

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SEPTEMBER 17, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**THE TRIPLE CRISIS OF ZIONISM:  
A Discussion of the World Zionist  
Congress at Jerusalem**

... pages 6-7

**Europe Eyes British Rearmament**

... page 3

**Calif. AFL Works a New Wrinkle**

... page 2

The Japanese Treaty-Signing—

## Not Peace, but a Cold-War Maneuver

By MARY BELL

The week of tension in official circles during the ceremonies attendant upon the signing of the peace treaty with Japan has given way to gloomy relief. As Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko's threats about the "responsibility" of the signers for the "consequences" of the "scheme for war" recede, the delegates to San Francisco may focus on further strategic anxieties that relate to the world power race between East and West.

There was universal awareness that the pact signed with Japan was a large maneuver in the current struggle. The meeting was not called to create debate, discuss, propose, amend and then to ratify a treaty. It was specifically openly cynical and with ballyhoo planned as a meeting to sign an already prepared document, authored by United States' John Foster Dulles. Thus the almost unprecedentedly stringent rules and conditions of the conference, incapable of being shouted down by the Iron Curtain representatives.

In advance of their acceptance, it had been expected and hoped that the Russians would decline the invitation. The official opinion of the Western bloc is adequately expressed by a British Daily Herald (8-14-51) writer who stated:

"The Russians, by accepting a formal invitation which they were confidently expected to refuse, have thus managed to throw a very large spanner into the preparations for signing the treaty next month." Disappointed as the Western leaders may have been at the presence of the Russians, to their great relief the Russian spanner did not wreck the carefully constructed machinery of the San Francisco rules and regulations.

### LIFELESS SPEECHES

By the terms of the treaty, Japan will be restricted to a little more than half of her pre-Pearl Harbor empire and confined to the four main islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu and Shikoku, approximately her territory at the time of Commander Perry's visit in

(Turn to last page)

## Truman, Wilson Cooperate To Axe Copper Strikers

By BEN HALL

Two events last week remind us that the Truman administration is already shunting aside the labor leaders and becoming indifferent to their moods and reactions.

(1) Copper workers, on strike for improved contracts, were forced back to work by a Taft-Hartley injunction.

(2) Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers Union and a labor member of the Wage Stabilization Board, told the New York State CIO convention that he was so fed up with the board that he had intended to resign in disgust but was dissuaded only by a personal appeal from Philip Murray.

These incidents are not directly related. Taken together, however, they are evidence that the administration feels confident that, come what may, the unions will trail behind its policies and that its "pro-labor" gestures need not be too vigorous or too serious. It was just such a miscalculation by Truman that led to the wage crisis at

the beginning of the year.

At that time, labor representatives walked off all war boards, castigating the domestic policy of the administration as anti-labor and demanding a complete turn. For many weeks, labor leaders sounded like radical agitators. And then, they walked back to their old posts, announcing with satisfaction that their major demands had been met. Perhaps they were momentarily appeased; in fact they did win certain concessions, even important ones. It was clear even then, however, that these concessions, measured against the charges leveled at Truman, were meager indeed.

### LEGITIMATE STRIKE

And now Rieve himself reveals just how meager they were. He told the New York CIO that inflation could not be curbed under the present Defense Production Act; he charged that the only effect of the Wage Stabilization Board was to hold down wages under formulas that ignore what the wage earner needs; that it is not interested in justice but only

concerned with applying mechanical rules. He indicts the board... but remains on it as window dressing. And all union demands are swiftly entangled in its cumbersome processes.

Which brings us to the copper strike. The strike was called by the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union, a union that was expelled by the CIO during the recent purge.

But just to set the record straight: not once during the involved contract negotiations did a single responsible person argue that this strike was not a legitimate union struggle or that the leadership of this union, whether or not it continues to follow a Stalinistic line, was in this instance manipulating a legitimate struggle for illegitimate Stalinist purposes.

On the contrary, as far as we can see, the leadership has been ready to compromise, yielding, and in the words of the New York Times "respectful."

The Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, since its expulsion from the CIO, has managed to hold together despite the fact that seventeen other unions, at one time or another, tried to win over its membership. It has won more votes in NLRB elections than all its rivals combined, winning thirty-six elections against thirty-one for rival unions. We report all this, at this point, neither in praise nor in criticism but simply to clear the ground for a discussion of the strike and the injunction. And during this strike, its picket lines were respected by 100,000 workers, including members of the AFL crafts and Railway Brotherhoods.

### WILSON INTERVENES

Here was a strike strangled to death by government interference on the very eve of success; the involved processes that caught it up were not devised for this union or this industry. They are part and parcel of government labor policy in the period of war mobilization.

Copper is a vital industrial raw material now in short supply. Naturally, as soon as the strike was called, government spokesmen announced a rapidly approaching "emergency." Whether their claims were accurate and truthful we cannot tell. But a rapid settlement seemed possible. Cyrus S. Ching, federal mediator, recommended a wage increase of 16 cents per hour in one local case, a recommendation that could easily have set a pattern for the industry. The union promptly announced its acceptance of this suggestion.

On the scene arrives Charles E. Wilson, director of defense mobilization. Just the man to intervene. The whole labor movement knows

(Turn to last page)

## TUC Congress Shows Wide Support To Bevan In Spite of Steamroller

By GORDON HASKELL

The annual Conference of the British Trades Union Congress met at Blackpool during the week starting on September 3. It presented a striking picture of the dissatisfaction with policies of the labor leadership of that country which is growing in extension and depth among the ranks.

The groundswell of this feeling is apparent even through the reports in the American press which make little effort to conceal a deep and bitter prejudice against the whole left wing of the British labor movement.

The discontent seems to be vague, and certainly it is not well organized. The workers feel that somehow things are not going as they should, but no leadership has yet presented itself which could crystallize this feeling into a striking, radical criticism of Labor Party policies and into an effective program which could give the discontent a real purpose and direction.

The most effective leadership which has presented itself is that of Aneurin Bevan and his friends. His criticism strikes at some of the major symptoms of what is wrong with the policies of the la-

bor leadership, but it rarely reaches to the roots of the disease. His program is, therefore, one of treating the symptoms. And as such, it contains weaknesses and inconsistencies on which the labor leadership can pounce easily and with a great deal of effect.

### DIM VICTORY

Yet Bevan's leadership is the best on the scene, and the workers are rallying behind it in large numbers. At the Trades Union Congress all resolutions directed against the government's policies along the lines of Bevan's program were defeated. But the Labor Party leadership can take scant satisfaction from the way in which they were defeated.

Bevan's criticism is weakest in the realm of foreign policy, and hence on the armament program which flows from it. Although he

has put his finger on one sore spot in British foreign policy, its dependence on the American State Department, the alternative he offers is both vague and timid.

And it was on questions of foreign policy that the TUC Conference gave its largest majorities to support of the government. Even on these questions, it is difficult to know what was the actual feeling of many of the delegates, let alone of the men and women they represented.

### BLOCK-VOTE SYSTEM

At British TUC conferences each union delegation votes as a unit, with the votes of the whole delegation, and hence of the total membership of each union, being cast in a block. Minorities in the delegations have no way of making themselves felt, and of a total of about 8,000,000 votes some 3,000,000 are controlled by the leaders of the Mine Workers, the Transport and General Workers, the General and Municipal Workers, and the Iron and Steel Workers.

Several votes were taken on different aspects of foreign policy. It is always risky to rely on the daily press in matters concerning

the positions put forward by socialist opponents of American foreign policy. However, the summaries of the resolutions as presented by the New York Times on September 6 indicates that a resolution calling upon the Labor government to take a "new initiative" toward ending the cold war, thus relieving the country of the burden of rearmament, was defeated overwhelmingly on a show of hands.

Another resolution, urging a resumption of East-West trade regardless of United States opposition was defeated on a card vote by 5,213,000 to 1,795,000 votes. On a resolution opposing the rearmament of Germany and Japan the margin was smaller, with the vote 2,608,000 in favor and 4,482,000 against.

### BEVAN'S WEAKNESS

These motions were, of course, supported by the unions in which the Stalinists still have some influence, as well as by anti-Stalinist left wingers. It appears fairly clear, unless the reports are completely false, that the left wing sought to attack Britain's present policies in the cold war, without

(Turn to last page)



# Cal. AFL Has New Wrinkle In Bureaucratic Control

SAN FRANCISCO, Sept. 3—With differences of opinion at their lowest ebb, the California State Federation of Labor went through the motions of holding its 49th annual convention. So well greased was this convention that the business was completed in four days instead of the usual five.

This achievement was made possible by the use of so-called "statements of policy." These statements are drawn up prior to the convention and cover very broad issues such as mobilization, political action, foreign policy, housing, civil rights, etc. They are then submitted to the convention and voted on before discussion and taking of any resolutions can vote place.

This procedure was first introduced at the 1947 convention. At the time there was a strong argument in favor of it. The war had apparently created many more problems than it was thought possible to handle through the usual method of resolutions. The statements of policy were designed to bring some order and simplicity into the handling of the problems.

Since 1947, however, there has been a steady decline in the number of resolutions submitted to each succeeding convention. Where previously there had been some three hundred resolutions, the number declined at this convention to 152.

## "EFFICIENT" IT IS

It is impossible to say to what extent the decline in the number of resolutions is due to the practice of presenting the convention with the statements of policy and to what extent it is due to the general apathy of the delegates. There can be little doubt that the statements of policy tend to inhibit submission of resolutions and, just as important, the discussion which these resolutions might prompt.

For example, a resolution to revoke the wage freeze was introduced. The resolutions committee reported it out as follows: "Because the subject matter of this resolution, elimination of wage freeze, is in conflict with Statement of Policy I, Mobilization, and the action just taken by the convention, your committee recommends that the resolution be filed." The committee's recommendation was adopted. From the standpoint of the labor bureaucracy a more efficient method of dispatching unwanted resolutions to the waste basket could hardly be asked for.

Admittedly, AFL conventions cannot be considered models of democracy. The California State Federation is controlled by a few large, well-disciplined caucuses such as the Teamsters and the Building Trades. The opposition is usually composed of small, unorganized locals. However, what is of concern is a clear tendency of the state conventions since the end of the war to dispense with even the small amount of democratic participation that was traditional in the past.

Besides the resolution to revoke the wage freeze, two other resolutions deserve to be mentioned. One was for the repeal of the Smith Act. The other was on political action, concluding with a resolve "That the California State Federation of Labor and the AFL work with the CIO and other labor groups to examine the possibility of promoting a labor party at the earliest possible time."

## ULPC TOO HOT

Unfortunately these important resolutions, submitted by the California State Association of Electrical Workers, were withdrawn with a statement that they had been submitted by mistake and that the resolutions had been turned down by the Electrical Workers' conference held the day before the convention. Whether or not the pressure was put on to remove these resolutions, it is significant that a labor-party resolution was introduced from a new source, the California State Association of Electrical Workers.

Immediately preceding this convention the AFL executive committee had voted to scuttle the United Labor Policy Committee. It was hoped that some resolution, or at least some discussion of this important decision, would take place. The ULPC had united most of the labor movement in its relations with the government and had organized the dramatic walk-out of labor from the mobilization agencies. Throughout the labor movement the ULPC was looked upon as a first step in the possible unification of labor.

Evidently, however, this issue was too hot to handle. The ULPC was disposed of by ignoring it completely.

## STAYS "RESPECTABLE"

On foreign policy the convention could not find one word of criticism of the foreign policy of the U. S. And this despite the elementary duty of the American labor movement to protest the propping up of dictators such as Franco against the working class of their own countries.

This lack of criticism negates the fine sentiments of the convention with relation to civil liberties. Under that section the convention adopted a statement to the effect that "communism" should be fought but not at the expense of the Bill of Rights. And "yet so hysterical have many of our legislators and others become that it appears possible that the fear of communism alone will be sufficient to accomplish what the communists at their greatest strength could never hope to bring about, short of total destruction of the country through armed conquest."

# Inside the Peron Circus

By A HURTADO

It is quite clear that Peronism has no fear of the ridiculous. First it let loose the "bombshell" of the atomic bomb, to the astonishment of the gullible and the laughter of others; now we witness the circus-like spectacle of the parades and demands on the president to present his candidacy in the next election. And finally something that looks like Peron soliciting Peron to have Peron accept the continuation of his rule over the destiny of the country.

What is going on? The fact is that regimes of this type have accustomed us to this kind of display. And for that matter, do not forget that Peronism is the type of regime which continues imprisoning oppositionists and building workers' concentration camps. Or can it be that you didn't know that Argentina also counts on its concentration camps?

However, all this chatter and bustle conceals a more crucial situation. In reality it is the crisis that the country is suffering under Peronism. The war has passed, and with it have passed the years of euphoria, of great prosperity, of easy business and audacious plans. And the crisis has arrived with all its consequences; a crisis that will be even more serious with the continuation of the Peron-Evita cabal in power.

On the other hand, the inflationary tendency has been notably intensified. The last balance sheet of the Central Bank shows the great monetary expansion which has taken place during the past years, which is reflected in the market. In order to appreciate the degree of "paper" finance under which the country suffers, let us look at the following official figures:

(In millions of pesos)	
May 1943	1,847
May 1946	3,414
Dec. 1946	4,064
Oct. 1949	10,127
Oct. 1950	11,591

An official index of the cost of life is not available. The last known index was given by Peron himself in his report to Congress in May of last year. The index was 265 (1943=100), which means, if one realizes that from 1939 to 1943 the rise in the cost of living was 48 per cent, that the real and effective rise from 1939 to 1949 has been 210 per cent. From May 1950 till the present, this trend has reached greater proportions. The depreciation of the peso reached a minimum of a third in 1946. Moreover, the reserves of gold have fallen from 5,646.2 million pesos to 2,216.7 million, or a decline of 60 per cent.

## FIGURES ON THE CRISIS

State intervention as practised in Argentina, particularly in the field of export products, allows the Peron gang to obtain fat benefits. We must recall that in the announced list of exports, the IAPI figures almost all the products which are exported to foreign countries and that it is the same IAPI which serves as an intermediary for the grain export houses. From this we can deduce that, since it is the IAPI which controls and imposes the prices for buying and selling, its profits must be extraordinary. Before the commercialization of the grain industry the private firms earned a profit of from 2 to 3 per cent; but in truth the profits of the state-run IAPI in wheat, after computing the costs, comes to 40 per cent of the price paid the producer. In other words: Of the 3 million tons of wheat exported its

profit is 300 million pesos. Good business for the "shirtless" boss. That is to say, the Peron gang. Yet we can supply some figures which even more clearly show the economic crisis which is just beginning to be felt. From the year 1946 to the year 1950 the national budget rose from 1,700 million pesos to 12,000 million, and the means of payment (money in circulation, bank deposits and official reserves) rose from 11,000 million to 32,600 million. In these same four years the public debt has risen from 7,000 million to 25,000 million.

In this ever-deepening and critical situation the Argentine workers are beginning to understand the force of Peron's demagoguery; that they are given with one hand a rise in wages which is taken away from them, with interest, by the other hand in the form of goods.

# Don Juan Wooded Franco, SP Left at the Altar

By RICHARD TROY

Before the recent rapprochement between Washington and Madrid, one of the great hopes for liberalization of Spain was, for many groups, the restoration of the monarchy. This hope was not only held by a number of prominent groups in the United States (who were frightened by the possibility of a revolutionary overthrow of Franco) but was shared by the Spanish Socialist Party in exile and other republican organizations. The restoration of the royal house which had been deposed by the Spanish people 20 years ago was looked upon as an entering wedge for reforms.

Don Juan, the prospective monarch, certainly seemed like an amiable character and even made occasional statements condemning the fascist regime. It was also obvious that Franco, in an increasingly tough spot, might, to save his regime, more willingly give in to the pretender than permit outlawed parties to return.

And thus the 20th-century world was confronted with the extraordinary spectacle of a group of republicans and Socialists rallying about a deposed royal family as a chief weapon in their offensive for the restoration of democracy.

## DON JUAN WOOS

The group among the Spanish exiles which steadfastly combated this design of action was the socialist POUM; its leaders pointed out again and again the illusory character of hopes based upon the pretender; they showed how it shackled much of their militant united-front activities within Spain itself; and they urged their compatriots in exile to focus all their support instead upon the only reliable ally of democracy in Spain, the masses of the people.

It was consequently with considerable satisfaction that the POUM newspaper, *La Batalla*, reported on a certain revelation made recently by the New York Times correspondent in Spain, Sam Pope Brewer. Brewer divulged the contents of a letter written by Don Juan to Franco on July 10 in which the hopeful king pleaded with the Caudillo for his immediate restoration.

In this letter he said that he was in no way hostile to the principles that General Franco represented; he reminded Franco that he had offered him his services several times during the Civil War; he remarked that he was absolutely convinced that the acts of the Franco government were motivated by patriotism; and he vigorously denied that he had any connection with any sort of "subversive activity" (by which, of course, he meant, his eager supporters among the émigrés in France and elsewhere).

The pretender admitted, however, that he did have certain criticisms of the economic program of one of Franco's ministers, and he thought the bureaucracy too corrupt. But he did not want these matters to stand in the way of an agreement. His trump argument, however, was that his restoration was the "only way of bringing about close relations with the United States and other Western powers." In other words, he was saying that the restoration would change nothing, or little at any rate, within the nation, but might well be sufficient whitewash to entice the Western powers to come through with aid and arms to keep the Franco state afloat.

## A LITTLE NICHE

The two big issues at these talks are: the cost of Western Europe's rearmament and the inclusion of West Germany into the Atlantic Pact armies. Other items to be considered include: the admission of Greece and Turkey into the Pact; the U. S.'s *de facto* admission of Franco Spain into the "community of democratic nations," and the Korean truce talks.

However, as we well know by now, it turned out that the United States was much easier to seduce than had been expected. Admiral Sherman closed the deal a few days after the above-mentioned letter was written. And so Don Juan remains camped in Portugal; he may well be composing move letters to Franco.

But what about the Socialist Party and the other groups that had counted upon the pretender to lift them into power? They have evidently not yet taken note of Brewer's revelation. Like many of their reformist comrades in other Western countries they are reluctant to give up their dream of defeating totalitarianism with idle kings, erstwhile fascists, UN resolutions, and various forms of "restoration."

## The Handy Way

To Subscribe!

## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:  
 NEW  RENEWAL  
 6 months at \$1.00  
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME ..... (please print)  
ADDRESS .....  
ZONE ..... APT. ....  
CITY .....  
STATE .....  
 Bill me.  
 Payment enclosed.

(From *La Batalla*)

Eisenhower Is 'Confident' but the Problem Is Unsolved—

# Europe Eyes British Plight on Rearmament

By SAM FELIX

Now that Washington has forced through the signing of what it calls a Japanese Peace Treaty, it turns its attention toward another part of the world—Western Europe.

The process whereby United States imperialism builds up military alliances throughout the world proceeds in piece-meal fashion. The framework of a Pacific Pact has been established with the Japanese treaty and the accompanying U. S. military agreements with Japan, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand. But with all this set up, the U. S. has to turn its attention to the functioning of its Atlantic Pact.

The present crisis in the North Atlantic Pact mirrors the future crises in the Pacific area once the armament programs begin. It demonstrates the reactionary consequences of the modern permanent war economy in an industrialized area of the world. And the effects in the non-industrialized, so-called backward areas, will be even more disastrous.

Now that Washington is finished with the San Francisco "conference," it has organized, in its characteristic "democratic" manner, two other conferences. One is now going on in Washington among the Big 3, the U. S., England and France. After they have discussed the main problems, and to all intents arrived at the conclusions, the rest of the Atlantic Pact nations will be called in for a conference at Ottawa to approve the Big 3 decisions.

## THEY WON'T FOLLOW

The two big issues at these talks are: the cost of Western Europe's rearmament and the inclusion of West Germany into the Atlantic Pact armies. Other items to be considered include: the admission of Greece and Turkey into the Pact; the U. S.'s *de facto* admission of Franco Spain into the "community of democratic nations," and the Korean truce talks.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, publication date Sept. 26 (except for first listed):

HOW TO KNOW THE AMERICAN MAMMALS, by Ivan Sanderson. A Mentor book, 160 pages, 35 cents. Published Aug. 10.

MAN MAKES HIMSELF, by V. Gordon Childs. A Mentor book, 192 pages, 35 cents.

BENARD CARR, by James T. Farrell. A Signet Giant, 352 pages, 35 cents.

A TREE OF NIGHT and Other Stories, by Truman Capote. A Signet book, 144 pages, 25 cents.

THE DAY AFTER TOMORROW (Sixth Column), by Robert Heinlein. A Signet book, 160 pages, 25 cents.

JUBEL'S CHILDREN, by Leonard Kaufman. A Signet book, 200 pages, 25 cents.

## LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14 Street, N. Y. C.

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.  
Send for our free book list.

## 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.

valuation of the pound experienced a rise in its trade balance, now is experiencing a complete reversal of this trend, as pointed out in the August 20 issue of LABOR ACTION. The former export surplus of the past two years has been changed overnight into an expected deficit for this year, according to Hugh Gaitskell, chancellor of the exchequer.

The Labor Party leadership, committed to the disastrous road of rearmament, has three choices for meeting the inflationary upturn in the economy: decrease the military spending, decrease exports or decrease the standard of living of the English people. The Attlee leadership made its choice when Hugh Gaitskell announced before the recent Trade Union Congress at Blackpool that living standards will have to decline while the export drive is to be raised.

## BANKRUPTS

Even since the 1949 devaluation, there has been a slow, but steady rise in living cost due primarily to the devaluation itself. That has been followed by the increase in world raw-material prices primarily because of U. S. stockpiling practices, which further raised the cost of living. And now on top of this has been added the rearmament program, the trade deficit and a new export

drive. The effects of a declining standard of living on the European worker is much different from that on the American worker. For the U. S. it means forgoing a household appliance, TV set or even a car. For the European it means food or clothes. In Europe it is really a question of guns or butter. There are no non-essentials to cut.

While the British Labor government can cash in on its political prestige among the British workers in order to start such an ambitious conversion to the war economy, the rest of the Western European governments appear bankrupt. Not another one of the Atlantic Pact countries has a government that enjoys the prestige among the working masses that Britain does, although it is also true that Attlee is using it up.

Although U. S. conceived of France as providing the bulk of the Atlantic Pact armies, as of now France has done literally nothing on the basis of its own economic power. One look at the British experience has been enough to convince the present French government to wait until it can get assurances of further American economic and military aid. But from present appearances it seems that Congress is going to cut economic aid rather than increase it.

## FRANCE'S SQUEEZE

Nevertheless even without an armament program comparable to Britain's, the French economy has felt a sharp inflationary turn. Official French government sources report that the cost of living has increased by 20 per cent in the past year. The Pleven cabinet has just increased the minimum wage by a mere pittance, and at the same time raised prices, all of which goes a long way toward solving nothing.

To superimpose an armament program on top of this situation will undermine the shaky Pleven government which came to power on the basis of rigged election laws. The search will be on for the strong man who will "rise above politics" in order to place the war economy straightjacket on the nation. And that strong man is there — De Gaulle.

The impact of these developments has strengthened the reactionary demands for French control of the German economy through the Schuman Plan and the payment of occupation costs, and the control of a German army through a unified Atlantic Pact army. Washington's role is that of placating the French demands on Germany with a plan for the utilization of German manpower and industrial resources, and the German demands of independence from the occupation.

## A Discussion on Problems of Poland's Struggle—

# Polish Miners, Peasants Show Way to Freedom

By A. RUDZIENSKI

How can the Stalinist autocracy be defeated in Poland?

As we have written in a former article, Stalin has passed in Poland from the "soft" Alexander policy to the "hard" Nicholas tactic. But the transition has been too rough, and hence has been met with great resistance by the workers and peasants, and the people of Poland in general.

Now the political "wisdom" of Stalin, which has been trumpeted by the fellow-travelers, is being put to a test. If the new "hard" policy turns out to be too hard, it could provoke spontaneous popular resistance, as has taken place in Dombrowa-Silesia, in Szczecin, and among the peasants.

The interests of the Stalinist totalitarian offensive are coming in to conflict with the interests of Russian international policy, which needs Polish help or at least Polish neutrality in the war against the United States. Stalin terrifies the Poles with the nightmare of a new partition of Poland and the annexation of the western territories of Silesia and Prussian Pomerania, now entirely populated by Poles.

Therefore the "great Stalin" has lost his courage against Tito, and is frightened by the Polish resistance. Therefore, also, the Polish opposition has a great historic opportunity before it.

The Polish nationalist and populist opposition asks for the support of the United States government in their fight against Stalin. But the Polish people do not have any confidence in Truman (or in a Republican administration) because they were disappointed by the Roosevelt policy at Yalta and Potsdam.

## NO CONFIDENCE

The Polish nationalist and populist opposition offers the Department of State the new Polish army and the new resistance in the country in exchange for a declaration that the Polish western borders will be untouched. But the Polish people have no confidence in the declarations of the American state department, and will not fight for American interests against Russia. The Polish bourgeois opposition would like to organize a new insurrection in Poland in support of "American democracy." But the Polish people do not want the restoration of capitalism in Poland; they want only the destruction of the Stalinist autocracy and the introduction of genuine socialist democracy which will assure the free national and social development of the Poles in their entire national territory.

The Polish workers and peasants do not trust the American bourgeoisie, neither Democrats nor Republicans. But they could believe in American labor, in the trade unions and an American labor party. Therefore the Polish people wait for the support of the official organizations of labor, of the CIO and AFL, of the American leftist groups, on the Polish question.

If American labor would promote the Polish workers and peasants support against the Russian Stalinist autocracy, and free national and social development in the whole national territory after the defeat of Russia, such a declaration by American labor could be a base for the political fight against Russian autocracy.

Between eight and ten million Poles are living in former Polish territory, and they have the right to live under proper conditions. Another eight million Poles live in Silesia and Pomerania and they too have the right to know what their future will be. I make no claim for a "great Poland." But I do make a claim for a proper national home for the Polish workers and peasants. Only the international working class, and specially the American labor movement, can guarantee this national home for the Poles, and their right to national self-determination.

because they were not supported reaction. But the opposition in the satellite countries is not as isolated from the world as was the Russian Trotskyist opposition, and the period of the international counter-revolution is now at its lowest point.

Therefore the "great Stalin" has lost his courage against Tito, and is frightened by the Polish resistance. Therefore, also, the Polish opposition has a great historic opportunity before it.

The Polish nationalist and populist opposition asks for the support of the United States government in their fight against Stalin. But the Polish people do not have any confidence in Truman (or in a Republican administration) because they were disappointed by the Roosevelt policy at Yalta and Potsdam.

## NO CONFIDENCE

The Polish nationalist and populist opposition offers the Department of State the new Polish army and the new resistance in the country in exchange for a declaration that the Polish western borders will be untouched. But the Polish people have no confidence in the declarations of the American state department, and will not fight for American interests against Russia. The Polish bourgeois opposition would like to organize a new insurrection in Poland in support of "American democracy." But the Polish people do not want the restoration of capitalism in Poland; they want only the destruction of the Stalinist autocracy and the introduction of genuine socialist democracy which will assure the free national and social development of the Poles in their entire national territory.

## AN ASSURED PLACE

There must be an assured place for the free, socialist Poland in the future United Socialist States of Europe. And that will be the first political condition for the resistance fight of the Poles against the Russian autocracy.

The second condition for this fight and the early defeat of Stalinist totalitarianism in Poland must be the political tactics of the workers, bourgeois and populist oppositions in Poland itself. One must break with the adventurist feudal tradition of insurrection in Poland. All insurrections of the nobility against Russia finished in defeat, because they were isolated from the Western bourgeoisie and

ants support against the Russian Stalinist autocracy, and free national and social development in the whole national territory after the defeat of Russia, such a declaration by American labor could be a base for the political fight against Russian autocracy.

It is possible that the nationalist opposition of Mikolajczyk could change the Polish feeling against support of the American bourgeoisie, and could organize the Polish armed forces or the internal national resistance movement against Russia. Any such policy could finish only with a new defeat and a new national catastrophe, because of the disloyalty of official United States policy toward the Poles. Either Democratic or Republican administrations would sacrifice the interests of the Polish people to the interests of the German or Russian ruling classes, as at Yalta or Teheran, because these countries are stronger and more necessary to the American bourgeoisie. On the other hand, nothing could be more convenient to Stalin than a premature Polish insurrection.

SPONTANEOUS STRUGGLE

There is no room for isolated national insurrections in the time of socialist revolutions. The spontaneous struggle of the Polish miners and peasants shows the way in which the Stalinist autocracy in Poland could be beaten.

There must be nothing of the adventurist, quixotic gesture, nothing of the isolated insurrections in the style of the nineteenth century. Only the mass fight of the workers and peasants could oblige Stalin to retreat. Not an hour of overtime for Stalin; not a bushel of grain for Stalin; not an acre of soil to the Stalinist "collectives." No production records, no Stakhanovism for Stalin! That is the road for the economic and political fight of the Polish people, the road by which the Stalinist autocracy can be stopped, can be obliged to retreat, and can be beaten in the end.

The Polish worker and peasant opposition and the international labor movement, especially the American labor movement, have a great historic task to accomplish in their fight against the Stalinist totalitarian autocracy. August 1951



# 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. \_\_\_\_\_

# YOU and SCIENCE

## Facts of Life at the Chemists' Congress

By PHILIP COBEN

The announcement at the Congress of Pure and Applied Chemistry, just held, that the structure of a series of proteins has been analyzed and determined is big news, even though it got somewhat less of a play in the press than the papers read at a simultaneous conference in Britain on the feasibility of reaching Mars. The former may mean the discovery of life on earth, or at any rate life's secrets. The latter made better headlines because they raised the possibility of new means of destroying life on earth; the focus of interest is not, after all, on a visit to the suburban planet but rather on the practicality of satellite space stations, with their fantastic-realistic possibilities for military domination. It was in another century that someone wrote bitterly about military men that "if they had their way they would fortify the moon." He was, you see, making an attempt at extreme hyperbole.

Without derogating interest in either Mars or space stations, however, the more terrestrial announcement at the American Chemical Society congress opens up even more important vistas. Man's "conquest of nature," up to now, has been to a great extent in terms of conquest (that is, control) of the inorganic world, above all in terms of power. As far as the control of life processes is concerned, which is possible only on the basis of fundamental understanding ("pure science"), modern medical men are not many cuts above the Indians who empirically discovered that quinine cures malaria. They themselves have made even more cynical remarks along this line.

The ability to control (not merely affect) the life processes of protoplasm would have social effects on a scale comparable to those of the Industrial Revolution in its sphere. But before we get over-enthusiastic about the possibilities, which can be exaggerated only with difficulty, it is well to remember, with whatever consequent bitterness, another aspect of the news from the ACS congress.

It is not merely that the analysis of life processes and structure is still in a "theoretical" stage; so was nuclear theory a very short number of years ago. The other aspect we have in mind, rather, means that it is in this early theoretical stage in a society which will not permit it to flower.

As is well known, the release of nuclear energy was possible only through the shared work and discoveries of scientists from many countries. It would have been impossible without the international collaboration of the scientific world, without which the billions spent on the Manhattan Project would have meant nothing.

It is this international collaboration of science which was spectacularly negated last week by the policemen's club, wielded by the State Department. The immediate legal basis for its intervention was presumably the McCarran Act, but the administration has boasted that it doesn't need the McCarran Act for the purpose.

### The State Department at the Microscope

Numbers of foreign scientists who planned to attend the ACS congress were kept out of the country because their visa applications could not be processed in time to detect "subversive" elements. The number of these has not been announced, but it would seem to be appreciable and includes prominent participants, including five who were scheduled to deliver important papers and the head of the Italian delegation.

There would be sufficient reason to marvel at the spectacle if the scientists involved were really "Communists" or otherwise "subversive." That which is disgraceful and criminal becomes fantastically ridiculous—more fantastic in its own way than space stations—when the press cites a couple of cases.

Marguerite Perey, who discovered element 87, ten years ago invited Irene Joliot-Curie (daughter of Marie Curie, co-discoverer of radium) to the dedication of her laboratory. But ah-ha, Irene Joliot-Curie is the wife of Frederic, the well-known French atomic physicist who is an open CP'er! Mlle. Perey didn't get her visa.

A Danish chemist who was refused a visa, Dr. Steig Viebel, is "said to be a Communist," says the press. Therefore . . . this alleged "Communist" is not permitted to divulge whatever information he possesses for the benefit of Western science! The case is only slightly further pointed up when the same Dr. Viebel is quoted as saying that "if America kept insisting on enforcing such strict exclusion laws, no more international meetings could be held in this country, and the United States would, in this respect, place itself in the same class with Russia."

If quoted correctly, Dr. Viebel is not only not an admirer of Stalin, but also he has said that the American Chemical Society should have thundered out. There is no report that they did so, in spite of excellent generalizations in speeches about freedom for science.

If scientists fail to dig out the facts of life in spite of theoretical advances, it will be because other facts of life have gotten in their way. Scientists are not the least important minority that needs liberation from the shadow of the police state.



## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 38 September 17, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-2222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, L. G. SMITH, BEN HALL  
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIKS

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

# READING from LEFT to RIGHT

## THE PATRIARCH AND THE COMMUNISTS, by Pachydermus.—East Europe (London), Aug. 23.

"Today, just as in tsarist Times, Russia's rulers make expensive use of the Orthodox Church in domestic as well as foreign policy. . . ."

"The May 6, 1951 issue of *Ukrainian News* describes the role of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Ukraine as 'a powerful weapon in the russification of spiritual life.'"

"Most of the bishops appointed by the Patriarch of All Russia, Alexius, were Russians, who ruthlessly pressed forward with the russification of the Orthodox Church, and persecuted all who attempted to preserve its Ukrainian character. The Exarch of All Ukraine was Ioan, the Metropolitan of Kiyev and Galicia. Archbishop Makarius resided in Lwow, being Archbishop of Lwow, Tarnopol, Munkachevo, and Uzhorod. For 'special services' rendered to the Russian Orthodox Church, Archbishop Makarius had been made an 'honorary member of the Moscow Ecclesiastic Academy.' Besides him, in Galicia resided Bishop Antonius of Stanislawow and Kolomeya, and Bishop Mihail of Sambor and Drohobych."

"In 1950, in the Diocese of Zhitomir, Patri-

arch Alexius had ordered the immediate 'removal' and subsequent arrest for 'Ukrainian-nationalism' of Bishop Alexander of Zhitomir and Ovruch. He was replaced by a Russian Bishop, Sergius Darin of Rostov, who began his activities by returning to the Yugoslav Government the medal of *National Liberation* bestowed on him in 1945. Soon after, he was transferred to Byelorussia, while the Zhitomir Diocese was put in charge of yet another Russian, the 'energetic' Bishop Nifont of Ufa, in the Urals.

"A new diocese, under Archbishop Stephan, was also created in Kirovograd, and placed in charge of Bishop Evstratius. Most of the Ukrainian clergy had been trained in Moscow and Leningrad, only a few in Kiyev. All of them had to speak 'literary Russian,' and know the history of the Russian Church."

"The slightest sign of Ukrainian nationalism was visited by deportation to the North or to Siberia. Candidates for the priesthood were closely investigated and had to fill innumerable forms about their personal history and connections. Under the Russian hierarchy, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was a powerful means of russification, which was extensively used by Moscow."

# SWP 'Theoretician' Takes Another Fling at Russian Question

Or: E. R. Frank Takes Alarm Clock Apart and Has a Few Pieces Left Over When He Tries to Put It Together Again

By JAMES M. FENWICK

In the last eleven years, the limitations of the theoretical leash restraining the Socialist Workers Party (Communist) from making serious political investigations have become increasingly obvious even to leading members of that self-styled orthodox Trotskyist group itself.

An article by the notorious E. R. Frank, titled "Notes on Our Discussion," which is contained in a recent SWP internal bulletin, is a case in point. Written in his usual consistently vulgar and shallow style, the article is not only a more or less unintentional revelation of the stagnation and demoralization of the SWP but also a depressing picture of the floundering of the membership of the SWP in its effort to stay afloat while being dragged down by their false policies.

He begins ritualistically by noting that "if the Shachtmanite cadre faces the imminent danger of total disintegration under the hammer blows of bourgeois and social-democratic public opinion, our cadre faces an opposite danger (although, as this discussion has demonstrated, an admittedly remote one)."

Having thus warded off the Evil Eye of heterodoxy, he then continues: "Our cadre, in its anxiety to steel itself against the pressures of a hostile world, faces a possible danger of petrification, of inuring itself to the play of criticism upon the organization, of people getting closed minds and adopting the attitudes of a shut-in circle, of converting the writings of the Marxist masters

into Scripture, of reducing Marxism to scholasticism." That statement errs only in ascribing a potential character to the dangers enumerated.

He then proceeds to take up "a number of important items still left dangling in the discussion, starting off with the problem of the nature of Stalinism. The analysis made by the Fourth World Congress of the Fourth International is, it seems, faulty. The Stalinist parties are not 'neo-reformist' parties. In fact, in 'two exceptional cases, Stalinist bureaucracies led successful revolutions. At present, they have assumed the leadership of the anti-imperialist struggle in Korea, Indo-China, Malaya. . . . Try as one might, therefore, it is difficult to see how clarity is served, or how anything is added to the wisdom of the ages, by calling the Indo-Chinese or North Korean Stalinists agents of imperialism; or by explaining that the third world war will be fought, in great part, between imperialism on the one side, and the agents of imperialism on the other.' That is not an inelegant statement.

IF THIS IS TRUE . . . If all this is true, if "these conflicts with capitalism, these leadership of mass struggles against imperialism are not epiphenomenal to the Kremlin's fundamental tie to imperialism," if the Kremlin "not only disorients and betrays workers' struggles, but also smashes in capitalism here and there, as it did in Eastern Europe, and helps incite great revolutionary storms elsewhere, which then have a menacing and

a momentum of their own," the and China," Frank says, "it was able to utilize—in the absence of the United States the SWP is, short of a complete reorientation, main reason for Trotsky's opposition to Stalinism—his belief in its constant capitulation of capitalist forces — no longer retains its validity.

Why the Fourth International should not revert to its status as a left opposition to Stalinism is difficult to see. That Stalin "can change overnight" is not only not decisive given this elaboration of facts; there is little evidence of his intention of doing so in the present conjuncture. The road to war having been opened (and Stalin understands its inevitability) the political weapon of anti-capitalism remains one of the most powerful in Stalin's arsenal. He is not likely to give it up.

### "REPULSIVE SUCCESSES"

Frank next takes up the criterion for a workers' state. In order to salvage the post-war analyses of the satellite countries made by the SWP Frank is forced to treat each emergent Stalinist national leader as a separate type whose attitude toward bourgeois property relations is not only strictly calculable: "It is impermissible, therefore, to telescope events in these three situations, and hold that the political victory under Tito, Mao, or outright Stalinist agents necessarily spells the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the institution of proletarian property relations."

This permits Frank to take a definite position upon Yugoslavia and the satellite countries, upon whose nature the SWP has at long last muddled through to a position, and leave open the question of the Chinese regime, whose nature is an enigma only to the specialists in social structures within the SWP.

"All this boils down to the fact that the old Marxist terminology did not foresee and provide for the many degenerated, repulsive forms that workers' struggles and even successes have assumed. We have no alternative as Marxists but to recognize the reality, and proceed to adopt the old terminology to the new developments, as Trotsky repeatedly did in his time. . . . Frank, at least, is ready for any barbarity—all in the name of the socialist revolution, of course."

COME-DOWN Frank next deals with the question "whether opportunist centrist parties cannot lead revolutions to victory; in other words, whether our traditional stand on this question is not due for some considerable modification?"

# Youth and Student Corner

## Some 'Relevant Evidence' on Prof. Hook's Claims for Academic Freedom

By GERTRUDE BLACKWELL

In a letter to the New York Times in May, Professor Sidney Hook stated his objection to the "notion that the faculties of American colleges and universities are being intimidated or frightened into silence by 'McCarthyism.'" He points to "their [students'] reluctance to sign or shout or agitate without reflection" as "a sign of political maturity."

As a sign of the political courage of the teaching profession he adduces as "relevant evidence" the overwhelming agreement of American educators with President Truman in his dispute with General MacArthur despite "the apparent preponderance of public opinion in the other direction." The opposition of American educators to General MacArthur is interesting but it can hardly be considered "relevant evidence" on the state of academic freedom in this country.

In this case, the majority of educators were ON THE SIDE OF THE GOVERNMENT, of the Truman administration. If freedom means the right to disagree with those in power, then what logical criteria are being used by the professor of philosophy who raises, as "relevant evidence," a case in which freedom refers to the expression of agreement with the official foreign policy of the government?

The fact that "there was an overwhelming preponderance of public opinion in the other direction" is irrelevant because the main basis

of the "anti-subversive" drive does not derive from action by the "general public" but from those in the seats of political power.

Hook states "that the situation is not ideal. There are abuses, occasions for protest, scandalous cases produced by political foolishness in some states. But all this is a far cry from the hysteria and fear which detractors of American educational institutions attribute to them."

From this we would derive a picture where the abuse of academic freedom was the exception and where, as he puts it, "teachers on the whole enjoy more personal and political freedom." Into this general picture, however, we must place the loyalty-oath struggle in the University of California. So roseate was the "personal and political freedom" at the University of California that after the resignation of 18 teachers, heads of department at the university complained that they were unable to find qualified replacements.

Hook is correct in stating that many teachers are "more courageous and outspoken" than at any other period but their courage is manifested by opposition to existing intimidation. An excellent example of this is the support given by faculty members of many leading colleges and organizations, such as the American Philological Association, the American Anthropological Association and Phi Beta Kappa, to the faculty at the University of California.

### The ACLU Report Testifies

Another jarring note in Hook's picture of academic affairs in America is the Feinberg Law in New York City barring "subversive" teachers from the public schools and the dismissal of a number of public school teachers for refusing to state whether or not they belonged to the Communist Party.

In New Jersey a teacher hired by the Newark College of Engineering was dismissed for failing to sign the state loyalty oath which, he contended, was an illegal amendment to the state constitution and infringing on free speech and due process. In San Francisco child-care centers, an investigation was carried on by the Board of Education to determine those employees who had voted against disaffiliation from the United Public Workers Union. A Pittsburgh school teacher accused by the FBI of being a member of the Civil Rights Congress and the Communist Party (which she denied) was fired.

Hook states that "the work of daily teaching and research goes on with the same freedom as in the recent past. If anything it is being conducted with even greater responsibility." How tenuous must be his standards of freedom of teaching and research when we learn from the 30th Annual Report of the American Civil Liberties Union that "in several cities, among them Atlanta and Macon, Ga., Providence, R. I. and Milwaukee, Wis., official publications of the Russian government circulating in school libraries and classrooms were banned and destroyed."

It was certainly not in the name of academic freedom that student organizations at Brooklyn and Queens College were disciplined for hearing speakers who (in the former case) were under judicial review and (in the latter) suspended from the public school system. Or perhaps Hook considers this part of "the work of daily teaching and research" that "goes on with the same freedom as in the recent past."

What better example of McCarthyism than the vacating of a nursery school in Fairlawn, N. J. from the premises it leased from the local American Legion post because the latter objected to the political affiliation of some of the performers on the phonograph records used by the school? The Legion also objected to the records because the record company had been declared subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee and further declared that one of the songs describing the building of a city omitted reference to a business group.

In Levittown, N. Y., the local school board ordered phonograph records destroyed on the basis of the alleged political affiliation of officers and employees of the company which manufactured them.

### Political Apathy among Students

Even if it were true that the major sections of American education still enjoy academic freedom, it is nevertheless true that the above type of incident is becoming more and more general and the undeniable tendency toward administrative repression is growing more dangerous.

Yet in the face of the evidence of discrimination against Stalinists and other "subversives," Hook states that the reason for the lack of articulation among "former fellow travellers" here and there "in their unqualified defense of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union" "does not mean that they are suffering from administrative repression. . . . But what is true is that the expression of their views now elicits an equally legitimate criticism by some of their colleagues." A glance at the record, however, would seem to indicate that keeping their jobs is a more important factor motivating their silence than criticism by their colleagues.

Hook points to the unwillingness of students to "sign petitions, shout or agitate" as a sign of "political maturity" which "by no means leads to passivity," and compares the present generation favorably with the "mindless enthusiasm which led them 11 years ago to affirmations such as the Oxford Pledge."

He does not, however, present any "relevant evidence" to prove the lack of passivity among students. If they reject "old slogans and shibboleths" which "seem so irrelevant to the concrete problems," then it would seem incumbent on him to indicate just what channels have absorbed the political energies and talents of American youth.

The truth of the matter is that the decline of political student organizations has developed from a fear of participation leading to a lack of interest not in "shibboleths" but in political problems and ideas and it is precisely that which makes the days of the Oxford Pledge so memorable in comparison.

For living Marxism—read

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

## Readers Take the Floor . . .

### Truman's Gesture

To the Editor:

Truman made another weak gesture against racism when he asked Arlington Cemetery burial for an American Indian soldier killed in Korea, after he had been refused burial in an all-"Aryan" graveyard. But discrimination against reservation Indians by Truman's Indian Bureau continues. Truman and the Republicans, too, use beautiful words and impotent gestures, but they don't fight racism.

The working people must rely

on their own efforts to fight racism.

Negroes, Jews, American Indians, Spanish-speaking people, Orientals and members of other minorities should cooperate even more in the fight for equality.

And, of course, it should be pointed out to white Gentile and non-Spanish-speaking workers that they, as well as minorities, suffer from race hatred—because it divides the workers, preventing them from uniting against their common enemy, the capitalists. Which is why bosses encourage race hatred—the opium of the ignorant. John LOEB



# The Triple Crisis of Zionism

By HAL DRAPER

One of the few things about which the Zionist movement in all its sections is pretty unanimously agreed is that the whole movement is today racked from top to bottom by a violent organizational and ideological crisis. The second point, under this, is that the crisis stems from the existence of the state of Israel itself.

Note: it stems from the fact that Israel exists, not from any special difficulties of that state. There is also, to be sure, a much-discussed crisis in Israel itself; but this does not contribute to the crisis of the Zionist movement—if anything, it mitigates its force. The crisis of Zionism is due to that which it hails as its historic success.

This is all very well recognized:

"Now the state is established . . . and the Zionist organizations are left minus members and without a mass-movement ideology. There has been a great searching for redefinition but so far no new definition has emerged."—E. Katz, president of the Intercollegiate Zionist Federation, in the *Student Zionist*, Feb.

"Perhaps the chief impression [at the convention of the Zionist Organization of America] was one of crisis and also how to explain this crisis. The ZOA now claims a membership of about 164,000. This is a significant drop from the quarter million members which were cited only about a year ago. . . ."—*Jewish Frontier*, July.

" . . . an intellectual crisis which cuts across parties, but divides Zionists in Israel from Zionists elsewhere. Spokesmen for the divergent viewpoints are trying hard to meet the crisis with the dignity and forbearance becoming to a dilemma so deep and so wounding. . . . Zionism reached its zenith in the creation of the state. But because of this, Zionism outside Israel has touched its nadir."—Lead article in the *Jerusalem Post*, Aug. 17.

"The rise of the Jewish state brought them [Zionists] a tremendous feeling of elation and triumph, while it also administered a severe jolt to their movement. . . . It is doubtful whether all our friends in Israel realize to the present day the extent and nature of this crisis. . . . Suddenly and at one stroke, the Zionist Organization was shown of its political prerogatives and much of its authority. . . . Zionists were not only dejected, but confused, having no clear idea where and how they fitted into the new picture. . . . The Zionist prognosis . . . doctrine . . . ideal had triumphed. . . . [Yet] in point of fact its position has tended to deteriorate. . . . This proud position [is] now threatened with collapse."—Emanuel Neumann, in the *Zionist Quarterly* (ZOA), Summer.

## THE THREE ROOTS

The roots of the Zionist crisis which stems from the setting up of the state of Israel are three. They are quite distinct and with independent effects, though not equally important or fundamental, not equally recognized consciously by the Zionists themselves, and certainly confusingly interlocked in the discussions and struggles within that movement.

(1) The one which the Zionists refer to as "the ideological question" is simply: "What is Zionism now, anyway?" and "What is a Zionist today?" What makes it an ideological crisis is that the answer lies not in providing a definition but in providing a reason for continued existence for the Zionist movement as such, now that Zion itself exists.

(2) With Israel there was born Israel nationalism as distinct from Jewish nationalism. It has made itself felt in a short space of time, not least within the Zionist movement. Within Israel, of course, there is no conflict between the two simply because the two are identified. For the Zionists outside, they cannot be. The national antagonisms within the Zionist movement are more than visible to the naked eye.

(3) The Zionist movement has always been divided into political parties—"General" Zionist (bourgeois conservative), Labor Zionist (socialistic, further subdivided into reformist and would-be Marxist), Revisionist (chauvinist and fascist), Religious, Stalinoid, etc. As can be seen, its spectrum is that of a state. The struggles were often fierce enough before there was any state power to be the object of the struggle. Now there is. The political antagonisms outside Israel now take on flesh and blood in terms of classes in Israel and their conflict for control of the government, and tend to become as irreconcilable as the class struggle itself.

The World Zionist Congress which was concluded at the end of August in Jerusalem mirrored and focused all the strains and confusions

set up within Zionism by these three sources of crisis.

It could not and did not resolve the crisis; it had not really been expected to do so by anyone. But through the struggles at the Congress, as in the discussion which preceded it, the triple crisis of Zionism is quite clear.

## The Political Antagonism

"Zionism has already achieved a remarkable result—something hitherto deemed impossible. I refer to the close union of the most modern with the most conservative elements of Jewry."—Theodor Herzl, at the first World Zionist Congress at Basle, 1897.

That was more or less true (and incidentally an index to the character of Zionism) up to the creation of the state. The union is now strained more and more.

We take it up first not because it is most important but because it is easiest to see. Mainly, at the present stage, it is a complication which serves to embitter and sharpen the crisis.

The power struggle in the movement is largely between the Israeli and American Zionist leaders, but it is not, of course, accidental that the most influential leaders and spokesmen of the Americans (Abba Hillel Silver, Emanuel Neumann, Benjamin Browdy, etc.) and the main organization, the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), are General-Zionist in politics. Their co-thinkers are the men of Israel's leading bourgeois party, the main opposition to Ben-Gurion's Labor Party (Mapai).

## THE PRIZE IS STATE POWER

For both sides this is not simply a matter of political theory, to be shelved by them in their capacity as Zionists. As we said, state power is at stake. For the Americans, of course, it cannot directly be their state power, but it is state power in "their" Zion. Not less than their non-Jewish class-counterparts in this country, they are mortally antagonistic to socialism, which they see in Mapai's controlled economy, labor base and program. For them the Israeli General Zionists' program (unreconstructed capitalism) is not only the American Way but also ordained. They cannot take lightly the fact that the state which they fathered and financed and which is the incarnation of their dream is in the hands of men who stand for anti-capitalism.

The ZOA, for the first time in its history, at its convention earlier this year, voted overwhelmingly to identify itself formally with the Israeli General-Zionist party. It meant throwing down a gage. At the ZOA convention, as well as in Jerusalem, Silver went out of his way to take a crack at socialism. Part of the struggle at the world congress turned on "how much of a say in the development of Israel the Zionist movement outside the country should be entitled to in return for its economic aid," as the N. Y. Times reported (Aug. 26), and by "the Zionist movement" it is the American bourgeois Zionists who are meant in the first place.

## THEY AREN'T NAIVE

"Translated into practical terms," continues the dispatch, "this, of course, means a measure of authority over immigration, the rate and sources of economic development, and inevitably Ben-Gurion's people believe this would have a political effect as well."

Naturally! And when the Israeli General-Zionists' allies from America yell that they want more determining power in fields which vitally affect Israeli economic policy, they can hardly be considered to be entirely naive. "The underlying issue. . . is whether the world Zionist movement shall influence life in Israel or whether it should be a welfare organization," explained the *Jerusalem Post* (Aug. 14)—and what happens when the would-be influencers of life in Israel are enemies of the governing party . . . ?

The bitterest words in connection with the otherwise carefully restrained world congress flowed from this antagonism. Rabbi Silver started the very day before the congress opened with an open accusation at a press conference that the Israeli government had undermined American Jewry because it wanted non-interfer-

ence from U. S. Zionists in political matters and "nothing pleased Washington more"—hence the drift of State Department policy away from Israel. He did not make explicit the inference that Ben-Gurion should tolerate interference from his American Zionist antagonists in the country's political affairs, or else.

On the other hand, Ben-Gurion's denunciations of the ZOA leaders had been even more slashing. At the congress Browdy had to stand up to rebut the former's statement labeling the ZOA "enemies of labor" and an outfit of labor-baiters. (He might have been more convincing if it had not been true, for one thing, that at the ZOA convention one of the chief speakers had waxed enthusiastic in praising the Israeli General-Zionists for supporting the right not to join a trade union.)

## BEN-GURION POURS IT ON

In a speech prior to the world congress on August 8, Ben-Gurion had cuttingly denounced the ZOA by name: "The leaders of this movement live in deceit. . . . The nation must know that the Zionist Organization of America has ceased to be a Zionist organization," and pretty clearly referred to them scornfully as a bunch of "merchants, lawyers and rabbis."

Perhaps the most heated moment on the open floor of the congress came when, after Rabbi Silver had been given time to speak his piece, Mrs. Golda Meyerson rose to answer him for Ben-Gurion, before a hall packed to see the sparks fly. Among other things she "demanded to know what Zionist leaders in America had done to refute the libels that the Israeli government was preventing private capital and foreign investors from participating in Israel's upbuilding. She asked whether some of these same leaders had not helped fan 'the fires of allegation.'" (Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Aug. 20.) The political struggle within Israel itself was being echoed.

It is, of course, not necessary to charge the gentlemen from the ZOA with the deliberate intent to substitute their own influence as foreign Zionists for the failure of the Israeli General-Zionists to do better in the last elections. The capacity of men to believe "sincerely" that they are acting not as "partisans" but only in the best interests of humanity is virtually infinite. But it is this which gave part of its heat to the congress issue of "special status" for the Zionist movement.

## THE "SPECIAL STATUS" ISSUE

The Americans came to Jerusalem with the No. 1 demand that the world Zionist organization, rather than the Israeli government and its agencies, be given a monopoly on the activities of Jewry all over the world on behalf of Israel. As Silver said, demanding a "charter" for the Zionist organizations:

"What we mean by 'charter' is not just affording the [Zionist] Jewish Agency diplomatic status in Tel Aviv. . . . We want the Zionist movement to be recognized as the channel for all important activities of Jews on behalf of the state of Israel."

They talked in terms of a "semi-governmental" status for the Zionist executive. The Israelis had more than good ground to suspect that what the Americans were demanding would mean in practice their assumption of a good measure of control and influence in Israel's foreign economic activities and consequently a long finger in all of Israel's affairs.

Under the circumstances this was more than a modest demand. Ben-Gurion rejected it, counterposing (perhaps only tactically) the demand that the Americans first recognize their obligation to aid Israel unconditionally regardless of their hostility to the political composition of its government.

Silver especially was quite clear on what he was demanding: "We do want, however, a say on how the money [raised for Israel] is spent. No taxation without representation, we say." There were the Americans, with the slogan of 1775 demagogically on their lips, demanding control over a vital part of another country's internal policies. The Israelis replied in effect that if Rabbi Silver wanted a voice in Israel's affairs,

# And the Jerusalem Congress

he would have to settle down as an Israeli citizen.

Browdy, at the congress, resorted to more weaselly formulas: "We have no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of Israel," he said piously, "but we have every desire to make sure its foundations are firm and will resist the ravages of time." And later: "We are prepared to work unconditionally, but not at the expense of our self-respect."

## WAVING THE DOLLAR

The Americans had two weapons with which to enforce their demand against the position of the Israelis: their influence in the world Zionist organization—and the almighty dollar. And it can be argued that these two are one. Everyone knew, as the report to the congress later stated, that American Jews had given 75 per cent of all moneys received by Keren Hayesod, the Development Fund, in the last 5 years.

The Americans were not too bashful about waving the dollar in a threatening pose. Silver hinted broadly: "Jews are not automatons which release coins upon the pressing of a button. . . . And in his speech to the congress he 'warned, however, that should Jews overseas begin to feel that Israel flouts them completely, they might cease to help you and there will be nothing you can do about it.'" (JTA, Aug. 20.)

At the World General Zionist caucus in Jerusalem just before the congress, the Americans threatened to make sure that the Jews would not act as "automats":

"The greatest impression was made by the speech of the chairman of the ZOA Executive Committee, Mortimer May, who said that the time had come to explain to American Jewry the internal problems of Israel. 'For a long time,' said Mr. May, 'I was of the opinion that not everything about Israel should be told in the U. S., since I felt that it might harm the Zionist movement. But we must now change our way of thinking.'" (ZINS, the ZOA news service.)

Naturally, extreme threats by both sides must be taken with a grain of salt, since the American Zionists need their relation with Israel (otherwise how exist as Zionists at all?) as much as the Israelis need the former's dollars. But the threats were there, including May's to bring the Israeli election campaign home to New York. Everyone knew a compromise would be reached, as it was; it was a question of who got how much, and how the vague terms of the compromise would work out in the period ahead.

But it is too easy to see the conflict at the Jerusalem congress in terms of this political antagonism alone or primarily. That would be quite inaccurate. This element of crisis is here to stay, but it is not accidental that we have largely had to speak (as the congress did) in terms of the "Americans" and the "Israelis."

## II

## The Nationalist Antagonism

"The Zionist axis is no longer, and has not been for 30 years, Tel Aviv-Odesa, but Jerusalem-New York."—*Jerusalem Post*, Aug. 14.

The axis has developed antagonistic national poles. For one thing, the American Zionist leaders came to Jerusalem with roughly the same spirit and with the same psychology as the American delegation at the San Francisco conference on the Japanese treaty: as the world's aristocrats, with wealth and power behind them, and little inclined to play second fiddle to the leaders of a piddling little country. That little country is dear to them, of course, because it is Zion, but it is dear to them as their Zion, not as a sovereign state with leaders of its own.

On the other hand, the development of Israeli nationalism (as distinct from Jewish nationalism, remember) and its effect on the character of Zionism in Israel would deserve a special chapter in a book on contemporary Zionism. "It is from here [Israel] that the principles of Zionism shall go forth," proclaimed Ben-Gurion a week before the congress.

In discussing the "special status" issue in terms of the political antagonisms, we had to be one-sided temporarily. Actually, the national sovereignty of Israel is also involved, and while the Americans could think of this concept only hazily, it meant a great deal more to the Israelis, and not Ben-Gurion's Israelis alone.

It was not just a matter of the Americans' "special status" demand versus national sovereignty as an abstraction. It is not hard to feel the reaction of an Israeli to the rich foreign tycoons, too many of whom apparently made manifest their scorn for "our alleged contempt for what a few among our guests consider to be elementary comforts of civilized life (e.g., hotel rooms with private bath)," as a *Jerusalem Post* article delicately put it.

The same paper editorialized during the congress about such people who come not as pioneer emigrants but as "alien experts with their talents for hire" and it urged that their contribution "be on this country's hard terms, without setting up two standards, one for those coming from the free, another from the enslaved world.

Let not those that come cling to the return ticket as to a lifeboat in a storm; and let them embrace our civilization without a mental reservation about the size of the British Commonwealth of Nations or the United States of America."

As for the other delegations, it is likewise not hard to feel their reaction before the dollar-power of the Americans and the governmental power of the Israelis. Prior to the Congress, the *London Zionist Review* had editorialized:

"It is necessary for them [the British delegates] to oppose the idea that the two important centers of world Jewry are America and Israel. . . ." And the president of the British Zionist Federation, speaking at the congress, "expressed fears that Zionists in Europe would be caught in a struggle between the 'power blocs' of Israeli and U. S. Zionism." (JTA, Aug. 17.)

## VOICE OF AMERICA

Before the dollar-waving of the Americans, the Israelis reacted not as Zionists but in the first place as Israelis. We are not criticizing them for this. On the contrary, it would have taken miserable men—not men who felt they were building a country—to listen without bitterness to one of the American Zionist leaders who actually got up and said:

"You don't know America. It is too big for you to understand. You have fantastic ideas about the United States. . . . We demand respect from the Zionist movement. Without the Zionist Organization of America, Israel will suffer." (Joseph Tenenbaum.)

The interests of Israel as a nation versus the interests of the Zionist movement could not have been more clearly counterposed than in the spectacle during Ben-Gurion's tour of this country earlier this year. The head of the Zionist state, the symbol of Zionism's great "victory," was here—and no reference to Zionism ever passed his lips at any of his meetings. More than that: he cut the whole American Zionist movement dead-cold.

He spoke at numerous meetings, but even the ZOA failed to secure his presence at their big "Salute to Israel" rally, where more than 19,000 waited for him. The president of the ZOA was not among the notables invited to sit on the platform during Ben-Gurion's Madison Square Garden bond rally. Zionism was never even mentioned in all the speeches and tableaux about the struggle for Israel's statehood. (He addressed not a single Zionist group until just before catching the boat—and then it was a semi-private meeting which we will discuss under Section III.)

## WOOLING THE NON-ZIONISTS

This is not to be explained by the political antagonism with the pro-General-Zionists of the ZOA; it is too extreme. Besides, he paid no more attention to his own Labor Zionists. And there is another very clear explanation for it, which the American Zionists understand only too well.

It is clear that Ben-Gurion looks on the Zionist movement as an obstacle to mobilizing the fullest aid to Israel from abroad, more than as an aid.

For now virtually the whole Jewish community, non-Zionist and anti-Zionist as well as traditional Zionists, are for aid to Israel. While Zionism was a dream, only the Zionists could be depended on. Now it is a state, a reality, and the old lines do not demarcate out the "friends of Israel."

The old Zionist movement is the old skin which has to be cast off in the moulting. As a state, Israel looks to and appeals to the Jewish community as such, and its appeal can only suffer if it gets involved with the traditional antagonisms between Zionists and anti-Zionists within the Jewish community. The Zionists, the Israelis feel, cannot hold back from giving. It is the others who are not to be offended; who are to be wooed. (Hence the Zionists' partly hollow threats, in reaction, to hold back the dollars.)

A "prominent Israeli official" is quoted by the Times correspondent in Jerusalem:

"Zionism has had a long and useful life and should now be given a decent burial," he said recently. "We Israelis, who pay taxes, maintain an army, fertilize the desert and bring in hundreds of thousands of new immigrants, cannot be expected to brook interference from Diaspora [non-Israeli] Jews. . . ."

The state of Israel congress, Nahum Goldmann, president of the congress, countered the demand for "special status" with the argument, among other things, that to give special status to the Zionists "would antagonize the good friends of Israel who are non-Zionists."

There is no doubt that the "special status" demand was opposed not only (though most sharply) by the Mapai Israelis for the reasons already explained, but by far wider Israeli circles whose motivations were not political-partisan but nationalist. Why should aid to Israel (as far as the Israelis are concerned) be farcically channeled through a privileged section of the Jewish community—just because of this section's past services? Let it be given a decent burial, with a cheer.

But the Zionist leaders do not plan to be buried because their existence is inconvenient to the Israelis. Unfortunately for them, however, as we shall see, their chief gravedigger is not Israeli nationalism but their own ideological bankruptcy.

There is another and quite different aspect of the national question in Zionism which bedevils the diaspora Zionists, especially the Americans, as a result of the existence of the Jewish state.

It is the delicate question of "double loyalty." In words it can be and has been resolved easily enough: We are American Jews loyal to our own country but

loving Israel; we are like good Irish-American citizens who love the old sod too; a man can have many loyalties, to family, party, religious group, country, etc. and they are not contradictory . . . and so on. This is a perfectly consistent attitude for a non-Zionist "friend of Israel." Within the framework of the full, undiluted Zionist ideology (which we shall see even more clearly in Section III) it is not so easy. It may be hard for American Zionists to understand this since the undiluted article is pretty rare in these States.

It was easier for the European Zionist (Labor-Zionist) leader, Jacob Yefroikin, editor of the *Paris Kiyum*. In the article which we shall quote he is talking what undoubtedly seems another language to most American Zionists. But the Americans, at Jerusalem, found most of the others thinking on the same basis, even though the question of double loyalty is the last question they would dream of bringing up. If Yefroikin is extreme, it is because he is following the heart of Zionism to its logical ends.

## A ZIONIST LEADER'S VIEW

"President Truman at the beginning of 1948, in his message to the convention of the American Council for Judaism, said: 'Jews must in their own interests and as loyal citizens, think and act exclusively as Americans.' And if this hint was not sufficiently obvious, it found a clearer definition in a speech at the same gathering by Carol Binder: 'If,' he said, 'the struggle for a Jewish state . . . would eventually have to cost the democratic countries the oil of the Middle East, the Jews of the United States would have to pay dearly for it.' . . . These words, veiled in Truman's and open in Binder's speeches, expressed not a passing mood; they are valid even now and their echo will be heard far and loud. . . .

"Even now in peacetime, before the storm has broken out, there are Jews, even so-called Zionists, who have the sorry courage to justify morally the preference of American patriotism above the Jewish if there should ever come to a clash between the two. States the editor of the *Reconstructionist* in an open letter to Lessing Rosenwald that, in a not-improbable case, if the state of Israel should be involved in a war with the United States, American Jews will act exactly in the same manner as if another country were at war with America and in accordance with their 'exclusive loyalty' would fight Israel as Jews of one country always fought Jews of another country, just as American Catholics would fight any Catholic country. (*Reconstructionist*, March 5.)

"There is a theory concocted by some Zionists, including Chaim Greenberg [American Labor Zionist theoretician], which says that we Jews are no exception to the general rule. Non-Jews too have many loyalties and this does not prevent them from being loyal citizens of their countries.

"This is true. . . . To each social cell man gives only a part of his loyalty. Only a totalitarian state demands the entire individual for itself. States which recognize a certain degree of individual freedom see nothing wrong in the pluralistic loyalties of its citizens.

"All this is true, but our specific Jewish [that is, Zionist—H. D.] problem is not exhausted nor answered by this. For it is one thing to have many loyalties to different objects, and something else to have one's own loyalty divided and split between two objects of the same category. A man can be true to his father and mother, to his class and state at the same time. But a person cannot have two fathers and two mothers and remain equally loyal to both of them, just as a man cannot be loyal to two nations at the same time and have two fatherlands." (Italics in original. Quoted from the *Jewish Newsletter*, July 23.)

## THE NATURE OF ISRAEL

This question of "double loyalty" arises for the consistent Zionist (if there are any such left in the United States), and not for the Jew, not because the former "loves Israel" with the sentimental or philanthropic attachment of an Irishman for old Erin but because of the consistent ideology of Zionism on the "Jewish nation." This gets us to Section III.

But before any American Zionist (as they virtually all do) rejects Yefroikin's views with sincere astonishment and an unwillingness even to consider such "absurdities" seriously, it would be well to look at Ben-Gurion's definition of Israel as a state. As a statesman, Ben-Gurion recognizes foreign Zionists' loyalty to their own country, but that is as a statesman.

"The state of Israel differs from all other states in that it is not only the state of its own citizens alone, but of the entire Jewish people, of every Jew wherever he lives." (Ben-Gurion at the Jerusalem congress.)

"The state is part of the nation [he is referring to the entire 'Jewish nation' in the world—H. D.] The state does not yet constitute the fulfillment of Zionism but it is the main and fundamental means for the ingathering of the Exiles, and this is the content of Zionism. . . . Israel is a state not only in respect to its residents—it is a state for the Jewish nation. The constitution of the state of Israel is one small law—the 'Law of the Return.' That is the special historic quality designating the *raison d'être* of the state of Israel." (Ben-Gurion in speech, Aug. 8.)

To be sure, Ben-Gurion does not want any "double loyalty" either. As we shall see, his demand is that every Zionist become an Israeli. But the American Zionists do not want to go to Israel; they want to remain Zionists in the diaspora even while "their own" state exists in the world. But their dilemma in this respect is only a part of their larger dilemma which is the content of the ideological crisis of Zionism, which underlies and embraces all that we have already discussed.

(Concluded next week)



# Steamroller at TUC Congress

(Continued from page 1)

presenting any real alternative to them. Every person who has an elementary understanding of Stalinism should know that this rapacious, totalitarian regime cannot be appeased by "new initiatives" for peace. As long as capitalist America and Stalinist Russia remain the only great power centers in the world, the cold war will continue its present insane pace to its final development into world devastating hot war.

The only way in which this can be changed is through the development of a third world force, which can make a telling appeal to the common people of the world now torn between these two exploiting systems. The elements of this force exist precisely in the Labor Party and the socialist movements of the world. A foreign policy which makes sense for the workers of Britain must take this concept as its starting point, and must develop a program designed to unite the socialist par-

ties and the trade unions of Europe in a movement which has as its immediate goal the establishment of a democratic West European Union. Only from a platform as broad and powerful as that can the workers' parties begin to speak in terms of negotiating with the ruling classes of Russia and America on a basis of equality.

But such a conception is still beyond the present leaders of the left wing of the British labor movement. Thus they find it very difficult to present a convincing case against the government's foreign policy, and therefore against elements of the domestic policy which can be shown to follow logically and inevitably from it, such as rearmament.

## CLOSE SQUEAK

The debate on domestic policy was preceded by a speech delivered by Hugh Gaitskell, chancellor of the exchequer, who painted a gloomy picture for the dele-

gates. He told them that the war in Korea has driven up world prices to a point where Britain is paying a billion pounds more this year for the same volume of imports than a year ago. He predicted an adverse balance of trade, and warned that the present low standard of living would fall further. He called for "reasonable" restraint in demands for wage increases, and said that they must be kept within the limits of increased production to avoid inflation. As to taxes, he stated that even if all net personal income over about \$5,600 were taxed away it would add only about \$148,400,000 to the national revenue.

Following this speech, a resolution which demanded that the "standard of living of the people must be improved at the expense of profit" was defeated by a vote of 5,284,000 to 2,199,000. Instead, the conference adopted a resolution supported by the General Council which asked for more

food subsidies, wider price controls, and more effective control of profits.

The leadership had its closest squeak on the demand that special charges for false teeth and spectacles be abandoned. The introduction of these charges was the issue which precipitated Bevan's resignation from the government, and are still highly unpopular among the working people. The resolution was defeated by only 500,000 votes.

Despite their success in turning back the opposition at this conference, the labor leadership is undoubtedly quite disturbed by what happened. The significant thing was not that the left wing failed to win, but rather the strong vote they were able to muster on almost all issues.

## NOT A TRUE INDEX

All reports agree that the leadership had to exert extreme organizational pressure to keep the delegates in line. Times correspondent Raymond Daniell, who makes little effort to conceal his hostility to the opposition, reports that "the delegates met in a spirit of smoldering revolt against their own leaders and the government. . . . These party and TUC conferences in Britain are weighted in favor of the leadership. At Blackpool the General Council sat on the platform and had the longest and sometimes the last word on every question."

And later in his dispatch of September 8 he writes: "On its face the record of the conference is a rebuff to Aneurin Bevan and his fellow rebels against the government's policy of placing national defense ahead of social services. But it does not follow that the resolutions adopted at Blackpool reflect the true feelings of the delegates or their supporters. Organization and discipline are an important factor. And the Labor movement in Britain has plenty of both. . . ."

It was discipline and organization that prevailed at Blackpool, not the convictions of the delegates who cheered attacks on

Chancellor Hugh Gaitskell's proposed charges for artificial dentures and spectacles and then voted in support of them, shouted for a soak-the-rich policy and then adopted a moderate resolution in line with government policy.

"But in a general election there will be no unit rule and no one looking over the shoulders of the people to see how they vote." Elsewhere he refers to "the General Council's steam-roller methods."

The conference of the TUC was watched carefully by everyone not only for what it would show about the present sentiment of the trade unions, but in light of the Labor Party conference to be held at Scarborough early in October. It is generally thought that Bevan's influence is stronger among the ranks of the local Labor Party units than in the trade unions, or rather, that it will be much more difficult to control the delegates from the local Labor Parties than it was to control the trade union delegations by bureaucratic measures. Yet such is the weight of the unions in a Labor Party conference that there is little likelihood that the Bevan forces will be able to win a majority.

Indeed, it would be a miracle if this were to happen at the Scarborough conference, and neither Bevan nor his followers expect to win. The best that can be expected is for the ranks to show that there is a powerful, determined opposition to the leadership and its policies. Such a demonstration can serve to increase the confidence of the ranks in their ability to assert themselves, in their capacity, in due course, to bring about a change in policies and leadership which more closely corresponds to their needs and interests.

Surely the powerful spirit of dissatisfaction and revolt which the ranks are showing will give the revolutionary socialists in Britain an excellent opportunity to gain a hearing, and eventually an important following in the ranks of the British Labor Party.

# Cold-War Maneuver

(Continued from page 1)

1854. She is to abide by the articles and principles of the United Nations. Reparations are to be made to the heavily damaged nations of Southeast Asia and a basis in trade reestablished in what was once considered the "co-prosperity sphere." She will be permitted a choice in the making of a treaty with China, to deal with either the Nationalist or Stalinist governments. The Ryukus and Bonin islands are to be administered by the U. S. in a UN trusteeship.

Most important, the terms which assure Japan's role as the keystone of American military power in the Pacific are those which approve Japanese rearmament and permit the "retention of foreign armed forces in Japanese territory." These made possible the separate Japanese-American agreement to retain U. S. forces and bases in Japan.

In accordance with the nature of the event, the planned, formal and unspontaneous speeches were dull and lifeless. A barely discernible tincture of differences in outlook on the part of the British Labor Government crept into the speech of Herbert Morrison when he expressed several times his regrets over the absence of the Chinese delegation and voiced a plaint at the absence of high standards of union labor in the earlier period of Japanese history.

## "AIRCRAFT CARRIER"

The official doctrine motivating the terms of the treaty was one of "no act of charity" and no imposition of "spiteful acts on the vanquished." Actually, the imposition of heavy sanctions and reparations would serve no practical purpose to those statesmen of the west who require a Pacific "aircraft carrier" in the struggle with Russia.

The list of those present and the absentees are likely to cause the most embarrassment and difficulty to the treaty planners. Russia's unexpected and unwanted presence served to point up the cut-and-dried proceedings; she escaped the criticism of having boycotted the meeting.

The absence of either Chinese

government points to one of the biggest problems of Western diplomacy and strategy. Chiang Kai-shek could not hold face with the Eastern delegates nor the British, yet the U. S. could not lose face by permitting the Chinese Stalinist Mao to attend.

Nor was the national-Stalinist wing of the Western bloc, Tito, represented. Most significant among the absentees and most damaging to Western intentions, was India—the most politically advanced and respected among independent Asian nations. While falling far short of a bold and complete policy which might make a third alternative possible in the power void in the east, the Indians nevertheless were impressive in their criticisms and in their absence. Objecting to the occupation of Japan by U. S. troops and the retention of Formosa by the Nationalists, they could not bring themselves to accept the rubber-stamp assignment undertaken by other Eastern nations in approving the treaty.

India retains the elbow-room to move independently in the interests of the newly developing nations of Asia—Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines—to say nothing of China. It is only the development of greater independence and forthrightness along this line that can challenge the big-power juggernauts. But Russia will have a talking point with India, too. This accounts for much of the gloom among Western officials.

## TIMETABLES FOR WAR

There is much speculation as to when the war will come, when the Russians will strike the decisive blow. Some Western theorists say we cannot know when, the blow may come at any time; others speak of and try to construct a Russian timetable, basing it on a purge here, a "collectivization" there, etc. The "timetable theory" connotes a demonic purpose on the part of the Russians, a positive plan and wish for war. This is no more true of Russia than of the U. S.

Living in the midst of it, one does not so easily follow the Western timetable. The Japanese treaty

was a scheduled item in it, undoubtedly speeded up to tie in with the Korean stalemate in armistice negotiations. Already visible on the time-table are the rearmament of Germany, the Ottawa meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations to bring Greece and Turkey into alliance, the \$61 billion armaments appropriations now approved by the U. S. Senate Appropriations Committee.

"This is coming pretty close to the Soviet jugular," writes James Reston in the N. Y. Times of these calculated moves. Or, as another commentator put it, a "barbed wire fence around the Iron Curtain" is being completed.

In those who remain outside the barbed wire fence as well as the Iron Curtain lies the sole hope for a re-scheduling of the timetable.

# Copper Strike

(Continued from page 1)

him as the representative of big business. (The course of events takes a devious twisting path; but it is worthwhile and instructive, even if a strain on the nerves, to follow it.) Charles Cox, president of Kennecott Copper Corp., producer of 35 per cent of America's copper, is inclined to accept the 16 cent figure (so reports the New York Times) but he collars Wilson to get his opinion. Wilson is said to have given an evasive reply, that is: "No." Moreover, he is reported as saying, the government is ready to risk a strike; besides the wage-stabilization program must be protected. Kennecott Copper thereupon rejected the Ching proposal and the latter withdrew it.

## TRUMAN COMES THROUGH

These brilliant efforts at settling the strike having failed, Truman became impatient and began to unwind the Taft-Hartley machinery. But first he referred the dispute to the Wage Stabilization Board. The board demanded that the strike be called off before it would discuss the union demands. "But what about the Ching 16 cents idea?" asked the union. "That's out of order," was the reply. "First, go back to work and then we will see." The union "respectfully" refused. Perhaps it was reflecting on board member Emil Rieve's speech.

For every problem, a commission of investigation. Truman appointed a commission of investigation under the terms of the Taft-Hartley Law. Just while the

committee members were occupied by a frenzy of investigation, lasting throughout an entire afternoon, a big break came. Their investigation seemed incapable of interfering with a settlement. Kennecott Copper offered the union 15 cents per hour. The latter promptly accepted and workers producing 35 per cent of the nation's copper supply went back to their jobs.

But three large copper producers remained on strike. These companies are very patriotic; as the Times reports: "The other companies fear that if they now agree to a wage structure uniform with Kennecott's they will be at a tremendous disadvantage when the emergency ends and competition returns to the copper industry." They refused to sign. But pressure from a fully operating competitor would have squeezed them morally, economically, and politically. They were spared any such inconvenience.

It was just at this point, when

a victorious settlement was within the union's grasp, that Truman imposed his Taft-Hartley injunction.

Perhaps we are too optimistic about "What might have been." Perhaps, the Wage Board would have overruled the agreement anyway. Or if not, perhaps Wilson would have intervened again. A record of some sort must have been set in this strike. In one week, a mediator, an attorney general, a president, two committees, and one injunction inflicted themselves on the course of collective bargaining.

One consoling thought remains: no matter how impossibly entangled in governmental red tape a strike may become, the administration can always cut through these complexities . . . with its injunction. Consoling? Yes, for administration bureaucrats. They just got through operating on the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. Who knows what union comes next?

The Standard Biographical Work—

"KARL MARX"

by Franz Mehring

British edition, cloth-bound—\$3.00—while they last

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street

New York 11, N. Y.

Labor Action FORUM • New York

Wednesday, Sept. 12, at 8:40 p.m.

'LABOR INTELLECTUALS AND UNIONS'

Speaker: Ben Hall

Thursday, Sept. 13, at 8:30 p.m.

'FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT & NEW DEAL'

Speaker: Gertrude Blackwell

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.