

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 9, 1953

FIVE CENTS

What Is the Significance Of Stalin's New Interview?

By ABE STEIN

With that inexhaustible fund of duplicity and cynicism that has always characterized him, Stalin has once more stepped forward as the "partisan of peace." This time the Kremlin autocrat disclosed his views to Dr. S. Kitchlu, as Indian recipient of a "Stalin Peace Prize."

According to a New York Times dispatch from its Moscow correspondent Harrison Salisbury, dated February 24, Kitchlu was received at the Kremlin a week ago and had an hour's conversation with Stalin which he characterized as "full, frank and free." Stalin has given such "frank" interviews before, and, as the New York Times points out, Stalin's conversations with foreign visitors and correspondents are always intended for world consumption.

Some of the views expressed by Stalin in this conversation do not

As we go to press, the news is that Joseph Stalin has suffered a stroke and is near death.

differ in substance from those relayed to James Reston, the New York Times political expert, at the beginning of the year. Stalin reiterated his claim that "the Soviet Union does not want war with the United States—it cannot afford war because that would jeopardize what has been built up in the Soviet Union in the last thirty-five years." Furthermore, he said, Russia does not believe that a third world war is inevitable, and is interested in ending the Korean war.

However, Stalin's remarks went beyond these time-worn melodies. For example, the unfavorable repercussions in the United States produced by the Kremlin's violent anti-American propaganda campaign throughout the world have apparently come home to Stalin.

For, according to Dr. Kitchlu, Stalin had the following kind words to say: "The people of the United States and the American nation have made a great contribution to world development. Though the American Revolution occurred long ago, it still offers inspiration to peoples striving for

(Turn to last page)

Will They Whitewash the U.S.-N. Y. Cop Deal?

By L. G. SMITH

For the past few weeks the Police Department of New York City and the Department of Justice have been engaged in attempting to cover up a shocking and illegal agreement between these two agencies.

It appears that last July 11 a meeting was held in the office of United States Attorney Myles J. Lane, between the heads of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice and the heads of the local Police Department, which provided that acts of police brutality and other violations of the civil rights of New York's citizens would no longer be investigated by the FBI. The Police Department was to conduct its own investigations and then send its findings to the federal agency which is charged by law with looking into such matters.

The total effect was to free the New York City police of any restraint in using violence, up to and including murder, against local citizens.

The agreement between the federal and local authorities came to light in connection with a grand jury investigation of the case of Jacob Jackson, 32-year-old Negro truck driver, who was picked up by police last August and beaten up so badly that he had to undergo two brain operations for the removal of blood clots.

His case was taken up and pressed vigorously by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and thus was not permitted to disappear from

sight as most cases of police brutality do. One of the aspects of the case is that the majority of the victims of the police tend to be Negroes and Puerto Ricans who inhabit the poorest parts of the city.

When the agreement to keep the FBI out of such cases in New York first came to light, it was openly admitted by James M. McInerney, former assistant attorney general, who is still an officer in the Department of Justice. It was denied by New York City's Police Commissioner George P. Monaghan and by Chief Inspector Conrad H. Rothengast, all of whom had been present at the meeting in Lane's office.

POLICE BRUTALITY

It appears now that the case is going to be deflected into a wrangle over whether Monaghan lied when he said there was no "agreement," instead of sticking to the real question of the extent of police attacks on the citizens and measures to put them to an end.

In testifying before a House judiciary subcommittee, McInerney insisted that there was no "agreement, arrangement, or understanding" for the FBI to lay low while the Police Department was covering up the tracks of their thugs.

"How would you characterize it?" he was asked by Congressman Collier.

"I would call it an experiment," replied McInerney.

He went on to read a prepared statement which said that the

TO DEFEND THE 'AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE'—

Washington Establishes The Stoolpigeon System

(But Don't Confuse It with the Practice In Moscow: Their Intentions Are Bad . . .)

By GORDON HASKELL

American newspapers have often carried a cartoon about the sad plight of the citizen and the government worker in foreign totalitarian countries. It is usually captioned: "I am the man who watches the man who watches the man who watches me." The cartoon portrays a series of people peering around pillars or over desks, each one intent on the activities of all the others.

This picture was brought right home to the good old

U.S.A. when Joseph M. Dodge, director of the Bureau of the Budget, issued instructions to all the employees of that department ordering them to report to their superiors any conduct on the part of any fellow worker that would be "inimical to the effective operation, security and standing" of the bureau. The instructions further stated that any failure to make such reports "will not be easily excused."

This directive is not a product of Dodge's personal whims. It has

been issued in line with the president's declaration in his State of the Union message that from now on the executive department of the government will assume full responsibility for "policing" itself with regard to "loyalty" and "security."

It appears that, in their effort to curb the wholesale snooping of Senator McCarthy and some of his colleagues, the government has hit on the ingenious if not original scheme of turning every government worker into a snooper and informer on his fellows.

SNOOPS FOR ALL

"This is not an invitation for snooping or gossiping," says the order. "It is a reminder that an important responsibility of each member of the organization is to protect and further the constructive interests of the whole group."

Just to make sure that no one would misunderstand the significance of the reference to "snooping and gossiping," the order assures the zealous employees that "any information given in such an interview will be held in confidence and will not be used unless and until it can be verified from another source. In no case will the individual giving the information be embarrassed by disclosure of the source. Whatever is reported will be used as a basis of an independent check of the facts."

The article in the New York Times reporting this little innovation in the practices of government in this country (of course, it is an old story to Stalin and to Hitler and Mussolini in their day) states that it has caused "resentment and uneasiness among many employees of the Budget Bureau." It states, further, that "some who are watching the unfolding of the administration's new security plan also are represented as feeling that the assurance of protection against disclosure may lead some employees to tell their stories to their superiors rather than to Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. . . ."

NEW PLAN

There are a good many hints floating around about the nature of the "administration's new security plan." The chief change is going to be that all review boards are abolished. Some kind of committee will be set up to look over whatever "derogatory" information may be furnished them about employees or prospective ones by the FBI, their fellow workers, or

(Turn to last page)

For more on McCarthyism in the government, see page 2.

Sidney Hook, Logic, and McCarthy

—Hook versus Louis Hacker on Academic Freedom . . . page 6

"I Represent the Slaves"

A Czech Trade-Union Champion in Stalinland . . . page 3

"Dear Comrade-Assassins . . ."

The 4th International and the Chinese Stalinists . . . page 7

UAW Wins on Issue of Reopening 5-Year Contract, but Battle Looms

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, March 1—The veil of secrecy surrounding negotiations between General Motors and the United Auto Workers (CIO) was torn aside finally this week-end with the announcement by the union that it had rejected an unsatisfactory offer from the corporation.

Nevertheless, the fact that GM had admitted that the present five-year contract between the UAW and itself was open for renegoti-

ation gave the union a powerful wedge to press for a satisfactory new contract.

It also raised the same issue regarding the five-year contracts at Chrysler and Ford, thus opening up the major UAW contracts for bargaining.

REJECT GM OFFER

GM offered two concessions: (1) to put 14 cents an hour of the present 25-cent cost-of-living gain into the basic wage structure, and (2) to give a five-cent hourly hike to the skilled trades. GM issued a brief statement with its offer:

"The proposals by General Motors are considered to be a practical solution to our problem, including the conversion from the old series price index to the new index."

The UAW pointed out that the GM offer showed that the corporation had accepted the principle that the five-year contract, which has two and a half years to run, was not a "legalistic, static document."

Negotiations between the union and GM are now recessed, to be renewed upon the request of either party. It is significant that

the union said that the entire problem, including the whole question of five-year contracts, would be taken up at the UAW convention—scheduled to begin March 22 in Atlantic City.

Thus the convention assumes special importance as a policy-making body of the highest authority at a crucial time in the union's relations with the corporations.

It should make the debate on five-year contracts, the escalator clause and the whole wage policy of the UAW far transcend the confines of the UAW, for Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, also has the responsibility of leading the national CIO.

WON'T WIDEN GAP

The ramifications of these issues may be illustrated easily by recalling, for example, that about a year ago, a sub-panel of the Wage Stabilization Board approved a wage increase amounting to 28½ cents an hour to skilled workers in the Detroit area, only to have this proposal voted down by the full Wage Stabilization Board. Can the UAW settle for less than that now?

And doesn't the GM offer of five cents for skilled workers appear almost as an insult in view of the background history of this issue?

Should not the production workers also receive a flat increase, to keep them on a comparative level with the skilled workers? Certainly any settlement that widens the gap in the auto shop between the assembly workers and skilled trades is bound to leave divisive effects and much dissatisfaction in the ranks.

CONVENTION AHEAD

The UAW demand, which GM rejected, for boosting the 4-cent annual-improvement factor raise to five cents seems a bit miserly, when contrasted with the fabulous profits made by the auto companies in the days of the five-year contracts. Apparently the matter of refusing the corporations any elbow room in the annual-improvement factor clauses to speed up the auto workers has not drawn much attention in top UAW circles. Yet it is precisely this point that is focal in the bitter disputes and wildcat strikes that have intensified in recent months.

The coincidence of the current negotiations and the forthcoming convention gives the convention special weight since it affords the first full opportunity for delegates from all sections of the union to make basic policy, and intervene in the negotiations, which have been strictly a top-level affair to date.

Furthermore, the contract negotiations are the first major ones by the UAW under the current Republican administration.

London Letter Labor Says No To Tory Plan

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Feb. 25—Last year Australia clamped controls on import of goods from the sterling area. Textiles and cars were particularly affected, and this precipitated a minor slump in the former industry.

Soon after this, the "liberal" *Observer* pointed out that, for the exporters' future, it would be better to concentrate on the manufacture of goods which have a higher proportion of skilled work put into them than does textiles, Japan, India and other countries can produce the same textiles more cheaply.

Ever since then there has been a contraction in the British textile industry. Until last Christmas the clothing business was absolutely dead. Many shops went out of business, and there have been continual "sales" since then, in a manner reminiscent of the market-catching in New York.

The situation began to improve a little when the government gave a large contract for clothing for the armed forces, which was by no means urgent.

This month when the Australians announced their relaxation of import restrictions, there was short-lived optimism in the industry. Of the \$52 million extra goods which they were allowing to enter the country, only \$5.2 million were likely to be textiles.

In the meantime the industry has been having internal troubles. As productivity is fairly low, a joint consultation was suggested by the government with a view to working double shifts. This would have the machines working 16 hours per day.

This has been a common practice in Russia and Eastern Europe, where modern machinery is short and labor comparatively plentiful. It decreases the overhead costs.

Labor has been suspicious of the scheme, because surveys have shown that it has only increased productivity by 4 per cent at considerable inconvenience to the workers. Furthermore, it would probably mean that workers would have less opportunity for doing overtime and increasing their wages that way.

Plans for double shifts have been envisaged not only in the textile industry. They are part of the Tories' "Industrial Charter" designed at increasing productivity. They propose, among other things, to increase the incentive to work hard, but how this is to be done they have not yet divulged.

The trade unions—while not prepared to take industrial action against the Tories—are unwilling to give their wholehearted support to any scheme for increasing productivity which will allow greater profits and expansion of monopolies without commensurate advantage to themselves.

McCarthyism and the State Dep't: Whom the Gods Would Destroy . . .

Whom the gods would destroy, they first saddle with McCarthyism. Instead of shrinking in importance for lack of nourishment, with an Eisenhower administration in, the Wisconsin witchhunter has been extending his power with the cowardly toleration of Eisenhower's appointees, to the degree that wide conservative sections of institutionalized public opinion see in him a menace to the most elementary operations of the government.

The capitulation to McCarthyism by Budget Bureau Director Dodge is discussed elsewhere in this issue, together with its consequences. Equally notable this past week has been his continuing effect in straitjacketing government arms concerned with pro-American propaganda abroad, the Voice of America and other State Department operations.

AS LABOR ACTION has pointed out before, the specific "menace of McCarthyism" is, to a considerable extent, an internal problem of the government, unlike the government's own attack on the civil liberties of ordinary citizens.

JOE'S KNIFE

Under the Truman administration, McCarthy's knife was out for the Fair Dealers as such, and it was for this reason that Truman and his co-thinkers were able to get very righteously indignant and oratorical about civil liberties in denouncing him, while at the same time they carried through government purges, "subversive" trials and loyalty-oath persecutions of left political dissidents as well as the Stalinists.

Under the Eisenhower administration, something of the sort still remains primary. It is the government itself which feels the burden of McCarthy's activities more than the man in the street.

Thus, as Jumpin' Joe's hearings on the Voice of America begin, it is plain that, unless his power is broken, even this feeble mouth-piece of Washington's feeble foreign propaganda would be "safe" only if it sticks to broadcasting nursery tales (outside of Little Red Ridinghood).

In the first batch of victims to be put over the McCarthy grill, a right-wing Rumanian émigré, employed for broadcasts to Rumania, accused his head of pro-Communist leanings in censoring his scripts. It appears from details reported in the press that this type considers anything to the left of stark reaction as "communist."

Behind his immediate boss who

You're Invited

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

came under fire, the attack also hit even at Bertram D. Wolfe, who was hired as an adviser because he actually knew something about Russia, as an ex-CPer, ex-Lovestonite and renegade Marxist. Such turncoats, nowadays enthusiastic supporters of American imperialism, should by rights be very useful to their new masters, from a reasonable pro-capitalist point of view; but not as long as McCarthyism holds sway.

"ET CETERA"

A State Department imbroglia publicized in the N. Y. *Times* illustrates graphically the meaning of McCarthyism as a galloping disease of the witchhunting mentality. The story actually begins with McCarthy's attack on the use, by the Voice of America, of Howard Fast's writings for pro-American purposes. Fast is the best-known Stalinist writer, and the Voice officials, not being entirely stupid, sought to use passages from his work which are in contradiction with the fantastically exaggerated charges about America spread by Stalinism over Europe and Asia.

This was put to a stop when McCarthy raised a row about it. The State Department meekly bowed.

One of the consequences was that, to ensure their own safety from the McCarthy dagger, directors of the State Department's information units sent out a directive to their offices ordering them to stop using material by "Communists, fellow travelers, et cetera."

Materials sent out by these State Department organs include publications of various kinds—big daily newspapers, magazines, etc. The publishers were asked to sign certifications guaranteeing that their periodicals contained no material under the three classifica-

tions mentioned—the third being "et cetera."

This third category, however, had to be translated by the department officials, and so their letter concretized it as "other controversial persons."

The result was a flood of inquiries by those affected pointing out that their products were full of material by "controversial persons" (as was the Bible, one pointed out), and besides, what exactly was the test for fellow travelers? Exactly what authors, for example, had to be removed from overseas libraries?

DISMAY

Reed Harris, deputy administrator of the U. S. International Information Administration, explained that he had picked up the taboo against "controversial persons" from the testimony before another congressional committee by State Department official Brad Connors. Connors had told the committee that "controversial persons" would not be used in the department programs.

This directive was finally killed but Secretary of State Dulles and Assistant Secretary of State McCordle are now wondering what to put out in its place.

The dismay of conservative organs like the N. Y. *Times* itself is evident in the situation. The time is long past when opposition to McCarthyism has either been peculiar to liberals or any mark of liberalism. The senator's rambles are utter madness in any reasonable interpretation of American imperialism's interests abroad or at home.

This is no guarantee that they will be stopped: "Whom the gods destroy. . . ." But it will explain why the Eisenhower administration itself may be compelled to bat him off his perch, out of sheer self-preservation.

Oil Cartel Sabotages War Machine to Blackmail Gov't

The Eisenhower administration is now juggling the hot potato baked in oil by its Fair Deal predecessor. The problem is what to do with the case against the world oil cartel, the details and background of which we reported in our January 19 issue.

The new development, reported in his March 2 Washington column by Robert S. Allen, is that the oil monopolists have put an armlock on the government. Faced with the threat of prosecution for violating the anti-trust laws, "they have stopped providing the Pentagon with reports on these stocks of aviation gas available throughout the world."

"This is crucial military information," explains the columnist. "It is essential for operations and planning. The Joint Chiefs are vehemently insisting that the way

be cleared for the immediate resumption of these key oil reports. The Joint Chiefs want the anti-monopoly case scrapped. They are vigorously supported by the State Department."

That lineup is not new. The military and State have been, from the very beginning, for giving the cartel its head. A report by the Federal Trade Commission exposed the exorbitant profit-making and monopolistic practices of the oil barons but the Truman administration suppressed it—until it was finally released, in censored form, in the middle of last year's election campaign, as a political maneuver. Then in January the same Truman administration, as one of its last acts, offered to withdraw its criminal charges against the cartel on the basis of a deal. The issue has been hanging

fire since then.

Allen's report means that the oil monopolists are perfectly willing to sabotage "national defense," the Korean war, the interests of "our boys over there," and all the other patriotic shibboleths which they invoke so fiercely to break strikes in wartime or cheer on persecution of alleged "subversives"—provided that doing so is in the higher interests of their own profits.

Such sabotage operations and "strikes of capital"—to hold up the government—are well known from both the Second World War and the First. They have usually been successful since the government has little alternative except to yield, in order to get its war needs without delay, since it is unwilling to use any big stick against big finance capital.

Not only that but it has usually cooperated with the capitalist blackmailers to keep the holdup secret, since it would "hurt morale" if known by the cannon-fodder who are drafted to fill the foxholes at something less than the salary of a cartel executive.

It would be surprising if the Eisenhower administration failed to follow this pattern again, in this case, in spite of the excellent reasons from its own standpoint for insisting that the oil barons do some sacrificing for the sake of its own class's war.

Don't miss a single week of

LABOR ACTION

A sub is only \$2 a year!

A Trade-Unionist Stands Up in Stalinland: 'I Represent the Thousands of Slaves...'

By GEORGE BENDA

When the Communist Party took over five years ago in Czechoslovakia, the Czech workers' movement was widely written off as a net loss. It was not clear then how the workers would overcome the control of the state's yellow "trade-unionism" and how they would behave politically without the leadership of a socialist party. The future seemed as black as an Orwellian chamber of horrors.

During the years 1949-50, however, signs multiplied of a divorce between the workers and the regime that had come to power after using them as movie extras in its coup. But for a long time nothing more than "passive resistance" or "sabotage" without any inner dynamics was admitted as the only realistic possibility. "Organized resistance" was thought of exclusively in terms of secret, conspiratorial circles or of Robin Hood detachments in the Slovak mountains.

It would have seemed illusory to hope for a transformation of the official "unions" from a strait-jacket into a tool of the workers' movement. Elections were practically of the 99 per cent kind and the most favorable perspective visualized was a long-lasting torpor of the trade-union organs.

CONCESSION

Then, in the fall of 1951 came the startling news of a new kind of semi-free secret election of plant trade-union officers, with a single list of candidates, it is true, but with the possibility of crossing out names and replacing them by others. Was the working class so domesticated that the regime could afford, without fear for itself, the gift of democratic-seeming elections?

Well, it was possible to view this surprising move as a voluntary gift only if one had not followed closely the previous stubborn, day-by-day struggle of the workers with their immediate supervisors; if one was willing to dismiss as insignificant, for example, an impromptu visit of a miners' delegation in the presidential office, voicing opposition to a lengthening of the working week, which occurred in March 1951; if one was inclined to depreciate the triumph of the Czech workers over official Stakhanovism, which was put into the attic of worn-out slogans and campaign failures in the spring of 1951.

If one takes into account all these scattered signs of spontaneous opposition it becomes evident that the quasi-free trade-union shop and plant elections constituted a concession by the regime. Further proof is Zapotocky's indignant reproach, made to the trade-union secretaries at that time: "Why did you grant secret elections if you were unable to guarantee them politically?"

PRESSURE

Zapotocky was right to sense trouble ahead. A significant silence reigned about the results of the elections. Only a very short and embarrassed notice on the last page of *Prace* showed that the official candidates lost out more often in the large plants than in the small ones. There followed a curious remark that "the bankrupt reformist officers tried to sneak into positions of the plant groups of the ROH [official unions]. However, their attempts were in vain." (*Prace*, November 29, 1951.)

In the course of 1952 the view of the battlefield gradually cleared. The new shop stewards and plant officers had plenty of occasion to show what stuff they were made of. They started the "inadmissible pressure" of which Zapotocky repeatedly complained during and after the summer months.

The "inadmissible pressure" in question consists simply of attempts at collective bargaining on the plant level. The plant directors were presented with concerted

wage demands for which the trade-union officers, often seconded by officers of the plant CP cells, made themselves spokesmen.

How broad this movement was is hard to assess with the meager information available. But each time particular cases reported by the press are corroborated by declarations of the highest officials of the regime, it is safe to conclude that the phenomenon is more than local.

One of the recent typical declarations on the results of the wage drive runs as follows: "It is necessary to stop the practice of different [wage] superstructures, and loosening of all norms by means of different coefficients, all this done in order to obtain a false peace and reconciliation in the shops." (*Prace*, Dec. 2, 1952.)

THE CASE OF ZIDEK

In order to give an idea of the extent of the gains in nominal wages let us quote another statement: In one plant "they have a table of additional coefficients which automatically raise the time fixed [by the time-and-motion study] by 60-70 per cent in the steel mill, by 50-60 per cent in the moulding department..."

In other plants "loosening coefficients are used which are still higher" (*Rude Pravo* Dec. 23, 1952.)

This shows how much less the worker would get if the official policy of "wages-according-to-performance" were not blown to pieces by the "inadmissible pressure."

Thanks to the official trade-union paper *Prace* we are enabled to reconstruct how the "inadmissible pressure" works in practice. The issue of December 14, 1952 furnished a vivid close-up of one of the new-style trade-union officers elected in the fall of 1951, who undertook the difficult part of working-class spokesmen against a totalitarian regime.

The scene is an iron foundry of the Ostrava mining and metallurgy region, the hero the head of the plant trade-union organ, denoted for his activities by intervention from above.

"Adolf Zidek... did not accept any criticism, he did not acknowledge the leading role of the CP in our country, and therefore not in the 'Stalingrad' iron foundry either. If he was to explain in the plant council [the plant trade-union organ] some of the resolu-

tions of the enterprise's party committee he swept it aside, or he excused himself: 'Those are people we did not vote for, we from the plant council. How are we then to submit to the party committee?' And if he had to acquaint workingmen with some resolution of the party committee he did it approximately in this way: 'Well, I'll present it in the presidium of the plant council as being a resolution of the party committee, and that's that. I myself am not convinced the resolution is right, and therefore I will not convince other people of it.'

"In his work, Adolf Zidek opposed himself to the criticism by the party committee. Comrades drew his attention, for instance, to the fact that the plant council cannot replace the plant management. But the head [of the plant council] refused to see it. On the contrary he issued orders which were in fundamental contradiction to the orders of the plant director so that more than once some workingmen did not know whom to obey..."

"POPULAR POLICY"

"After one session of the committee of the plant CP organization where once more he refused to accept a resolution he started a new method: He invited individual members of the committee to the plant council, tried to persuade them in advance, tried to gain them 'for his side'... The president's way of acting had the result of creating a double-track situation in the plant..."

"If the member of the party committee, Lubomir Bilek, came to visit the plant council, Adolf Zidek received him this way: 'Welcome, comrade, among us workers!' Thus

the former president of the plant council wanted to show that he was a spokesman for workers, that he defended their interests... He tried to gain the workers' sympathy by a popular policy. He often acted as if we did not live in a people's democracy but in a country governed by capitalists because his relationship to the plant administration and to the plant CP organization was as if they were capitalist owners of the factory against which it is necessary to defend the workers.'

WORKERS' DEFENDER

"An example of such a popular policy of 'defense of workers' interests' was Zidek's behavior during discussions on whether overtime earnings of rolling-mill workers, who work less than 48 hours on the whole, were to be subject to taxes. Normally, wages for work up to 48 hours are supposed to be taxed. [It is a common practice in Czechoslovak industry to combine absenteeism with overtime work on other days. Since overtime work is better paid and tax-free the workers are thus able to gain some leisure without losing money.—G. B.]

"The party committee decided that the matter should be discussed first by the officers and by the members of the CP so that all of them realize the measure is correct and so that they could explain the principle to others and persuade them. The meeting of officers took place. Almost all comrades agreed but suddenly the president of the plant council stood up and asked for negotiations with higher organs of the ROH [the official unions], so that the rolling-mill workers won't get their overtime taxed. Before the

meeting he expressed the opinion that it was necessary to 'struggle' with the ministry of mills and ore mines until the enterprise 'wins its cause'...

"NOT ALONE"

"When, due to poor organization of delivery, the local shops... lacked potatoes the president of the plant council came to the 'National Committee' in Mistek [the district town] and started to threaten: 'If there aren't any potatoes in the shops I'll load a car full of workers and will put some order into the National Committee...' [The so-called "national committees" are organs of the civil administration.—G. B.]

"At other times he intervened with the prosecutor of the district court and threatened to provoke a strike in the plant if he did not obtain satisfaction of his demands... [It seems probable that the intervention concerned some of the trials against absentee workers staged in factories throughout the past year.—G.B.]

"As an opportunist he saw all the wage-workers on one side and the CP and the government on the other, which were in his eyes in some kind of an imaginary conflict, and he himself, Zidek, was born in order to 'defend' workers against the party and against the workers' government..."

"He crowned his opportunism... permitting himself to say: 'I represent the thousands of slaves in our plant.'

"Zidek was not alone in committing errors of this kind..."

We know of no other document which gives a better insight into the concrete forms of the class struggle in Czechoslovakia today.

ISL FUND DRIVE

The Tempo Is Too Slow—Speed Up!

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

A total payment of practically \$600 this week raised the total drive income to \$2400 or 20.8 per cent of the national quota.

This week saw BUFFALO enter the lists with a contribution of \$200 to put it in fourth position in the standings, ahead of cities that failed to keep up their first week's payments. As a matter of fact, only four areas responded at all in time for this report. This should mean a considerable jump upward next week, and we are waiting to hear from those areas which have as yet to send in their first contributions.

The biggest drop came from NEW YORK which sent in a total of \$186.50, which is considerably below their previous average. It is true that New York carries the big burden in the campaign, but if it is to run a successful drive, it will have to

average much larger weekly payments than the one recorded this week.

The SYL, which is usually the star of our Fund Drive, is lagging way behind the pace it set last year. Our youth also have accepted a large quota, but they are confident in achieving the goal which they have themselves set. Don Harris, the SYL secretary, tells us that there is no need to worry about the Socialist Youth League. He says he has facts and figures to prove that the SYL will most certainly complete its quota, and very likely surpass it. Challenges are quite in order, we are advised. Are there bidders?

We don't know what else we can say this week after L. G. Smith's excellent appeal in LABOR ACTION of March 2. He hit it right on the head. There is little point in adding to his remarks. All we can do is urge you not to procrastinate in sending in the contributions you have already decided to make; or if you are still wondering about the matter and debating it with yourself, don't overdo it.

A friend of mine used to say, when he wanted something done: "Get off the dime!" All we can say now is to repeat his slogan: "Get off it—and we don't mean just a dime, either!"

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Per Cent
TOTAL	\$11,500	\$2403	20.8
Pittsburgh	150	61	40
Streator	25	10	40
New York	4,000	1261	31.5
Buffalo	650	200	30.7
Cleveland	200	50	25
Detroit	500	100	20
SYL	1,250	214	17.1
Oakland	500	75	15
Los Angeles	600	80	13
Philadelphia	250	32	12.8
Chicago	1,800	225	12.5
General	1,075	95	8.8
Akron	50	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0
Newark	250	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Reading	50	0	0
Seattle	200	0	0
St. Louis	25	0	0

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL 1953 Fund Drive.

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

MARXISM for TODAY

The Fallacy of Historical Parallelism

By HAL DRAPER

The fallacy of historical parallelism is as rife today as it ever was. In fact, only in our times has there been an historian who was greeted with awed praise for his contribution to historiography in spite of the fact that he traded on this primitive method almost exclusively, at bottom.

That was Arnold Toynbee, author of six tomes on *A Study of History*, a work which was justly described as weighty if one takes the epithet literally. In essence Toynbee's method depended on the marshaling of superficial parallels in various historical epochs, together with an attempt to systematize these parallels into recurring patterns.

We must add to this, as is often true of these parallel-collectors who write history books, that the parallels, while superficial, were nonetheless real ones, nonetheless interesting quite frequently, nonetheless even instructive in a limited framework; the work becomes superficial, however, when the interesting collection of parallels is used to try to EXPLAIN the course of history in connection with the solution of fundamental historical problems.

METHODOLOGY

While Toynbee parlayed this method into an international reputation, others have made wide use of it. One of the most interesting examples I know of was an attempt to make a guide to contemporary American politics out of the history of the Roman Empire.

This was *The New Deal in Old Rome* by Henry J. Haskell; its thesis was that Roosevelt's New Deal had already been tried way back then, and that it had not only been found wanting but indeed had been the cause of the fall of Rome! This he "proved" in detail ranging from the phenomena of Roman bureaucratization to the OPA established by the Emperor Diocletian.

Now the thesis itself may sound wide of the mark, and it is, but the author had his eye fixed on the superficial collection of parallels he amassed in such scholarly fashion, and merely assumed that where there was such common phenomena there also had to be a common explanation and inevitably common consequences. That is an error in methodology, in this case an unexamined methodology.

HISTORIANS' SPORT

But it is not true that history ever simply repeats itself. The indubitable kernel of truth in the saying can be easily wrung dry, and after the contents are thoroughly exhausted, what remains is this: when history seems to be trying to repeat itself, in a quite different social conjuncture, it

finds itself really doing something quite different.

Thus a columnist recently discussed the problems of NATO by telling the story of the ancient league of Greek city-states organized by Athens for defense against the menace of the Persians: a very suggestive parallel which tells one absolutely nothing about the most important questions still to be answered about NATO.

It's a popular historians' sport, however, and not without value if kept within its limits. In this respect it is not unlike some modern historians' penchant for psychoanalyzing their subjects: here too one can enrich history with insights into certain aspects; it becomes self-defeating only when substituted for a social-political analysis of the mainsprings of historical events.

Each day has its indicated victim for the game; in the '30s it was the New Deal-Rome parallel for many others besides Haskell. In our day it is often Russia.

The game consists in "proving" that the Stalinist Russia of today is still "fundamentally" the same as the Russia of the tsars, if not indeed of the Russia of the ages. For those writers who may consciously hold the crude view that "national characters" are eternal and determine the oneness of a nation's history, this is at least a legitimate extension of their theory. For others, it may merely be a trap into which they fall.

POLITICAL SIDE

It is a thesis, however, with political (not only theoretical) implications. In July 1951 a group of Russian émigrés (right-wing anti-Stalinists) felt justly called on to write a letter to the *N. Y. Times* denouncing an editorial which had appeared in that paper; the editorial had broadly implied that Stalin was merely continuing the work of the tsars and led to the conclusion that the enemy was "Russia," not the Stalinist regime. While these right-wing émigrés replied in part by white-washing the tsarist regime, they had an important point in combating any theories which tended to fix an undifferentiated "Russia" in the popular eye as the national enemy.

It is too bad, then, that a recently published book of great interest is weakened by this fallacy of historical parallelism as applied to Stalinist and tsarist Russia. It is the book which we have given some space in three issues because of its other contents: *The Russian*

Menace to Europe, a collection of writings by Marx and Engels, edited by Paul W. Blackstock and Bert F. Hoselitz. Here, and apart from the Marx-Engels material, we want to turn our attention to the introduction by the editors.

It is true, as we also wrote, that Marx and Engels were among the most acute political commentators of their day; but Blackstock and Hoselitz make out too good a case for them; they would have been the first to reject it.

THEIR CLAIM

For the editors let down all inhibitions in playing the pure-and-simple parallel game; and here is what they finally come out claiming:

"The conclusion therefore is warranted that the analysis made by Marx and Engels of the external as well as the internal policies and socio-political trends of Czarist Russia are fully applicable to similar aspects of Stalinist Russia. The main provisional and final objectives of Russian foreign policy have not been altered and only relatively small and incidental tactical features have changed. This is, of course, to be expected, as a consequence of technological and economic advancement inside and outside of Russia and of the altered power-constellations which have evolved in the last hundred years. What is truly significant, and perhaps surprising to some, is the very direct applicability of Marx's and Engels' analyses of Russian foreign policy during the 19th century to present-day conditions."

And more of this. It is "due to . . . the intrinsically unchanging nature of Russian foreign policy," they say, for example.

"PARALLELS"

Now one need not at all quarrel with the specific examples they have cited of "parallels" between the policy and methods of the tsars and of Stalin. I have myself checked a longer list, from the same book, than the examples they give in their introduction.

Nevertheless these examples, even if doubled in number, would not and do not add up to the claim they make, which does Marx and Engels too much honor and too little honor at the same time.

So the tsars also used foreign mercenaries for their purposes. So the tsars excelled at playing their enemies against each other. So the tsars' methods included "bribery, deceit, the exploiting of disunity (often artificially incited or maintained)." So the tsars also made "superficial tactical alterations" according to shifts in the power-complexes among their allies and foes. So the tsars also aimed at Constantinople and the Straits, and at world domination. So the tsars used falsehood, pretense, shows of sham strength, naked force, intrigue, corruption, infiltration tactics, Trojan Horse techniques, etc., etc.

MARX'S VIEW

The editors neglect to remind the reader (though of course they know) that about 80 per cent of the parallels they point to could be duplicated in the case of many other imperialist world powers. That leaves 20 per cent for another factor which Marx himself pointed out—in a passage included in the very book of Blackstock and Hoselitz.

"The unity, then, in the objects of Russian policy, is given by her historical past, by her geographical conditions, and by her necessity of gaining open seaports in the Archipelago as in the Baltic, if she wants to maintain her supremacy in Europe." (Page 168.)

During the period that Marx is discussing there was also an infinitely greater degree of social continuity in the Russian system than there is when one compares

the tsarist regime with the modern Stalinist society of bureaucratic collectivism. Yet Russia's geographical situation and its consequences is a continuing source of continuity about much of Russian imperialist policy, whether under Stalin or the tsars. And the factor of national tradition is not to be neglected even when a social system has changed.

But unlike his editors, Marx knew where to draw the line. In another place he is discussing the parallel between the Roman proletariat and the modern proletariat under capitalism. This passage winds up:

"Thus events which were strikingly analogous, but which took place in different historical circumstances, led to entirely dissimilar results."

"By studying each one of these evolutions separately, and by comparing them afterwards, the key to these phenomena can easily be found, but one will never succeed with the open sesame of an historico-philosophical theory, of which the supreme virtue consists in its being supra-historical." (Page 218.)

THE BIG DIFFERENCE

This is why the editors' parallels do not add up to their claims. It is rather amazing that they can write that "only relatively small and incidental tactical features have changed."

The big modern fact about Stalinist foreign policy is its ability to use a weapon entirely alien to tsarism: mass dynamic anti-capitalist movements in the lands of its imperialist rivals, movements which are under its domination. It is simply playing with historical curiosities to compare this with the tsarist attempt to use the Pan-Slavic appeal.

And this difference—a difference as big as a chasm—is due to the new social nature of the Stalinist tyranny, which is anti-capitalist as well as anti-working class.

Furthermore, the social motives of Stalinist imperialism are not those of feudal or semi-feudal tsarism. The consequences of Russian victory in any imperialist ventures are not the same under totalitarian Stalinism as under tsarism. Vital inherent contradictions and weaknesses of Stalinist imperialism (cf. Titoism, for example) are not the same as for tsarist imperialism. In brief, this is not the 19th century.

FALL IN THE TRAP

Blackstock and Hoselitz keep reiterating and insisting on this identification of Stalinist imperialism with tsarist policy. Speaking of Pan-Slavism, they write: "Let no one pretend, that the case which Engels had in mind [in attacking the Pan-Slav weapon of tsarism] and the actual policies of Stalinism are fundamentally different." (My emphasis.) Of course, Stalinism has made a Pan-Slav appeal also—it is one of the continuing gambits of Russian imperialism.

But the policies are different precisely in their "fundamentals," their bases, roots, drives, consequences, contradictions, and main weapon.

To take a last example of the editors' insistence on this point: They quote a Stalinist Russian historian who attacks Toynbee because, "to his [Toynbee's] way of thinking the present contradictions between the U. S. and the USSR are a recrudescence in a new form of the struggle waged between Rome and Byzantium." And the editors remark that this Toynbee thesis was "developed at an earlier date by Marx himself."

This is the best example of how the editors fall into the trap of "supra-historicism," and also, as a matter of fact, into the trap set by the Stalinist professor. Marx, to be sure, discussed the struggle between tsarist Russia and the West in connection with the Rome-Byzantium struggle—but, without giving the matter another thought, the editors apply this to "the present contradictions between the U. S. and the USSR." A whole social system has been transformed, but what of that? Russia is Russia is Russia. . . .

POSSIBLE EXPLANATION

We hasten to add that we are quite aware of two possible reasons why the editors write this way. They think, in the first place, that they are saying the needful to polemicize against the Stalinist apologists who draw a fundamental line of distinction between Stalinist and Tsarist Russia. Naturally the Stalinists do this to whitewash themselves.

But the fundamental line exists. It is, however, not between an imperialism and an anti-imperialism, as the Moscow line goes, but between two quite different types of imperialism, based on two quite different social systems. This is what the editors tend to forget, or at least they write as if they do.

The second reason, we imagine, is that the editors were desirous of pointing out that a study of Marx and Engels' analysis of Russia is relevant to our times, that their book is not simply a collection of musty historical documents. They pushed this effort too hard.

AN AX TO GRIND

But a different suspicion may enter our minds when, in the course of their introduction, the editors make another use of their supra-historical approach. It is their own attempt (pioneered by the Second International in 1914 when it collapsed in social-chauvinism) to use Marx's position on war against Russia a century ago to justify a pro-war position today. Or so they seem to imply: speaking of Marx's call for revolutionary war against the tsarist reaction, they write that his views—

" . . . are proof that he clearly preferred the capitalist-democracies of Western Europe to the barbarian tyranny of Russian Czarism. This was not a policy of choosing the lesser of two evils, but a clear recognition that the chief aim which he favored, the ultimate abolition of human exploitation, was possible in the one but not possible in the other system."

Now the editors are no doubt entitled to have their own position on the present-day world struggle, including one of support to the Western imperialist camp; but it is not good scholarship to foist the responsibility for this onto the defenseless body of Marx. Not a word in the paragraph we have just quoted has anything to do with Marx's motives for his position on war with Russia a century ago. And the proof of it is that there is not a line in the collected writings which the editors themselves present, in their own book, which resembles their assertion.

At this point we cannot conceal our opinion that the editors' introduction to the work is something less than a reliable guide to a reader's appreciation of the contents. On the other hand, it takes up only 17 pages. The Marxist student will find the most interesting material presented by the editors in the back of the book under the head "Bibliographical Notes and Editors' Comments."



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 17, No. 10

March 9, 1953

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, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL
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.

SYL Book Bazaar

POLITICS, FICTION, SCIENCE, etc.
at give-away prices!

Friday, March 20
from 8:30 p.m. on

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Sidney Hook, Logic, and Joe McCarthy

I — Sidney Hook Meets Louis Hacker in Debate on Communist Teachers

By PHILIP COBEN

On February 12 Professor Sidney Hook met Dean Louis Hacker in combat on the question "Should Communists be allowed to teach?" and the sparks flew.

Hook and Hacker each had a second along. The occasion was a panel discussion on academic freedom sponsored by the American Civil Liberties Union, as part of a conference on the purge system spreading over the country. Lined up on the affirmative with Hacker was Professor H. H. Wilson of Princeton, and ranged with Hook was James Marshall, long a member of the New York Board of Education.

Since we are willing to assume that most of our readers are already well acquainted with the main issues in this problem, which has often been discussed in LABOR ACTION, we will not rehash the whole discussion but put the spotlight on two aspects of it especially.

The first of these is Hook's reputation as a logical thinker and analyst, a reputation he enjoys among many who disagree with his views. Hook himself was not at all backward about putting himself forward in this role. As the last speaker in the panel presentations, he began by informing the audience that others (meaning the previous panelists) substituted "rhetoric for analysis" on this question. He was going to confine himself to analysis, eschewing rhetoric and demagoguery. It was very considerate of him thus to prepare the audience to hear a brilliant display of tight reasoning, even if the outcome was somewhat less than brilliant.

The second is a question which Hook raised only peripherally in the discussion: the difference between Sidney Hook and Joe McCarthy.

Louis Hacker's Stand

Professor Wilson was not much of a help as the initial speaker. Though he is a leading light of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and a writer for the *Nation*, and though he had made vigorous speeches at the recent conference of the ECLC, in this panel on academic freedom he just missed saying absolutely nothing on the subject which was the almost exclusive concentration of all the others, Communist teachers.

His presentation consisted of excellent but thoroughly abstract generalities about academic freedom, even when he wound up with some remarks about "radicals" and "conformists" in society. Only in his summary minutes, after all the heated controversy, did he make a relevant (and quite apt) remark about the real subject of the afternoon. To put it bluntly, he played dead—why, we do not know, unless his strategy was simply to let Hacker carry the ball.

Louis Hacker was the bombshell of the afternoon. An ex-Marxist like Hook, but with quite conservative political and social views nowadays, Hacker at any rate was vigorous and militant on the issue of academic freedom and of the threat to academic freedom posed by the congressional witchhunters as well as by men like—Sidney Hook.

The heat mounted between these two up to the minute the chairman banged the gavel to adjourn the session. Hacker was "appalled" by Hook's argumentation, he said, and in his last word warned against "the Savanarolas who light the fagots but who will be burned themselves." With this the gavel fell, and as the audience milled out, Professor Hook could be heard, in an unphilosophic but towering rage (with Hacker's buttonhole all but in his fist), demanding to know "Who the hell do you mean by the Savanarolas?!"—Or perhaps it was "Whom the hell do you mean. . . ."

However, since Hook had previously plainly and publicly implied that Hacker was demagogic and a fuzzy rhetorician (neither of these being obscure historical references to Italian heresy-hunters), he can scarcely complain of injured dignity, we imagine.

Hacker had introduced his talk by saying that he was presenting "the Tory position" of "the extreme right," a position "for all times and all places," "equally germane to Socrates and today"—thereby referring to the conservative philosophic approach through which he came to his position on the current problem. For him, the universities should be considered as corporate bodies (in something like the medieval sense) with corporate responsibilities, including self-policing; this view Hacker also applies to the capitalist structures of today. But after this brief exposition of his socially conservative approach, he proceeded to attack the contemporary threat to education.

We are seeing today, he said, a revival of the trial of Socrates. The charge is NOT only Communism. There are the loyalty oaths and the straitjacket on the 5th Amendment. Universities will be in peril if they have to discharge instructors solely because they are or have been Communists . . . or Deweyans, or Freudians, he added. He presented a clear positive view: Teachers who abuse the interests of the classroom to indoctrinate, or who are not free intellectual agents, can be dealt with as incompetent. Our criterion must be competence, he stressed, while making clear that there can be, in given cases, a real connection between a teacher's Stalinist (or other) views and his competence.

Hacker's line, in our view, presented to Hook the central question which he has never yet taken up in his numerous articles on the subject. Here he had an opportunity to practice his penchant for analysis rather than rhetoric.

For Hook's main cry is this: a teacher who is a Communist Party member cannot be an intellectual free agent and therefore can be automatically considered unfit to teach without an inquiry into any other aspect of

his work. If his teaching is bound by the decrees of a Central Committee, which he is compelled to parrot, he cannot "seek the truth without any other control except the control and authority of those rational methods by which truth is established" (his definition for the basis of academic freedom).

Hacker's position (and incidentally, our own too) grants that a teacher who is such a parrot of intellectual decrees-from-above is unfit. But the core of Hook's view is that this criterion is automatically fulfilled by the fact of CP membership. And this is what he has never analyzed. Unless you call the following an "analysis":

He is talking about "members of the CP under intellectual discipline," he explained; but "how about 'blunderers' in the CP?" How about teachers who join the CP for one reason or another but who are not willing to, and in fact do not, parrot the intellectual decrees on any subject handed down to them? He raised this question in this way himself; he did not deny that there were such CP teachers.

Inference by a Philosopher

And his answer? It was simply and solely to quote Earl Browder's testimony at some hearing (at the time when Browder was still American CP leader) to the effect that the CP has a Central Control Commission to supervise all members and that "a member must carry out all decisions and orders."

Then with a coruscating display of that brilliant logic for which he is noted, he merely added in so many words: "From this I infer that any member of the CP is *prima facie* unfit to teach."

Some freshman in an NYU philosophy class ought to submit this as an exercise in logic for his professor. What Hook has proved, of course, if proof was necessary, is that it is the aim of the CP to have members conform to all "decisions and orders." Assuming that this applies equally—in aim, if not in practice—to intellectual discipline, Hook has not yet taken up the real problem about the "blunderer" who joined the CP.

Is he contending perhaps that CP discipline is so rigidly, infallibly, invariably and immediately enforced upon all its teachers as to make the existence of such a "blunderer" impossible? Is he contending that such a "blunderer" would be promptly or even soon expelled, or that he will quit equally promptly?

Hook did not carry his analysis this far for the excellent reason that he knows this *doesn't actually happen*. His paltry quotation from Browder, flung before the audience with the air of a prosecutor seeking to impress a Smith Act jury with a "document," is a piece of deception.

What actually happens is that a teacher usually joins the CP (in this country, not in Russia) because, as a free intellectual agent, he agrees with or thinks he agrees with the ideas of the CP—or even, as happens often enough, convinces himself that he agrees with a sufficient number of the CP's political ideas to warrant membership in spite of any other reservations.

This writer, like others, has known many a CP teacher who obviously has his reservations about the official Stalinist line on intellectual questions, often precisely the questions in his own field. This is a not-infrequent type.

Most typically, CP teachers in this country are not (necessarily) mere robots of the party line but have come to accept Stalinist views (to whatever extent) because of their own unfortunate intellectual development. Some may break with the party eventually; some may be expelled eventually; others may increasingly subordinate their doubts and deviations to party orthodoxy and become intellectual robots; etc. It is this real situation, with its plurality of possibilities, which that brilliant analyst Sidney Hook solves with a quotation from Browder about the party Central Commission . . . and meets with the threat of the government policeman's club.

Any reader is entitled to believe, if he wishes, that Hook nevertheless has valid grounds for his position; as we mentioned, we are not reviewing the whole question here. We are putting the spotlight on his statement: "From this I infer . . ."—an attempt at an inference which is involved in the underpinnings of his whole position.

"Indoctrination"

But this is not all, by any means. Skilled professors of philosophy, especially those widely admired for lucid thinking and brilliant analysis, are not supposed to shift from one position to another, in the course of argumentation, while allowing their philosophically untrained auditors to believe that they are arguing for the same position all the while. But this is what Chairman Hook of the NYU Philosophy Department does.

We have explained that he bases his position on the unfitness of a teacher who allows his intellectual views to be determined by outside control; that he equates this automatically with CP membership; and that he thus comes out with the second equation: CP membership = unfitness to teach.

And then half the time we find him talking about INDOCTRINATION, as if he were still discussing the same point. But a confusion of this sort would not merit an A in one of Professor Hook's classes.

There is no doubt that "indoctrination" is an evil to be combated in teaching. It is the effort of a teacher to imbue students with a particular set of conclusions (usually his own, naturally) instead of using the classroom to lead them to think for themselves and grow in in-

dependent power of analysis. It implies partisan and one-sided presentation of material.

Now this is indubitably an evil and a count against a teacher's fitness, but (first of all) it is a *different* evil from the one we discussed above.

A teacher who himself has a firmly held point of view on anything (and this is no evil at all, except in the eyes of mushheads) may or may not indoctrinate. If he understands his job as a teacher and is loyal to the ideals of the profession, he will not. On the other hand, a teacher who is immune to the temptation *because* he has no convictions of his own does not thereby become any model for others.

CP teachers have convictions; no doubt. So do socialist teachers. So do Deweyan philosophers. So do reactionary teachers. And liberal teachers. (Personally we have more often seen cases of crass indoctrination in the classroom from university liberals and reactionaries than from any to their left or from Stalinists.)

Does CP membership automatically mean a teacher who indoctrinates, in the objectionable and derogatory sense? Here again Hook quotes the CP as officially urging what amounts to indoctrination. But did Professor X, a Stalinist, DO this? Did Instructor Y?

The fact is that many typical CP teachers (and we are not even speaking of the "blunderers" at this point) do not do so—and do not even feel the need to do so, insofar as they are honestly convinced of the strength of their own views when stacked up against others; that is, they do not do so any more than Sidney Hook himself. That is not an unimportant qualification for the statement.

We mention Hook because he provided the occasion for the comparison himself. He told the ACLU audience that he likes to spend some time presenting his students with the case for Marxism, and then (he said) when the students are getting to feel perhaps that there's something to it, he swoops down to systematically pick the case for Marxism apart item by item.

Slanting the Issue

Is this indoctrination or no, as Hook describes it? That is no easy question.

Does Hook *really* try to present the case for Marxism as effectively and convincingly as when he starts working in rebuttal? Does he present also the replies to his own rebuttals? Judging by his later works on Marxism, no Marxist would have any illusions about his objectivity.

Would Hook consider it "indoctrination" if a Marxist teacher were to reverse his procedure: present the case against Marxism and then work away at clearing away every objection to it in the minds of his students . . .? Would he consider it indoctrination if a Stalinist teacher followed his procedure (no worse, no better) in favor of a sympathetic view of Russia?

Obviously these are difficult questions. It is not we who propose a pat answer. It is Sidney Hook who proposes to solve this question with the prosecutor's formula and the policeman's club: CP member = indoctrinator, automatically, inevitably, without exception. And he does not even inform his auditors, whom he has promised analysis rather than rhetoric, that he is thereby also proposing to solve a different question from the one he began with!

Professor of Philosophy Hook not only performs sleight-of-hand with different questions, he also uses different terms as if they were thoroughly interchangeable. Such is the case with the terms "indoctrinate," "slant," and "angle."

We have never seen a professor, who does have firm convictions on a question he was discussing, who failed to "slant" his discussion along the lines of his own views, to a greater or lesser extent. Perhaps some reader has met such a paragon; that is quite possible. Not infrequently such slanting is done quite consciously and openly; perhaps more often than not it takes place unconsciously—as it will in any case.

Is this "indoctrination"? Not by a long shot! or at any rate, not necessarily. As Louis Hacker and others have argued in part, one reason a university desires to have teachers of different schools of thought on its faculty (other things being equal) is to expose the student to varying opinions. That is, the university *expects* slanting. In a sense which we hope will be understood in this context, it is even of positive value in the educational process.

These should be important distinctions for a brilliant analyst. Yet time and again, in the course of the discussion, Professor Hook used "slant" as equivalent to "indoctrinate."

What is the polemical effect of this prestidigitation? The auditor naturally agrees that CP teachers can be expected to "slant" their teaching. It may be the exceptional header who stops to think, as Hook's talk flows on, that most other teachers can be expected to "slant" also. From this agreement on "slanting" he is led to keep on nodding his head mentally when Hook shifts the gear over to "indoctrinating," using the latter word in the context of its objectionable meaning. He has been deceived.

Now we are by no means of the opinion that this deception by Hook is deliberate or planned. In fact, it may be argued that what we have just seen is a process by which Hook has himself "slanted" his argument without necessarily being aware of it! But much as this may be true, it is hardly entirely forgivable in the case of the chairman of the NYU Philosophy Department who sneered at his fellow panelists as rhetoricians rather than analysts. . . .

(Continued next week)

"Dear Comrade-Assassins . . ."

The Fourth-International Trotskyists Appeal to the Chinese Stalinists

By ROBERT MAGNUS

Under the influence of the post-war expansion of Stalinist power, the self-styled "official Trotskyists" of the Fourth International went over from "defense of the Soviet Union" to a position of support to the whole Stalinist camp in its struggle for domination of the world.

Another and notable demonstration of its present line is given in the February 23 issue of the *Militant*, organ of Cannon's Socialist Workers Party in this country, which reprints an appeal by the "International Executive Committee of the Fourth International" to the "Central Committee and members of the Chinese Communist Party."

Although many things about the present Chinese regime and its future evolution may be obscure, one fact is absolutely clear: the Chinese Stalinists will act toward any and all opponents of their regime exactly as totalitarian Stalinism has acted all over the world for the last thirty years. They will round up every last oppositionist, no matter how loyal, mild, courteous, he is, no matter if he bends his spine in eighteen different directions, takes off his hat, curtsies, places his nose in the unobliging earth, eats mud or worse; they will arrest him and probably execute him and at the very least place him to work in the "progressive" army of slave laborers which daily grows under the Stalinist barbarism.

The evidence of the political-police character of Stalinism, it would seem, has piled up to such mountainous proportions by this time that even the blockheads who run the Fourth International would be able to get the point: *the victory of Stalinism in any country means the complete liquidation of any free labor movement in any and all of its forms.*

But the appeal, which the deep thinkers in the top leadership address to the jailers, wardens and associated slave-drivers who run the Chinese regime, complains that "Once more alarming news comes to us from our Chinese comrades telling of searches, arrests and even executions."

We note parenthetically that the Fourth International does not seem to be at all "alarmed" by the fantastic growth of Stalinist slave armies and the open institution of slave-labor camps all over China.

Addressing itself to the servitors and co-disciples of the Russian bureaucracy and Stalin, the appeal manages to "protect with utmost vigor against these actions which copy the methods used elsewhere against Trotskyists by the servitors and co-disciples of the Soviet bureaucracy and Stalin."

The Paris international committee of the F.I. operates in the grand manner. Instead of declaring its own war on Stalinist barbarism, this organization has transformed itself into a committee for addressing shameless "appeals," ridiculous proposals for "united fronts," and various and assorted bombastic "open letters" to the top leadership of that pitiless enemy of socialist progress—Stalinism! This nincompoopery passes itself off as the "only authentic revolutionary current."

Tearful Whimper

What gives these so-called Trotskyists the colossal impudence to address appeals to the police barbarism of Mao-Tse-tung? The answer is that they are seeking to collect on the unasked-for services they have rendered Stalinism in the post-war years. The appeal mentions these services rendered, proudly and passionately: "The Trotskyists are for the unconditional defense of China against imperialism, as well as for the defense of all the conquests of the Third Chinese Revolution against the actions of the native feudal-capitalists and their agents."

Furthermore: "In all capitalist countries, especially the United States and England, the Trotskyists are conducting a struggle against the imperialist intervention in Korea and China, for recognition of the Mao Tse-tung government, for freedom of trade with China, for help of every kind to the Chinese Revolution." And what is more: "In Ceylon it is the group of Trotskyist deputies who have headed the struggle for trade with China." These pitiful moans are addressed to the Chinese Stalinist regime!

Descending to the depths, the appeal continues: "We leave to history to judge whether this struggle we have conducted, despite the calumnies and persecutions, has been confirmed or not by events. In any case, do you believe that precisely this struggle merits now the extermination of the Trotskyists? Or perhaps that their presence, as living witnesses of your past errors, is now more embarrassing than ever?"

With one stroke of the pen these stalwart "Trotskyists" reduce the long struggle of the Left Opposition, the theoretical contributions of Trotsky, his close and careful study of the evolution of the Stalinist system in an ever more reactionary direction, to an historical difference. Is it possible to conceive of this political whimper coming from the pen of Leon Trotsky? They are tearfully arguing with their assassins.

If the "revolution" (this is their jovial term for the transformation of China into a Stalinist slave state), has conquered in China without the active intervention of these Trotskyists, what now? The appeal is very explicit on this point: "Today the Chinese Trotskyists, after the victory in fact over the feudal-capitalists and the establishment in fact of a power which claims to be of the working class are ready to work loyally and openly in the framework of proletarian democracy for the completion of the revolution."

Today, almost twenty years after Trotsky declared that it was impossible to reform the Comintern or the Russian regime, that the Stalin gang had to be over-

thrown by revolution, that Stalinism throttled every kind of democracy, much less established "proletarian democracy"—today, these people send such a letter to the top committee of the Chinese Stalinist party.

This is not all, however: "The Chinese Trotskyists will not range themselves against this leadership. They will continue to defend it, while at the same time working toward the following ends. . . ."

These ends include the following absolutely capitulatory statements: "That the party of the proletariat [these idiots mean the anti-socialist, anti-working class party of Stalinism] function democratically and allow free manifestations of tendencies which may on occasion [sic] be in disagreement with the line of the leadership"; "that the trade unions remain primarily organizations for the defense of the rights of the workers, that they may on occasion [!] be in opposition to the state that claims to be the proletarian state. . . ."

The logic of politics is much stronger than all of

the noise, bombast, and officialness which can be piled up by any number of capitulators and apologists calling themselves Trotskyists. In actual fact, the political friends of Cannonism have the idea that they are somehow going to continue to exist by moving closer and closer to the Stalinist regime. This has been their general line ever since their Third Congress. As Stalinism becomes more powerful, they must attach themselves more firmly to it, work for its success, defend or gloss over its crimes, and finally split to pieces and become swallowed up in its claws. That is the prospect.

There it is in black and white for all the world to see: "The Chinese Trotskyists will not range themselves against this leadership. They will continue to defend it. . . ." From defense of the "nationalized and planned economy" despite and against Stalin, to the present course of defense of the Stalinist leadership in principle (for the time being only in China), is but a short step for them. This step has been taken.

FI's New Line: China's Unproletarian Revolution

By BERNARD CRAMER

The accompanying article on this page deals with the latest appeal of the official-Trotskyist Fourth International for the embraces of the Chinese Stalinists. This appeal is a continuation of a line-switch adopted by that group's last International Executive Committee plenum. Some details on the latter will round out the picture of increasing Stalinization which the line of these people represents.

At this plenum (held last May) the assembled deep thinkers decided that the Chinese Stalinists had really adopted the basic ideas of . . . Trotskyism.

E. Germain, the eminent confusionist who delivered the main report, stressed this several times: the Chinese Stalinists' struggle "has been transformed into the Permanent Revolution unfolding before our eyes." And: "the Chinese CP has begun, in an opportunist and empirical manner, it is true, but it has begun in reality to apply the theory of Permanent Revolution in its own manner. . . ."

True, Germain's colleagues would have done it better, they thought, being the official custodians of their detroykyized Trotskyism, but they are not sectarians and they do not cavil.

Caviling was unpopular, if not downright counter-revolutionary, at this plenum. Neither in the report nor in the discussion did anyone mention the detail (if only on comradely reproof) that there is not a speck of democracy for the workers and peasants (or anyone else) under the Mao regime.

Germain did, however, voice one complaint with regard to a detestable habit of the Chinese Stalinists, especially disconcerting for comrades who in reality have adopted the heart of Trotskyism. This was the Stalinists' penchant for assassinating Trotskyists.

Naturally this merited only passing notice, lest anyone think the official types were getting to feel personal about the matter.

Germain merely mentioned it as a kind of curiosity of history: "The theory of Permanent Revolution," he said, "has begun to be put into practice by those who fought it savagely for 25 years, and in part against those who have during this same period been its fiercest defenders, EVEN PASSING IN PART OVER THEIR DEAD BODIES." (Our capitals for emphasis.)

Germain does not specify the cause of decease in order to show that he was not getting morbidly subjective.

He does, however, try to account for "the blows that our Chinese organization suffered" from the comrade-assassins. The trouble is the latter's "Stalinist past," their "brutal bureaucratic sectarianism," and their "mean spirit of revenge." In this last connection he deplors the fact that the comrade-assassins' government "dynamited the tomb of Chen Du-siu" (the CP leader who became a Trotskyist) and "sent his widow, who is now very old, to a concentration camp."

NEW THEORETICS

But these few words already verged on petty-bourgeois lamentations over the stern march of history, and so he hastens to add:

"But as Marxists we know that we have no special interests to defend outside those of our class," and the Chinese Revolution is really "a triumph for us, despite the blows which we may temporarily suffer."

And he adjures the Chinese Trotskyists to "overcome pessimism and skepticism which are in danger of developing in their ranks," and to refrain from "obstinately continuing to condemn CP policy for past crimes which it is no longer committing today."

This, it seems, was a bit of overoptimistic, and the new appeal of the F. I. to the comrade-assassins is forced to register another demurrer.

But at the plenum no one else mentioned this nasty habit of Mao's. Unless it was in the mind of another speaker, Burns, when he remarked that "their [the Chinese Trotskyists'] fears and hesitations arise from personal resistance before a revolutionary movement which has taken unexpected forms. . . ."

All this does not come from reading too much of *Darkness at Noon* but from the F. I. theoreticians' new analysis of the CP and its totalitarian state.

Germain, who specializes in historical peculiarities, raised the question why the F. I. never foresaw that the Chinese proletarian revolution (or any other proletarian revolution, for that matter) would take place without the participation of the proletariat—without workers' uprisings, without the activity of the workers as a class,

without the organization of the workers. In other words: who is playing the title role in this "Hamlet without the Dane"?

He solves it, handily as usual. The truly and basically "proletarian" character of this unproletarian revolution was determined by the leading role of the CP.

That's one down, but leaves two to go. For the next question arises thusly: The preceding "solution" makes sense only if the CP is considered a proletarian party. But these thinkers had not quite brought themselves to do so, for one thing because Trotsky (in 1932) had indicated he thought it should be regarded as a kind of peasant party.

The plenum fixed this up. It decided that the Chinese CP was a true-blue proletarian party. But why? because of its composition or program or what?

No traditional criterion would quite work out, but Germain solved this too: "the Chinese CP has officially adopted statutes" which come out for socialism, and he asks, "Have we ever known a peasant party which possessed such a program?" No one answered in a hurry, so he went on to: "Have we ever known a peasant party which affirmed its unshakable loyalty to the USSR. . . .?" and so on.

This proved that the CP was not a peasant party, and no one piped up with the question: "Have we ever known a workers' party like the Chinese CP?"

STRAIGHT POISON

So Germain unraveled the mystery by the process of elimination—not a peasant party, must be a workers' party, Q.E.D.—but these acrobatics were not congenial to the real inspirer of the F. I.'s Stalinization, its secretary Pablo, who has been dragging Germain along with him as reluctantly as the Chinese Stalinists made their "Trotskyist" revolution.

Pablo poured it out straight:

"Insofar as the Stalinist parties are concerned, what is decisive for characterizing them as working-class parties, is their allegiance to the Kremlin bureaucracy, that is to say, to the bureaucracy of a degenerated workers' state."

All of which made two down: (1) The Chinese Revolution is a proletarian revolution by definition because it was made by the CP. (2) The CP, in turn, is a working-class party because (a) it is not a peasant party [Germain], or (b) because it owes allegiance to the Kremlin bureaucracy, which runs a "workers' state" [Pablo].

This leaves one to go to make these theoretics really airtight, watertight, gastight and vermin-proof. Namely, in its turn the Kremlin's state is a workers' state because . . . well, that much is well-known to official-Trotskyists. Stalin's Russia is a workers' state (degenerated) because it is based on nationalized property.

But, miraculously, at this point we report that our theoreticians refused to apply precisely this formula to China! True, Mao hasn't expropriated the whole bourgeoisie yet, they admitted, but they insisted that this did not stand in the way of considering Mao's China a workers' state.

What did stop them from this characterization was something else; as nearly as we can make out from Germain's doubletalk on this question, it is either the fact that fighting is still going on against elements of the old regime in some parts of China, or else the fact that old elements still remain in some parts of the administrative apparatus.

This is absurd bashfulness on their part, but they make plentifully clear that their attitude toward the Chinese not-yet-workers' state (whose central government, however, is controlled solely by a workers' party which has already made a proletarian revolution!—the head swims) is a lot more enthusiastic than it is toward the genuine-guaranteed workers' states of Stalin's. This difference in degree of enthusiasm is on no small matter.

These people, we remember, are for "revolutionary overthrow" of the Stalin government. Trotsky was; they repeat it. But when one solitary speaker at the plenum expressed the opinion that in China too they should "work for the overthrow of the Mao government," Germain came down on him like a ton of bricks.

"Such words are absolutely irresponsible," cried the reporter. These are "counter-revolutionary ideas," he exclaimed!

The deviationist got a word in edgewise: "And in the USSR?" he asked.

Germain told him the difference right off: The Russian "workers' state" is "in the period of its worst de-

(Turn to last page)

Stoolpigeon System — —

(Continued from page 1)

anyone else who may want to get a lick in. But the decision will be made by the head of each department, and there will be no appeal from this decision, except possibly to the courts. As it was with the old lady Guillotine, "justice" will be administered with one swift, sure, and irrevocable stroke.

Of course, there will be no nonsense about the accused having the right to question his accusers, or even to know the exact charges on which he is being accused. That would invade the privacy of the affairs of the accuser, and might make him hesitate to bring his accusations in the first place unless he was sure they could be proved. It is rumored that in compen-

sation for his utter helplessness in the face of this procedure, the discharged employee's name and the cause of his dismissal will not be made public. The rumor does not say that when and if he has the courage to try to get a job elsewhere, and lists his former government employment on his application, the reasons for discharge will not be communicated privately to the person who otherwise might have been his prospective employer.

THIN "RIGHT"

Of course, there is also an additional rumor to the effect that the employee who feels that he has been unjustly dealt with will have the right to appeal to the courts.

In a certain sense, he has always had that right (exercised, for instance, by James Kutcher, the courageous legless veteran who was fired from a clerk's job in the Veterans Administration in New Jersey for membership in the Socialist Workers Party).

But to exercise it takes both a lot of courage and more money than the average person dares think of. This "right" affords about the same degree of protection to the average citizen as does his well-known "right" to arrest a cop who is violating the law while on duty.

If this new government program would actually stop Joe McCarthy's rampagings, one could at least say that it had accomplished

something — even though that something might be very akin to the "success" of the famous psychoanalyst who cured his patient of hysterical deafness only to have him go blind.

But there is nothing on the record so far to lead us to believe that this government is going to cramp Joe McCarthy's style even as much as the last one did. The abject surrender of the State Department on two occasions in one week seems to show that however tough they may get with the poor federal worker, they will never turn their back on good old Joe. For one thing, that is not altogether safe, and for another, they are too busy salaaming as they back out the door.

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 worldwide 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!

For information about
The ISL,
write to

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

New Stalin Interview — —

(Continued from page 1)

freedom. No one has any quarrel with the American people, and that is true both in Asia and in the Soviet. . . .

"But," said Stalin, and it is a very big and significant but, "the United States Government is another matter. For a long time the United States followed a policy of so-called isolation and its influence in world affairs, generally speaking, was good. But participation in two world wars has given the United States capitalists a taste of the profits that can be made in wars. It is this desire for profits that lies at the root of the present threats to world peace."

That Stalin's "theory" of the U. S. drive to war is crude and provincial, having nothing in common with Marxist or Leninist ideas on the matter, is beside the point. Stalin uses theories like other people use shoes: it depends on where he intends to walk, in the swamp or in the mountains. With Stalin, "theory" is a very practical matter and always subordinate to the immediate needs of the moment. In this particular instance what Stalin is aiming at is hinted in his very next breath.

"FAIR PLAY"

While President Eisenhower, Dr. Kitchlu reports Stalin as saying, is a good military man of proved ability, and for that reason quite realistic in his appreci-

ation of the world situation, he has surrounded himself "with a group of capitalists — precisely those persons who are particularly interested in more war profits. The people around the American president are likely to cause difficulty in getting questions settled."

In the same expansive mood, Stalin further confided to his Indian visitor that Britain and France would not continue to support the present policies of the United States and that this would lead to "an eventual break between Britain and France on the one hand and the United States on the other." Stalin expressed pretended surprise at Britain's post-war policy of hostility to Russia and lack of gratitude to the Russians who "saved" Britain in the last war. Where—Stalin, who is renowned for his sense of honor, wanted to know—where was the British sense of fair play?

Stalin's explanation for British policy was as "profound" as his explanation of America's present drive toward war—it was a result of Winston Churchill's bad influence, who incidentally "got Mr. Truman, not a bad man basically, off on the wrong track" with his Fulton, Missouri, speech.

JUST PROPAGANDA?

For the special benefit of Nehru and the Indian bourgeoisie, who do not view the activities of the Indian Stalinists or Chinese and Russian imperialist strivings with equanimity, the Kremlin dictator repeated his views that "The Russians do not believe that there is only one path of political and economic development open to a country, but recognize that each country has its individual peculiarities and that these are marked in the case of India."

Are Stalin's views to be dismissed as the usual propaganda designed to further the discords between Washington and its unwilling captive European "allies" and to strengthen India's neutralism, or do they herald a twist in the line?

On the surface, there is as yet no important indication that Stalin is relaxing his present "hard" line. He may praise the American people in one isolated interview intended only for foreign consumption, but the anti-American propaganda war continues on all fronts. For example, Peking has again renewed its charges of "germ warfare" against American forces in Korea.

SOME SPECULATION

Again, Stalin may prate of a general settlement, but the activities of the Russian High Command in Berlin aimed at completely blockading West Berlin, and the bellicose pronouncements of the East German Stalinists calling for the overthrow of the Bonn government, do not support the idea that Stalin is preparing for a new turn.

Similarly, in the Far East, the Korean war continues, and reports indicate that Stalin is preparing to increase his material assistance to the pro-Stalinist guerrilla forces in Indo-China.

In general, it would seem that, like the Reston exchange, the interview with Dr. Kitchlu is merely one of Stalin's propaganda devices designed to counteract the much-heralded new Eisenhower program of psychological and not-so-psychological warfare. While Washington denounces treaties, pushes the European army project, takes the wraps of Chiang Kai-shek and prepares to give more aid to the French in Indo-China, Stalin steps forward as . . . "the partisan of peace."

Nevertheless, the possibility

that Stalin is seeking a breathing-spell cannot be excluded. Tremendous social and economic convulsions are wracking the satellite countries and the intractability of the populations in these countries is a force Stalin must reckon with. Nor can the signs of serious internal difficulties of a political order inside Russia itself be waved aside. The tremendous strains of building both a war and peace economy at the same time, as well as supplying the Stalinist forces in Korea, may have reached a critical point.

If this turns out to be true, then it may supply the answer to one puzzling question: Why were the new purges and anti-Jewish drives started now? Before proceeding to a new turn in policy, Stalin may have decided to eliminate and terrorize those elements who would interpret such a turn as the signal for less repressive policies and who would gravitate toward a pro-Western orientation. It is of interest to note that the present series of purges began in Czechoslovakia and it was precisely the Czechoslovakian Communist Party that greeted the Marshal Plan enthusiastically and hastened to join it. Only Stalin's personal and brutal intervention reversed this pro-Western orientation.

These questions must remain for the present speculative only, but Stalin must respond in one form or another to the new tactics of the Eisenhower regime. The period of diplomatic stalemate which characterized the last phase of the Truman administration may be at an end.

The FI and China — —

(Continued from page 7)

generation" and the hatred of the people is concentrated against the bureaucracy. In China, however, "we find ourselves in the rising epoch of the revolution. . . ."

"How is it possible not to see the fundamental difference between these two situations?" he wound up; no doubt looking around triumphantly amidst applause.

One's head no longer swims; it sinks like a stone. The Russian "degenerated workers' state" has thoroughly consolidated itself, and therefore we are in favor of overthrowing it. The Chinese not-yet-workers-state (or degenerated-workers-state-to-be) has not yet consolidated itself, and therefore . . . the conclusion is inevitable . . . we cannot be for overthrowing it. As soon as Mao has thoroughly consolidated his regime, we may be in favor of overthrowing him too, but not a minute before then. No consolidated regime—no overthrow.

This theory ranks with the discovery made by the eminent theoretician Pogo, who found the answer to the baffling question: What ingredient does every housewife need before she can start cleaning?

The solution, at long last revealed to Pogo's faithful followers was: DIRT. No dirt—no cleaning.

There is a brighter side to be recorded about this Pogoite plenum of the official-Trotskyists:

Besides the lone deviationist mentioned, the opposition to the majority line on the Chinese question came from—the Chinese representatives present. Their opposition, it is true, was only to the new steps taken in capitulation to Stalinism, but they also reported that a "minority" in the Chinese section made the "error" of even "denying the revolutionary character of what has taken place." A remark by Germain would tend to indicate that a majority of the Chinese Trotskyists opposed the international line: "In our Chinese movement," he said, "there is at present a struggle of ideas. Some forces have emerged there which are orienting themselves on the same road as the International." (Our italics.)

It is to be hoped that the Chinese Marxists refuse to accept the advice, handed down by the theoreticians of degenerated-Trotskyism, that they commit suicide in order to assure the rule of the comrade-assassins.

George Orwell's Homage to Catalonia

Orwell's personal story of the Spanish Civil War and the Stalinist betrayal.

Harcourt, Brace & Co. \$3.50

Order from

Labor Action Book Service
114 W. 14 St., N.Y.C.

N. Y. ISL BRANCH FORUMS

WEDNESDAY

March 11

JOHN KILLEN

discusses

Samuel Lubell's book
'The Future of American Politics'

THURSDAY

March 12

STAN GREY

discusses

Sidney Hook
on the
Smith Act

Forums at 8:30 p.m. at

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, New York City

The Handy Way To Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription:

- NEW RENEWAL
- 6 months at \$1.00
- 1 year at \$2.00

NAME
(please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE APT.

STATE

- Payment enclosed.
- Bill me.