

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 23, 1953

FIVE CENTS

Problems before the UAW Convention

... pages 2 and 3

Sidney Hook on Conspiracy and Picasso

... page 5

The Stalinoids on Stalin

... page 7

Political Action Comes First!

The UAW Can Tell the World

By BEN HALL

Of all the problems which come before the United Auto Workers convention, beginning on March 22 in Atlantic City, one stands at the head of the list; no other will outrank it in importance. That is *political action*.

In every decisive case, every union which fights with the big corporations for a better life for workingmen comes up against the government. Some of the most inspiring goals of American unionism, proclaimed in resolutions and manifestos as they will be at this convention, can only be brushed against, not achieved, by simple union action.

Civil rights, civil liberties, peace, housing—and a dozen other objectives—can hardly be won industry by industry, by strike battles and ordinary union struggles. To pass a series of excellent resolutions is indeed praiseworthy; but they remain idle speculation and impotent wishful thinking unless they are armed with a program of action for their achievement.

At a UAW gathering, everyone knows that this means *political action*. The fate of the labor movement will be decided, in the long run, by its political policy.

An honest, but brutally frank, appraisal of our labor movement leads to one conclusion: it has not been able to match the power of its good intentions, the power of its numbers and solidarity, the power of its industrial and trade unionism, with the power of its political action. Not because it has failed to devote its energies to politics—that it has done—but because it has utterly failed to work out a correct political policy.

The UAW has boasted, with justice, that it intends to act as the "vanguard in America and the architect of the future." To fulfill the responsibilities imposed by such a leading role, the UAW is required to show the way; to close the awful gap in labor's program; to open up a new political road for labor.

What Reuther Said—Then

At one time it seemed about to do it.

In 1948, just before the presidential election of that year, the International Executive Board of the UAW issued a dramatic public statement. It announced that we were on the eve of a new era in American politics; it pointed out that the workers and the common people generally were looking for new leadership. And, most significant, it proclaimed the need for a new political realignment that could be achieved only by the formation of a new, progressive political party in this country.

Everything that it said then is just as true today, five years later. If anything, the need for new leadership is more pressing and urgent. Walter Reuther, then fresh from the fight to consolidate his program and control in the union, seemed as determined as anyone in 1948 to carry out this plank in his platform. He wrote a long, heart-moving letter to the membership of the UAW, published in full in the *United Auto Worker*. He told them that he really believed in this goal; that nothing was more imperative; that he intended to devote himself first and foremost to its achievement; that this was the most significant contribution he, as UAW leader, could make to the UAW and to the whole labor movement.

Sad to say, this enthusiasm dwindled, then evaporated. By the time of the next UAW convention, the inspiring slogan for the formation of a new party lost its character of

(Continued on page 2)

Malenkov's Demagogic Peace-Talk Sets Washington Guessing Again

By GORDON HASKELL

Over one thousand hand-picked representatives of the Russian ruling class met in Moscow on March 15 to ratify the new government set up after Stalin's death. The delegates to the so-called Supreme Soviet whipped themselves into a frenzy of applause as each of the top tyrants took his bow.

It took just one hour and seven minutes for this august body of bureaucrats to "ratify" a government reorganization which drastically cut down the number of ministries, replaced its own chairman and secretary, reconcentrated administrative power in the hands of a few men. Most of the time was given up to cheering and to the reading off of the decisions which had already been made.

For anyone who needs a demonstration of the totalitarian nature of this regime and of its extreme concentration of power in the hands of half a dozen men, this was it. The "delegates" to the "highest body" in Russia have long been accustomed to performing the functions of a rooting section. This time they had to carefully

distribute their "stormy ovations" among the leaders. Who knows: a lack of zeal in clapping for Beria or Bulganin today may have to be answered for in the cellars of the secret police six months from now. . . .

With this show of "monolithic unity" as a backdrop, Malenkov did say a few words which caused the rest of the world to prick up its ears. While talking about the troubled state of the world which

requires the peoples of the Stalinist empire to bear an enormous military burden on their backs, Malenkov stated that "at the present and in the future there is no such troublesome or unsolved question which cannot be solved by peaceful means."

SPECULATION

Immediately the inevitable speculation started in the capitals of the world. One diplomat in Moscow is reported to have said that this was "almost an offer to sit down with the United States and anyone else and try to ease the world's tension," and that "it could be one of the most important statements to be made in a very long time."

But the reaction from most governments was quite different. An American State Department spokesman told reporters that "protestations of peaceful intent are not new from the Soviet Union, but words must be weighed against deeds." The British Foreign Office let it be known that "if there is anything Mr. Malenkov wants to say, I am sure he will find no difficulty expressing himself through diplomatic channels. We have heard similar speeches before. It is a new government, however, and naturally we shall be interested to see if their actions are different from previous governments."

ACCIDENTS?

When asked about the Malenkov statement, German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer replied: "Why don't you rather ask me what I think about the shooting down and buzzing of Allied planes by Communist jet fighters over Germany during the last week?" And the French socialist newspaper *Le Populaire* wrote: "To Malenkov's statement proclaiming Russia's will to peace and the possibility of coexistence of the Stalinized and free world, the bursts of machine-gun fire of the MIGs reply like a sarcastic and sinister echo."

(Turn to last page)

Here's Something New—Even for Joe McCarthy

By L. G. SMITH

One aspect of Senator McCarthy's current investigation of the Voice of America will bear further watching.

We have become accustomed to McCarthy's blunderbuss tactics of firing at random in the hope one of his shots will hit, or if not, that the sound and fury will give the impression that it has. We are almost used to his habit of waving handfuls of "documents" in front of auditorium and TV audiences, thundering that "in my hands I hold the proofs which, ladies and gentlemen, are subject to inspection by the gentlemen of the press," after which he and his documents take off for parts unknown, and the reporters are left to inspect their consciences.

But in the Voice of America "investigation," we are being treated to something which, if not new, is at least relatively new to this country. That is the open attempt of McCarthy to get the idea across that any administrative or technical blunder on the part of the people who are running the Voice is probably due to sabotage.

RUSSIAN STAPLE

The idea that when mistakes are made there must be sabotage in the background is, of course, a staple of the Russian ideological diet. In all the show trials in Russia and the satellites one of the chief points which was made was that if the people had too little

food or if there was not enough clothing to go around, or if some bureaucrats decided to build a plant at a place where there were neither workers nor raw materials available, it could all be blamed on a deep, dark plot to ruin the country.

Throughout the whole New Deal and Fair Deal era the Republicans contented themselves with ridiculing the bureaucratic mistakes made by the administrations. At times they turned up some real bloopers. The idea that things are likely to go wrong

(Turn to last page)

Let Freedom Ring

PLACE: New York City, USA.

OCCASION: Meeting of Board of Higher Education to take action on suspension of four teachers and school clerks who had refused to answer questions of a witchhunt committee.

PRESENT: About 70 students from city colleges, and others.

YOUNG WOMAN FROM BROOKLYN COLL'G, SPEAKING FROM THE FLOOR: "If you fire the teachers, academic freedom becomes a myth."

BOARD MEMBER GUSTAVE G. ROSENBERG: "Some day you may want to apply for admission to the bar and to some other place. Why don't you watch what you say? Your names are being taken down. Some of the remarks you make today may be misinterpreted. I advise you—don't be misled by anything that carries you away for the moment."

RESULT: all city employees were fired.

CURTAIN.

Other Issues Before the UAW Convention: GM Negotiations—Annual Wage—Social Policy

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, March 14—Unquestionably the 14th constitutional convention of the United Auto Workers (CIO), assembling at Atlantic City this week with over 3,000 delegates, is going to be a far more impressive event than would be suggested by the so-called pre-convention "conferences" held throughout the nation by its top leadership.

For the pre-convention "conferences" (they once used to be described more accurately as caucuses) assumed such a routine cut-and-dried character as to be more in keeping with the traditions of the conservative steel workers' union than the dynamic UAW-CIO.

And the UAW leadership remains far too sensitive of its national reputation, as well as conscious of its new role of formal leader of the CIO, to permit a big public display of any retrogressive tendencies toward the ordinary business unionism that confines and handicaps most major unions in America.

Nevertheless, the task is formidable — as President Walter P. Reuther himself indicated in a speech delivered recently before 1,500 active union leaders in the Detroit area. It is rather difficult not to reap the harvest of what one has sown.

No Contests

The UAW opens this convention as the biggest and one of the most powerful unions in the world, with over 1,350,000 dues-paying members. It is becoming increasingly wealthy. Its leadership has no serious, organized and effective opposition. Its secondary leaders are more homogeneous than ever in its history.

Outside of one regional directorship — on the West Side of Detroit, where Carl Stellato, Ford Local 600 president, is challenging Joe McCusker — incumbent director, no contests are expected. And the Reuther leadership claims to have more than a 100-vote majority to defeat Stellato. Rumblings of dissatisfaction may be heard, to be sure, in many regions, but Reuther's dictum, "no changes," has the weight of law.

The team of leaders is running together. Take one on and you take the whole international union on, as the saying goes within UAW circles.

It is within the framework of this political and organizational situation that the convention begins and discussion of issues arises. It was within this context that the election of delegates occurred and caused scarcely a ripple in the union, for most slates were mainly a

question of "ins" versus "outs" rather than based on programmatic differences. Again the exception was the Stellato struggle against Reuther.

Of what little concern the opposition is to Reuther was perhaps best illustrated by the fact that in a major policy speech before the 1,500 active union leaders in Detroit last week, Reuther didn't bother even to mention them or their program.

Programs

Unlike the last convention, where all committees were composed of loyal Reuther supporters, this year Reuther deliberately placed known anti-Reutherites on key committees, to assure discussion and to keep up the old reputation of the UAW as a democratic union.

Stellato has announced his intentions of fighting on two major issues: (1) against 5-year contracts; (2) for the election of top officers by secret referendum of the rank and file.

In his speech before regional conferences Reuther posed four problems as especially vital: (1) current wage policy in negotiations with General Motors; (2) launching of the campaign for a guaranteed annual wage in 1955 negotiations; (3) holding of all local union and shop elections biennially; (4) strengthening the constitution to empower the top officers to act more vig-

orously against racketeers and the Stalinists.

As a matter of record it should be noted that Reuther's views on these questions provoked exactly one and a half minutes discussion by one local union leader at the Detroit meeting.

Unlike other speeches in other days, Reuther's comments on these issues were matter-of-factly stated, without the usual agitation and intellectual content which has been the keynote of all Reuther public speaking.

GM Issue

The essence of his remarks on wage policy was that the UAW was glad that GM agreed to its contention that the "long-range" agreements were living documents. (Reuther shies away from the term 5-year contract.) The GM offer was not satisfactory; the convention was expected to put pressure on the auto industry. There is no deal between Reuther and GM. Other corporations are waiting for GM to set the pattern.

Among the questions Reuther did not discuss were the effect of the escalator clause, its value, any prognostication of wage raises or cuts. But these issues are bound to arise on the convention floor.

The UAW expects to present at the convention its ideas on the guaranteed annual wage, and to propose a

public commission to study its program. Later it intends to ask the corporations to set up a commission to meet with the public commission, so that by 1955 everyone will know what the UAW is asking for and why. A huge public relations campaign is integral in this work.

Switch

Reuther warned his Detroit audience against any tendency to view the UAW as a "dues-collection agency," and spoke of the need for unionizing the organized workers, as well as organizing the unorganized. Immediately afterwards he declared that at the last convention he deliberately ruled that the constitutional change for biennial local union elections was lost on a voice vote because "such a basic change in our structure should not be decided that closely." This year, the change is advocated by the leadership, and it has vigorous support among Detroit local union officials. How this proposal affects the admittedly growing gap between the men in the shop and the union officialdom was not discussed.

That this is considered a settled question was shown by its approval without discussion at the Detroit conference. The controversy is expected to be around whether the new proposal should go into effect in 1953 or 1954. Reuther indicated that

this matter will be left to the judgment of the delegates.

CP Clause

The top leadership of the UAW has decided that the present constitutional clauses relating to trials on a local union level are not sufficiently binding to accomplish the aims of the Reuther leadership: (1) actually barring all Stalinists from holding any office; (2) eliminating the lengthy struggles of the past in cleaning out any tendencies toward racketeering which plagued at least two local unions.

Reuther states that he is out to eliminate "miscarriages of justice," where local union officials who are popular are acquitted of charges, be it Stalinism, racketeering, or misuse of local funds. The idea of the proposed constitutional changes to the convention is to allow the international union to retry, through the trial-committee procedure set up for the international union, any decision of a local union trial committee which the top leadership finds unacceptable.

Reuther denies that such a proposal strengthens the power of the top officers or infringes on local autonomy. Nor has the union leadership answered the question of what was wrong with the old, traditional and democratic methods of defeating either Stalinists or any other

(Turn to last page)

The UAW Can Tell the World —

(Continued from page 1)

a fighting, pressing, speedy goal and was put aside as a cherished but embalmed statement of good intentions in the indefinite and far-off future. It was to be referred to on occasion at special UAW gatherings but it was not to be fought for and defended in the labor movement.

CIO conventions, local industrial union councils, state councils met, discussed and adjourned. But no one ever heard from the lips of UAW representatives about the need for a new party.

"Good Judgment"

We cannot demand that the UAW achieve the impossible; it could not, of course, actually form a new nationwide party by itself. But it could have, and it did not, talk about it, bring the idea into the labor movement and try to convince others.

Five years have passed. Is the labor movement any better off because the UAW was silent? We need only say that the political policy of American unionism is as ineffectual now as it was then.

Two years ago, there was a new stirring. Labor had just walked off all war boards in protest against the anti-labor trends in the actions of the Truman administration. At the 1951 UAW convention in Cleveland, one-third of the delegates voted for a minority Resolutions Committee report for "Political Action through the formation of a Labor Party," which concluded: "That this convention calls upon the United Labor Policy Committee to convoke a representative Congress of Labor to take steps for the speedy formation of a Labor Party in preparation for the 1952 elections."

The minority resolution was defeated only by the personal intervention of Reuther in the discussion. But even though he opposed it, he expressed a certain sympathy for its stated objective. "Your sentiment is fine," he told the supporters of the minority resolution, "but your judgment is bad. Your timing is bad. I can say on behalf of all four of the top officers, and I believe the whole Executive Board,

we admire the sentiments of both resolutions, but we endorse the sound judgment of the majority resolutions. . . ."

A majority of the '51 convention agreed with the "sound judgment" of the majority resolution. Consequently, let us remind ourselves of what it involved.

It called upon "the International Officers, through the national CIO [to], request the United Labor Policy Committee to call a representative conference of labor in the spring of 1952 prior to the convening of both old party conventions . . . to determine the political course that should be taken in the 1952 campaign."

The officers were ready to appeal for a nation-wide political conference of labor to prepare for '52. They were not willing to say what they themselves would propose at that conference. That seemed to them like "good judgment."

UAW Can Move Forward

Regrettably, however, they never carried out their own proposal in any shape or form.

In 1948 an excellent resolution—soon filed. In 1951, a somewhat watered down version—also filed. Since 1948 and since 1951, large segments of the American people showed that they were discontented with the results of Democratic Party rule; they looked for new leadership. None was available. Without any other alternative, they turned control of the country back to the conservative Republican Party.

A change has taken place in the CIO. When Murray died, the leaders of the most important CIO unions chose Reuther to replace him. The stand-pat Steelworkers Union drops down in influence while the prestige and influence of the UAW rises. The president of the UAW is now president of the CIO.

This UAW convention can make a unique contribution to all labor: to express itself in favor of the formation of a labor party and call upon its president to defend its policy. And if it is not ready, by a majority, to do that, it still can move forward. It need only reiterate the distinctive political policies already endorsed by the union in the past and ask that its spokesmen tell the world.

Test for UAW Constitutional Proposals: Do They Strengthen or Weaken Democracy?

By V. H. CASLON

At the 1949 convention of the UAW in Milwaukee, a discussion of tactics in the fight against Stalinism turned toward problems of internal union democracy, and Walter Reuther felt it necessary to make the following statement:

"We are not talking about internal UAW democracy. . . . If people want to see some dictatorial unions, they can just look at the Commie unions, where the members usually have one privilege and that is to pay dues; and if anybody tries to change the UAW constitution to conform with these Commie-controlled constitutions you will see me up here fighting like hell to block that kind of dictatorship."

The delegates welcomed these remarks as a sign that the UAW would remain what it has always been: an example to the whole labor movement of democracy in action.

The 1953 convention in Atlantic City this week will be called upon to act on a series of constitutional amendments and organizational changes suggested by the International Executive Board. These proposals, of varying merit, will be considered, as is proper, in the light of the concrete organizational needs of the union at this stage of its development.

Cold Bureaucratization

Just as important, however, as the objective of efficiency is the goal of democracy. All these issues must be tested from this standpoint: Will they serve to stimulate and strengthen the vigor of rank-and-file participation in the internal life of the union and lead toward an even more healthy democratic atmosphere?

Under the most ordinary circumstances, every delegate would be justified in asking such questions but at this convention they have more than ordinary significance.

Since Reuther's victory in 1946, all the old caucuses have been disintegrating. The Reuther caucus itself, in the absence of any substantial organized opposition, has in effect disappeared as a formal body. In its place power in the union has been wielded by the official, centralized union leadership.

This leadership, although it is composed of various tendencies and leanings, seldom if ever allows whatever differences of opinion may arise within it to come to the attention of the rank and file. Scores of old militants who once were highly vocal and active in the discussions and disputes of the past have now been elevated into paid positions in the union. They remain silent or simply argue for whatever policy the top leadership chooses to favor at any given moment.

The danger arises of a slow, cold drifting away from the real spirit of internal democracy even while all the rights of democracy remain in force.

It is with this in mind that we think of some of the recommendations of the board.

Don't Economize on Democracy

In 1951 the UAW constitution was amended to provide for conventions every two years instead of every year or every eighteen months. Reuther pressed for this change. At the same time the proposal to increase the period between local union elections from one to two years was defeated when he indicated that he did not feel too strongly on the matter. At this convention the defeated proposal will be reintroduced; and this time he is openly plugging for its adoption.

Arguments are advanced on the grounds of economy. Appeals are made to free local union leaders from annual "factional" fights. Regional conferences all over the country indicate that the convention will favor the change, starting in 1953. The recommendation of the International Executive Board calls for the first two-year election in 1954. Large amalgamated locals with a "business agent" philosophy are naturally in favor of the proposal.

The argument about saving money is not weighty enough. If the UAW could afford annual elections in the first 17 years of its existence, certainly now when it is in a better financial position than ever, democracy as expressed in annual elections is something it surely can afford. Elections bring the ranks into union life.

The Councils

One of the outgrowths of the fight against Homer Martin was the establishment of special Wages and Hours Councils in skilled trades, foundry, agricultural implement, trucks, copper and brass, aircraft, etc. These councils are composed of delegates from local unions who discuss the particular problems of their group. Some councils meet annually; but others meet bi-monthly; and still others, three times a year.

Last year the Copper and Brass Council conducted a nation-wide strike. The Agricultural Implement Council has its own officers, conducts its own business, and meets three times a year. Other councils have International Board members as officers.

The board will recommend annual council meetings. It argues that officers must attend too many meetings, that amalgamated locals with small affiliates are being taxed to death by such affiliations. One local, it is claimed, must participate in 17 different councils.

The Agricultural Implement Council is fighting this recommendation. It has publicized its position that more frequent council meetings are necessary. The problems of this industry make it essential that local leaders meet to find out what is happening from company to company. The contracts in this industry demonstrate the advantages of their work. Contract clauses are superior, despite the terrific problems posed in an industry still on piecework.

It points out that affiliation is optional and that local unions should have autonomy in spending their own general fund. Its representatives believe that the affiliates should decide how often to meet. They suspect that one of the reasons they are under attack is because they favor the election of Corporation (GM, Ford, Chrysler) Council directors as against appointment. The attack on the Councils started out to limit Corporation Council meetings but retreated to a position of limiting Wage and Hour Councils.

No More Johnstones

The experiences of the General Motors Department under Art Johnstone make it logical to amend the constitution to provide for the election of Council Directors by the convention. Heretofore directors have been appointed by the Board after each convention. The history of Johnstone showed the danger of giving a man high position without responsibility to rank-and-file delegates. He became company stooge. He would not listen to his own field staff but would take the company's word for everything. He entered into agreements unbeknown to anyone.

Read about Independent Socialism

*in the special pamphlet-issues
published by LABOR ACTION*

**THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF
INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM**

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

THE FAIR DEAL: A SOCIALIST CRITICISM

10 cents each

Order from:
Labor Action, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

He rode roughshod over local union leaders engaged in militant fights with the company.

He was finally dismissed. Today he is Labor Relations chief for the Detroit newspaper industry and is reported ready to put the printers, pressmen, and guildsmen "in their place."

Local 600 objects to the appointment of the Ford Director and has a proposal for a referendum. It is hoped that this question reaches the floor; it will be healthy for the UAW-CIO. The most democratic proposal seems to be the election of corporation directors through the same machinery as UAW Regional Directors—that is, by the 1953 convention delegates. There might not be any changes; yet it will be much more democratic and efficient and make the director responsible to the locals that elected him.

Trial Procedure

A new trial procedure will be recommended, based upon the emergency procedure established in Milwaukee in 1949. The procedure permits the International Union to move into a local situation immediately dangerous to the union. The jury is composed of delegates to the last convention drawn by lot.

This procedure has been used only twice since 1949. One case was the trial of Local 838, Waterloo, when a group was accused of misappropriating funds during the 1950 John Deere strike; the other was against a group of the Leland Allen division of Local 205 who tried to split the local and take the unit into another union.

What is known of the new recommendation indicates that it would apply wherever a local trial committee makes a decision that is obviously "erroneous." A protest could set up the special jury system for a review of the local action.

In some trials of embezzlers or racketeers local unions have refused to convict those guilty. A two-thirds majority is necessary for conviction. Sometimes a personal machine of racketeers can make it difficult to get such a majority.

It is precisely for such cases that the 1949 convention set up the new trial procedure. What is different in the latest proposal has not been disclosed. The UAW-CIO has led the way up to now in the fight against racketeers without the proposed constitutional amendments.

Why Is It Necessary?

The amendment seems to center on delivering another administrative blow at the Communist Party. Why is that necessary? The CP is at its lowest point in the history of the UAW-CIO. The workers and secondary leaders understand the role of that party. They remember the piecework boys, "open up the Second Front," stooling on militants to have them fired by the companies, and their flipflops every time the Kremlin sneezes.

Reuther has repeated hundreds of times that now is the time to stand up and be counted in the fight to preserve civil liberties and academic freedom and in the fight against the mass hysteria that corrupts the minds of men, that allows the McCarthy's, Jenners and Veldes to use their congressional immunity to smear innocent people. Why is it necessary to amend the constitution of the UAW-CIO for new special procedures against the CP? Haven't they been eliminated politically?

What if one or two locals democratically elect people who are followers of the CP line? Can that possibly hurt a union of 1,400,000 members with over a thousand local unions in the U. S. and Canada?

Many of the simple organizational suggestions of the International Executive Board that need not be enumerated are excellent and will undoubtedly be adopted by the convention overwhelmingly if not unanimously. The disputed questions which we have discussed here must be measured and tested by one main standard: Does the proposal strengthen the internal democracy of the union or weaken it?

YOU and SCIENCE

Twenty Out of 100 Never Heard Tell of the H-Bomb

By CARL DARTON

Recently the Gallup Institute of Public Opinion made a survey of the American people's ideas on the destructive power of the H-bomb. The findings were as follows:

Of every 100 persons, 20 had never heard or read anything about the H-bomb.

Of every 100 persons 15 had no opinion whatsoever on its destructive power.

The remaining 65 of every 100 persons interviewed showed a range of guesses that all people would be killed within areas extending from "a half block" to "a thousand miles" from the point of its explosion.

The *Chemical and Engineering News* of February 23 called this lack of knowledge a reflection on American educational efforts. We quote from its editorial:

"Indeed it is a sad commentary that the American public is not better informed on what we might define as the social, moral, and economic aspects of nucleonics. We should add, of course, the military implications.

"We do not expect the American public to understand the intimate scientific and technological angles of fission. No matter how over-simplified we make such explanations, they are not understood by the majority of the lay public. Possibly such explanations appear to make sense to the man on the street momentarily, but rarely, if ever, is he able to repeat the story intelligently to his neighbor.

"What is essential is an understanding of what an atomic war would mean to the future of civilization. If the report of Dr. Gallup is correct, and we do not doubt it mirrors the actual thinking of all citizens, then a huge job of education remains to be done.

"Why is the public so poorly informed on this particular subject? Is it because our educational facilities are inadequate? We suspect part of the explanation can be found in the fact that many citizens frankly are afraid to be informed on the implications of the atom bomb or the H-bomb and find it less disturbing to their equilibrium to remain ignorant."

POOR RELATION

Contrary to the above statement, we believe that it is the ruling elite of American capitalism that is afraid to educate the citizens in the total implications of the H-bomb.

The truth is that conditions under capitalism do not permit the revolutionary impact of science, as well as the H-bomb, to be known to the people. It is no accident that study of the social significance of science is one of the most neglected phases of academic learning and the American educational system. Sociology, like most social sciences, is the forgotten poor relation in the scientific pic-

ture. A sociology of science is almost non-existent.

Robert K. Merton in his preface to Bernard Barber's *Science and the Social Order* (Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1952) has some interesting comments to make on the neglect of this subject. Dr. Merton points out that among the several thousand American sociologists, less than a dozen report the sociology of science as their primary field of interest. Most of the scholars who have contributed to this field are physical and biological scientists who have done so in their spare time. Because of this the results are neither voluminous nor profound.

Why are professional sociologists reluctant to specialize in the sociology of science? One reason is described by Dr. Merton as follows:

"It may be that the connections between science and society constitute a subject matter which has become tarnished for academic sociologists who know that it is close to the heart of Marxist sociology. Such an attitude need not stem from a fear of guilt by association with politically condemned ideas, though this, too, may play a part. Like attitudes toward most revolutionary ideas, attitudes toward Marxism have long been polarized: they have typically called for total acceptance or total rejection. Sociologists who have come to reject the Marxist conceptions out of hand have not uncommonly rejected also the subject matters to which they pertained: American sociologists do not much study the conflict between social classes just as they do not much study the relations between science and society.

"At the other pole, those who regard themselves as disciples of Marxist theory seem to act as disciples merely, content to reiterate what the masters have said or to illustrate old conclusions with newly selected examples, rather than to consider these conclusions

as hypotheses which they are to test, extend, or otherwise modify through actual empirical inquiry. At both polar extremes, the sociology of science suffers, either by inattention or by preconception."

WHY THEY FORGET

As interesting as these remarks are, we do not believe that Dr. Merton has touched upon the real reason why the sociology of science is neglected and why there is no real effort to educate the American people on the revolutionary impact of science on our lives.

It should not be news to the readers of this column that the ruling minority of the United States is more interested in exploiting science for its own profit than in seeing that it fulfills its promise of liberating humanity from the physical and psychological restrictions of 20th century living. For this reason those fields of science which further profits and its cruel companion, war, are emphasized and fully subsidized. On the other hand scientists and sociologists, consciously or not, see that there is "just no future" in such a subject as the sociology of science.

One of the extreme contradictions of capitalism is that the terrific dynamic of science makes it imperative that all the people participate intelligently in all aspects of economic and social life; yet the restraints of an outworn and decadent political and economic system do not permit this interaction to take place. Such is the dilemma and, in the long run, unsolvable problem of American capitalism.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to educate for suicide or almost certain doom. Thus people try to forget or ignore what the H-bomb means to them. What the people need to realize is that the way out is neither educational nor fundamentally scientific but political.

What 'Automation' Holds in Store

Our recent column entitled "Automation" Comes to U. S. Industry brought me the following note from my most critical reader, the editor: "Interesting subject. It will be worth following up, as you say. Caution: be discreet about prospects for its future; I'd say we can discuss all that's necessary about its implication and practices without giving the impression which the Technocrats raised to the pinnacle of a principle: that industry is moving toward the elimination of the working class."

At that moment we were concluding the reading of *AUTOMATION'S The Advent of the Automatic Factory*, by John Diebold. In the final chapter of this very

interesting book there are some direct answers to the Technocratic fantasy referred to:

"(1) Automation will not progress as far as the proponents of the completely automatic factory have predicted, and (2) the changes will not occur as quickly as most forecasts have led us to believe. . . . Automatic factories will not be workerless factories. The examples which exist today show this to be true. The atomic processing plant at Oak Ridge, although operated by a few girls at a control panel, employs many hundreds of maintenance men."

CONSEQUENCES

Diebold gives a list drawn up by R. L. Meier of the University of Chicago of the industries believed ripe for automation. These industries (including bakery products, knit goods, printing, chemicals, petroleum refining, agricultural and miscellaneous machinery, and communications) use only about 8 per cent of the total work force.

He says: "the labor shifts that could be expected from these changes and the time span during which they are likely to occur are no greater . . . than the abnormally great population shifts that occurred during the 1940s. This comparison emphasizes the fact that the nature and rate of population shifts due to automation are both of an order of magnitude with which we are historically familiar and with which we are able to cope."

We agree with Diebold on the quantitative estimate of social dislocation but feel rather skeptical about the ability of the present government to cope with such

and Youth Student Corner

U. of C. United Front Evades on Broyles Bills

By JANET MAXIM

CHICAGO, March 12—The All-Campus Civil Liberties Committee of the University of Chicago has met and recessed for the between-quarters interim without discussion of the Broyles "anti-subversive" bills now pending in Springfield.

The action reveals those tendencies which are the greatest obstacles to a successful civil-liberties campaign. Perhaps primary blame falls on the Steering Committee, whose agenda was largely concerned with granting broad interim powers to that body and less with sustaining a democratic committee.

The first the whole committee knew of the imminent open hearings on the bills was when the Steering Committee requested power to choose several delegates to testify. A motion was introduced that these delegates be elected by the ACCLC and this motion was defeated by the votes of the liberal caucus.

At the close of the consideration of that point, a Politics Club spokesman introduced a motion, requiring a two-thirds vote, to substitute for the remainder of the agenda general discussion of the Broyles bills. The argument for this motion pointed out that ACCLC was nowhere officially re-

corded as opposed to the Broyles bills; and that consensus that they were "no good" did not mean general agreement any more than our defense of civil liberties found us all in accord.

The Independent Student League liberals argued that ACCLC was not qualified to discuss the technicalities and history of the Broyles bills—thus implying that these were the only relevant considerations. The need for political discussion did not enter their arguments. The Independent Student League line tallies with their general cautious and timid attitude on civil-liberties questions.

As the situation stands, several individuals chosen and instructed by the Steering Committee will go to Springfield in the name of an ACCLC which has never discussed their actions. This procedure, undemocratic as it is, is defended by some of the liberals as necessary to prevent irresponsible self-interested action on the part of the Stalinists; but the result is the stifling of free discussion and domination of the ACCLC by the Steering Committee.

It is difficult to foresee how militant a stand the liberals will be willing to take on this and future issues; but they have clearly shown that they want the choice to be theirs alone.

problems. Unemployment, war, and a chronic housing crisis are far short of satisfactory solution.

Automation, given free rein for its potentialities in an economy unrestrained by the profit motive, could immensely increase productivity, and it is thus part of the technological development which points to the possibilities of a socialist classless society. Under the profit system it tends to sharpen the contradictions of the present system.

TRENDS

In our previous article we dealt with automation in the plant—specifically, in the auto industry. Diebold's book gives a number of other examples in manufacturing. The Rockford Ordnance Plant has a million square feet of floor area, yet employs only 140 workers including the engineers. Other striking examples are: the continuous casting of metals, and the automatic production of radio circuits.

Substantial as are the changes which automation can bring about in the factory, these seem destined to be eclipsed by its impact on the office. The basic implement for automatic control is the computer, which is fundamentally an information-handling device. Thus there is good reason to believe that computers will be more widely used in offices, the information-handling portion of our industry.

This use might even reverse the modern historical trend toward ever-increasing numbers of white-collar employees. The distinction between these groups of employees may become smaller as shop and office grow closer together with

the automation of time-study, quality control, and production-scheduling.

There are industries not engaged in manufacture which can make good use of automation. Diebold claims that "By use of magnetic tapes, the storage space for the policy information of a large insurance company can be reduced from ten or fifteen floors of files to 350 or 400 spools of magnetic tape which, with control gear, would occupy one medium-sized room . . . each employee who desires policy information . . . would dial a code number . . . and thereby activate a series of relays; the policy information spool would spin very rapidly and stop at the part containing the coded information on the desired policy; the information on the spool would be 'read' by a decoding device and printed on the ticker tape . . . all within a minute."

Several examples are given in the field of transportation. The Pennsylvania Railroad has installed an automatic reservations-handling system called Interlex—an application of electronic devices to the present way of handling reservations. A corresponding system at American Airlines, Reservisor, uses a new procedure devised solely for automation.

We hope that many of our reader will be interested in reading Diebold's book. Another good source of information is the September 1952 issue of *Scientific American*, which is devoted entirely to automatic control. Articles there by Ernest Nagel and Wassily Leontief deal with social implications.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.

I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.

I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).....



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 17, No. 12

March 23, 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.

Part II of "Sidney Hook, Logic, and Joe McCarthy"

Sidney Hook on Conspiracy and Picasso

This is the second part of an article on "Sidney Hook, Logic and Joe McCarthy." The first part appeared in issue before last (March 9), this one being crowded out last week by Stalin's death.

Under discussion is Sidney Hook's argument that Communists have no right to be teachers, as given before a symposium on academic freedom sponsored by the American Civil Liberties Union on February 12. The other panelists in the symposium were Dean Louis Hacker, James Marshall and Professor H. H. Wilson.—Ed.

By PHILIP COBEN

We have seen that Sidney Hook seems to base his position about the automatic unfitness of Communist teachers upon the argument that CP teachers cannot be intellectual free agents, that they must (and necessarily do) parrot the party line, that they cannot be independent seekers for the truth. We have seen how he took up the question of "blunderers" in the CP, and how this professor of philosophy, who is so highly admired for his brilliance in analysis, drew an "inference" from a quotation from Browder.

We have also seen how he shifted from the above position to another in the course of his debate—from the argument about intellectual free agents to the argument about "indoctrination," which he consistently equated with any sort of "slanting."

It would seem that, for a professor of philosophy who is so far from modest about his analytical attainments and so scornful of the substitution of "rhetoric for analysis" by his fellow panelists, this amount of confusion would be enough.

We will now see that, still claiming to be basing himself on his original approach, he introduces yet a third position, without notifying his hearers that he has shifted in the middle. This last shift is to his argument about "conspiracy."

Vicious Circle

It is, of course, quite in order to base a viewpoint on three different arguments—provided they do not get in each other's way. It is quite another matter when a "brilliant analyst" interweaves the three different arguments as if he were talking about the same thing all the time.

What does Hook mean by "conspiracy" in this connection? The fact that CP teachers do not publicly admit that they are members of the party. At the ACLU panel, Hook found it sufficient to refer to the practice of using "false names" and to the fact that publications of CP teachers' groups do not give the names of the teachers who write it.

If this were the decisive basis for Hook's demand that CP teachers be fired, then he should be satisfied if a teacher admits membership. In such case he should be for that teacher's right to hold his job, since that teacher is not a "conspirator." But no Stalinist will be eager to test this out. For then our brilliant analyst will remember that his very first proposition is that a CP member cannot be an "intellectual free agent" and must be fired on that ground.

Not only has Chairman Hook of the NYU Philosophy Department shifted through three different positions: he has made a vicious circle out of them. Since he (backed by the government cops) demands that CP teachers be fired, they prefer to conceal the fact of their membership ("conspiracy"). This then becomes a "proof" of their unfitness to teach in the first place.

"Conspiratorial" Teachers

Let us suppose that (contrary to the fact) all CP teachers hold their Stalinist views because they are intellectual robots of the party line. How would it follow from this that they must also be "conspirators," i.e., conceal their membership—unless they first have reason to believe that admission of such membership will mean reprisals by the authorities?

Perhaps Stalinist teachers prefer to conceal their membership—quite apart from fear of reprisal or discrimination, and purely out of choice and for their own nefarious ends—because they can thereby more cleverly infect their students' minds? We grant for the sake of argument that this applies to some. But there is incontrovertible evidence that it is not true of many or most, and that is what is decisive against Hook's all-inclusive rule.

The proof: (1) In France, for example, there are a multitude of teachers who make no bones about their Stalinist affiliations. Why? Because in that country they have much less to fear from such open admission—and it changes nothing to add that this is so in part for reasons we may regret, such as the strength of the CP-controlled teachers' groups and other movements. If CP membership automatically led to "conspiracy" because of the nature of the ideology (which is the same in France as in the U. S.), this would be inexplicable.

The proof: (2) Even in these United States, there were a number of years during the 1930s when Stalinist teachers had least to fear from knowledge of their CP association. During these years CP teachers were far

more free and frank about their political connection, though of course they never publicly flaunted membership cards. Indeed, most typically they wanted interested students to know they were Stalinists.

Does the CP itself have a conspiratorial apparatus quite apart from the activities of this or that teacher? Let us grant that. Norman Thomas is quite capable of confusing this question with the one under discussion, but then he notoriously enjoys no great reputation as a brilliant analyst.

Why do people "conspire"? When they intend to do something illegal, or if they wish to carry on perfectly legal activities which will still bring reprisals from the community. (If Professor Hook wished to subscribe to the Nation in some parts of this country, he might be wise to have his aunt readdress it to him in a first-class sealed envelope.) There are laws which enjoin conspiracies directed toward illegal ends. But membership in the CP is not illegal. Has Professor Hook devoted his powers of analysis to inquiring whether CP teachers tend to become "conspiratorial" because they are Stalinist or, rather, because of the extra-legal witchhunt directed against Stalinists?

Shift in the Dark

Hook's slogan is "Heresy, yes! conspiracy, no!" But this is quite beside the point which he presents as the heart of his position. An honest, sincere heretic may be forced to be "conspiratorial" in a police-state. Short of a police-state, a believer in Negro equality in some parts of the South and elsewhere (heretic) may be somewhat less than frank about it ("conspirator"). The heretic-conspirator disjunction can be a false one, since the two parts of the disjunction may overlap not only in a given time and place but in the case of given individuals.

But Sidney Hook proposes an automatic rule: CP member automatically—no heretic but only a "conspirator." This logic may appeal to the mentality of a cop, but we are discussing a professor of philosophy at the moment.

What is perhaps unspoken in this connection is that Hook thinks every heretic is duty-bound to be a martyr, which is something else. Perhaps like a friend of his named Kristol, Professor Hook thinks that heretics who do not bare their breast to the heresy-hunters' lashes are disgusting creatures. But then he should make this piece of stupidity clear as being a necessary adjunct of his view. We cannot impute it to him. We can only say this: the heretic undoubtedly faces the moral responsibility of making sacrifices for his convictions; but on the other hand, the non-heretical democrat has a responsibility a thousand times greater for ensuring that the heretic need not make such sacrifices for his right to hold his views. The heresy-hunter who goes so far as to abuse the heretic for declining to martyrize himself is quite a study in self-righteousness!

Hook, then, starts with the argument that Stalinist teachers must be intellectual robots, therefore unfit to teach, etc. If he shifts over in the dark to the position that Stalinists are "conspirators," as if continuing his argumentation instead of changing it, it is because the latter charge sounds more damaging from the angle of the government cops whose activities he is whitewashing.

Exception for Picasso

The payoff on this question came (in the ACLU symposium) when Hook himself raised a question for rebuttal-in-advance, no one else having mentioned it. "We will be asked," he said, "what would you say if Picasso came over here to teach an art class in a school? Would you let him teach?"

This sticker is no difficulty for our brilliant analyst. Though Picasso is a publicly admitted CP member, Hook explains why he would make an exception in Picasso's case. And it really is not difficult for him, since he has three positions to fall back on, and he need only take the right one out of his pocket to fish up an answer.

Is it position No. 1, which incidentally is supposed to present his fundamental criterion? It obviously cannot be. Picasso is a CP member, but it is also public knowledge that he is no parrot of the party line on the subject he would be teaching, art. On the contrary, CP member Picasso personally, as well as his school of art, is denounced in Russia. Picasso is one type of "blunderer" in the CP such as we discussed in our first article. He is an independent intellectual free agent, on the subject he would be teaching.

This happens to be world-wide public knowledge because of Picasso's prominence. Hook does not know whether or not this is also so in the case of Stalinist teacher X or Stalinist teacher Y, who get bounced simply because they are CP members. In the latter cases, they are guilty of being "intellectual robots" (whether or not they are in fact) because they obviously cannot prove themselves innocent.

If Picasso is an exception to the rule, what happens to our philosophy professors' rigorous "inference" from Browder's testimony that the CPs have Control Commission to discipline members, which we discussed in the first part of this article? Perhaps Picasso is the only exception in the world? In any case, be that as it may, in seeking to explain an exception for Picasso, Hook has to forget Position No. 1.

Well, then, if there is no doubt that Picasso will be expounding his very own views on art and not parroting the party line, why should there be any doubt about him at all, CP member or not?

Does the doubt stem from Hook's position No. 2? This is the argument about "indoctrination." But the com-

ments on this argument which we have already made stand out in a lurid light as soon as Hook raises the question of a Picasso teaching visit to America. Of course Picasso will "indoctrinate" in his lectures on art; that is, he will "slant" his lectures in accordance with his views! This has nothing to do with the question of Stalinism at all. He is being invited, in fact, precisely because of his views on art, precisely because he represents a school of art, and not only because of his own creative attainments. He would be expected to "slant" his lectures, and his students would be disgustingly disappointed if he posed as an "objective" professor.

Neither position No. 1 nor position No. 2 applies to Picasso. Yet, to explain his exception, Hook justifies "taking a chance" with Picasso (his way of putting it) ONLY on the ground that the artist is not a "conspiratorial" CP member but a publicly admitted member!

A Few Twists

The serpentine rationalization behind this approach deserves to be spelled out:

(1) Suppose Picasso was not a public CP member; suppose (let us say) he was simply quite well-known publicly as a Stalinist, while not admitting to membership, whereas Hook was convinced by evidence that he really carried a party card. In other words, suppose Picasso had the same public status as Hook's colleague at NYU, Professor Burgum, who has now been fired by the authorities in the wake of a congressional inquisition.

What exactly would be changed for Hook? It is still just as true that neither position No. 1 nor position No. 2 applies to Picasso. Would Hook be for barring him, in spite of the irrelevance to the case of what he claims to be his fundamental approach?

(2) Picasso is an open member of the CP, and this, says Hook, is his saving-grace, sufficient to justify "taking a chance." Is Picasso an open CP member because he is less "conspiratorial" than (say) Burgum, or than any of the small-fry Stalinist teachers who have been witch-hunted out of their jobs?

But this is clearly not so, or at any rate there is no reason for Hook to believe that it is so. We have already mentioned the fact that in France, where the political climate is different (whether for better or worse is not relevant here), lesser men than Picasso admit CP membership, because they have nothing to fear or think they have less to fear. In addition, Picasso's world-wide reputation gives him an independence of status which gives him more leeway to flout any dangers of open admission of CP membership.

This does not impugn Picasso's possible willingness to make personal sacrifices for his Stalinist views, whatever they are; it merely explains that he doesn't have to. Would he admit CP membership if that meant he could no longer put brush to canvas? And if he chose to conceal membership in such case, would that mean he was so infernally "conspiratorial" that he should not be allowed to taint the politically pure ears of Sidney Hook's NYU students?

Cultural Hangover

(3) When Hook explains why he is willing to "take a chance" in Picasso's case, we can be grateful for small favors. But what exactly is the "chance" he thinks he is taking?

Is he "taking the chance" that Picasso will slip in some favorable references to Russia or Stalinism in the course of (say) lectures on modern art? Before we get too horrified by the prospect, we must remember that sympathy with Russia or even the holding of CP views is not a bar to the right to teach, in Hook's formal position. Hook only insists that the teacher's views be those that he has come to himself and not be dictated to him by a party line. Well then, what "chance" is Hook taking?

What twists of thinking are behind such language on the part of Hook? Or can it be claimed that it was a slip of the tongue on the part of our analytical professor of philosophy?

(4) We pointed out that, by public knowledge, Hook's fundamental approach to the question of CP teachers (positions No. 1 and No. 2) does not apply to Picasso in any case. Why didn't Hook rest his exception for Picasso on this obvious ground, which stared him in the face? The answer is: because that is exactly what would make clear that his fundamental approach had broken down.

As a matter of fact, it is muddleheadedness or fakery for Hook to speak of making an "exception" to admit Picasso to an American school. If he really believes that teachers are unfit for employment not because of Stalinist views but because of intellectual subordination to the CP party line, the admission of Picasso is not an exception to but a carrying out of his position—if that is his position.

The "exception" is not to his position that teachers who are intellectually unfree are unfit to teach; the exception is only to his rule-of-thumb formula that CP membership automatically=intellectually unfree.

What the case of Picasso does is reveal the big leap in analysis between his intellectual position and his purge formula. It also reveals that Hook is still at the stage where cultural hangovers stand in the way of drawing the inevitable conclusions from witchhunting premises. We permit ourselves to feel a modest glow of gratitude at the cheering thought.

(Concluded next week:

The Difference Between Hook and Joe McCarthy.)

Malenkov's Speech at Bier Highlights Three Problems

By S. HOROSHCHENKO

On March 9 a new chapter in the history of Stalinism began. Stalin was buried at noon, and a new constellation of leaders, headed by Malenkov, Beria and Molotov, began to rule Russia.

All three men delivered orations at the funeral of the dead *Vozhd* and swore to remain his pupils and followers. Georgi M. Malenkov, son of a tsarist officer and present new leader of the bureaucratic class, utilized the funeral oration to present what is in effect the political program of his government. We can quote its main elements as follows:

(1) "It is our sacred duty to continue to strengthen our state. . . ."

(2) ". . . to strengthen and preserve the unity and friendship of the nations of the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Great-Russian nation. . . ."

(3) ". . . to strengthen the mighty Soviet armed forces by every means. . . ."

(4) ". . . to preserve the monolithic unity of the ranks of our party. . . ."

(5) ". . . to strengthen the unbreakable bonds between the party and the people. . . ."

(6) ". . . to preserve and consolidate the friendship and solidarity of the peoples of the Democratic bloc. . . ."

(7) ". . . to preserve peace and prevent war on the basis of prolonged coexistence and peaceful competition of two different systems, capitalist and socialist. . . ."

These programmatic formulas are not new: they are essentially a digest of Stalin's policies and aims. They are, however, expressed in an especially clear way and with special emphasis.

HOLDING TIGHT

At the very first glance it is evident that Malenkov's program is thoroughly conservative. It is aimed at "strengthening," "consolidating" and "preserving" the existing status quo in every aspect. Even in such formulations it clearly reveals characteristics of the social forces which stand behind Malenkov.

Malenkov's formulation of his program in conservative terms does not camouflage any revolutionary contents. In point of fact, its contents are reactionary.

The bureaucracy, speaking through the voice of Malenkov, wants to continue to strengthen the state because the state is theirs, because they feed on this state, because it maintains their power over the oppressed people.

The bureaucracy needs to preserve the strength of their state because failure to do so would be their doomsday.

The bureaucracy wants to strengthen the unity of their empire, by advocating the "unity and friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union under the leadership of the Great-Russian people," because the larger their empire the greater is the mass of toilers under their exploitation, and the bigger is the amount of surplus product which goes into the pockets of the bureaucrats. The emphasis on the Great Russian people is necessary because this conforms with the imperialist ambitions of the bureaucracy, because the bureaucratic class is mostly Great-Russian by origin and totally Great-Russian in ideology, education and consciousness.

The bureaucracy wants to preserve their empire because otherwise their power would be undermined, if not totally destroyed.

The bureaucracy wants to preserve the unity of the ruling party's ranks because a split in the party would mean the shattering of the very foundations of the bureaucracy's power, and because a fight inside the party would lead to the weakening and perhaps even the

destruction of the bureaucratic class. The "unity" of the party is necessary also to prevent certain young elements (even though of bureaucratic origin) from expressing "deviationist" views, like some of those which Stalin attacked in his last work on "socialist" economics.

The bureaucracy wants to strengthen the "unity" of the party and the people because such unity secures the stability of the bureaucratic regime, maintains the rule of the party over the people, and requires the party bureaucrats to be vigilant and ever-watchful of the mood of the people, does not allow them to relax and forget that the people may rise against them.

The bureaucracy wants to consolidate the ties with the "People's Democracies"—Russia's colonies—because these colonies produce almost 40 per cent of the goods produced in the Russian empire and because they can supply a substantial amount of the necessary human cannon-fodder in the event of war.

The bureaucracy wants to preserve peace and peaceful coexistence with the capitalist world (on its own terms, like every other imperialist) because, for one thing, it is afraid that anti-capitalist revolution in the West may not be controlled by the Russian forces, and in such case revolution in the West will stimulate revolution in the USSR.

EMPHASES

Such are the contents of Malenkov's program. But the emphasis he placed on some of its points reveals basic problems which today stand before the Russian bureaucracy. In fact, every point of his program also represents a problem which the bureaucracy is striving to solve. Of these problems three seem to be most urgent at the present time.

In last week's LABOR ACTION we commented that the two previous declarations of Malenkov's government stressed the need "to

prevent disarray and panic" and to fight "internal enemies." This was a symbol of the great fear evoked among the bureaucrats.

In Malenkov's funeral speech there were further indications that the bureaucracy faces troubling problems. These were shown by his emphasis on three points of the program: (1) the question of the non-Russian nationalities; (2) the unity of the party and the people; and (3) relations with China.

On the first of these problems, Malenkov said, "The question of the nationalities is one of the most complicated questions in the history of the development of society." He piously declared that this question has been solved by Stalin's theoretical contributions, but . . . nevertheless it is still necessary "to preserve the unity of the peoples of the USSR," etc.

WHO'S AFRAID?

We are reminded that Stalin told Roosevelt at the Yalta conference in 1945 that "The vote for the Ukrainian republic in the United Nations is necessary for us to preserve the unity of the Soviet Union" (as reported by Stettinius). This problem of the unity of the empire goes back quite a distance. Yet, after declaring that this problem was "solved" by Stalin, Malenkov declared in the very next sentence of his funeral oration: "We are not afraid of any internal and external enemies!" Clearly, the brave do not shout this way. . . .

The reference to "internal enemies" was again repeated after Point 5 of his program, under the head of the unity of party and people.

His third heavy emphasis was on the question of relations with China, under Point 6, consolidation of the "democratic bloc." He repeated several times that unity between Russia and China must be "eternal, indestructible and fraternal."

These three problems evidently are the most urgent for the bureaucracy today,

LONDON LETTER

British Press Churns Out Some Aged Stalin-Myths

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, March 12—The British press is now filled with articles, speculations and obituaries on the death of Stalin, as is undoubtedly true of the American newspapers.

It would seem that the national press here felt a certain sympathy with Stalin. The Stalin of the war years—built up assiduously by the capitalist press—was recalled in more than one obituary article. The fact that Stalin was on "our" side at that time, the influence of the Uncle Joe legend which was then created, contributed to the comparative "friendliness" and "objectivity" of most comment on Stalin's life.

It is a regrettable fact that, as a result, some leading articles churned out material that most of us had thought was refuted by history. The myth of the pro-Nazi "fifth column" in Russia which was rooted out by the Moscow trial frame-ups in 1936-1938 has found its way back into print.

The only articles on Stalin's death which were at all readable and informed were to be found in the *London Times*, the *Manchester Guardian* and the *Observer*, and these were written by Isaac Deutscher. Deutscher's thesis that Stalinism "negates" itself with its expansion beyond the boundaries of the USSR, was developed in a long article in the *London Times* of March 8. Though I disagree with Deutscher's conclusions, there is much to ponder upon in his well-constructed article.

SCUTTLING?

Apart from Stalin's death, the most important news of the week comes from Egypt's relations with Britain. General Naguib seems to be rather anxious about the Sudanese elections. He is also adamant on the subject of the unconditional withdrawal of British troops from the Suez Canal Zone.

Here he has the firm support

of the Bevanites, particularly Ian Mikardo and Barbara Castle. The form of colonial Bonapartism we are witnessing in Egypt seems to have a far lesser coloration than some of us expected.

The British lion can no longer roar in the same old way. The policy of "scuttle" which the Tory back-benchers charge to Foreign Minister Anthony Eden is inevitable under the circumstances: Iranian Premier Mossadegh's victory on the issue of the impounded oil in Venice also gives further evidence of the general retreat of British imperialism. There can be no turning back. Neither a Tory nor a Labor government can evade the issue—to accept the accomplished fact with good grace or bad.

BELATED BEVAN

Emanuel Shinwell, former defense minister in the Labor cabinet, is now finding himself playing the role of another Bevan—two years too late. Reginald Paget, a right-wing Labor MP, has put forward a motion demanding Shinwell's resignation from the "shadow cabinet" of the Parliamentary Labor Party, for departing from the party line on the question of the two-year period of National Service (conscription).

Shinwell is now in the center of a first-class row. The right wing is gunning for him. Perhaps he will find himself an ally—willy-nilly—of his erstwhile bitterest enemies, the Bevanites.

Another interesting development took place in Rangoon, where Aneurin Bevan has been staying recently. Bevan warned the Chinese of the dangers of a too close linkage with the USSR. Perhaps Bevan, like many others, hopes that Mao Tse-tung will take advantage of Stalin's death to assert his independence from the Stalinist world, and thus cleave the empire in half.

The Dangers of Reading Marx in Russia

Unwary Propagandists Find That Even Pie-in-the-Sky Talk Is Risky

By B. D. NADSON

In his most recent work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, Stalin, justifying himself for "spending time reiterating generally known truths," wrote:

"The fact is that we, the leading core, are joined every year by thousands of new and young forces who are ardently desirous of proving their worth, but who do not possess an adequate Marxist education, are unfamiliar with many truths that are well known to us, and are therefore compelled to grope in the darkness."

The reading of the Russian press over a period of time will convince one that this is so: the Stalinist press offers an abundance of instances of people who are "groping in darkness," that is, who are unfamiliar with how to distort Marxism in the Stalinist manner. What is more, it is precisely the educators—the party lecturers, agitators, propagandists, etc.—who are woefully lacking in a "Marxist education."

"SHORTCOMINGS"

Is this bad? As Stalin would say: it isn't good. Take, for example, the following case. E. Tretyakova, secretary of the Moscow regional committee, back in 1951 attended a conference of party lecturers. A good criticism was had by all; and, among other things, here is what secretary Tretyakova had to say:

"A creative discussion of lectures permitted the exposing and elimination of a series of typical shortcomings and mistakes that had been allowed in the clarification of certain important questions. For example, the lecture *Roads to the Gradual Transition from Socialism to Communism* was discussed. . . . In the course of the discussion, among other serious shortcomings of the lecture, it also came out that in many lectures concerning the gradual transition from socialism to communism, a stress is incorrectly placed on questions of distribution, and not on the tasks of creating the technical, material bases for communism." (*Bolshevik*, No. 14, 1951, p. 66. Emphasis mine—BDN.)

EQUALITY?

The trouble (one might guess) is that Marx defined the goal of communist society in terms of a principle of distribution—from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs. This was a "typical shortcoming" of Marx from the standpoint of the Russian reality. Young, raw elements think they are tooting the line when they work out head-spinning dodges to show that Stalinist Russia is "approaching Communism," as Stalin says, but they make the serious "error" of taking Marx seriously.

Tretyakova does not say so, but the unfortunate lecturer he raps

may even have discussed the "irrelevant" question of equality.

Even older, apparently already "arrived," members of the Stalinist intelligentsia permit their minds to wander on this subject of the "gradual transition." *Bolshevik*, for example, in an editorial demanding a rise in the theoretical level of the party, writes:

"Certain philosophers and economists in works devoted to the transition from socialism to communism bring to the fore, not questions of the development of the productive forces, of the technical, material bases for communism, but problems of distribution; they will discuss the question, what will the realization of the principle of communism begin with? With the distribution of bread according to need, or with free transportation? Such 'theories,' unfortunately, have not been subjected to proper criticism by philosophers and economists. These 'theories' thwart the interests of the government, concentrating interest as they do, not on the main conditions and tasks of communist construction, not on questions of productive development, on questions of consumption and distribution." (*Bolshevik*, No. 18, 1951, p. 7. Emphasis mine—BDN.)

THE BIG GAP

Bolshevik does not say so, but the philosophers and economists

are probably indulging in day-dreaming, building castles in the air, as a kind of retreat from the sordid facts of Stalinist reality.

The editors of *Bolshevik* are advised to read the following statement of Marx's: "The religious reflex of the real world can, in any case, only then finally vanish, when the practical relations of everyday life offer to man none but perfectly intelligible and reasonable relations with regard to his fellow-men, and to nature." (*Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 92.)

The Stalinist "philosophers and economists" discuss the distributive norms of genuine communism (as Marx wrote about them) and raise ideas in people's minds about free bread or transportation—when there are queues before shops for basic foods and when a Russian citizen cannot even travel freely around the country with the fare in hand. Up to a certain point, this is religious "pie-in-the-sky" stuff. After a certain point, it reminds the people too forcibly of the great gap between Russian myth and reality.

WEEK by WEEK . . .
LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism.
A sub is only \$2 a year!

The Stalinoids on Stalin

By BERNARD CRAMER

The death of Stalin brought out the worst in the American Stalinoids and Stalinized liberals, giving them a field day for the exercise of their peculiar brand of "critical" whitewash of the Kremlin tyrant.

The Nation unleashed its two experienced whitewashers, Del Vayo and Alexander Werth, and backstopped them with Earl Browder. Werth made it clear that he was not to be taken in by the sensational press stories on the event. No, he was critical, selective, and skeptical:

"The only press story which seemed to me to ring true was the United Press dispatch telling of the people weeping in the streets of Moscow and whispering in the street cars as if they were actually in the death chamber."

Perhaps the word in the above quotation which rang true was "whispering." It can get to be a habit.

Werth concentrates on this theme of the Russians' emotional loss. It seems that "even the pre-war Stalin had become reasonably popular." This obviously refers to the cheers of happiness with which the Russian people greeted the bloody purges of 1936-38.

Not that Werth is duped by the state-organized laudations of Stalin the Genius as to a divinity. He reveals that "No one believed in his infallibility," not really, not even Stalin himself. Stalin "tended to laugh" at the "element of toadying in the talk of his genius" and at "the hyperbolic poetry addressed to him, especially by Oriental bards." This amusing deification of the *Vozhd* grew up because he was a symbol and a father image. "Emotionally, therefore, Stalin's disappearance is a grave blow to every Russian, even the malcontents, especially in the present international situation."

APPEASEMENT

The "malcontents," scurvy fellows as they are, who no doubt would be grumblers even in paradise, were probably the ones doing the whispering.

The *Nation's* editor, on another page, makes her usually thoughtful contribution to a "sane" approach to the new Russian regime. Sanity means appeasement and "negotiations" for a deal, as before, but in addition she recommends a unique tactic. She wants the Western capitals to display caution "until some unmistakable sign of a break appears in the Soviet world." When breaks in Stalinist power occur, the *Nation* does not decry them. But until a break, "The only move the administration could safely make would be one based on the assumption that the new Moscow regime is as strong and unified as its appearance."

Lack of "caution" would apparently consist in trying to stimulate breaks in the empire of the bloodiest despot the world has ever known. One of the things that "could lead to total disaster" is "psychological warfare" based on the notion that the Russian people hated Stalin and would welcome the overthrow of their government." She warns against "fantasies or counter-revolutionary maneuvers."

QUESTION OF MANNERS

This is the *Nation* in typical form. It does not direct its liberal-Stalinoid rhetoric against the total incapacity of Washington to take advantage of any opportunities in the situation in a progressive direction, but rather against any attack on Stalinist power as "counter-revolutionary," it would seem.

The independent pro-Stalinist I. F. Stone (in his newly established personal organ *I. F. Stone's*

Weekly, for March 14) consoles himself with the thought that "Amid the burst of bad manners and foolish speculation, there was remarkably little jubilation." This contribution is to be paired off with the complaint registered by James Burnham (in *The Freeman*):

"Is there no leader of the Western world with wisdom, intelligence, courage — and common sense—enough to declare: 'Let mankind rejoice that the bloodiest butcher in history has gone to his dishonored grave!'"

NEW BROWDER

In this so-very-fundamental difference of opinion over etiquette in politics, Stone finds support even to the right of Burnham: "Syngman Rhee, ruler of a satellite state precariously engaged in fighting for its life against forces supplied by Russia, demonstrated a sense of fitness in his own condolences [on Stalin's death] which Washington seemed afraid to show."

For the rest, Stone (who is willing to agree that Russia is a totalitarian dictatorship when you push him to the wall) preaches that "Every great leader is the reflection of the people he leads and Stalin in this sense was Russia." This is Stone in his typical form. So Hitler "was" Germany? It was as a matter of fact true that Hitler was a "reflection" of one section of the German people; and so in a sense McCarthy "is" America.

Earl Browder takes the oppor-

tunity, in his own article, to announce that he no longer calls himself a Communist, though what this has to do with the death of Stalin is a little obscure. It is his opinion, however, that Stalin retired from "active operational leadership" as far back as 1945.

The proof of this, as far as a reader can see, is that this is the date when Browder went on the skids in the American Communist Party. This unhappy event was due to the fact that Stalin's influence no longer "kept hostile critics from demolishing my policies for the American party." This would make it appear that Browder disagreed only with the American CP leadership, but he remarks that "from 1945 on I found myself in deep and growing disagreement with the international line of the Communist movement."

SWP BRAND

The purpose of all this, in a personal vein, is to dig a chasm between Stalin as an individual and the movement and system which he headed. Thus Browder maintains his allegiance to Stalin's memory while coming out as a critic of "the Soviet type of socialism."

Among the present company we might as well also include the organ which reverses Browder end-to-end: heaping well-merited abuse on the person of Stalin while using its own brand of whitewash on his empire and his totalitarian system. This is the *Militant*, of the official-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party,

which plugs the line that Russia, "since it is organized on the basis of revolutionary property forms, has assumed a great social significance as a spearhead of revolutionary social transformation in the present world conflict." This group looks on Stalinist victory in the world as an installment of the "socialist" revolution.

PEACEFUL BUTCHER

In the *Militant's* editorial on "Imperialism's Lie About Stalin," we find that one "monstrous lie" was that "he was the 'aggressor' moving to conquer the world and throw us all into slave labor camps." On the contrary, Stalin was simply a timid rabbit who would "try by every means at his command to come to friendly terms with the capitalist powers." The threat of war comes only from the Western capitalisms.

It seems that Stalin may have been a butcher, as other articles in the *Militant* explain with the proper quotations from Trotsky, but he was a very peace-loving butcher.

However, if no fierce struggle inside the Kremlin is in sight, this is partially compensated for by the fact that a different prospect appears inside the minuscule bureaucracy of the SWP. Here a knockdown factional fight has broken out, on the "Russian question"—the first such since 1940—apparently in reaction to the increasing Stalinization of this movement, which reflects the Stalinization of the Fourth International groups in Europe.

ISL FUND DRIVE

We Must Hit 50% by Next Week!

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

The end of the fourth week of the ISL Fund Drive finds us a little short of the \$4000 mark. That means we are running behind schedule at this date. By the time the next report is due, the half-way mark in the campaign will have been reached, but as the box score below will show, we are still a considerable distance from reaching the same point in contributions.

There was too big a letdown this week following the rather good showing a week ago. If the same pace had been maintained then we would certainly have reached the half-way mark in contributions by the next report. The reason for this drop is easy to see, when you note that out of eighteen possible sources of weekly contributions, payments were received for only five of the quotas. The vast majority of the areas listed sent no money in this past week.

LAGGARDS

We received a total of only \$417 as compared to \$1134 a week ago. Contributions came in from Streator (which is now over the 100 per cent mark), Newark, Oakland, the SYL, and New York City. Percentage-wise, the largest contribution came from Oakland, and lifted it to fourth place in the standings. Although New York, Newark and the SYL sent in contributions, the amounts were not substantial enough to change their positions in the standings to any appreciable degree.

The laggards in the drive at this stage are the cities with the larger quotas. Good contributions from Seattle, Detroit, Newark, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Chicago and New York would change the whole pace of the campaign.

By the end of next week, we ought to have another \$1700 in order to keep pace with the half way mark of the Fund Drive itself. Is this possible? That depends entirely upon the branches

of the ISL, the SYL and on our friends and sympathizers.

A little calculation will tell you the whole story. There are six more weeks left to the drive. We

need to raise slightly over \$7,500 to complete the total quota. That means that we should receive \$1250 weekly for the rest of the campaign. It's really up to you.

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Per Cent
TOTAL	\$11,500	\$3954	34.3
Streator	25	30	120
St. Louis	25	25	100
General	1,075	605	56
Oakland	500	235	47
Pittsburgh	150	67	44.6
Reading	50	20	40
Cleveland	200	75	37.5
New York	4,000	1423	35.5
Chicago	1,800	565	31.3
Buffalo	650	200	30.7
SYL	1,250	375.50	30
Philadelphia	250	65	26
Los Angeles	600	141	23.5
Detroit	500	100	20
Newark	250	28	11.2
Akron	50	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0
Oregon	50	0	0
Seattle	200	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)

N. Y. ISL BRANCH FORUMS

WEDNESDAY

March 25

Sidney Hook's
Line on
Smith Act

THURSDAY

March 26

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

Forums at 8:30 p.m. at

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, New York City

**Get ALL your books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**

We specialize in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement and Marxism.

Write for our free book list: all the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky; labor history; socialist fundamentals; economics of capitalism; Stalinism and Stalinist Russia, etc.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street

New York 11, New York

Socialists Run Campaign for L.A. School Board

LOS ANGELES, March 12—The Socialist Party here has entered its candidate for the coming election of the Board of Education, and a good campaign is developing. Backing the SP candidate, Vern Davidson, is also the Los Angeles branch of the Independent Socialist League, which has accepted a place on the Campaign Committee.

Torn by fear and pressure, the once proud Los Angeles school system lies stricken. UNESCO has been torn from its curricula. School books are being censored. The *Nation* and the *New Republic* have been removed from school libraries. Everybody signs a loyalty oath. And last year the American Legion was given per-

mission to visit every high school to explain the advantages of universal military training.

The incumbent school board has not had to be forced into laying the ax to freedom. It came naturally. Also coming naturally to the incumbents was an ability to make pocket money by selling school-bus contracts to favored companies. This has resulted in half the board being forced to resign or risk jail. But the other half is still there, determined to "preserve the freedom" of the Chamber of Commerce and the NAM to run public education.

The usual slate of "liberal" candidates is running in opposition to the incumbents. When they make speeches, they make speeches about "corruption" in the school board, but they are afraid to talk about the major issue—the "corruption" of our freedom.

Recognizing the serious danger

to freedom in the public schools, the socialist campaign will counter the reactionary attack and the liberal evasion of issues.

SCHOOL PROGRAM

Calling for a free lunch program for children in lower-income areas, free medical care for all children, special facilities for the retarded and maladjusted, a sympathetic attitude toward teaching the history of labor unions and the cooperative movement, the public ownership of the school-bus system, and an end to the present anti-civil-liberties hysteria, Davidson offers not only the socialist solution in general but also a concrete program to raise the level of Los Angeles education.

Realizing the need for cooperation of progressive forces in the city, the Socialist Party asked for the help of a number of commun-

ity groups. Thus far the Independent Socialist League and the student group Vanguard at the University of California (UCLA) have accepted places on the Campaign Committee. Former Governor Olson has accepted the co-chairmanship of the Citizens Committee backing Davidson.

Speaking before Mexican groups on the East Side or the League of Women Voters, one theme has been hit again and again—the need for restoring civil liberties to the school system. Citizens who have been told that socialists believe in a totalitarian state are seeing a socialist candidate demand the restoration of freedom and the practice of democracy.

PROTEST VOTE

Against the \$100,000 the incumbents have reportedly paid a local advertising agency to run their campaign, and against the endorsement of the major unions which the "liberals" have, Davidson has only an outside chance of winning a place on the School Board. But every vote cast for him will be a clear warning to the new school board that there are citizens for whom financial corruption is a secondary issue as against the perversion of the right of the youth in Los Angeles to a decent education in an atmosphere of free inquiry. It will also mean that the Chamber of Commerce, the NAM, and the Rev. Fifield's "Freedom Clubs" are put on notice that the Socialists, at least, will continue to raise their voice clearly and openly in opposition to capitalist control of education.

There is an unusual element of drama in this campaign. The SP candidate, Davidson, formerly Youth Secretary of the Young Socialists (YPSL), may be arrested at any moment for his refusal to be drafted. The Los Angeles group of the Socialist Party, as well as the state SP organization in its majority, is associated with the anti-war left wing of that party; however, these comrades' position is largely colored by pacifism.

Any readers of LABOR ACTION in Los Angeles who would like to join in working on the campaign should write to: Rina Winokour, 358 South Cochran, Apt. 103, Los Angeles.

Other UAW Issues — —

(Continued from page 2)

elements with reactionary programs and policies.

As usual, there will be discussion of political action, with a few local unions advocating some form of labor party as the goal of the UAW-CIO. Interestingly, this was not discussed at various conferences, nor was the problem of attitude toward the Eisenhower administration taken up. But in one form or another these vital political problems are bound to assert themselves at the convention.

Yardsticks

Criticism of the wage conferences and councils has been made quite frequently by regional directors who find the task of meeting with delegates and answering questions becoming more burdensome, and there is every likelihood that attempts to cut these conferences down will be made at the convention. As against this trend, there are some resolutions demanding the election of all department heads and council officials, and otherwise giving the rank and file more voice in the affairs of the union.

Using as its yardstick of measurement the program, structure and status of other unions, the UAW-CIO leadership assuredly can present an impressive record that is bound to make its impact on the delegates and the nation as a whole. Using as a basis of comparison its own previous programs and goal, the UAW leadership becomes a bit uncomfortable. Institutionally the UAW is stronger; but how does it stand as a social force, with genuine influence over its ranks, as a vanguard? That is a different question, which the 14th convention will answer more clearly than ceremonial speeches at anniversary affairs.

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.

Something New — —

(Continued from page 1)

when vast bureaucratic machines are set into motion without any democratic control is not an altogether reactionary one. At the very least it keeps the big shots on their toes. But once you start the idea rolling that mistakes are not just a matter of bureaucratic bungling but probably have something more sinister behind them, you are on the road not only to paralyzing the operations of the organizations involved, but to creating an atmosphere in the country in which suspicion and fear is the dominant role.

MOSCOW METHOD

It is not denied that there is a possibility of Stalinist agents sabotaging various government programs from within the bureaucracy. The point is that without uncovering even a mite of evidence that this actually is the case, McCarthy is in full cry after the Voice with sabotage as his chief barking point.

First he got one Glenn D. Gillett, a radio consultant who had planned some of the army's broadcast installations, to agree with him that sabotage could be involved in the Voice's decision to cut a Vienna radio transmitter tower from 900 to 450 feet in height. Then he got another engineer, Lewis McKesson, in on the act in connection with the "Vagabond Project," a roving ship which broadcasts to Russia. McKesson criticized the project severely. He charged that the mismanagement was too grave to have been due to mere stupidity.

"If you were trying to sabotage the Voice is this what you would have done?" McCarthy asked.

"If I were a saboteur, I would do things like that," McKesson replied.

TAFT CHIMES IN

But who was the saboteur? Of course, McCarthy doesn't know, and he really cares less. He has found a number of people with radical or Stalinist pasts among the Voice staff, but to date he has not revealed anyone as presently connected with the Stalinist movement, either in the technical or the propaganda division of the organization. Yet his "revelations" have induced Senator Taft to make the remark that the whole organization of the Voice of America should be fired and a new bunch put in.

Of course, LABOR ACTION is not the guardian of the morale of the Voice of America staff or any other government department. That is the business of the administration and of the liberals who back its line in foreign policy. But McCarthy and his buddies are getting more dangerous, the more rope they are given with which to hang anyone in the government who fails to see things just the way they do.

And make no mistake about it: They are on the offensive in the Republican Party and the govern-

ment as a whole. So far Eisenhower's policy of conciliating everyone who has a bit of power has been playing into their hands. Even Taft now becomes the liberal wing of the Republican Party, not because he has moved toward the left, but because the center of gravity has shifted farther right.

SQUEAKS

And where are the Democratic guardians of the traditions of the Fair Deal, of democracy and enlightenment? Except for a squeak here and a muffled grumble there, they are hardly heard from. That is about what we expected of them.

In the meantime other organizations, such as the National Council of Churches of Christ and the Commission on Justice and Peace of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, have condemned McCarthy's tactics roundly. The feeling that things have gone too far is widespread, but to date no real political conclusions have been drawn from it. Before this is done in any way which will lead to action, the labor movement will have to recognize that its position is endangered by the rampaging reactionaries.

Malenkov's Peace-Talk —

(Continued from page 1)

These observations had a point. The shooting down of an American fighter and a British bomber within a week could be an accident, but that is not at all certain. Even if these specific acts were not committed on order, it is clear that the Russian pilots have orders to shoot to kill the moment they even think foreign craft have violated their "air space." That is the least ominous interpretation that can be given to these incidents, and even if it were the correct one, it would not hint at a turn in Stalinist policy toward a softening of the cold war.

INTERPRETATIONS

One of the likely interpretations of Malenkov's speech is that he is seeking to ape one of the tricks dearest to the heart of his dead master. This is the guise in which Stalin often appeared as the man of moderation who is shocked and appalled at the "excesses" of his subordinates or of foreign powers. Russians who went through the period of the forced collectivization of agriculture, when millions of people starved to death as the result of the brutal policy of the regime, will not easily forget that when the country was on the verge of collapse Stalin made a speech in which he said that his henchmen had become "dizzy from success," and ordered that the pressure on the peasantry be let up somewhat.

Now Malenkov talks peace and settlement of all disputes, while his MIGs turn on the heat and his

propaganda machine tells his people that they are simply defending themselves from the encroachments of foreign aircraft.

He gains doubly by this. Among his subject peoples his own reputation for peaceful intentions, and that of his clique is enhanced. At the same time, their attention is distracted from the difficulties involved in the shift from Stalin's control to the threat from beyond the borders. The clique is thus in a position to turn in either direction at any moment. They can either step up the tempo of the cold war if they feel that the menace from outside has to be emphasized, or they can slow it down if they feel that this will serve their purposes more.

To conjecture which way they will actually turn would be to indulge in pure guesswork. The point is that neither the British nor the American governments are in a position to call the turn. They don't have "peace" movements all over the world which can echo the "peace" statements of their own statesmen among the masses, and make effective propaganda about the shooting down of their planes. They can only reply with a "tough" aerial policy of their own. Yet everyone knows that this kind of thing brings one closer to war, not farther away from it.

Stalin is dead, but his heirs retain the political initiative, even in the midst of their reorganization. This is not due to their own diabolical cleverness but to the impotency of the capitalist bloc's foreign policy.

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 unremitting 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.

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.