

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

FEBRUARY 25, 1952

FIVE CENTS

"Why Can't All Socialists Unite?"  
A Reply to a Question

... page 6

Franco Spain: Rotting in Corruption

... page 7

Speedup: Labor's Unsolved Problem

... page 4

The Struggle Goes On Inside NATO

... page 8

## Flint Rally a Flop For Anti-Reutherites

By WALTER JASON

FLINT, Feb. 17—The petty factional character of the handling of the arrangements for the 15th anniversary celebration of the great General Motors sit-down strike here backfired on its sponsors.

Placing their hopes entirely on the appearance of John L. Lewis, the pro-Stalinist clique that influenced the arrangements were left holding the bag when Lewis did not appear. Without this attraction, the affair drew less than 2,000 auto workers.

Why Lewis changed his mind about appearing only he knows. The political effect, of course, was a triumph for Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, who did appear.

Without the cover of Lewis, the sponsors looked pretty bad. They failed, for example, to invite Genora Johnson Dollinger, leader of the 1937 women's brigade, whose work at that time won her nation-wide recognition. They didn't invite the chairman of the

Chevy strike committee. They put out a factional souvenir program, which is noticeable only for the way it praises only pro-CP leaders.

Certainly the photograph of the year, which illustrates perfectly the kind of affair this celebration turned out to be, appeared in the Detroit papers. It shows Bob Travis, Wyndham Mortimer, and Leo Krzycki with Walter and Roy Reuther, and Emil Mazey in the background; ostensibly all are holding hands, but it's faked. The factional heat was evident.

Walter Reuther announced that the UAW would seek a guaranteed annual wage in 1955. Roy Reuther spoke for more political action. Governor Williams made quite a hit with the crowd, and tried to assume the mantle of the late Governor Frank Murphy. Mortimer hit hard at the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The celebration didn't revive the spirit of 1937. It was more like a funeral of the 1937 strike.

## Murray Charges Steel Bosses Are Deliberately Provoking a Strike

By G. McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, Feb. 16—The steel industry is trying to deliberately provoke a strike in order to force the government to raise steel prices. If that strike takes place, the steel workers fear the return of company gunmen and terror.

Philip Murray, president of the United Steelworkers (CIO), made these charges before the Wage Stabilization Board hearing on the steel case this week. In so doing, he landed another body blow on the industry in the month-long verbal battle over a new contract.

He has correctly laid the responsibility for any strike at the feet of an industry which has steadfastly refused to bargain. And he has made plain that any violence in a strike which now seems very likely will be started by the giant corporations which have employed machine guns, tear gas and clubs so often in the past.

By thus beating the industry to the punch in fixing re-

sponsibility for a strike, Murray strengthens the belief that a strike will take place over company acceptance of the WSB panel recommendations.

### STEEL UNION STRONG

Murray's charges cannot be dismissed as mere talk, as industry spokesmen have attempted to do. It is known that several large steel plants have been laying in huge supplies of food and housekeeping equipment for weeks now. The companies are preparing, and the union too is making all necessary plans.

The economic situation today is more favorable to the steel workers than it has been in recent years, so far as striking is concerned. There is generally a shortage of labor in the steel areas, so that not only is strike-breaking on any large scale out of the question (which it has been, of course, for the past decade, at least) but also strikers stand a better chance of finding full or part-

## Labor Left Without a Line In Presidential Jockeying

By GORDON HASKELL

Our national politics have been reduced for the moment to a big guessing game. Newspaper and magazine writers, "political analysts," labor leaders and the great bulk of the people who are in any way interested in the political fate of the country are playing it for all they are worth.

Actually they are spectators at a show over which they have no control. A handful of politicians, and the businessmen and bankers who "advise" and back them, are running the show. And if this state of affairs is permitted to continue through November, it is this handful of men who will once more decide the political fate of the nation.

American politics is organized in such a way that it appears that what is at stake is simply the question of who will be the presidential nominees of the Republican and Democratic Parties. Of course, everyone knows that each potential candidate stands for certain policies, and therefore represents and is backed by powerful groups of businessmen who

want a man in the White House who will put those policies into effect. They are also backed by groups of machine politicians who are primarily interested in getting a winner, regardless of his policies, since their personal fortunes depend primarily on their ability to produce lucrative jobs for their own local political organizations.

### MARGIN OF DIFFERENCE

These groups are actively jockeying for position in both parties. The rest of us—and that includes everyone in the country minus (say) about 50,000 men and women—will then be given the privilege in November of voting between the candidates who finally emerge out of this jockeying.

Before we get to the candidates, let us take a quick look at the issues which face the American people. On foreign policy, the margin of difference is narrower than partisan charges might lead one to believe. It lies between those who advocate the present policy of forging the whole non-Stalinist world into an armed camp in preparation for World War III, and those who want to limit the armed camp to the United States and, perhaps, Britain, and some sections of the Far East.

The first group includes Eisenhower, Truman, all the Fair Dealers, most of the Dixiecrats and Southern Democrats, and most of the labor leaders plus a tiny tail of right-wing socialists. The second group includes Taft, Hoover, MacArthur, many of the leading Republicans in and out of Congress, and an apparently powerful group of businessmen in and out of the so-called "China lobby."

In describing this group it must be added that it shows a tendency toward wanting to fight Stalinist China right now. Further, it is clear that for many of the Republican leaders foreign policy is not too important. That is, they want a winner more than they want their particular brand of foreign policy, and thus will gladly dump Taft for Eisenhower if the latter shows signs of being a more likely winner.

### DOMESTIC POLICY

The margin in foreign policy is that narrow, not because there are no other possibilities, but because there is no powerful group in America which advocates a real foreign policy for democracy and peace. Both leading policies

can lead only to a disastrous world war. This is a hard fact, but it must be recognized. And it is not likely to change until a few more catastrophes like Korea teach the American people, or at least a large section of them, that rich and powerful though the U. S. is, it cannot simply drag the peoples of the world into its military service.

On domestic policy, the margin between the contending groups of politicians and money men is much wider. But even here it is not nearly as wide as one might think. In addition to the real differences which are meaningful when it comes to putting words into practice, there is a whole area of domestic policy which is confined to party platforms, traditionally to be forgotten before the votes have been counted.

In this sphere, Taft and Eisenhower appear to be identical twins. The difference seems to be that the former, as a professional politician, has talked and voted as a reactionary for years. The latter, as a professional general turned politician, has talked very little, and seems determined to remain silent as long as it will serve his political purposes.

### IN FAIR DEAL CAMP

In the Democratic Party camp we have a more "confused" picture. We have the Fair Dealers ranged behind Truman and his possible alternative, Governor Stevenson of Illinois. True, since the Korean war started, Truman has continued to talk more or less like a Fair Dealer while quietly dropping the Fair Deal down the drain. One has to rack one's brain to think of a single specifically Fair Deal issue for which he and his closest supporters in Congress have put up a real fight during the past two years. Not on housing; not on taxes; not on Taft-Hartley; not on civil rights; not on the famous health insurance plan; not even on Point Four, the great hope of the liberals on foreign policy. On all the vital policies connected with the mobilization program this Fair Deal hero acted so vigorously... as to drive the whole labor movement into open revolt last spring.

On some of these questions, it is true, bills have been introduced. But in each case it has been an open secret that they were put forward simply as a formality, with the full knowledge that they

(Turn to last page)

# Union Funds Finance a Scandal in UAW Region 4

By P. JARMS

CHICAGO, Feb. 17—It is taken for granted that the UAW-CIO stands for the traditional right of civil liberties. Every convention of the union and all speeches of its top officers record this fact.

The Cleveland convention of the UAW held in 1951 attacked the hysteria of the period that followed the Korean events. In the resolution attacking the McCarran Act these words were included: "this act is a vengeful and vicious conglomeration of all the reactionary, undemocratic poisons with which so large a part of our press and so many of our elected representatives are incurably infected. We mandate our International and local union officers to alert our membership and the American public generally to the grave threat to personal liberty and the powerful weapon against liberal thought and action which these men who distrust democracy have forged in the enactment of this law."

This resolution was unanimously passed and therefore became policy of the union. International representatives working for the union are supposed to follow union policy. However, Region No. 4 of the UAW-CIO has a policy of its own and refuses to abide by convention mandates.

This was clearly revealed by a recent event. It followed just a few months after the regional director of Region No. 4, Pat Greathouse, had made his infamous remarks about dumping Robert Pickus, of the American Friends Committee, in the Illinois River if he ever came back to the Ottawa, Illinois UAW Center.

### SETUP FOR TRIAL

This time the "hero" was Robert Voss, international representative of Region 4. While being paid by the union, supposedly for organization work, he spent three days (and was not docked for the time so spent) as a defense attorney for four Local 719 members who were accused of conduct unbecoming union members.

The trial came about because the four used red-baiting against a candidate for shop committee in an election to fill a vacancy. In a leaflet, these people called upon the members to beat the "Commie candidate" and asked the question: "Do you want a Commie for shop committee?" The leaflet was passed out supporting a rival shop committee, and candidates for the CIO state convention.

The candidate attacked, Louis Lorca and his slate for delegates were elected over Greathouses' candidates. Charges were preferred and the four were suspended pending trial.

The trial committee was elected that was to whitewash the four.

### Voice of Doom

On January 15 the Chase National Bank told its stockholders that the tax burden is "so heavy as to be almost confiscatory."

In 1951 Chase earned \$2.91 per share as against \$2.83 in 1950 and \$2.63 in 1949, when taxes were much lower.

On the same day that the Chase officials issued their lament, the *Journal of Commerce* headlined: "Bank Holders Get Cheerful Earful on '52 Outlook," reporting on stockholders' meetings.

### Red Agitator Bared

"KRESTOVA, B. C., Feb. 14 (UP)—A former Doukhorov was stripped of all his clothing and driven from the Sons of Freedom settlement here yesterday for alleged Communist agitation. The only adornment on the unidentified man was a string of tin cans tied around his neck. Police said women members of the sect tied the cans around his neck."

Chairman of the trial committee was a man who had run for state convention on the Greathouse ticket and had been beaten. The trial committee was elected through an unprincipled bloc which Voss had worked out.

The trial committee had arranged for a court reporter to have everything down for the record. The trial began with a very adequate presentation of the traditional union position on slander and irresponsible propaganda. The union role of Lorca was explained, proof was established that he was a militant member and never a member of the Communist Party. The November CIO convention resolution against flagrant attacks on civil liberties was entered into the record. Voss was so taken aback that he had to ask for a continuance.

A week followed and Voss made his defense. His whole position was that Lorca had run with CPers in the past and therefore he was a "Commie stooge." He even used the term "guilt by association," as if he had coined the expression himself.

### GREATHOUSE'S ALLIES

It was astonishing! Here was a paid representative of the UAW defying union policy, while drawing full wages plus daily expenses. It was fitting to read in the January issue of the *Auto Worker* a reprint of Stuart Chase's article attacking "guilt by association."

In spite of voluminous testimony and arguments, the Committee brought in a verdict of "Not guilty—no report." No motivations were given. When they were asked for reasons from the floor, they answered contemptuously: "Read the record."

Voss won the round. He joined

forces with the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Hearst Examiner*, which had given the issue publicity. The *Examiner* carried an article reporting that Pat Greathouse was speaking with Storey, Labor Relations Manager of Allis Chalmers (a company that never abides by an arbitration decision even though now they have healthy "right wing" locals) at a meeting chaired by Victor Riesel. This meeting was under the auspices of the National Industrial Conference Board, a subsidiary of the NAM. The subject was "How to Fight the Communists in the Labor Movement." After this meeting articles appeared in the *Tribune* and in Riesel's columns about the "Trotskyites" and "Stalinists" combining. The article of Riesel was blown up, reprinted and placed on the company's bulletin board.

At the same meeting where the trial committee reported, the members voted to protest against the company's interference in union affairs. This resolution passed and was reprinted in "719 News" and sent to all UAW locals.

Local 719 is an important local in Region 4. It is the second largest local. Its 83 votes were cast for 719's president, running against Greathouse at Cleveland. It's Voss's job, with union funds, to change that picture.

Voss was never reprimanded for his stand. He was never called to task for using anti-Semitism against political opponents. Anything goes, it seems, as long as it's for the good of the machine in Region 4.

At the foot of each administrative letter coming out of the UAW-CIO International office is a sentence that reads, "If in doubt about international policy, contact your Regional Director." What a joke!

# ISL \$12,500 Fund Drive Kicks Off

By ALBERT GATES  
Fund Drive Director

Our editor Hal Draper started something in his article last week—"Operation Survival—No. 12" when he wondered why we have not prodded readers with the alarm that our Fund Drives are indeed survival-operations. Well, as a matter of fact, we have made clear that such is the case, though we hope without undue alarmism or exaggeration, by stating exactly what the facts of our existence are. Members of the ISL, and close sympathizers also, are fully aware of the precarious financial situation that we find ourselves in every year. And if other readers are not, we're telling them. And that goes, of course, not only for LABOR ACTION but for all our institutions.

This year things are tougher and the fight to survive our financial difficulties is harder. That we have been able to maintain our press and institutions for the past two-and-a-half years is testimony to the fundamental vitality of our movement. We have no doubt whatever that we can make a successful fight of it this year, too, but we must admonish our comrades and friends

**Victory on the Barrel**  
Democracy is not dead. A St. Louis judge has ruled that it is legal to picket in a barrel.

Judge FitzGibbons reversed a city judge's conviction of two unionists for disturbing the peace when they picketed the Richman Brothers Clothing Company in barrels during a CIO Clothing Workers organizing drive. The two men were fully dressed under the barrel, but had rolled up their trouser legs.

that the only way we can defeat inflation and heavy costs that assault us daily is by the quickest and most generous response to our appeals!

If that is not forthcoming, our fight becomes one of survival in the most concrete terms. Good enough? Well, then, let us see that all of you understand it in these simple terms and make it unnecessary for us to scream or wave a club, or whatever.

The 1952 Fund Drive opened officially only a few days ago and the first results have not all come in so that they might be published in this issue. However, we can report that the total amount already received in these first few days was \$981!

This fine sum was made possible by the extraordinary efforts of the Socialist Youth League, which contributed \$542 of the first total. As last year, the Chicago SYL unit is leading the field with \$358. It is possible to say that this contribution will go to the benefit of the youth eventually, but that is not wholly true, and in any case it means a substantial help to the ISL in the total drive. The SYL has taken on a stiff quota of \$1500 but we are confident that they will make it.

Right behind the SYL comes Streator. It looks like our little group in that town will go ahead as it did in 1951. The other returns are a good omen. But an omen is not enough.

We should like to point out once more that the big push out to come early in the drive, for campaigns have a characteristic of weakening with time. So let's get on with it. Where is New York? And Detroit? And Buffalo, Seattle and General? We expect to hear from you by the next report.

# Un-American Probers Try to Whip Up Detroit

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Feb. 17—Even before the House Committee on Un-American Activities began its public probe here, scheduled with TV and all public sound effects, this city received a preview of events to come. And it was an ugly foreshadowing of a witchhunt.

For Detroit papers utilized the hearings of the McCarran Act board in Washington, which included the testimony of an FBI informer on the Communist Party in Detroit, to whip up a real "anti-red" hysteria.

Actually, the testimony in Washington concerned the most routine facts, as far as the Stalinists here are involved. The FBI agent, a woman, testified that Nat Ganley was a Communist; also Carl Winter, Hugo Beiswinger, and other well-known and admitted Stalinists.

But the papers played it up with sensational streamers, headlines, and feature stories. They dug up details like the fact that William Allan, *Daily Worker* correspondent here, lives in a public housing project. They demanded his removal.

### UAW WARNS

One of the men named by Mrs. B. Baldwin, a Detroit housewife who said she reported to the FBI for 9 years, now works at the Hudson Motor Car Company.

When his name hit the public print, the trim-line workers there staged a brief sitdown strike until he left the plant.

UAW-CIO officials, backed by the international union, immediately instructed the men to refrain from further demonstration. Delwin Craig, right-wing president of Hudson Local 154, sent a letter to each of the 350 workers involved in the strike, stating: "Until the Communist Party or

any other party is outlawed by the federal government, you, as good citizens, will refrain from any further demonstrations of this nature."

Craig quoted the man involved as saying that he "was not a party member for several years, and I do not intend to belong to the Communist Party or any other party."

The man involved had worked at Hudson for six and a half years, Craig said. He was told by the union to report back to work on Tuesday.

### WITCHHUNT CLIMATE

The Common Council of Detroit was holding a special meeting to see what could be done about the demands of the newspapers, especially the *Hearst* press, that Allan be ousted from his project apartment. The newspapers claim that since Allan pays low rent, because the *Daily Worker* pays low wages, the city is subsidizing the *Daily Worker*!

Interestingly enough, the smarter city councilmen are somewhat lukewarm to the idea of any hasty action. Eugene Van Antwerp, former mayor and a prominent Catholic layman, pointed out that Allan is guilty of nothing, no charges have been made against him, so the council had better act slowly. There may be a lawsuit involved, for the City Council does not have direct jurisdiction over housing; and as a war veteran Allan has met all the legal qualifications for that apartment.

Up in Grand Rapids, the UAW-CIO for the third time ordered strikers to quit their demonstration against W. Glenn, the man who visited Russia last year, was fired by General Motors, then reinstated by an arbitrator's ruling, but whose appearance in the plant has led each time to a shutdown. The man is still out in the street.

### LONDON LETTER

# Bevanism Has Undercut The British Stalinoids

By ALLAN VAUGHN

LONDON, Feb. 13 — Although the Stalinists are very weak in Britain as an organized force, one should not underestimate the extent of the semi-Stalinist pacifist and "neutralist" tendencies inside the Labor movement. These confused tendencies provide the CP with material for pushing forward their own line in a disguised fashion. The CP tries to organize well-meaning people on particular issues such as West German rearmament, the Japanese peace treaty, trade with the "people's Democracies," etc., hoping to draw them into the many fellow-traveling organizations that exist for the unsuspecting.

Thus, one of the main problems facing the socialist left wing in the Labor Party, Cooperative Party and trade unions is how to draw away these confused and amorphous tendencies from the Stalinist machine. The Bevanite mood now dominating even the Labor Party's members of parliament has had a salutary effect on the confused Left in the Labor Party.

The *Tribune* has provided an alternative rallying center as against the Stalinist forces. Despite the many weaknesses of Bevan and his *Tribune* group, the Stalinists are faced with a competition that is far too much for them.

This explains their ambiguous and ambivalent attitude to the Bevan tendency itself. On the one hand, the Stalinists realize that Bevan is leading the workers who are moving left in a non-Stalinist direction; on the other, they realize that they have no alternative but to "critically support" the movement (which they distinguish from its "Titoite" leadership) for fear of losing all contact with the left moods in the Labor Party.

### CP IN A FURY

One of the best indications that the CP is in a panic at the present moment is their publication of a book by James Klugmann entitled *From Trotsky to Tito*. Crammed into the 204 pages of this book is more fantastic nonsense than can be picked up even in *The Great Conspiracy!* Klugmann, who actually fought with Tito's Partisans during the war, states that "Those of us, like myself, who in the early stage were deceived by the maneuvers of the Titoists, can well understand the gratitude that we owe, and that indeed the peoples of all countries owe, to the wisdom of the warnings given by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Indeed, we only have to think what might have happened if the Communist Information Bureau, on Soviet initiative, had not warned and had not unmasked the plots of the Tito gang, to understand the debt of all progressive people to the Soviet Communists." (Page 202.)

Klugmann works himself into a fury against the Tito-Trotskyists and Trotsky-Titoists who are "confusing" the leftward-moving Labor League of Youth, who are "corrupting" the anti-imperialist colonial students. When Klugmann storms that "in the universities the old Trotskyite arsenal of anti-Soviet slanders dressed up as Marxism was heavily drawn on to

confuse the students who were moving left," he has good reasons. More than ever it is necessary for the anti-Stalinist Left to participate in the shaping of Labor's policy both in opposition and for the next election. The magnificent response to Bevan inside the party has found its echo in Europe; I believe there has been a noticeable stiffening of the European social-democracies, particularly in Belgium, Western Germany and even perhaps France. Maybe the American labor movement will be stimulated as well.

However well-meaning the attempts by socialists in West Europe to form "independent" parties in this period, they can but fail. The crumbling of the UAP [Independent Workers Party] in West Germany underlines the futility of even one of the most important of these ventures. To the extent that revolutionary socialists enter into the mass labor and socialist movement and become an integral (not alien) element in it, to that extent it can broaden the left-wing assault on conservatism in thought and timidity in action. There is no other practical course.

More than ever it is necessary for the anti-Stalinist Left to participate in the shaping of Labor's policy both in opposition and for the next election. The magnificent response to Bevan inside the party has found its echo in Europe; I believe there has been a noticeable stiffening of the European social-democracies, particularly in Belgium, Western Germany and even perhaps France. Maybe the American labor movement will be stimulated as well.

However well-meaning the attempts by socialists in West Europe to form "independent" parties in this period, they can but fail. The crumbling of the UAP [Independent Workers Party] in West Germany underlines the futility of even one of the most important of these ventures. To the extent that revolutionary socialists enter into the mass labor and socialist movement and become an integral (not alien) element in it, to that extent it can broaden the left-wing assault on conservatism in thought and timidity in action. There is no other practical course.

It slipped out in debate last week that our three-year rearmament program would probably cost \$2,900 million pounds (one pound is \$2.30), not 4,700 million pounds as previously estimated. People are referring to pre-war days as the time when you might have been able to do more with the shilling that you didn't have then, than with the five shillings you don't have now. . . .

People are referring to pre-war days as the time when you might have been able to do more with the shilling that you didn't have then, than with the five shillings you don't have now. . . .

People are referring to pre-war days as the time when you might have been able to do more with the shilling that you didn't have then, than with the five shillings you don't have now. . . .

# SCRIPPS-HOWARD AND TITO

By HAL DRAPER

We see by the papers that the Scripps-Howard chain has been running a series of articles entitled "Stalin's Blueprint for World Conquest," in the course of which we get the real lowdown on the Tito split with the Cominform. (The series ran this month in some of the S-H organs of public enlightenment—last month in the *N. Y. World Telegram*.) In general the writer, David Snell, has been vying with the *Daily Worker* for honors in yellow journalism; the installment on the Stalin-Tito "feud" is one of the worst. It also has a special purpose.

The Scripps-Howard picture, both in purpose and execution, gives the symmetrical equivalent (in terms of American imperialism) of the foulness which the Stalinist press pours out on the same theme.

First of all, however, Snell has a revelation to make—"new light on the Stalin-Tito rift"—and he cannot understand how no one spotted it before. He discloses that, way back in the 1920s, Stalin publicly described in a book the "audacious and cunning . . . subterfuge" which he and Tito are pulling now, in cahoots. The revelation purports to show that the Stalin-Tito split is a "faked and put-up job" which is old stuff for American lamebrains and others—but the "evidence" is unique.

### STALIN'S "PLAN"

It is all in Stalin's old book *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, which even the S-H staff writer was able to discover since all CP bookshops flaunt it on their shelves. Here Snell finds the plan for a faked split, which "happened just as he planned it," as well as "important clues that bear on the true nature of the feud and its possible usefulness to the Soviet Union." We needn't go into lurid details to show how this nationally syndicated "expert" ignoramus and political illiterate reads such a plan

into the book—which, even back then, was merely a Stalinized, crude and mechanical version of the right of nations to self-determination. This will suffice:

Stalin's book lays special stress on the national question in Yugoslavia (very sign-if-icant!). Stalin tells the Yugoslav Communists that, looking forward to a "Soviet revolution," they must "include in the national program a special point on . . . secession." (Get it?) Finally they must "include a special point providing for national territorial autonomy . . . in Yugoslavia. . . ." (Everything is clear now. . . .)

Assuming out of charity that the Scripps-Howard's expert Snell is merely stupid and ignorant and not really a scurvy emulor of the Kremlin's own falsifiers, we only point out that the references to "secession" and "territorial autonomy" concern the right to secession and autonomy of the national peoples WITHIN Yugoslavia (Croatia, Macedonia, etc.) FROM the Yugoslav state itself! Snell's revelation comes when he triumphantly identifies "the present territorial autonomy for Yugoslavia" as having been "created in June 1948 with an announcement by the Cominform of the Stalin-Tito split."

Well, this piece of deception may be stupidity compounded by ignorance, as we said, or it may be deliberate knavery—it is hard to tell the difference, these days, with the experts on Marx, Lenin and Stalin—but it is used for a much more serious political purpose.

### A DEMAND

For, having "proved" that Stalin planned a fake "secession" of Yugoslavia, Snell still adds: "Although Stalin actually planned a Yugoslav state 'secession' and it happened squarely according to his timetable, it is possible, of course, that his feud with Tito is genuine."

How is Tito to prove its genuineness? The crux is Snell's

into the book—which, even back then, was merely a Stalinized, crude and mechanical version of the right of nations to self-determination. This will suffice:

Stalin's book lays special stress on the national question in Yugoslavia (very sign-if-icant!). Stalin tells the Yugoslav Communists that, looking forward to a "Soviet revolution," they must "include in the national program a special point on . . . secession." (Get it?) Finally they must "include a special point providing for national territorial autonomy . . . in Yugoslavia. . . ." (Everything is clear now. . . .)

Assuming out of charity that the Scripps-Howard's expert Snell is merely stupid and ignorant and not really a scurvy emulor of the Kremlin's own falsifiers, we only point out that the references to "secession" and "territorial autonomy" concern the right to secession and autonomy of the national peoples WITHIN Yugoslavia (Croatia, Macedonia, etc.) FROM the Yugoslav state itself! Snell's revelation comes when he triumphantly identifies "the present territorial autonomy for Yugoslavia" as having been "created in June 1948 with an announcement by the Cominform of the Stalin-Tito split."

Well, this piece of deception may be stupidity compounded by ignorance, as we said, or it may be deliberate knavery—it is hard to tell the difference, these days, with the experts on Marx, Lenin and Stalin—but it is used for a much more serious political purpose.

For, having "proved" that Stalin planned a fake "secession" of Yugoslavia, Snell still adds: "Although Stalin actually planned a Yugoslav state 'secession' and it happened squarely according to his timetable, it is possible, of course, that his feud with Tito is genuine."

How is Tito to prove its genuineness? The crux is Snell's

# An Israeli Liberal Voice On the Arab Refugees

The Arab refugee problem is now no longer taboo, but is even being discussed, in the Israeli and American Zionist press. It is now no longer denied that 700-800,000 Arabs have been kept from returning to their homes by the Israeli government. But while the fact is conceded, the injustice is still denied. . . .

The Zionist viewpoint on "The Arab Refugee Problem—How It Can Be Solved" has been put forward in a booklet issued by a group of prominent U. S. Zionists. It informs us that "the unwillingness of the Israeli government to permit the return of the Arab refugee population has hardened into adamance," the reasons being the old ones: the Israeli leaders "opposed and tried to prevent" the flight of the Arabs; the refugees have been "incorrigible" with hostility to Israel and would be a security threat; the vacuum has been already filled by Jewish refugees; the Arab states refuse to discuss a settlement, etc.

### PROPOSAL FOR ISRAEL

"Three quarters of a million human beings—of whom nearly 80 per cent are felahen (peasants), artisans and workers—suddenly fled their cities and villages, driven by the terror of war. . . . They believed that their would be only a temporary departure; that however the war ended, they surely would be allowed afterwards to return to their homes and to their way of life. However, things did not

turn out that way for them. The war ended in the defeat of the Arabs, and their conquerors—the Israelis—closed the country's doors to its (Arab) inhabitants and would not let them return to their own homes. . . .

"On the other hand, the villages of these refugees were occupied by newly arrived immigrants, people who until recently had been dignified by the Hebrew title of *Ma'apilin* (Commandos—so called because they dared the British mandate forbidding their entry into Palestine), as against the humiliating title of *infiltres* now bestowed upon such old-time Arab inhabitants who attempt to return to the houses they themselves had built, the orchards and vineyards their own hands had planted and to the fields they toiled in the sweat of their brow, they and their forefathers, for upwards of a thousand years! These are called *infiltres* and are treated like thieves. . . .

"Such is the tragically depressing problem. . . . The flight of the Arabs was not a political maneuver calculated to conform to pre-conceived Machiavellian strategy, as some of our speechmakers would have it. It was rather one of those hysterical moves which take place over so often in time of war—the kind, for example, which overtook millions of Frenchmen in 1939. It was the spontaneous reaction of people who weren't ready for war and didn't want war, and fled merely to escape death. . . .

"And as their exodus (from Israel) was no conspiracy, so is their will to return no conspiracy. It is not stubbornness of heart that prompts them to return, but only the pain and suffering of exile. . . . And we Jews are responsible for the condition at least as much as the other elements that helped to create it, the other elements being the Arabs and the world at large. We are responsible, consequently, for at least one-third of the solution. And the solution must be a humane and just one. To those who, with Bismarck and Hitler, think that the answer to every problem is force, that we have the force today and will have it tomorrow and ever, that we therefore could afford to ignore the problem altogether—to those people I have not a word to say. Their God is not my God; their Bible is not my Bible and their morals are not my morals. But surely, the voice of conscience is not yet entirely silenced in Israel, and people with a conscience will weigh these words carefully. . . .

"I propose that the Government of Israel, in the very near future, proclaim to Israel, to the Arabs and to the whole world that: (1) The government of Israel, having reconsidered the problem of the Arab refugees . . . decided to bring back one-third of the total of Arab refugees, especially the felahen and the artisans and the workers, at the rate of 50,000 souls a year over a period of five years. The government of Israel hopes that the problem of the remaining two-thirds of refugees will be tended to by the Arab states and the United Nations.

### YUGO INDEPENDENCE

Snell, for example, pretends not to know that Tito's UN delegates have "stood against the Soviet bloc" in the world body. He does not mention any of the cases in which the Titoists have manifested their turn in the direction of support of the Western bloc against Russia. He wants U. S. UN troops physically occupying Yugoslavia's soil now.

But more than that, his argument means that, in event of war, he and his people (that is, the people for whom he pounds a typewriter) have a rationalization for invading a would-be "neutral" Yugoslavia in order to get at Russia.

Now, as a matter of fact, Tito has indicated, as clearly as he dares to do at this time before his own people, that war would find

turn out that way for them. The war ended in the defeat of the Arabs, and their conquerors—the Israelis—closed the country's doors to its (Arab) inhabitants and would not let them return to their own homes. . . .

"On the other hand, the villages of these refugees were occupied by newly arrived immigrants, people who until recently had been dignified by the Hebrew title of *Ma'apilin* (Commandos—so called because they dared the British mandate forbidding their entry into Palestine), as against the humiliating title of *infiltres* now bestowed upon such old-time Arab inhabitants who attempt to return to the houses they themselves had built, the orchards and vineyards their own hands had planted and to the fields they toiled in the sweat of their brow, they and their forefathers, for upwards of a thousand years! These are called *infiltres* and are treated like thieves. . . .

"Such is the tragically depressing problem. . . . The flight of the Arabs was not a political maneuver calculated to conform to pre-conceived Machiavellian strategy, as some of our speechmakers would have it. It was rather one of those hysterical moves which take place over so often in time of war—the kind, for example, which overtook millions of Frenchmen in 1939. It was the spontaneous reaction of people who weren't ready for war and didn't want war, and fled merely to escape death. . . .

"And as their exodus (from Israel) was no conspiracy, so is their will to return no conspiracy. It is not stubbornness of heart that prompts them to return, but only the pain and suffering of exile. . . . And we Jews are responsible for the condition at least as much as the other elements that helped to create it, the other elements being the Arabs and the world at large. We are responsible, consequently, for at least one-third of the solution. And the solution must be a humane and just one. To those who, with Bismarck and Hitler, think that the answer to every problem is force, that we have the force today and will have it tomorrow and ever, that we therefore could afford to ignore the problem altogether—to those people I have not a word to say. Their God is not my God; their Bible is not my Bible and their morals are not my morals. But surely, the voice of conscience is not yet entirely silenced in Israel, and people with a conscience will weigh these words carefully. . . .

"I propose that the Government of Israel, in the very near future, proclaim to Israel, to the Arabs and to the whole world that: (1) The government of Israel, having reconsidered the problem of the Arab refugees . . . decided to bring back one-third of the total of Arab refugees, especially the felahen and the artisans and the workers, at the rate of 50,000 souls a year over a period of five years. The government of Israel hopes that the problem of the remaining two-thirds of refugees will be tended to by the Arab states and the United Nations.

(2) The government of Israel will rehabilitate the Arab refugees at its own expense. As far as possible, the felahen (peasants) will be restored to their former places; but whenever impossible, they will be settled in other places inside the state of Israel. They will also be given some money and seed and will be free from taxation for several years. . . .

"All returned refugees will automatically become full-fledged citizens of Israel, on par with the Israelis. . . .

The above information, including the quotation from *Ner*, is from the *Jewish Newsletter*, Feb.

Now, as a matter of fact, Tito has indicated, as clearly as he dares to do at this time before his own people, that war would find

But more than that, his argument means that, in event of war, he and his people (that is, the people for whom he pounds a typewriter) have a rationalization for invading a would-be "neutral" Yugoslavia in order to get at Russia.

Now, as a matter of fact, Tito has indicated, as clearly as he dares to do at this time before his own people, that war would find

Now, as a matter of fact, Tito has indicated, as clearly as he dares to do at this time before his own people, that war would find

# 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 State

## Discussion: Suggesting an Approach to a Knotty Issue and a New Demand for the Trade-Union Movement—

# SPEEDUP: An Unsolved Problem for Labor

By BEN HALL

A bitter dispute between the union and the companies has arisen in the course of the steel negotiations, one which has been almost ignored by the daily press in its detailed accounts of debates on wages and profits.

But it is an issue of such concern to unionists not only in steel but in every mass production industry that its decisive importance would be hard to exaggerate. The question is: To what extent shall the employers have the sole and "unilateral" and unqualified right to increase the workload? Every unionist is acquainted with this as the problem of speedup.

Reporters for the bourgeois press, understandably enough, are not very sensitive to this dispute. Without necessarily intending to be unfair or slipshod they simply ignore it; for they know far more about the abstract facets of the "labor problem" than they do about the human aspects of work.

### INHUMAN SCIENCE

At the assembly belt and on the production line, be it in auto, steel, rubber or packinghouse, in every key industry the workers know to their sorrow of the universal drive by the big monopolies to demand a greater and greater intensification of labor, to make the machines and production lines move ever faster and faster, and to force the men and women who tend them to keep pace. A whole new dehumanized "science" of time-keeping and clock-watching is developed to allot a given number of seconds to every motion, to measure every flick of the wrist, so that each moment of the worker's life in the factory may be accounted for and utilized in the interests of greater production and profits.

The "public" hears very little about the man who leans in a leisurely fashion against a post glancing at his precision stop-watch while the nervous and anxious worker wonders what new twists and turns can be added to his job.

### LABOR'S RIGHTS

The worker who gets paid by the hour faces speedup in its simplest form: the employer simply orders him to produce more pieces or to take care of more machines every hour or every day. The worker who gets paid by the piece—the "incentive" or piecework man—finds the employer cutting the rate of pay for each piece so that he must produce more and more parts per day to get the same total pay as before.

To one worker it appears as a demand for more production; to the other as a wage-cut; but to both it is essentially the same thing: speedup. For the same pay he must work harder and harder.

The CIO unions have never been able to deal adequately with speedup nor to defend their members in a clear-cut and aggressive fashion. Not because they are unaware of the danger or unwilling

to fight out the issue. No doubt every union official feels keen twinges of compassion when he learns that his members have been victimized by some new speedup device. But the organized labor movement has never been able to decide what rights it will fight for and what rights it will concede to the employers in setting the rate and pace of production.

The owners of industry, with a clear class insight, know what they want. "We are the owners, we are the 'managers,'" they declare, "and we assert our sacred right to manage production. We insist on our right to determine what is produced, how much is produced, and how fast and in what manner it shall be produced. That is 'free enterprise'; that is the 'American way.' You, the unions, are admitted for free enterprise. Then you must recognize our basic rights."

### HALF-MEASURES

And what do the unions want? They do not know. Our labor leaders, even those kind men of good-will, cannot match the class demands of the employers with an equally clear working-class demand. In a general sort of way they are reconciled to capitalism—"free enterprise"—and they are willing to concede certain basic rights to the employers without challenge. But when the employers begin to assert their rights in actual practice, the union leaders often are frightened by the results of what they concede in theory.

Despite itself, despite its own pronounced adherence to the principles of capitalism, the labor movement is impelled to wrest greater and greater rights away from the capitalist owners of industry and to seek greater rights for itself. But because it does only what it is forced to do and does not act on the basis of a clear long-range class program, the union movement dabbles with half-measures and seldom succeeds in arousing its own members for great aims.

### CASE IN POINT

In the same patchwork fashion the unions take up the matter of speedup. Which brings us back to the steel negotiations.

The steel monopolies have compelled the union to face the issue by a series of sweeping company demands. In its paper *Steel Labor*, the union reports: "Company proposals on the 'management' section give an indication of the company's attitude during the negotiations. One of them was that the management clause spe-

Comrade Hall and LABOR ACTION present the accompanying article for discussion by readers, including discussion in the columns of L.A.—Ed.

cifically state that the company retains both the right and the responsibility to establish, change, or terminate jobs, to arrange or rearrange the duties of employees and to assign the work the company requires to be performed." In its counter-demands, without realizing what it is doing, the union begins to assert an important principle and to establish a far-reaching union right. But as though it were frightened by its audacity, the union flees from the logical implications of its own words.

### HIDDEN BOMBHELL

One of the union demands should be published on the front page of every union paper in the country. It reads: "19. Responsibilities of the parties: There shall be no discrimination by the companies for any reason whatsoever. FAILURE TO WORK AT A UNILATERALLY IMPOSED INCENTIVE PACE SHALL NOT BE REGARDED AS A VIOLATION OF THE CONTRACT."

In this innocent-sounding, legalistic formula, a bombshell is hidden. Consider what it means. Under the terms of virtually all contracts in the big mass-manufacturing industries, no worker has the right simply to "refuse" to work—unless it be for reasons of "health and safety." For example: a group of workers finds that a piecework rate has been cut, or a low given rate set for a new job; they object; they insist on a higher rate. They are not allowed to stop work. They must continue to work at the company rate; they file a grievance; they go through a procedure; they must wait—wait while negotiations take place; meanwhile they must continue to work until finally the issue is settled. In some cases, the union reserves the right, after due procedure, to strike.

### EQUALITY FOR UNION

What happens in real life is not provided for by contracts; the workers become irritated and walk off the job. The contract is violated. Their most militant leaders are fired. Or they continue to work at the old rate of speed and find their weekly paycheck cut; they can't afford to lose the pay; they work harder to meet the new rates; but by working harder and harder they "prove" that they can meet an intensified work schedule; the very "impartial" arbitrator finds, therefore, that the lowered rates are eminently "fair" and they lose their grievance.

If the steel workers won their demand, all this would be cut away. The contractual right of the company to set a piecework rate would be no greater than that of the union. The workers would not be obliged to work at any piecework unless, through their union, they were ready to accept it. The company rate and the union rate would stand on an

equal legal plane. And although all the old conflicts and struggles over rates of pay would continue, the worker would now be fighting from a more advantageous position. A new labor right would have been won.

All this may seem either too technical or too limited in scope to have real significance. But it is neither.

If the union demands that the pieceworker have the right to refuse to work at a rate which his union has not accepted, how can it oppose the same rights for all workers? It follows logically and clearly that an hourly-rated worker should have the right to refuse to work at a rate "unilaterally" imposed by the company. The rights of the working class and of the employers on setting production rates would then be on a more equal plane and the whole fight against speedup would be raised to a new level.

### IT FEELS UNEASY

Needless to say perhaps, the Steel Workers Union does not follow out its own demand consistently. It reaches out with one hand and gives back with the other.

Referring to the general right of the employers to assign jobs *Steel Labor* announces: "Where there are changes in equipment, in materials, processes, in manufacturing methods—in fact, in any material fact which would require a change in job duties or content—the union proposes that management be given the right to make the necessary changes in job duties." Such is the union's basic acceptance of the rights of the capitalist class.

But even here, the union feels uneasy. Notice that it yields to the employers where "changes" are involved. It resists, however,

the company demand for "a free hand for itself in increasing work-loads, reducing crews, and generally reassigning duties so as to reduce the total wages of its employees." Says the union: "It would give the company the unrestricted power to change, at its own whim or pleasure and without relation to any technological or external change, conditions of work which have been maintained for years. . . . The union can see no reason why management should be given the unilateral right at any time to disturb such a relation."

### EXTENDING OUR RIGHTS

Here one must ask: If the union is justified in demanding an equal voice in the defense of "conditions of work which have been maintained for years," by what principle can it justify granting the employers a "unilateral right" to determine conditions of work on new jobs?

As speedup, work standards and piecework rates come up for discussion in the steel negotiations, and as the steel union tries to grapple with these problems, unionists find it possible to discuss them from a new standpoint. The steel union, in its own fumbling manner, points the way.

It is time to demand at least an equal voice for the working class on the question of production rates, for another step forward toward greater working-class democracy, toward the control by labor over its own conditions of work. The fight against speedup is no longer a purely local affair to be fought out in each case by small groups of workers. The unions can effectively counter the speed-up drive of the employers only with the demand for an extension of the basic rights of labor over production.

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor . . .

## Letter from an Indian Socialist

The following letter from a socialist reader in India was received addressed to Comrade Shaachtman, with regard to his article on "Norman Thomas and the Third Camp." This article was recently reprinted by *Janata*, the weekly of the Indian Socialist Party.—Ed.

Dear Comrade Shaachtman: I read your reply to Mr. Norman Thomas who is opposing the idea of a Third Force in one of the back issues of LABOR ACTION [issue of Nov. 5].

I have been a regular reader of LABOR ACTION for the past 1 1/2 years and I have thought of writing to you so often. But my preoccupations prevented me from writing to you. Now after I have read your brilliant article on Third Force, I simply cannot suppress my desire to convey my deep appreciation of it.

I am a member of the Socialist Party here and a student of world politics. I am convinced that the only way out of the present impasse is to form a Third Bloc. The only way to prevent another world war from breaking out, and the only cure to all our socio-economic ills, is democratic socialism.

Today, there are two ways of life contending for world leadership. One is decadent capitalism with all its exploitation and extension of its octopus-hold over other nations and peoples, and the other a military regime which makes man a mere animal or machine by interfering in all his walks of life. Not only are both systems bad but they are also going to lead the world to a major cataclysm.

Each side is propagating to the peoples of the world that the only solution to all problems is to join its bloc. The United States and its rulers are telling the people that the only hope against Communism and aggression is to join their bloc and to agree to their extending their economic stranglehold. Similarly, Communists all over the world and the Soviet Union are telling us that the only solution to present-day exploitation, slavery, misery, poverty and imperialism is to line up with Soviet Russia and swell the ranks of the Communists.

The Communists argue that they have completely liberated China from all foreign yokes and that all imperialists have been expelled. They also aver that China is not a satellite of the Soviet Union and that it is completely independent.

But a close analysis will reveal that this is far from being the case. Because of the war in Korea, China has to sacrifice lakhs and lakhs of her men who could otherwise be enlisted for constructive work. The whole nation has to suffer hardship to fight the war in Korea, which is not of their creation. The Chinese people have to suffer hardship just to help the Soviet Union to expand her sphere of influence.

And tomorrow if the war is carried into China, the Chinese will have to suffer still more because of the policy of the Soviet Union to bring the whole world under Communism. The Soviet Union persuaded North Korea to invade and conquer the narrow strip of South Korean territory. That led to the intervention by

# Youth and Student Corner

## Some Notes on the Federal Aid-to-Education Bill

With the running out of the GI bill for veteran students, the colleges are becoming more and more depleted. Enrollments have shown a tendency to decline, and it is thought that the only reason they are not falling off catastrophically is that draft exemptions are being allowed for students.

The expanding Permanent War Economy requires a vast army of trained technicians to staff its research programs for warfare. The concern of the government in this respect is clearly shown by its interest in maintaining enrollments in higher education by the grant of draft deferments. However, this inducement to education does not appear to have fulfilled the needs.

Therefore President Truman proposed a \$688,000,000 Federal Aid to Education bill. In addition to this requested appropriation was another \$30,000,000 in the form of fellowships and grants to students in higher education. Any notions by the liberal Trumanites that the president's proposed legislation stems from a liberal program to raise the educational level of the people because of an abstract interest in education is dispelled by the president himself.

Referring to the necessity to increase the educational program Truman said: "At a time like this we cannot afford to waste any resources; yet this pool of inadequately used human resources is being continually enlarged because many people are denied the opportunity for a proper education." He was particularly referring to the tremendous number of people who have not been able to pass the educational requirements for the armed forces.

The National Education Association, speaking for the profession, came out in support of the measure. The *New York Times* summarizes its arguments: "only a high quality of education will provide youth with the technical and scientific skills they would need in modern warfare demands and with the preparation they need for the war of ideology in which we are engaged." (My emphasis).

It is clear then that Truman's motivation for an increase in emphasis on education is the needs of the cold war. The justification for education, instead of being the development of the intellect and the development of the power to select between conflicting ideas, will now be the training of tech-

nicians well prepared ideologically and technically for modern war on behalf of "free enterprise."

Such a program, it might appear, should certainly receive the enthusiastic support of Congress. That is not the case. Opposition to the measure seems strong enough to defeat it. No attacks on the bill are based on any progressive notions.

The most reactionary attack appears from the Catholic hierarchy which refuses to endorse any aid to education that does not include grants to parochial schools. The split between the Catholic element and the Protestants, who have been further enraged against them lately because of the Vatican deal, seems to foredoom the bill.

In addition to this conflict over the bill is the objection raised by the right-wing Republicans. The desire to spend for arms on a large scale they accept. But when the issue is one of education they shout about the necessity for economy and the threatened bankruptcy of the nation. The relationship between the money for education and the money for armaments is so disproportionate as to cause the most timid analyst to sense the direction of this country's future under the cold war.

Graham A. Barden (Dem., N. C.) introduced an educational bill earlier which was passed and then vetoed by the president. The bill required that, in spite of federal aid to education the government could not interfere in local educational procedure, especially as regards to Jim Crow schools in the South. Barden stands as a significant opponent to the president's proposal in the House. He will organize the bigots against any legislation which will allow the federal government to have any say at all over the way the states operate their schools.

It is well-known that in the South the educational problem is greatest. The inadequacy of the school system, even for whites, is clearly recognized. For the Negroes the situation is impossible. Yet in the proposed war for democracy, Negroes make as suitable cannon fodder as do whites. Fourteen million people in the population cannot be ignored in the cold war. This is one reason for Truman's interest in extending federal educational aid.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

down and make available their huge resources through the UN for the development of the underdeveloped and undeveloped countries.

People like Mr. Norman Thomas, by opposing the Third Force idea and advocating open alignment with the American bloc, are sowing the seeds of world destruction. Under the circumstances, the responsibility of the Independent Socialists like you and me, in America and Asia, becomes all the heavier. They must make strenuous efforts to make the Americans and Asians conscious of the danger to which the present-day leaders of the United States are leading them and that the only solution is to form a Third Bloc of democratic socialism.

R. V. RAGHAVAN  
Bombay, Feb. 5

### On Socialist Unity

To the Editor: Roy Hollister's letter of Jan. 28 proposing an all-embracing American Socialist League—in which present and anti-Stalinist socialist organizations would be factions—is a good idea. But it's ahead of itself, I think. Only after present socialist groups agree on many points of difference can a unified movement be built. At present, an organic union of differing socialist groups, with the groups becoming factions, might cause more factional fighting than now occurs between separately organized groups.

However, what about organizing an all-embracing group that would be merely a federation—or a committee representing anti-Stalinist radical groups? A United Socialist Policy Committee—or

something like that—could allow radical groups to exist as separate organizations. Since the different groups would still have their own organizations, their members wouldn't be thrown together so closely as to encourage factional squabbling. But the united committee or federation could issue statements to the public, on subjects on which all socialists agree, for educational purposes.

And the various radical groups also could join in the united committee to plan projects on which all socialists agree.

Of course, the all-embracing committee could help to reduce fratricidal strife between anti-Stalinist radicals. This—and the fact that the American socialist movement could, on occasion, speak as a unified voice to the American public—would be its main value. But the various radical groups could continue to disagree in their own publications and activities.

John LOEB

See the article on page 6 for a discussion of the problem of socialist unity, in particular the passage toward the end on "United Action." With regard to correspondent Loeb's idea for a kind of coordinating committee: Given the desire and will by any other group or groups besides the ISL to further other cases of united action, and given an expansion of such activities, such an idea might become practicable as a next step. Quite aside from what we or our correspondent might desire, we suspect that it is united action by socialist left elements that would be most realistically possible.—Ed.

LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly Vol. 16, No. 8 February 25, 1952 Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Editor: HAL DRAPER Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Reply to a Question—

“WHY CAN'T ALL SOCIALISTS UNITE?”

By HAL DRAPER

“Why don't all socialists get together instead of scrapping among themselves in different groups and wadding their energies?” That, in effect, was the question asked by a reader's letter (Jan. 28 issue). It's by no means a new question and we have discussed it in classes, meetings and personal talks innumerable times. But we could not think of any article our press had ever carried on that frequent question; and so we promised one. The article below is not solely concerned with the recent letter from our reader; we also have others' questions in mind. As we jotted down notes for it, it threatened to turn into a small book. It's here rather painfully limited to outlining our way of approaching the problem, for more fruitful further discussion if necessary.

First of all, it's the U. S. we're writing about. The whole problem of socialist unity is quite different in most countries abroad—especially Europe, also India and others. The big difference is: In Britain, West Germany, etc., a mass socialist (or social-democratic) party exists which is the mass party of the working class, or at least of the non-Stalinist working class. In this country, only small socialist groups exist, and there is no mass party of the working class of any kind. (Those two facts, incidentally, are close-related but that's another story.) The U. S. is just about the only important country in the world where this is true; it is, in fact, a special case. A very important special case!

In general it is the ISL view that the socialist Left, in these countries abroad, belongs in the mass socialist party of the working class—as proponents of their own views, of course, and as opponents of reformist, timid and compromising leaders and policies; as the left wing of such a mass party; but as a loyal left wing, not as “aiders” on a maneuver. If we need say little more about this here, it is because this view, which we urge on our friends abroad, has been put forth and discussed at length in our pages by Max Shachtman in two long articles (Sept. 10 and Dec. 31 issues of last year).

This at any rate should be clear: We have no sympathy for the idea that the socialist Left, in the concrete conditions of the movement today, must at all odds maintain its own separate identity as an independent Marxist sect, on “principle.” The real task of the socialist Left today is to fructify the mass labor political movement with those policies which can and will lead it in the direction of socialist reconstruction and victory—as a loyal left wing, we repeat.

That's also a start in dealing with the “special case” in the U. S.

Socialist Groups in the U. S.

In the U. S. there is no mass labor political movement (let alone a mass socialist party) as yet. Indeed, help in its creation, through the formation of a Labor Party by the trade unions here, is one of the top-priority tasks of American socialists. The whole question we are discussing would be radically changed once it comes into being.

Under these conditions, today, socialist groups in this country are political propaganda groups in fact, whether they boastfully name themselves “party” or not. (When a small group labels itself a “party,” that is supposed to symbolize its orientation, but it can be a misleading one. The Independent Socialist League forthrightly presents itself as a propaganda group.)

The Socialist Party has not been a real party for many years; the Socialist Workers Party never was; the Socialist Labor Party is the fossil-remnant of DeLeon's movement; the reason for existence in each case is as a propaganda group, likewise.

Now the primary role of a propaganda group (a necessary one, it goes without saying) is to advocate its own ideas as a TENDENCY of the workers' movement, however much it may also undertake limited activities. The role of a real-mass PARTY of the working class is to organize and lead the general struggle of its class in society.

That simple distinction is the fruit of much experience in working-class history and there has been many a group that has broken its back by ignoring it, trying to jump over its own head. What the difference is can be seen, in one case, by looking at the relation between the British Labor Party (as the party of the British workers) and, say, the loosely organized Bevan group within it, or for that matter any loyal left-wing group in the BLP, however formally organized as such.

The reason for existence of a socialist propaganda group is its distinctive political ideas or program for the movement as a whole. A group which, on the one hand, has no mass roots in the workers' movement and cannot therefore really function as a party, and, on the other, has no clear program of its own, has no basis for existence at all. This is precisely the tragedy of Norman Thomas' Socialist Party, as we have pointed out before this. We will come back to it.

Between Two Stools

Well, what about unity among the existing socialist propaganda groups, under U. S. conditions today? (We are talking here about “organic unity,” organizational fusion; united activities and collaboration are quite a different matter, and only a few words will be necessary on it later.)

Friends who pose that question often suffer from a number of illusions, which it would be well to understand. All the socialist groups mentioned, united, would still

add up to only a somewhat larger propaganda group—and nowhere near anything more. (Larger, that is, at the BEGINNING of such hypothetical unity—if not later. . .) If anyone really thinks that the weakness of the American socialist movement is DUE to the fact that it is not united in a single organization, he is, I'm afraid, up a very useless blind alley in his thinking about American problems. In a real sense, he's got the cart before the horse.

Such a purely artificial fusion of different tendencies into a would-be propaganda group, with the best will in the world, but without a mass base and role in relation to working-class struggles in society as a whole, could not possibly endure. At its very best it could only re-live the problem which the Norman Thomas party is going through now, within its own four walls. It could make no distinctive impact as either a party or a propaganda group, and would merely fall between two stools, flying apart again. It would not be a new and “noble experiment” either—or rather it may seem a “new” idea only to those unacquainted with the history of the movement. Since we do not want to take space to cite history, let us see why this is so in practical-political terms.

Unity as an Abstraction

The way this abstract plea for unity is usually put, it amounts to this: We're all socialists, aren't we, so why can't we all get together on that basis alone? Sure, “other questions” are very important, but not as important as simply advocating socialism versus capitalism, which is the first problem for advancing American workers. These “other questions,” then, ought to be subordinated, by mutual good will, where energies are focussed on the all-important point of agreement.

It is natural for this to sound attractive to some, especially when they first come over to the socialist idea and are illuminated by their discovery—their first big break with capitalist thinking. But it would be a pity to remain merely at this level of development, without some further thinking. It happens that today the further thinking does not have to be so very hard.

Isn't it quite clear to all today that the mere word “socialism”—or, if you wish, merely some general statement of the aim of socialism—does not by itself add up to a political program which can grapple with the real problems of our society? (Remember: a socialist group in the U. S. today, unlike a labor party, has a reason for existence, or has none, depending on whether it has a meaningful social program which it stands for.)

Example: The Stalinists

The Stalinists are for “socialism” too. They give lip service to a general and abstract “definition” of socialism repeated from the “books.” In actual fact (which means: virtually as soon as you get to the very first real and basic political problems of the day) one finds that their “socialism” has absolutely nothing in common with ours.

Not our recent correspondent, but others who may be more or less influenced by Stalinism (even if not friendly to the Russian regime), may disagree. There are Stalinoid types (like those of Sweeney's Monthly Review) who quite sincerely languish for the popular-front days when the Stalinists themselves hit this key hard. If they have not learned better, it is because their own conception of socialism is not differentiated from that of the Stalinists. In our view this is a destroying virus of the socialist movement today. Any socialist group which does not bend every energy to fight it, is, at the very best, entirely useless. Anyone who disagrees with this has his democratic right to yell for “unity,” but obviously he will be wasting his time unless he tries to convince the rest of us that Stalinism is a “kind of socialism.” He will have to discuss the political question (the “other questions”) and not merely advocate the fetish of “unity” of and for itself.

We have deliberately started with the example of unity with Stalinists in spite of the fact that (with some justice) it may be considered “unfair” in the context by some: “Yes, yes, we agree that Stalinism is no kind of socialism.” But this agreement comes only because the questioner has already gone beyond the stage of being dazzled by the idea of unifying all who say they stand for “socialism,” without going into “other questions.”

Example: The SWP

If the example of the Stalinists is unfair to some extent, it is because, in our own eyes, the Stalinist movement cannot even be considered to be a legitimate tendency of the working-class movement, but rather basically a political agent alien to the working class, whatever the sincerity of individual adherents. This is not the case with the socialist tendencies we started discussing. That is quite true.

But for them too, it is impossible to divorce the question of “unity” from the “other questions.”

The easiest reason to see today is: the war issue. Take, for example, one of the socialist groups we have mentioned, which not only insists that Stalin's Russia is a kind of “workers' state” but which advocates support to Russian imperialism in the present cold war and in the looming third world war; which, quite consistently, has a defensist viewpoint in favor of the Stalinists in the present Korean war, etc. That is the Socialist Workers Party (“official-Trotskyists”).

A socialist tendency with such a disastrously wrong policy has a democratic right to advocate its point of view (so have the Stalinists), and also its adherents should have the right to advocate their point of view within a mass labor party. But I would bend every effort—and any socialist propaganda group I would wish to be-

long to would not be worth two cents to me if it did not bend its efforts—to combat and isolate such a point of view within the labor movement or within any future labor party!

I do not believe that even the basic concepts of socialism can be fruitfully taught except by counterposing them not only against capitalism but also against Stalinist and pro-Stalinist views.

Again: anyone has the right to disagree with this but he is not disagreeing with my views on “unity,” he is disagreeing with my views on socialism and Stalinism, which are different from his. And if he merely keeps on talking about the wonderful abstract advantages of “unity,” he would not be wrong—and he would not be right—he would merely be talking up a spout. We would first have to discuss the “other questions,” that is, the real political questions of the content of socialism; that is, the real and basic political questions of today. That has always been true: it is merely clearer than usual today.

Example: The Thomasites

But what about, on the other hand, the Norman Thomas “kind of socialists”? They are not tainted with Stalinism or support of Stalinism—not at all. In the person of their main leader and other leading figures, they have “merely” scrapped their socialism for the camp which is the rival of Russian imperialism in the world today! We need not here review Thomas's evolution in the direction of support of imperialist war (that is how we see it), his wobbling even on civil liberties, his desire to support Fair Deal capitalist politicians, etc.

One reason we need not review it here is because this question of unity is being acted out in life in Norman Thomas' Socialist Party today. We have reported this development for our readers. The fact is: Even the right and left-wing tendencies within the SP itself (let alone a united group of “all socialists”) are finding it impossible to stay together. And we hereby testify: this has happened with the best “good will” in the world on both sides, from the personal point of view! In fact, the bending-over-backwards for the sake of party unity has been . . . as much as anyone has a right to demand. It is political program—which is making it impossible for the pro-war and anti-war wings to remain united. All indications are that this is felt to be true on both sides. Consistent adherents on neither side are willing (quite rightly) to subordinate to the fetish of an impotent unity that which they conceive to be the main political task of the organization.

In other words, the war issue is a line of demarcation not only with regard to supporters of Russian imperialism but with regard to supporters of American imperialism. (About the Socialist Labor Party we need say nothing much. Way back at the turn of the century its attitude of opposition to the trade-union movement as such—it's for “socialist trade unions” only—led to the split which brought the Socialist Party into being. A very healthy split it was too. And as for unity: this model, sectarian outfit refuses to recognize the existence of any socialists outside its own ranks, let alone work with them as such, let alone talk about unity! If they were really socialists, you see, they'd be in the SLP. . .)

The Politics of Unity

The plea for “unity” around socialism per se, regardless of “other questions,” has another aspect: it assumes the possibility of putting separate practicable political compartments between the “domestic” program and “foreign-policy” program of a socialist group. The Wallaceites tried to do that too, in a way, quite unsuccessfully; it can't last. Too many well-intentioned liberals, as well as Norman Thomas himself, have shown that a pro-war line (“foreign policy”) leads with practical-political logic to unendurable differences on vital policies at home. It is by no means inevitable that any given individual will be pushed by a pro-war line into non-socialist and anti-socialist policies in all the fields which hinge on the war question; but it is difficult to conceive of two rival conscious tendencies coexisting under the present strain of the war drive.

The Politics of Unity

In any case, the central point is that the possibility of organizational unity can be considered only within the framework of a given political program. This is no special discovery or view of ours. It has been found true, from its own point of view whatever that might be, by every socialist tendency today or in the past, and from right to left.

Well, what exactly is that political framework? How little difference does there have to be before unity is possible? Where is the line to be drawn? Is it always just a matter of the war issue? Of course not. We saw that the present Socialist Party was originally founded by an absolutely necessary split from DeLeon's crustified SLP around a revolt against DeLeonite sectarianism. The Social-Democratic Federation people (“Old Guard” reformists) pulled out of the SP in 1934 on issues around New-Dealism, road to power, etc. Entry into capitalist coalition cabinets has been a basic issue for European socialist parties, etc.

We need not try to lay down a formula. In the last analysis, this cannot and never did depend on anybody's arbitrary or fixed standards for all times and places. At bottom, splits take place on “fundamental” questions, but particular policies bear on fundamental questions only in a given historical context. To be sure, it is not a question of just any difference of opinion (outside of cracks) but of questions where the whole meaning and effectiveness of the socialist movement are at stake. We have seen what some of these are today, in our eyes:

(Continued bottom of next page)

The Face of Franco Spain:

Born in Blood—Rotting in Corruption

By B. Sa.

MARSEILLES, Feb. 1—In Madrid, in Barcelona, in Seville, it is the vivacity, gaiety and beauty of the Spanish crowd which strikes you right off. You discover the poverty behind it only afterward, for such is the character of this people: they would rather deprive themselves of food than fail to dress impeccably or to go out.

The most terrible poverty of all I met in Barcelona, scarcely 1 1/2 or 2 1/2 miles from the brilliant avenues of the Pueblo Nuevo. There, along the shore, are two rows of squalid barracks—much, much worse than (for example) the Paris “zone.” There you see skeleton-like children and mothers, some with eye diseases. They cook on little charcoal stoves, in the “street.” The latter is full of filthy puddles. The dwellings are real huts often without windows, sometimes of flimsy brick, often of boards. An extraordinary impression is created by this single street, long, swarming, poverty-stricken. Beyond, the sea; on the other side, factories and wastelands. Where the street ends, it is no longer along the sea but along a canal into which the city's garbage flows. The odor is stifling. Children are playing about 500 yards away, and women are still cooking on the charcoal.

Everywhere up to the city's gates there are such quarters. The poverty seems more terrible in Barcelona because the hovels are tightly packed; elsewhere there are cave-like dwellings scattered over the sides of hills. Stay a whole day in one of these quarters and you will not meet a single policeman, nor a Civil Guard with his black three-cornered hat, nor a member of the Policia Amada, who elsewhere swarm in the real streets. And that is too bad: add a single one of these swaggering policemen to the scene amid the barracks of the Pueblo Nuevo, or among the Ventas cave-dwellers in Madrid, and a spotlight would be thrown on the fragility of the Spanish situation, on the disparate character of the society.

What have they to do with the regime, these Spaniards of the third zone? Nothing. They detest it; in the first place, they ignore it; they make shift to try to live; it is always outside of the framework and the norms which the totalitarian regime tries to impose, however, loosely.

The People

Regime and people are two distinct categories in Spain, and this is true not only for the cave-dwellers outside the city gates but for the immense mass of the population.

“Sometimes I come to regret the days of the socialist and anarchist trade unions,” a Madrid industrialist told me. “There were strikes, but once peace was made, you knew where you stood. Now everything is a mess of

frauds: orders and counter-orders, time lost with the bureaus, controls and reconcontrols, all of it executed by incompetent people. The long and short of it is that one has to hand out tips everywhere.”

I asked some underground opponents, whose addresses and passwords had been given to me by their organizations' headquarters in Paris: “How come, in such conditions, the regime does not fall?”

“Because there is nobody to push it over,” they answered. “The mass of people have no arms and in reality they do not want to organize. They have become very skeptical about politics. The strikes and demonstrations of last spring were a surprise for everyone, including ourselves. It was magnificent, and such explosions can happen again; but can Francoism be overthrown with bare hands?”

“Many directed their hopes abroad; now that is finished. The Spanish tragedy is that we are thrown back on our own forces and that the people do not have the means of overthrowing the regime.”

Everybody Steals

“The regime was born in blood; it is not only hateful but incompetent and corrupt. However, since it controls the country, it corrupts all of society. Everybody steals—in Spain, from the minister to the laborer; the construction worker who earns 18 pesetas a day, when a meal comes to 7 or 8 pesetas, steals a packet of nails or a piece of pipe to sell on the black market. From where we stand here, you can see how the workers on the pipe lines leave every day with a piece of pipe under their jackets.”

“No one does anything about it because everybody on the job steals—everybody from the supervisor down. The walls of this house, built five years ago, are as thin as a cardboard: out of six truckloads of cement which went in by one door, four went out by the other.”

“According to official admissions,” they continued, “the cost of living has gone up eight times compared with 1936—wages only two or three times. It is impossible to condemn the workers for stealing, but that will leave its marks on them. Already it deforms and corrupts them, for the situation has lasted for years. More than the repression, which was bloody up to 1944, poverty has left its mark on the working class.”

“Now the worker is willing to work 10 and 12 hours a day. There are cases where, during the season, the workers work 15 hours a day. They have no time and no spirit for anything else. From Monday to Sunday, their wives keep saying that they do not have enough money; so they start thinking how to work more, or how to steal and operate on the black market.”

“For years there have been whole industries which have worked only three days a week, for lack of electricity or raw materials. And yet goods have not been

lacking: internal purchasing power is at a minimum. The companies have not gone bankrupt, but that is only due to the low wages and high prices; they have to cover general expenses and make a profit with only half the normal labor time.”

The “Franco Generation”

“Another problem,” they went on, “and everyone agrees about this, is that of the youth, the ‘Franco generation.’ It is a lost generation. In general they think only about amusement and money. No other concern, no other ideal, no other hope. As for us, we read ‘comic books’—like Coyote, which you can see on all the stalls—up to the age of 12; now, look around you, they read them up to the age of 25-30. The books that come out, the newspapers, the magazines, are without exception nothing to speak of. At public school the youth learn very little. The good schools are those of the Jesuits, but they are not for the people, for the fees are enormous.

“It's like under the old regime in Franco. Yes, the regime can boast of this: it has ‘idiotized’ a generation. The youth are offered just one thing: sports. But from the intellectual point of view, it is black night.”

“Generalized theft, black market, brutalization of the youth: there is the payment for our failure to overthrow this corrupt regime.”

“What a magnificent vassal for a good lord!” said the poem of the Cid in the 17th century. That was already Spain's problem; so it has been throughout Spain's history since then. Napoleon's armies were met at Madrid by the armed people in whatever way they could, commanded by two artillery lieutenants and an infantry lieutenant: the government and the general staff had fled or surrendered. In 1936 in the Franco uprising, there was no longer a republican government: the city halls, the trade unions, the parties organized armed groups.

Last spring, the masses fought spontaneously, without leadership, with the greatest solidarity and the greatest courage. The people I spoke to in the underground resistance groups never tired of recalling recent or more distant episodes of the political and working-class struggles in Spain. All of them are marked with the courage, the magnificent self-sacrifice, the sense of solidarity that this people possesses.

And besides how can anyone who has gone to Spain fail to keep a lively recollection of the gentleness, the generosity, the simple and direct spirit of mutual help which are Spanish characteristics? Truly, what a great people! and what a tragedy the impotence to which they have been reduced! For alas, the verse from the Cid applies not only to the regime but to a certain extent also to the Spanish resistance.

(To be continued next week)

“WHY CAN'T ALL SOCIALISTS UNITE?” A Reply—

(Continued from page 6)

Stalinism and war are certainly two.

It surely is not a question of “theoretical” differences, important as they may be for internal democratic discussion. I consider (for example) the labor theory of value and dialectical materialism as integral parts of Marxist theory, but no serious socialist movement has ever split or should split over questions on this plane. Nor is it a matter of “historical” differences: different historical evaluations of “Bolshevism,” or “Luxemburgism,” or what have you, I would be anxious to unite with socialists who think (say) that the Bolsheviks erred in putting down the Kronstadt rebellion, or in the way they put it down, or something along those lines, provided we agreed on what I would consider the basic political policies of the movement and its tasks. (We would argue about Kronstadt another day.) Certainly, “theoretical” and “historical” differences may be indicators of vital political differences, or lead to them, but one finds that out not in theory but in practice.

The Politics of Unity

With regard to the basic political questions of today, which we have touched on, and in relation to the existing socialist groups in the U. S., it is not necessary to get into such hypothetical matters.

For there are, roughly but clearly enough, four socialist tendencies before the American socialist. (This is far fewer than the number of different kinds of World Federalists, or of Zionists, or of cliques in the Democratic or Republican Parties, which last are held together as united organizations only by the staves of the pork-barrel.)

With their organized representatives, they are: (1) Sectarian—Socialist Labor Party. (2) Stalinist-oriented—Socialist Workers Party (“official-Trotskyist”).

World History—Year by Year!

The BOUND VOLUMES of LABOR ACTION are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. 1945 to 1949 \$3 a volume LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

(3) Reformist, pro-war, pro-Fair Deal—Socialist Party (Norman Thomas leadership), Social-Democratic Federation.

(4) The Marxist Left—and in this socialist Left we include the Independent Socialist League.

The real problem of unity before us, as Independent Socialists, is the unity of the socialist Left, not the will of the wisp of “all-socialist unity.”

It is this that can have a real political meaning and is not merely wishful utopianism.

For example, in conformity with the tendency for unity to correspond to political programs, the Norman Thomas leadership and wing of the Socialist Party turned some time ago toward seeking unification with that other group which corresponds to it politically, the hardbitten right-wing Fair Deal-socialists of the Social-Democratic Federation. They belong together, in all fairness. The left wing of the Socialist Party, on its part, as SP leader Thomas moved further and further to the right, equally emphasized its anti-war “Third Camp” position and fundamental disagreements with Thomas.

This situation may come to a head at the SP convention later in the year. We do not pretend to know, naturally, whether this left wing (of both the SP and its youth group, the YPSL) will clarify its own perspective, or what orientation they may adopt; whether they will really make a fight or not; whether they will find it possible to compromise their incompatibility, and at whose expense; etc. We wish to illustrate our approach:

Unity of the socialist Left has a basis in reality, and any steps toward it would be welcomed by us. The “overall” proposition has little link with reality, under present-day conditions.

United Action

Short of organizational unity (fusion), there is really little that need be said here about united activity and collaboration between socialists—from our own point of view, that is. We are not only for such unity in action wherever possible but—permit us to boast just a little—it is the ISL which has pushed most vigorously toward this end. Our role in organizing united picket lines at the Franco consulates in a number of cities (in support of the strike demonstrations in Spain) was the best evidence of this. We would refer also to the joint statement on “Stalinism Is Not Socialism” in 1949, which shed some light on various approaches of the different groups toward practical collaboration. On the student field, it is our comrades of the Socialist Youth League who have especially helped to blaze a valuable trail for socialist collaboration.

To be sure, even with respect to united fronts (and this is by no means limited to socialist groups), the given occasion for the united action also necessarily involves political differences. It would be ridiculous to think about united action with the SWP in a case where the object of the united action collides with its pro-Russian line in foreign policy; or with the Norman Thomas SPers where the particular united action is in contradiction with their support of American imperialism. Even united action has its minimum politics. But that is ABC. There is plenty of room and occasion for specific collaboration on many issues—collaboration wider than the socialist movement too.

Last word: it is to be hoped that we have made clear that we do not claim that the ISL constitutes the “finished product” of the crystallization of the socialist Left in this country. That is not due to modesty. It would be a rather poor Marxist who ever got the notion in his head that the development of the socialist movement, or of the vanguard party of the socialist movement, ever came to a halt in some static form—any more than the socialist idea itself ever mummifies into a “finished program” which requires only a thumb index to answer all questions of the past, present and future.

It is precisely because of our approach to the question of building a vital socialist movement, organizationally as well as politically, that we are proud of the role which the ISL has played and can play. Within the framework of this approach, without being hypnotized either by unity-fetishism on the one hand or sectarianism on the other, the last word on this question is—flexibility.

“NEXT— A LABOR PARTY!” by Jack Ranger • A Hard-Hitting Presentation Of the Need for an Independent Labor Party • 25 cents Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street, New York City

# Labor Left Without a Line — —

(Continued from page 1)

would either be pigeonholed or defeated by the reactionary coalition which dominates Congress. In no case has the president or his supporting group carried the fight to the country even after the fashion of Roosevelt's famous campaigns during the '30s.

But here the picture is even more confused than is evident from the above. No one knows whether Truman will run again, or whom he will select to run for him. At the moment we have two hats in the Democratic ring. One is the coonskin cap of Estes Kefauver who is reported to be a "liberal" of some kind. This means that he is not quite reactionary enough on the civil-rights question to please the Southern Democrats and Dixiecrats, and has voted "right" on most of the bills which labor leaders like to put on lists as a substitute for a program.

The other is the ten-gallon hat (ten gallons of oil, that is) of Senator Kerr of Oklahoma. He is also reputed to be "right" on most liberal issues, and is tarnished chiefly by the known fact that on any question affecting oil his Fair Deal principles tend to get drowned in gushers of self-interest, since he is a millionaire operator himself.

## GUESSING GAME

Despite the lack of much enthusiasm for either Kefauver or Kerr among the liberals and labor leaders, no one need count them out of the race. For the Democratic Party still has the South to reckon with.

In 1948 Truman risked a split in the party on the civil-rights plank in his platform. But then it was clear that the most the Dixiecrats could do was to keep their states out of the Democratic column in the electoral college. This time they have served more or less open notice that unless they get much of what they want at the convention they are quite ready to support a Republican candidate. . . . especially if he has five stars around his name. Thus a "compromise" Democratic candidate is not at all impossible. The "compromise" would, as usual, be made at the expense of the working people of the country, and especially of the Negroes.

In leading labor-political circles the guessing game is going about like this right now: Truman is the strongest possible "Fair Deal" candidate. If he runs against Taft, they will have no alternative but to support him, and they will do it with as much enthusiasm as they can pump into themselves. But Truman probably will not want to run against Eisenhower. If the latter is the Republican choice, Truman will probably back anyone from a man like Vinson, who was his reputed first choice, through someone like Adlai Stevenson. But the range there is considerable, and might quite possibly include candidates like Kefauver or Kerr.

## ON THE SIDELINES

With this prospect before them, many of the labor leaders are seriously considering "sitting out" the presidential election, and concentrating their efforts on campaigns for congressmen and senators. Yet such is the weight carried by any presidential candidate that when push comes to shove they will probably be forced to make a choice whether they can muster any enthusiasm for it or not.

Two facts are most striking with regard to the present thinking in leading labor circles.

One is that they are even considering the possibility of having to "sit out" a presidential election.

The other is that they are completely powerless even at this stage of the campaign when things are still quite fluid, to influence, let alone determine, the decision in the Democratic Party on who the candidates will be. They are forced to sit on the sidelines and

indulge in the game of guessing (and wishful thinking), just like any citizen whose control over national politics extends no farther than his right to mark the ballot prepared for him on November by the political decisions of others.

But this is the year 1952. Four years ago the leaders of the AFL and CIO boasted that it was their political organizations, Labor's League for Political Education and the Political Action Committee, which played the major role in electing Truman and almost two hundred congressmen. In 1950 they claimed that it was the work of their organizations more than anything else which prevented the usual strong swing to the "out" party in a non-presidential election year. And even though there was a little bragging and exaggeration in this, it was not too far from the truth.

Yet now they stand helplessly by, waiting for Truman to make up his mind, or for someone who has some real power to make it up for him.

The labor leaders claim that their political organizations are today stronger, better organized and more experienced than ever before. That is a fact. But it is also a fact that they have nowhere to go. Although they are organizationally independent of either party, they have been built and trained to follow the Democrats.

## NO LINE

They are like a powerful locomotive, with steam up and everything in working order for a long haul. The engineer can only drive it down the track on orders from the dispatcher. But now the orders are confused, and he can see for himself that the track has a blind end. He can do nothing but sit and wait for someone to straighten things out for him.

The point is that the political premises on which the labor leadership has been acting (and this applies equally to the Liberal Party in New York, the Americans

for Democratic Action, and the liberals in general) have led them into a position of powerlessness. They have no alternative line of action to the one forced on them by Truman, and they have, therefore, no means by which to force any given line of action on him, the Democratic Party as a whole, or anyone else.

It goes without saying that they have not even thought, except with apprehension, of striking out on their own and mobilizing a political movement behind their own domestic program, independently of the Democratic Party. But even inside that party, they have acted as the leg-men and hurrah-boys of the Fair Deal wing. They have accepted its deals and compromises and betrayals of what they claim to be their own program with hardly a whimper.

That was supposed to be "practical politics." And now, in 1952, practical politics turns out to be little more than a practical zero for the labor movement and all the millions of workers and farm-

ers and professional people whose interests are the same as its own.

In this crucial year, when the nation is confronted with problems as grave as any it has faced in its history, the best they have to offer is another four years of political futility with Truman, and the worst . . . to sit out the election while the destiny of the nation is fought out between an Eisenhower and a Kerr!

This is the month of February. There are still eight months till the election. There is still time in which to assess the helpless position into which the labor movement has been brought by its past political policies, and to change them effectively. But this can only be done if enough men and women in the labor movement and around it speak up now on behalf of an independent political and organizational policy, through a labor party, geared to the interests of the American people rather than to those of the two big political machines and the men who finance them.

# The Struggle Goes On Inside NATO

By SAM FELIKS

The "traveling road show" of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has finally been able to start its oft-postponed Lisbon conference. The reasons for the two previous delays—agreement on plans for German rearmament and the Harriman economic report—have only slightly been mitigated and Secretary of State Dean Acheson gives solemn assurance that no basic problems are going to be solved at this conference.

So inconsequential have been results of these NATO conferences that there has been serious talk of ending them and returning to the private diplomacy of cloistered embassies. Perhaps the only reason for their continuance has been the demands of the small nations for a public arena where they may present their objections to the policies of NATO's Big 3—the U. S., Britain and France.

The two main topics on the agenda for the Lisbon conference are the formation of a European army, called the European Defense Community, and its relationship to NATO; specifically this is the question of German rearmament. The other is the chronic and even more important question of the burden of rearmament: how the military budget that the U. S. is pushing upon Western Europe is going to be financed. This is the guns-or-butter question.

There is one other point, not included on the agenda: the relationship of Spain to NATO. The U. S. thought that the inclusion of Germany in the West European army would have been all but settled by this time and that holding the NATO meeting in Lisbon would highlight the inclusion of Spain. Not that there would have been

any formal introduction of the Spain-NATO relationship at the meeting, but it was hoped that the meeting on the Iberian peninsula would point to the importance of considering Spain at a subsequent meeting.

The U. S. was earlier rebuffed by the Western European countries, with the exception of the "democratic" ally, Salazar of Portugal, on the inclusion of Spain. But despite the public statement by President Truman about his personal distaste for the Franco fascist regime, this remains a major part of U. S. strategy in Europe. Franco, formally or informally, as an ally or co-belligerent, with regret and nose-holding, is to become part of the alliance to save the "free world."

## POWER STRUGGLE

But Spain will have to wait for another occasion. They still have not got past German rearmament nor the consideration of the Harriman report on the cost of the military budget.

Up until several weeks ago, the State Department seemed to believe that it would be able to fulfill its promise to General Eisenhower that the problem of recruiting German manpower into his NATO army in one form or another was all but settled. In fact this is still the official whistling-in-the-dark opinion of the State Department. But the terms on which German divisions were to be had have thrown the entire policy into a crisis affecting not only the European army idea but its related scheme—the Schuman Plan.

The entire discussion was removed from the level of socio-historical generalities on the meaning and importance of European integration, to the hard-headed realities of the power struggle going on beneath all the talk of "integration." Western Europe was to be "integrated," but what did it mean to the nations involved?

The idea of a united Europe has wide currency today as a basic step toward a solution of Europe's crisis. But the dispute over German rearmament shows the relative apathy and even hostility toward the "integration" which the U. S. appears intent on forcing on Western Europe.

It is an "integration" that brings forth the fears and historic hostility of the people whose support and cooperation is necessary if Western European is to build a new life for itself. It cannot win the support of the people and nations if a united Europe is used as a cloak for the domination or hegemony of one nation, France, over the others, or as the vehicle to create a European army to prepare to fight, under an

American general, a war from which the Europeans feel they have nothing to gain.

## FRENCH LINE

Just as the U. S. and Russian-dominated war blocs struggle for power in our own world, a struggle goes on inside of the respective camps for positions of importance and influence vis-a-vis the dominant power. Inside of NATO, as in the former European Marshall Plan Council, there is the division between the large and small nations. This struggle for the survival of national independence and influence in policy continues up to the level of the Big 3.

England has today undisputed second place in the Western camp because of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the vast sterling bloc for which she is the banker. France's position in the Big 3 rests upon its shaky position as the most powerful of the continental nations. France does not have the economic or military resources and power of even England nor does she speak for a large bloc of nations and colonies outside of Western Europe as does England.

It has been a major aim of post-war French policy to construct an area in which she is the immediately dominant force. Any reference to the "French Union" is made ludicrous by the revolts rocking it from Indo-China to Morocco. To offset this weakness, successive French governments have proposed and supported the Schuman Plan and the European Army (Pleven Plan).

These plans were formulated not only to build up French hegemony but even more specifically to counterbalance the resurgence of German power on the continent. The Pleven European Army Plan was designed to provide a framework within which France

## SCRIPPS-HOWARD AND TITO —

(Continued from page 3)

him militarily ranged with "Eisenhower's troops" even if Yugoslavia itself is not attacked. But even so Tito might or might not be able to mobilize the Yugoslav people for such involvement in the third world war. In any case (this is what Scripps-Howard mean) the West need not respect any desires for independence on the part of the Yugoslavs: such desire for independence would merely "prove" a masked alliance with the Kremlin.

As if to underline the symmetrical parallel between this contempt for Yugoslav independence and Moscow's attitude on the same point, Snell (approvingly) quotes none other than Stalin to

could control and even limit the rearming of Germany after the abrupt announcement by the U. S. in the fall of 1950 that it was going to push for a German army.

## SHOWDOWN PUT OFF

This is openly admitted to be the purposes of these two plans, which form the backbone of French continental policy. The idealistic socio-historical generalities about the Schuman Plan uniting the European community in order to raise living standards reveals itself as part of the power struggle to suppress the national independence of Germany. Instead of raising European iron and steel production and standards of living, it was designed to restrict German production to levels approximately that of France.

Proving that nothing was learned from the history of the Treaty of Versailles, the French have all but completely incorporated the Saar region in order to equalize French and German steel and coal production. But with U. S. insistence on German arming, the French have sought even closer control in face of German demands for greater equality.

The Lisbon NATO meeting was to be practically the final stepping stone for a European army. However, the French government just prior to this conference, informed the Adenauer government, and in turn the U. S., that it had no intention of agreeing to German equality, by appointing an ambassador to the Saar. This was taken to demonstrate its intention to continue control over the German economy, and to deny political equality.

The temporizing compromises that the U. S. may work out with France and Germany on this question only delay a showdown on the entire rearmament of Western Europe.

argue that in war "only two alternatives confront the border regions. Either they join forces with Russia . . . or they join forces with the entente. . . . There is no third solution."

Scripps-Howard agreement with Stalin on this crucial question of world politics will not make that reactionary newspaper trust suspect in the eyes of the Un-American Committees. The Un-Americans, rather, try to find "subversive" implications in the attitude of socialists who fight for respecting the independence of neutral nations (as of all nations) and who oppose the reactionary doctrine of Stalin on the necessity of choosing between support of one imperialism or the other.

Don't miss a single week of  
**LABOR ACTION**  
A sub is only \$2 a year!