israeli economy [June 11] we pointed out that a large part of Israel's economic difficulties come from the fact that Israel is a "beleaguered island in a hostile sea" and explained how this disrupts its normal trade channels and imposes a terrific burden of armaments on its economy. The substitution of a citizen army or militia in place of a standing army would be of some help; but above all, what is needed is peace—not only a formal peace treaty but a peace based on the establishment of friendly relations with the Arab peoples, such as would permit a substantial lightening of the burden of arms and restore normal trade within the Near East.

The Stern group and Heruth are, of course, opposed to any peace with the Arabs until Israeli borders extend to all of Palestine and Transjordan. But such extremist groups do not affect the day-to-day political conduct of the vast majority of the population.

In general, both the old government coalition (Mapai, religious bloc, etc.) and its major opposition, the General Zionists, believe that peace with the Arabs can be obtained by holiday speeches about their desire for friendly relations with the Arabs while waiting for time to heal the wounds, plus the strengthening of Israel militarily and economically to force the Arabs to accept Israel as a permanent reality, and plus the use of diplomacy, especially the pressure of foreign powers such as the U. S. and Britain, to compel the Arabs to sign a peace treaty. They are willing to sign such a treaty with any of the Arab states, including Abdullah's Transjordan and accept the existing lines as the future boundaries.

Toward Arab-Jewish Unity

Mapam, on the other hand, is opposed to signing any peace treaties with any of the present Arab regimes. It demands that peace wait till the "progressive forces,"—i.e., the Arab Stalinists—come to power. It is especially violently opposed to any peace with Abdullah. Mapam demands the creation of an independent Arab state in the economically and politically unviable portion of Arab Palestine left after Israel's victory in the war deprived it of even the small chance of independent existence it may have had at first.

The Mapam program, in essence, subordinates the need for immediate peace with the Arabs to the interests of world Stalinism. This is further underlined by the fact that the Arab Stalinists, who represent Mapam's hope, have changed their line on orders from Moscow and are no longer advocates of peace with Israel.

As to Mapam's position on Arab Palestine, it has a dual motivation. The first is, of course, that it expects the miserable remnants of Arab Palestine to be dependent on Israel. The second: having eliminated Abdullah and recognizing that no other force will voluntarily rule in such a state, they hope the Arab Stalinists will be aided to power, and they purport to believe, with assumed naïveté, that such a state will listen to Israel rather than Moscow. Aside from all other considerations, the prohibition of union of Arab Palestine with Transjordan would violate the people's right to self-determination; the minimum that must be accorded by any self-styled democrat is a free vote for the people to determine their own will on independence versus annexation by Transjordan.

The Mapai government's program is not likely to achieve peace by itself, and if it did the resulting formal peace treaty would be little better than an armed truce.

At present there is more sentiment for peace among the Arab ruling classes than there is among the Arab masses. The only Arab voices raised for peace are those of elder statesmen. The Arab rulers dare not submit to foreign pressure since this may well topple their regimes. The governments of the Arab countries are notoriously unstable—for example, Syria has had three "revolutions" in that many years. Other regimes are almost as weak. Without any popular support or demand for peace from below, the regimes would be in danger of falling if they submitted to outside pressure and signed a treaty. The intensity of national feeling in all the Moslem countries of the Near East is easily capable of bringing that about.

Real peace will come to the Near East only when there is created a desired for Arab-Jewish unity among the Arab masses, when diplomacy has a foundation in the desire of the people for peace. The creation of such a sentiment among the grass roots of the Arab peoples demands a program and a positive attitude on the part of the Israeli labor movement toward the Arab masses, both those in Israel and in the surrounding countries. For both peoples such a policy is not an exercise in morality or good will alone but is a crying need if the interests of both peoples are to be realized.

Read

The NEW INTERNATIONAL

Halley: Where's His Program? —

(Continued from page 1)

pointments without the benefit of any political recommendation or intervention.

TRIED A DEAL

Some interesting sidelights were revealed by Berle on just how Halley came to be named by the Liberal Party. The party leaders first tried to get Jack Javits, congressman from Washington Heights, to run on a Republican-Liberal coalition, but Javits couldn't get the proper Republican assurances that they would support him to the hilt rather than knife him as they have done with some other coalition candidates in the past. Also, rumor has it that Javits has his eye on bigger posts.

Berle insisted that the Liberal Party has no partisan axe to grind; it was supporting Halley as a public service. In this light, he appealed to the Republican Party to name Halley as their candidate (to date they have not yet selected their man) and insisted that would do them more good than any narrow Republican candidate. He reminded them that no Republican in New York City had been elected to high office except with the support of the Liberal Party (Isaacs, Javits, Frankenthaler, etc.), and now was the time to repay this political debt by giving Halley their vote. Berle plaintively expressed it: Give us the same generosity which we have given you in the past.

PROPPING THE GOP

We wonder what feelings of pride were aroused in the breasts of Liberal Party members by this appeal. How proud could they be that Liberals had been the indispensable helping hand leading Republicans to posts of high office? The Liberals thus help to refurbish the tarnished reputation of the party and enable it to hold its share of power. Even from the practical point of view, which the party leaders always trot out as their argument for making deals, how often do those same Republicans campaign against Liberal Party candidates in the very next election.

Republican Newbold Morris, supported by the Liberals in 1949 for mayor, vigorously campaigned against the Liberal-Democratic nominee, Ferdinand Pecora, in 1950, and his attacks were all the more effective since he spoke with the authority of having been the Liberal candidate for good, clean government. Again and again, the party members have been placed in this highly embarrassing situation and will continue to encounter this problem so long as the Liberal Party continues to support candidates from the two old parties rather than run in its own independent candidates.

WILL HE SPEAK UP?

Halley, in his speech, echoed the same appeal as Berle. He appealed to Republicans to support him; in fact he appealed to all citizens concerned with government corruption to support him, regardless of party affiliation. He pointed out that no one party had a monopoly on corruption—hence he could make his broad appeal on a non-party basis. Thus he made plain the kind of campaign he would put up—a clean-house campaign for good government.

Various described as an outstanding liberal, a fighter against injustices, and a consistent advocate of social progress, Halley in his speech gave no shred of evidence to support any of these views—outside of the fact that he's against crime and undoubtedly against sin. He insisted that there was "no partisan way of cleaning the streets . . . of con-

trolling traffic, of running subways, of building schools."

What are his views on the witchhunt inside the Department of Welfare? Silence. What are his views on the demands of the transportation union for a shorter week and more pay? Silence. What are his views on the unionization of city employees? Silence. What does he think of the attempt to organize the policemen? Silence. What does he think of using City Hall to break strikes? Silence. What does he think of the demand of New York teachers for more pay? Silence. What are his views on Negro discrimination in Stuyvesant Town? Silence.

Silence may be golden, and precious to a candidate who wishes to offend as few people as possible, but we suspect that Halley will have to express himself on some of these questions. The Liberal Party position on some of these questions is a matter of public record. Does Halley endorse this position?

BLAIKIE'S ROLE

It would have been interesting to hear Halley express himself on why Robert Blaikie, Democratic leader challenging Tammany's domination, is supporting him and how he feels about such support. Blaikie urged the Liberals to run

Halley, and even urged Halley to enter the Democratic primaries. Is it true that this advice wasn't followed because the estimate was that too many independent voters would be out of the city in summer and Halley wouldn't have a chance—not to mention losing campaign ammunition against the Democrats in the actual campaign?

Liberal Party leaders stated that their support to Halley was conditional on his refusal to accept the Democratic nomination. If so, it would certainly have been interesting to hear an honest answer to the above questions. Blaikie is Mayor Impellitteri's patronage dispenser and operates exactly as Tammany did in the days when it controlled City Hall, only Blaikie operates from the Abbey Hotel rather than from Tammany headquarters, which he hopes one day to take over.

LAST YEAR'S GHOST

Another question can be asked the Liberal Party leaders. In 1951 they insist that their candidate cannot be tainted with the support of the Democratic machine. And yet in 1950 they accepted the support of this machine and jointly sponsored Ferdinand Pecora for mayor. They may pride themselves on being a "different kind of a party" which operates on the basis of principles and

morality in politics; but their actions rarely reveal this. Yesterday's fearless and upright candidates become today's opponents, and the party is constantly put in the position of eating its words of the previous election. It is a vicious merry-go-round which robs the party of its strength and succeeds in making its members dizzy in trying to follow the gyrations of the leadership.

Still another ghost rises in this campaign. The Democrats have named Acting President Joseph Sharkey as their candidate for City Council president. And how did Joseph Sharkey get on the City Council in the first place? You've guessed it—the Liberal Party endorsed him and helped elect him, with the usual accolade of "good progressive man." The slogan of the party leadership might well be: Put them where they can hurt you.

POST-GRAD LESSONS

Rent Commissioner McGoldrick, who has sanctioned higher rents for New York, is another graduate of this policy. When he was named among the honored guests at the Liberal Party banquet at another of the stalwart liberals, there was a murmur of resentment. And what has happened to that great hero borne to victory by the Liberal Party—Franklin

D. Roosevelt Jr.? Is it true that he has turned two cold shoulders in base ingratitude to the Liberal Party? How many more such liberals will be carried to victory? The Liberal Party leadership talks about the new Halley comet streaking across the political atmosphere of New York City—but we recall that comets are composed of highly diffused gases. Halley could more accurately be described as a flash in the pan.

But the Liberal Party does have a past—and it is one which they must learn if they are to have a future. Their past record of supporting candidates from the two old parties has hogtied them and blunted their appeal to a corruption-weary electorate.

Without principles to guide them, they have compromised themselves in election after election, getting themselves hopelessly entangled. In 1949 they endorsed Republican Newbold Morris for mayor, in 1950 it was Democrat Ferdinand Pecora, and now it is "independent Democrat" Rudolph Halley. They have just about tried everything except choosing an authentic Liberal Party leader—there are plenty in the party's Trade Union Council—and running a forthright independent campaign appealing to the people on the basis of a bold program for their welfare.

PRO AND CON: WAR POLICY

More from McKinney Criticizing LA Policy

By E. R. McKINNEY

Significant differences between the first, second and third world wars have already been alluded to. These differences indicate the necessity for modification of political approach, and of course in the content of political propaganda. The problem for revolutionary socialists in the First simple. Expand, elaborate and elucidate the slogan: the enemy is within your own country; carry on the class struggle. No one believed that if Germany won that there would be any deep-seated change in the political complexion of the world or in the matter of "freedom." American students would continue going to Germany for their Ph.D.'s just as before.

By the time of the Second World War, however, a change had taken place. The struggle was still imperialist but also bourgeois democracy versus totalitarianism; Roosevelt against Hitler. Now the enemy is not only within your own country but your outlook on Hitler is not the same as to the kaiser. The enemy is also in Germany. The German working class as a class was prostrate and could not oppose its own ruling class as under the kaiser. In the period of the third world imperialist war the situation has changed again despite the fact that the war is still imperialist on both sides. But totalitarianism is now linked with collectivism and opposition to capitalist production and primarily to the accompanying political structure of capitalism: bourgeois democracy. The enemy is still within one's own country. In Russia, however, this is practically without meaning. It can be said that there is no working class in Russia. There are only toiling individuals; some millions chained to factories, mines and fields, other millions fastened to the stake in forced-labor camps. It can't mean much, therefore, to a Russian worker to tell him that the enemy is within his own country and that it is his responsibility to do something about this.

The problem of the working class in the First World War was simple at least in theory: each national working class was to pursue the class struggle irrespective of the effect on the military front. I believe that this is the correct position for revolu-

tionary socialists today and that it is our business to teach this to the working class. But how? One's propaganda today must not be determined solely by the fact that capitalism "is in decline" or that "capitalism is doomed." To American workers and colonial peoples U. S. capitalism seems far too vigorous and aggressive. It will not be possible to talk capitalism out of existence; nor possible to talk a "garrison state" or totalitarianism into existence.

The problem as I see it is not even how to get U. S. workers to accept my view about the class struggle in wartime, especially in this wartime, but how to explain it to them so that they will understand it. I hold that what they read in LABOR ACTION not only does not aid their understanding, but repels them. They will be driven closer either to Washington or to Moscow. This is true in part because they read too much which they know isn't true. They know that despite all the assaults on civil liberties, despite increasing disproportion between war goods and consumer goods, etc., that the differences between the "democratic" nations and Russia are profound, significant and that this difference must be preserved. This is the meaning of the support of Washington by the masses.

I say that this is an imperialist war and not to be supported. But why? Merely because it is an imperialist war? NO. If, in this concrete situation that were all, I would myself support Washington and advise others to do likewise. (And I don't mean any nonsense like "critical" or "military support.") Those who believe that "imperialism is imperialism" have an easy time; they can fire away indiscriminately at Washington or Moscow. But the masses do not believe that the U. S. is in the anteroom to a "garrison state." They haven't yet accepted Republican propaganda on this matter.

The masses support Washington because they prefer "democracy," even "garrison state" democracy, to police-state totalitarianism. They are correct. Where they are incorrect is to believe that they can have what for them is democracy, without political power and control in their hands. Their mistake is not so much that they support Washing-

ton today but that they believe that the democracy which Washington fights for is the same as that desired by the masses. The working class does not understand that wage earners cannot take responsibility for or control the acts of the bourgeoisie or its government. While the masses support Washington because they are for democracy and because there is some measure of mutual interest in this respect between the masses and the bourgeoisie now; the masses do not understand that they cannot guarantee that this bourgeoisie will be for even its own democracy tomorrow. That is, the masses cannot guarantee for themselves the continuation of bourgeois democracy. If they could, particularly at this time of totalitarianism and the absence of working-class political organization, it would be politically stupid to tell them not to support Washington; "critically" if this is balm to one's conscience. This is the line the masses should be taught about the reasons for not supporting Washington today.

Finally I want to discuss a matter which I touched on in my last article. There are two sets of people who oppose the position I am taking. I will call them LABOR ACTION and X. Now X believes that we should give "military" support to Washington against Russia. Both X and LABOR ACTION have said that my position is pro-Washington. I read in some youth publication that I was beating the war drums. X claims that if one says (as I did) that "The great pity of the present is that there is no force to go against Stalinism except bourgeois-democratic imperialism," then you are really giving support to Washington, that is political support. This apparently was also the position of the editor of LABOR ACTION when my article containing this statement and the statement that there would be only two camps in the 3rd world war, was given the head: "The Choice is Between U. S.-UN or Stalinism."

I was puzzled by this as well as by the statement made to me that my position was no different from Susan Green's. And then it occurred to me that what X and others were saying was the following: "If you say that only the U. S. can administer a military defeat to Stalinist Russia, then you must give military support to

Washington. Because it is progressive to prefer, the military victory of bourgeois democracy over totalitarianism." When I rejected this point of view in one discussion, no point of contact remained. I was told that if I said only Washington could administer a military defeat to Russia and then did not support Washington, I was holding inconsistent positions.

But how about LABOR ACTION? It is clear to me now that the editors of LABOR ACTION hold either (1) the position of X, or (2) they believe that there is some force other than the U. S. which can inflict military defeat on Russia. That is, they believe that if it is true that only the U. S. can defeat Russia, then one must support the U. S., or one must find some other force to defeat Russia. But I ask, where is this force to be found? The Asian masses? The "embryonic" Third Camp of Attlee and Nehru?

One comrade remarked that "if the position of McKinney prevails I will leave the ISL." (The comrade is stuck.) What is this comrade saying? Just this: "If it is true that only capitalist imperialism can defeat Russia even militarily, then the struggle for socialism is already lost and one may as well quit."

I say that there is great muddle around this question but that it is not McKinney's muddle.

"Tribute" to UN

James Reston, the N. Y. Times' star Washington correspondent, lets the cat slip in the course of an article in which he gives the needle to MacArthur's speeches in Texas. Replying to the general's charge that U. S. foreign policy is "largely influenced" or "dictated, from abroad," Reston says:

"Indeed, the general feeling here [in Washington] is that never in a coalition of nations, certainly not during the last war, has any one nation had its own way to the extent that the United States has managed to do within the Western alliance in the last three or four years." (June 17.)

Not that everyone didn't know it before, but the boast ought to give the UN delegates that glowing feeling as they indignantly spurn the charge that Washington manipulates the "world organization."

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!