

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 30, 1953

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

## The Russian Peace Maneuvers: A Move to Split Western Bloc?

By GORDON HASKELL

### Old China Hand

That paladin of Fair Deal liberalism, Adlai Stevenson, resting from the burden of carrying the banner of progress and democracy in the last election, has just visited Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa. It's a pity he didn't do so before running for president: he might have saved himself the trouble of opposing Eisenhower. For it seems that on a point which was considered crucial by many of his Fair Deal liberal enthusiasts—attitude toward reactionary dictators in foreign policy—his eyes have been opened.

The post-inauguration act by Eisenhower which caused the biggest wave of disconcertment among the U. S.'s allies everywhere and liberals in this country was the president's "unleashing" of Chiang. On this Stevenson told reporters in Formosa:

"It seems a very logical thing to do. However, I had not realized it was necessary. I did not think the Seventh Fleet was used to protect the mainland. Most of the people back home had the impression the Nationalists had been making many raids on the mainland despite the Seventh Fleet."

Was there ever such a confession of political bankruptcy? (The answer, by the way, is: Yes, others have been more pitiful, but they weren't standard-bearers for Americans for Democratic Action. . . .)

What was Stevenson talking about, during the presidential campaign, in some of his more trenchant remarks about U. S. support to dictators abroad?

After dinner with the generalissimo-butcher who drove the Chinese people into the arms of the Stalinists, he termed his Formosa regime's work "splendid and very encouraging"—"an essential part of the Pacific defense of the free world"—"a laboratory demonstration of better government and a healthy economic setup."

(Turn to last page)

The Kremlin's moves in foreign policy are teaching the ruling classes of the world a few lessons in just how "psychological warfare" can be waged.

They have not yet reached the stage where a clear line of "political warfare" can be seen in them, and they may not actually reach that stage. It is impossible to tell, at the moment, whether what the Stalinists have been doing reflects differences of opinion among members of the ruling clique, whether it is a temporary ploy calculated to keep the American bloc in a state of nervous suspension, or whether these are the opening salvos in a radical turn in Russian foreign policy.

Last week LABOR ACTION referred to Malenkov's speech to the Supreme Soviet in which he went out of his way to say that the United States is among the countries with which all outstanding problems can be solved peacefully. This speech was made against a background of several "incidents" in which Stalinist planes were reported to have opened fire on American and British aircraft, shooting down one of the latter with the loss of seven lives.

### WOING BRITAIN

Since then the Stalinist governments have made a number of additional "conciliatory" moves, and accompanied them with about an equal number of "tough" ones. It is quite noticeable that the conciliatory gestures have been made to Britain, while the "tough" ones have been directed to the United States.

In a speech to the House of Commons, Churchill admitted that the British plane which was shot down "may have" flown briefly over Stalinist territory. Nevertheless, he condemned the ruthless destruc-

tion of the craft and its crew in the strongest terms, and the note which was sent to the Russian authorities by the Allied commissioners in Germany was a stern one.

Much to everyone's amazement, General Vassily I. Chuikov sent back a very mild reply in which he expressed the "regrets" of his government at the loss of life involved in the incident, and suggested a conference to avoid "misunderstandings" in the future. The note was addressed to the British, and ignored the others who had protested.

Although such a note would be normal among "friendly" powers, it was quite out of character for the Stalinists. This was emphasized by the very cold attitude they

took in replying to an American note protesting attacks made on American planes near the Czechoslovak border and 25 miles off Kamchatka, in the North Pacific. The Russians curtly said that both planes had been engaged in "visual reconnaissance" of their territory, and warned against repetition of such acts by the Americans.

The next move was for Molotov to inform the British that he would see what he could do to obtain the release of some British civilians who have been interned by the North Koreans for a couple of years. This was in response to a British request which had been made some time ago and had apparently been ignored un-

(Continued on page 7)

## Auto Workers At the Convention— The UAW Takes Up Foreign Policy

By BEN HALL

ATLANTIC CITY, March 23—Two significant events highlighted the otherwise routine sessions of the first two days of the United Auto Workers (CIO) convention which opened here on March 22: (1) the beginnings of a discussion on foreign policy; (2) the meeting of more than 150 delegates at a special caucus convoked by large agricultural-union locals of the union.

Discussion on foreign policy was provoked by the report of the resolutions committee on "International Relations." The aim of this resolution, as of the plans put forward by Reuther in the past, is to seek some way of rallying the peoples of the world behind the struggle against Stalinism and for democracy, and to inject into the foreign policies of the United States the greatest possible democratic content.

At the same time, it reflected the weaknesses of the Reutherite position. While calling for a new slant in foreign policy, while recognizing the need for an appeal to the revolutionary sentiments of the world's masses, it managed to associate itself fundamentally with the basic line of official governmental policy as developed by the Truman administration and to a lesser extent even of the Eisenhower regime.

The convention thus records the basic contradiction of labor's line in world affairs.

The substance of the lengthy resolution can be summarized by a few excerpts:

"A revolution is going on in the world," it stated, "a revolution against poverty, human misery, economic exploitation and political subjugation. The Communists did not start this revolution. But they hope to capture and betray it."

The United States, it indicated, must

(Continued on page 2)

## The Home Front Now McCarthy's Victims Need Clearance from Whittaker Chambers . . .

By L. G. SMITH

Senator McCarthy and his helpers continue to tie the Republicans' State Department in knots. After effectively demoralizing the Voice of America, they have now moved on to bigger game in the person of Charles E. Bohlen, the proposed ambassador to Russia.

What do they have on Bohlen, or against him? As far as anyone can tell, they have nothing "on" Bohlen at all. The only actual piece of "derogatory" information against the man which has been mentioned by anyone in the whole debate is a letter from a citizen who "said he looked at Bohlen and with his sixth sense determined that Bohlen was a man who did have in the back of his mind such a tendency toward immorality as to make him unfit."

What do they have against him? It is not quite clear whether they have anything against him, or are just using him to get at Dulles. At most they seem to be irritated by the fact that Bohlen was a translator for Roosevelt at Yalta, and that he dared to defend the actions taken by the administrations under which he had served during and after the war.

### FINAL CLEARANCE

But McCarthy is having his usual field day. The less reactionary Republican and Democratic papers note with delight that for the first time he was really contradicted and opposed by Republican leaders on the floor of the Senate on March 23. But the issue hardly seemed to go against McCarthy.

The upshot of the debate was that next day the Senate Foreign Relations Committee assigned Senators Taft and Sparkman to examine the file the FBI had sub-

mitted to the State Department on Bohlen, which is another slap at the State Department which these gentlemen are supposed to be defending against McCarthy.

The whole situation is getting more fantastic, if not more amusing, as it develops. McCarthy let it be known that he was going to visit Whittaker Chambers. Immediately the rumor spread that Chambers had "something" on Bohlen. Although recovering from a heart attack, Chambers issued a statement that "I know nothing whatever, by my direct knowledge, that bears in any way adversely or otherwise on Mr. Bohlen as a security risk. If, repeat if, any information in his security file bears unfavorably on Mr. Bohlen, none of it comes from me."

The newspapers gave wide publicity to Chambers' statement. It appears that for

(Turn to last page)

Labor Action FORUM  
New York

Next Thursday, April 2  
AFTER STALIN—  
WHAT?

Speaker:  
Albert Gates  
Secretary, ISL

8:30 p.m. at Labor Action Hall  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

# The UAW's Foreign Policy — —

(Continued from page 1)

appeal to these aspirations, it must dissociate itself from world reaction, and it must repudiate any support to Chiang Kai-shek, to Franco or to Peron. It denounced the French government for its responsibility in the assassination of the Tunisian labor leader Farhat Hached.

"We must answer the propaganda of the Cominform not by pious slogans about democracy's virtues, but by a bold program of social and economic action—a total war against poverty and injustice...."

"We must make unmistakably clear that we support the aspirations of people for political independence; that in the Middle East and elsewhere we are aligned with the people, not with their landlords or their exploiters...."

But the excellent intentions and admirable adjectives of the resolution are vitiated by its failure to dissociate itself from the directly opposite course pursued by the United States in actual fact.

## BAROMETER

On the contrary, the resolution indicated its sympathy and support of the government's basic policy, as it was and as it is.

On Truman: no criticism but this endorsement: "We reaffirm our belief that the decision to meet aggression in Korea with the armed resistance of United Nations forces was vital to the defense of the free world against Russian plans of world domination. President Truman's timely and courageous leadership in this decision checked the design of the Kremlin...."

And on Eisenhower: "It is too early to express judgments of the new directions in foreign policy, but we commend President Eisenhower for standing out against his party's leadership in the Senate when he refused to repudiate international agreements entered into by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman." Criticism of Eisenhower was limited to a recording of the fact that his "immoral and unrealizable campaign promises have evaporated."

Floor discussion was provoked by the resolution's comments on "revolution" and by its repudiation of "reckless military adventurers who [favor] an overwhelming offensive in the Korean campaign...." Two speakers, echoing the sentiments of the more conservative sections of the UAW membership and officialdom, found the radical phraseology offensive. In vigorous terms, they asked for a "realistic" policy of beating Russia by pure-and-simple military force.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, published March 25:

*Out of My Life and Thought*, by Albert Schweitzer, 216 pages, Mentor, 35 cents. *The Catcher in the Rye*, by J. D. Salinger, 160 pages, Signet, 25 cents. *Blind Curies*, by W. C. MacDonald, 160 pages, Signet, 25 cents. *Captive in the Night*, by Donald Stokes, 168 pages, Signet, 25 cents. *The Hoods*, by Harry Grey, 368 pages, Signet Giant, 35 cents. *Dangerous Voyage (Willoway)*, by Gore Vidal, 160 pages, Signet, 25 cents. *Sybil*, by Louis Auchincloss, 192 pages, Signet, 25 cents. *Destination: Universe*, by A. E. von Vogt, 160 pages, Signet, 25 cents. *Let It Come Down*, by Paul Bowles, 256 pages, Signet, 25 cents.

## LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor and Socialist Library.

SEND FOR OUR FREE BOOK LIST.

114 West 14 Street, New York City

A basic pamphlet—  
"SOCIALISM:  
The HOPE of HUMANITY

by

Max Shachtman

Read it! 10 cents

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

The dispute became a barometer of the sentiments of the assembled delegates. At the convention two years ago, when the Korean war was still young, one delegate had relieved himself of an all-out jingo speech which bolstered the biological theory that the Chinese "breed like rats" and that the only way to handle them is to "drop that good old apple." His frothing effusions were greeted by an astounding ovation.

But this week showed the atmosphere has changed. Conservative opposition to the UAW line was listened to in sober silence. Three years of the war have passed and men must begin to think.

A delegate from Ford Local 400, who had served on a CIO committee of observers in Scandinavia, emphasized that the peoples of Europe see U. S. policy represented not by labor but by reaction and that the task of labor is to show the peoples of the world that the working class of this nation is truly for a democratic policy.

## RANKS SPEAK UP

One hundred and fifty delegates responded to the call of the Agricultural Implement Council of the union for a

caucus meeting to oppose the suggested restrictions of the rights of UAW councils. The International Executive Board is recommending that these councils be restricted to one meeting per year. Another official proposal is for a two-year term for local union officers, who are now chosen annually.

At this convention there is no organized anti-administration group. At the same time, the Reuther caucus has in fact ceased to be a genuine caucus. On the eve of the convention, a mass meeting was called as a Reuther "caucus" meeting, but in fact it was simply a preliminary rally to hear speeches from Reuther and other leaders. No time or opportunity was allowed for discussion of any of the disputed issues.

The Agricultural Implement caucus was called independently of the Reuther meeting but not in opposition to it. The speakers made clear that they were not opposed to the UAW administration but that they were in opposition to tendencies to build up too much power at the top and reduce the voice of the ranks and secondary leadership below. Its meeting was an encouraging sign of the vitality and persistence of rank-and-file democracy in the union. The call for the meeting was issued

by locals representing more than 40,000 members.

Two delegates from Harvester Local 6, Carl Shier and Westray Henney, pointed to the activities of their Agricultural Implement Council as an example of the kind of democracy in action that must be encouraged and not curbed. Westray touched the heart of the question when he said: "I find a discrepancy between the remarks of Walter Reuther in support of democracy in the union and all the proposals to cut down on the participation of the rank and file in the life of the union."

Ernie Mazey, Briggs Local 212, in a soberly thought-out presentation of the state of affairs in the UAW, indicated that the issues faced by the Agricultural Council were part of the problem of stimulating democracy generally. Five-year contracts, he said, freeze working conditions and make the leadership unwilling and unable to face the daily, pressing demands of the ranks that arise during the five-year period.

A growing dissatisfaction with long-term agreements is evident among the more conscious sections of the union and the leadership will present the problem to the convention at later sessions.

## LOS ANGELES On the Labor Front—

# Edison Co. Tries Big-Scale Union-Busting

By V. S. RIVSON

LOS ANGELES, March 19—The 3700 members of Local 47, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL), at the Southern California Edison Company, along with 650 employees of the California Electric Power Company in Riverside, went out on strike March 10. This action came after a week of fruitless negotiation between the company and the representatives of the union. The main issues were a 25-cent-an-hour wage increase for linemen and a demand for the union shop. This was the first strike called against Edison since the inception of the union in 1945.

Before the union's contract expired on March 3 there had been a four-month period of negotiation which included 24 full-day sessions. The only unresolved issues were those of wages and the union shop. On the 3rd the company turned down the union's demand and offered only a 10-cents-an-hour increase and no union shop. But the union was still determined to arbitrate. Then the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service asked the union to extend its contract 48 hours. This they did. The extension expired on the 6th, at which time the union reported the company's offer to the membership and it was rejected by a vote of 100 to 1.

Because of the deadlocked situation the Los Angeles Central Labor Council requested a meeting of both parties in order to find a possible solution but the company refused to appear. Again, on the 9th, the federal mediation agency called another meeting which was quickly adjourned because the company was unwilling to negotiate further.

## STRIKEBREAKING

The union asked the company to submit the issues to a tripartite fact-finding board. Edison refused stating that "the board might uphold the union and then the company would find it hard to support their position to the general public" and it admitted that the company had no new solution, adding "Since you are determined to strike you might as well do it! We are ready for you."

The negotiating committee then used its authority and called the strike; it was left with no other possible alternative.

The issue of the wage increase revolved around whether or not the Edison people could afford to grant it. This increase would have put the LA linemen in a position comparable with others of their trade throughout the West Coast. The average rate is about \$2.50 an hour (the present wage of the Edison linemen is \$2.21).

The company contends that it cannot give such a raise without a substantial increase in the rates charged the people in Southern California. In fact, last December the company applied to the State Regulatory Authority for such an increase in the amount of \$16,000,000—this they said would offset higher costs of material, wages, and other expenditures.

By reading the company's propaganda

one would be led to the impression that it was suffering acute hardship. Actually the exact opposite is true. Reported 1952 earnings of \$3.21 per share compare "rather favorably" with \$2.81 per share in 1951.

The other outstanding issue is that of the union shop. The union modified its demands in this issue, but to no avail. It is now willing to accept the status quo for present employees not in the union but will require all future employees to join.

The way in which the company has savagely reacted has surprised even those who are well acquainted with the Los Angeles labor scene. No company action here in recent years has reached the reactionary labor-baiting heights of Edison's vindictive reprisals against the union and its membership in the very first week of the strike.

Prior to the strike the company tried to intimidate the workers by padlocking all gates and by stationing armed guards in all areas where employees report to work. This little stratagem had just the opposite effect on the workers—it made them more, not less, militant.

The company then resorted to smear ads in every newspaper in the communities they serve. They offered a \$5000 reward for stoolpigeon information concerning "acts of sabotage" against company property. They are advertising over the radio for strikebreakers. Edison notified the employees on strike to "pick up your final pay check," thus trying to frighten the striking workers into a belief that they have been fired.

The company is also phoning the wives of employees and telling them that unless their husbands return to work immediately they will not be taken back. They have hit strikers with the threat that if they don't return the company will cancel all their accumulated benefits (those strikers receiving care under the company medical plan have been denied further treatment unless they agree to become strikebreakers).

## COMPANY'S AIM

But by far the most unconscionable and outrageous company action has been directed against the employees living in the Big Creek Hydro Project (located 68 miles from Fresno in the Sierra mountains). A union bulletin describes the situation thus: "Edison has denied [them] the privilege of buying groceries at the company-owned commissary, unless they will agree to come back to work now as strikebreakers. The single employees working there live in a company-owned boardinghouse. Management will not allow them to eat at the cookhouse unless they will return to work. There are no restaurants or cafes in this area."

On March 11 the Edison group accused the union of "acts of sabotage." The union quickly denied this false and slanderous charge. Anyone familiar with the tactics of distortion and misrepresentation used by the company will recognize these accusations for what they are

—lies. But it is not unreasonable to believe that the company's labor-hating and strike-breaking supervisors are behind such acts.

From the outset the aim of the company's over-all policy has been to get government intervention to break the strike in behalf of the Edison interests. Its first reaction to the strike was a telegram, by President Mullendore of the company, to various government officials from Eisenhower to local mayors. The telegram called the roll of the large number of industries serviced, many of them "important defense plants," and added that "the so-called right to strike, however it may be justified as applying to other less vital industries, has absolutely no justification in this industry... employees... are occupying quite as much an office of public trust as are firemen, policemen or any other necessary public servant...."

There is talk in labor circles around town that the public-utility lobby in Washington is pressuring for legislation that would legalize strikes in public utilities and set up a system of compulsory bargaining. Along the same lines Mullendore has said that he "had received assurances from some government officials of their willingness to assist in your situation." (Los Angeles Times, March 12.)

The union needs the support of the whole labor movement. Los Angeles used to be known far and wide as an open-shop city; that changed considerably during the war but Edison is clearly trying to turn the clock back.

## Note for Curious Readers

Constant readers may observe that there has been a modification in LABOR ACTION'S makeup with this issue: four wider columns, instead of five, over the page. In order to save wear and tear on their speculative powers, we hasten to reveal the reason. The sole motivation is to increase the inside margin of each page (by 2½ picas, or about ¼ of an inch) in order to facilitate the binding of the LABOR ACTION volume at the end of the year. The change to a four-column setup was thereby entailed because otherwise each column would become slightly too narrow for efficient linotype-setting. We originally expected this change would also involve a 4 per cent loss in wordage but (for reasons too complex to explain to laymen) this hasn't happened. There has been no appreciable loss in wordage at all. While we were at it, by the way, we also added some new column heading cuts. But the new department "Spotlight," which you see on the front page, comes in this week also only by coincidence; it was planned some time ago. Under it we want to use the space for briefer news commentaries—briefer, that is, than our usual articles.—Ed.



**BOLIVIA** Government Forces Make a New Turn Toward Reaction—

# Nationalists Launch Vicious Attack on Workers' Left

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, March 16—The "national revolution" in Bolivia is in full retreat. This is indicated by the latest events.

The reasons for this trend are three-fold: (1) the reactionary and counter-revolutionary policy of the Nationalist party (the ruling MNR) and its government; (2) the economic bankruptcy of the government policy; and (3) the ebbing of the wave of revolutionary offensive on the part of the workers.

At the national convention of the MNR Nationalist party, there was much talk about "revolutionary policy," about agrarian reforms and about the "deepening of the national revolution," but it was talk. President Paz Estenssoro, himself said that "our policy must be more courageous, bolder and more revolutionary," but this was only intended to please the ears of the majority of the delegates, who were workers led by Juan Lechin and Torres, of the MNR's left wing.

Formally, the "left wing" of the Nationalist party won in the party congress, but politically it was the right wing which was dominant. One expression of this was to be seen in the return of Vice-President Siles from the U. S., and it is he who is slated to be Paz's successor, not Juan Lechin, although the latter formally gained a majority in the party congress.

Moreover: it was Lechin who greeted Siles as the vice-president of the republic, acknowledging his political supremacy. Siles is considered by all the people, working-class and bourgeois, as the head of the right-wing tendency. In spite of its leftist phraseology, the Nationalist convention represents a turn to the right, the liquidation of the "revolutionary period."

Of course, this turn has become possible not only because the Nationalist leaders now show their real faces, but basically because the economic situation enables them to do so. The economic situation of the country is catastrophic.

### ECONOMICS WINNING

The nationalized Corporacion Minera de Bolivia cannot sell its tin—the economic mainstay of the country—to the United States, and this entails a scarcity of dollars. The sale of 51 per cent of the tin production to William Harvey & Company of England is in reality a defeat for the government, because the main stockholder in this English smelting enterprise is Patiño—the tin magnate who formerly owned the Bolivian mines. It is said that a large part of the output is intended to go to Patiño's indemnity fund. The eventual sale of the rest of the tin production to the U. S. is also conditioned on agreeing to indemnity for American shareholders.

The economic pressure of the capitalist relations of production and of world capitalism makes a mockery of the phrases about the "economic liberation" of Bolivia. The world tin market is stronger than the Bolivian Nationalist party.

The dollar is quoted today at about 400 pesos, while the official figure is 100. The Corporacion Minera cannot pay its workers; the state must step in to do it; and this means inflation, the printing of paper pesos. Such inflation makes an illusion out of the wage rise decreed by the government.

The only solution in this situation would indeed be the deepening of the revolution—in the first place, the agrarian revolution, then the nationalization of foreign trade and all industry. But such a policy could be pursued only by a workers' and peasants' government, that is, a socialist government. As Trotsky foresaw, the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution can be carried through to the end only by a workers' government.

The Nationalist government is incapable of "deepening the national revolution," in spite of all its phrases and demagoguery; it wants only to limit it within the confines of Nationalist power. The first condition for the turn to the right is the destruction of the left-wing movement of the working class, in this case the destruction of the POR, the Trotskyist party which stands in the vanguard of the masses' struggle, and the destruction of the revolutionary role of the trade-union federation, the Central Obrera Boliviana (COB).

The Nationalists' aim is to subordinate the COB entirely to the policy of the government. Instead of a "courageous, bold and revolutionary" policy, as announced by President Paz at the Nationalist party congress, the government has begun a reactionary offensive against the

influence of the POR within the Central Obrera. In anticipation of its physical destruction, the government forces aim to undermine it through a Moscow-Trials type of witchhunt within the Central.

### FRAME-UP ASSAULT

At a session of the leading committee of the COB, the Nationalist wing of the organization together with the Stalinists charged the POR with being in the service of the *Rosca* (the reactionary right of the tin magnates) and of American imperialism; they charged that its policy was "reactionary" because it will "divide" the "forces of revolution"; that its program for a workers' and peasants' government and a socialist revolution is "counter-revolutionary" because only their "national, democratic revolution" is possible, etc., etc.

This reactionary offensive began when the POR forces inspired and led the great demonstrations of the Indian peasants of the Cochabamba region in favor of agrarian reforms. At this point the Nationalists, frightened stiff, decided to unleash the Stalinist party and the Stalinist elements in the COB in a witchhunt against the workers' party.

Now at every session the COB is lending itself to this Stalinist frame-up system, attacking not only the POR but Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, which has shown its essential validity precisely in Bolivia.

Of course, as LABOR ACTION readers know, this writer has frequently criticized the line of the POR, particularly its collaboration with the Nationalists, but in this situation it is the duty of revolutionary socialists to defend the only revolutionary party in Bolivia, in spite of its political mistakes. Naturally, the charges that the POR is "in the service" of reaction or American imperialism are of a piece with the fulminations of Vishinsky and his GPU frame-up artists against the old Bolsheviks in the Moscow Trials.

The reactionary offensive of the MNR government, seconded by the Stalinists,

has been made possible by the decrease in the pressure of the workers' and peasants' struggle.

### THE WORKERS WAIT

The workers are disillusioned with the results of mine nationalization as this has taken place within the limits of the Nationalist policy, and they have demanded the social compensation to the mine workers which the government presumably decreed; but Lechin and Torres convinced them to wait. These "workers' ministers" were able to argue that the regime cannot pay the three billion pesos which are coming to the workers. The Corporacion Minera declared that 10,000 workers are sick and unable to work in the mines, but it cannot pay them what is due and it also cannot pay the wage increase which it granted.

In accordance with the pleas of Lechin and Torres the workers keep on waiting till the government can pay. But the government will not be able to do so because the economic condition of the country cannot stand the burden.

This latent conflict over the workers' social compensation may well dig the grave into which the corpse of the regime will fall.

For it is impossible that the Nationalist policy, limited as it is, can solve all the contradictions of the economic, political and social structure of this country within the framework of capitalist relations. It is impossible to do so without a government monopoly of foreign trade, without an agrarian revolution which will give the land to the Indian peasant masses, without the nationalization of all industry. But these steps would add up to the socialist revolution, and it is just such a revolution that the Nationalists are deathly afraid of.

It is to exorcize the specter of such a revolution that they begin their shameful attacks on the POR and, behind the POR, on the Central Obrera. It is to avoid a real agrarian revolution that they adopted terrorist methods against the rebellious peasants.

Lechin, who is behind this, must know that after the POR goes, he goes too; and after Lechin, Paz will be the next victim, with the right-winger Siles as the inheritor of the fruits of the MNR's counter-revolutionary policy. Without the revolutionary pressure of the workers, on the basis of which it came to power in the first place, the present Nationalist government cannot endure against the pressure of the capitalist Right.

### A TURN NEEDED

What is indicated, as the only course to stem this retreat now going on in Bolivia, is a radical turn on the part of the POR to rally the working-class left.

The POR, I think, has to seek to lead the mine workers in their demands for social compensation, through strike action against the Nationalists in the mines, against the pernicious policy of Lechin, Torres, Butrón & Company. In answer to the disgraceful slanders of the MNR and the Communist Party, it should take the offensive against these people as betrayers of the revolutionary will of the masses.

It should make clear that the COB apparatus is being turned into an instrument of bureaucratic anti-working-class policy and alert the workers to the danger that the power is being turned over to the Siles right wing. Under the slogan of a government of the workers' unions, it should seek to mobilize the workers against the Nationalist party.

If such a new tactic on the part of the POR does succeed in unleashing once more the aggressive spirit which the workers displayed a few months ago, its end-result can be the renewal of the course toward socialist revolution. If it does not, and even if the Nationalist government falls, the POR goes free of any responsibility for the fatal policy of the Nationalists.

Spontaneous strike actions on the part of the mine workers show the way to save the Bolivian revolution. That is also the way indicated for the POR.

## ISL FUND DRIVE *Five Weeks to Go!* At the Half-Way Mark, the Big Pull Is Still Ahead!

By ALBERT GATES  
Fund Drive Director

We almost did it!

At the halfway mark in the 1953 ISL Fund Drive, we are just five percentage points away from 50 per cent of our goal! This was made possible by contributions totalling \$1264.50, which is the best week we have had in the campaign so far.

The best showing made this week was by Detroit, which jumped up from the bottom of the list to third place, behind Streator and St. Louis which are 100 per cent or over. Detroit climbed from 23.5 per cent to 78.5 and we are told by our friends there that they really expect to go beyond their quota. They want to carry the honors in this year's drive.

Most of the other sums this week come from branches which have been sending contributions regularly, and so their rise in the standings has been steady though not spectacular. Aside from Detroit, the areas with the larger quotas lag behind in the standings. They are the ones which

will have to carry the ball in the next half of the campaign.

We don't want to needle our friends in the SYL, but they are still far behind the pace of their campaign of a year ago when they were in or near first place during the ten weeks of the campaign. Although the SYL makes its steady weekly contributions, these are not of sufficient size to shoot it up to the top. Don Harris is still pretty sure that the SYL will make its quota with something to spare. Maybe, but it had better hurry things up a bit or there won't be time enough left for it to take the leadership.

We are not so much concerned about the branches over 60 per cent. Those holding the campaign back are the 50 per centers and under, and they include rather large quotas.

So far we haven't been able to record a single contribution from Seattle, Akron, Indiana and Oregon. They are overdue, and if seeing their goose-eggs another week doesn't induce some action from those places, we will miss our goal by a wide margin.

The next half of the campaign, experience shows us, is reality the tough part of the grind. Weekly payments should be a little higher than the level of this week. That is possible if the eleven individual quotas under 50 per cent, and the three quotas between 50 and 60 per cent, really come through in the next few weeks, for the totals of these quotas make up the overwhelming part of the over-all quota of \$11,500.

Los Angeles, Newark and Philadelphia are lagging far behind other branches. Buffalo has been unheard from for a number of weeks. New York, the SYL and Oakland are pacing themselves far too slowly.

These are the branches we are expecting to put some more steam into the Fund Drive in the next several weeks.

### Box Score

	Quota	Paid	%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$11,500</b>	<b>\$5218.50</b>	<b>45.3</b>
Streator .....	25	30	120
St. Louis .....	25	25	100
Detroit .....	500	392	78.5
Pittsburgh .....	150	112	74.6
Reading .....	50	35	70
General .....	1,075	620	57.6
Chicago .....	1,800	942	52
Cleveland .....	200	100	50
Oakland .....	500	235	47
New York .....	4,000	1770	44.2
SYL .....	1,250	520.50	41.5
Buffalo .....	650	200	30.7
Philadelphia .....	250	65	26
Los Angeles .....	600	141	23.5
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)



# Malenkov's Structural Change: Reversal of a Trend

By S. HOROSHCHENKO

The first post-Stalin session of the USSR, the "Supreme Soviet," met in Moscow a week after Stalin's funeral and unanimously approved the Russian governmental setup. The 56 highest government posts which existed under Stalin were reduced by Malenkov to only 32, and were put in the hands of 28 bureaucrats.

It took only 67 minutes for these 1200 "representatives of the toiling masses" of the USSR (among whom only 13 per cent are real workers and collective farmers) to listen to the new premier's report and vote "democratically" to approve everything he said. We are reminded only of the sessions of the tsarist duma in the last years of the reign of Nicholas II, when Russia's state affairs were decided in one hour!

The structural change itself is significant.

In Stalin's time the development of the productive forces of the country forced the dictatorship to broaden its apparatus. A slow process of decentralization in the government took place. The efficiency of management demanded the decentralization of industries, offices and ministries. In this way the government's control posts spread over 56 ministries and special committees.

This process, of course, by no means involved any broader participation of the toiling masses in the government. On the contrary, it was hailed by the bureaucracy and fitted into the latter's purposes; greater control over the processes of production was possible for individual bureaucrats and hence a bigger slice of the surplus product could be squeezed from the workers and put into the bureaucrat's pocket, in the form of increased profit in the enterprise, a portion of which goes into the "director's fund," or in the form of the managerial bonus, or simply in the form of theft.

## 'PERSONAL' DICTATORS

But obviously this process of relative decentralization was forced upon Stalin not so much by the demand of the bureaucratic class for higher incomes as by the objective economic needs of the developing productive forces.

This fact incidentally suggests an interesting point concerning the general role of "personal dictatorship" in modern times. It indicates to what extent it is false to think of Stalin (or Malenkov, or anyone else) as an absolute personal dictator within the regime of totalitarianism.

Under conditions of such a high

development of productive forces, culture and civilization as exists in modern times, a personal absolutism in the usual sense is physically impossible. A single person, no matter how much power is concentrated in his hands, cannot grasp everything, cannot control all the numerous processes of economic, political and intellectual life in the society. A single person may be abstractly the final authority on everything, but in practice there must be thousands of more or less trusted lieutenants who are more or less independent in their judgments, decisions and actions.

## NERVOUSNESS

This factor is one of those which shows that there exists a social class behind the dictator (Stalin or Malenkov), and helps to refute the arguments against this class view of the Stalinist society. If it is agreed that there is no real workers' control over the economy and the state, and this is beyond doubt, then it must be admitted that some other class necessarily controls Russian society. This class is the bureaucracy.

Malenkov's drastic reversal of the trend toward structural decentralization under Stalin reveals once again the nervousness and fear of the new executive committee of the bureaucracy's will. In order to help stabilize his power, he has decided to dispense with half the ministries and committees and amalgamate them, in a more centralized setup. This concentrat-

ed power he distributed among new and younger bureaucrats whom he probably trusts more or less. He elevated at least 10 new top bureaucrats from subordinate posts to the top ministries.

Among the 28 top government officials there are now 20 Russians, two Ukrainians, two Belorussians, two Armenians, one Georgian, and one Jew. The percentage of Russians in the government is approximately the same as it was in Stalin's 56 ministries.

## DILEMMA

Among the newly appointed ministers, aside from the War Ministry which we mentioned in a previous article, one of the most fascinating persons is P. Ponomarenko, the new minister of culture. This man, who can boast of a high-school education, is supposed to control the former ministries of higher education (universities), labor reserves, movies, arts, literature, radio, and the graphic arts. Before he was assigned to this post, he headed the Ministry of Agricultural Requisitions under Stalin; that is, he was responsible for squeezing grain out of the collective farms. With such appointees, Malenkov really can boast that the difference between manual and intellectual labor has disappeared in his Russia!—though in a sense contrary to Marxist aims.

Malenkov's centralization of the executive power evidently runs counter to the process of development of the productive forces. He is striving to preserve and freeze the existing socio-economic relations, but in so doing he objectively undermines his own power. The narrowing of the dictatorship's structural base means its strengthening on top but its weakening below.

But this is an inevitable process. In order to preserve the existing relations and keep a strong hand at the summit of the bureaucratic class, he must centralize the bureaucratic apparatus. And he has to do this, not just in words or verbal pleas for "unity," but in deeds, because Stalin's personal authority, which was great enough to hypnotize many by its mere presence, does not exist any more.

By centralizing the power, Malenkov probably intends to have the same effect as a cobra which swells its neck and swings its body in front of a goat. Perhaps he will succeed in this, as Stalin did. But because his centralization policy contradicts the objective needs of the forces of production, Malenkov necessarily will face a dilemma: either to return to the expedient of decentralization, or to face a constantly growing rift between the control and management of the processes of production on the one hand and the development of the productive forces on the other.

He may find a timely warning in Stalin's last work on economics, in which the dead dictator wrote: "In a correct policy of the leading organs, these contradictions [between productive relations and productive forces] cannot become an antithesis. It is another matter if we shall carry out an incorrect policy. In this case, conflict will be inevitable and our productive relations can be transformed into a most serious brake on the further development of the productive forces."

In case of the latter, where the real social relations of Stalinist society become a brake on the productive forces, then (as Malenkov probably knows from Marx) a social revolution will be the only way out.

## Reading from Left to Right

### What Happens When Jewish Pro-Stalinists Break on the Issue of Anti-Semitism?

**RADICAL CHAUVINISTS**, by "Diarist."—*Jewish Newsletter*, March 16.

In a thought-provoking statement, this liberal "Review of Jewish News and Views," edited by William Zukerman, raises a question which, however controversial, deserves close attention. Its essential point, plainly, does not apply only to Jewish chauvinism; it has its analogues elsewhere; but here it is brought forward most sharply in terms of the *Jewish Newsletter's* field of interest:

"Since Soviet Russia and the satellite states have turned against Zionism and Israel and in the process have revealed anti-Semitic features and acts, a number of well known Jewish writers, commentators and intellectuals have come out publicly against Soviet Russia and have repudiated their association with Communism. Among these are the poetess Malka Lee, the columnist B. Z. Goldberg, the journalist Joseph Brainin and the courageous fighter for civil rights, James Waterman Wise, son of the late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise. These people (who represent many others less known), although they were never Communists officially, have supported Soviet policies and defended Communism long after other intellectuals, Jewish and non-Jewish, have abandoned it. They can be accurately described as the last die-hards of pro-Communism, and their public denunciations of Soviet anti-Semitism and their repudiation of their association with Communism which in many cases lasted for decades, are worth consideration.

"These public pronouncements are not to be dismissed as a belated jumping on a bandwagon, or a shallow reflection of a fashion. They represent a profound and bitter disillusionment which goes deeper than that of most intellectuals of other peoples and has been described in many

books of late. To Jewish intellectuals, Communism meant above everything the end of anti-Semitism. It offered the great hope of the final solution of one of the most painful problems nearest to them. This is the reason why so many Jewish intellectuals clung to Communism so pathetically long after other intellectuals left it. This is also why the Jewish disillusionment is deeper than the parallel manifestation among other people. It is the disillusionment of a group, not only of individuals, and the break is more painful.

"Yet, for all that, it is difficult to understand why the assault on Zionism and Israel should have moved these people more than any of the other actions of the Communists. Soviet Russia and the Communist movement have, during their 35 years in power, perpetrated some of the most terrible crimes in history on a scale larger than any other tyranny known to man. They have betrayed every principle of morality, democracy and humanity. They have crucified freedom, outraged justice, and degraded the individual as

he has never been in modern history. And yet none of these brutal crimes could shake the faith of the Jewish Communists, and of their pro-Communist friends. But the first political quarrel of Soviet Russia with the State of Israel was enough to drive these die-hards from their ardent faith in the Soviet Union.

"In what way is the present Soviet attack on Israel a greater crime than the subjugation of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and the number of other states, big and small, which Communist Russia brutally enslaved? Is the present Communist attack on the Jews more cruel than the physical extermination of the Voilga Germans, the Tartars, the Armenians and the various other national and ethnic groups which the Russians first raised to nationhood and then destroyed? Why did the terrible mass-deportations to slave labor camps of millions of other non-Jewish people fail to move liberals like Mr. James Waterman Wise to a break with Communism? For more than thirty years, B. Z. Goldberg, probably the most brilliant of Yiddish columnists and commentators, witnessed such stupendous crimes as the return to slavery of more than a hundred million Russian peasants under the guise of collectivization, the Soviet-Nazi pact, the purges and other staggering crimes and he was not moved to terminate his friendship with the regime that perpetrated them. But the moment Soviet Russia, which raised Israel to the status of a nation, changed its diplomatic attitude toward it, he could no longer bear the injustice of the act.

"What is it that turns Jews, even the most liberal, radical and humanitarian, into bigoted chauvinists the moment *dos pintele Yid* (the 'little dot of Jewishness') is touched?"



LABOR ACTION

March 30, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 13

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—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.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: MAL DRAPER. Asst. Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Don't miss a single week of

**LABOR ACTION**

A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

**YOU'RE INVITED.**

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



# Concluding: "Sidney Hook, Logic and Joe McCarthy"—III The Difference Between Sidney Hook and Joe McCarthy

This is the third and last part of an article on "Sidney Hook, Logic, and Joe McCarthy." 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 Louis Hacker, James Marshall and Professor H. H. Wilson.—Ed.

By PHILIP COBEN

At the end of the debate which we have been discussing, at the close of his summation remarks, Sidney Hook exclaimed, "Why, McCarthy never even heard of me!"

This assertion is not in dispute, but what brought it on?

We mentioned in our first article that the atmosphere became somewhat strained in the dispute between Hook and his chief opponent in the ACLU symposium, Dean Louis Hacker of Columbia, who defended the principles of academic freedom against the NYU philosophy professor and James Marshall. Hacker vigorously denounced the witchhunting expedition into the schools by the congressional committee investigators now running rampant. Among his own last remarks, Hacker had this to say:

"What we have had voiced here [by Hook and Marshall—P. C.] is a distrust of the intellect, and so all those unhappy forces in our culture have been unleashed. . . ."

"What I worry about, despite Professor Hook's and Mr. Marshall's assurance, is that these Congressional investigators are here because such concepts are abroad in the land. I am appalled that Dr. Hook and Mr. Marshall give aid and comfort to such forces. . . ."

This at any rate is what my own notes tell me Hacker said, as well as I could take them down at the time. In this context Hacker also referred to McCarthy and McCarthyism.

It was in reply to this that Hook indignantly answered the charge that . . . the McCarthyite witch-hunters were at work on the schools because of people like himself. So he chose to interpret Hacker's words and sense, adding insult to injury by simultaneously accusing Hacker of being "demagogic." In this connection he wound up: "Why, McCarthy never even heard of me!"

Hacker, however, had made no "amalgam" between Hook and McCarthy. I am afraid that the effect of Hook's type of reply, whether intended or no, was to impute this piece of outrageous stupidity and slander to the Columbia dean; it was certainly easier for him to rebut it.

Hook is an enemy of McCarthyism, of course. He even looks on his own witchhunting proposal as a means to stop the McCarthys and Veldes. He has publicly deplored "cultural vigilantism." At the end of his presentation in the symposium he devoted a minute to this danger: it is easy to go wild on this question of ousting Communist teachers, he said; we are going into a period where there may be excesses. . . .

**He conceives of himself as fighting on two fronts: against both the Hackers and the McCarthys, so to speak. Was it, then, justified for Hacker to charge him with "giving aid and comfort" to the cultural vigilantes?**

The evidence in the case appeared in the symposium itself, right before the same audience. For by Hook's own definition, a representative of the "cultural vigilante" viewpoint was one of the panelists sitting at his side, his comrade-in-arms in the discussion. We shall see about "aid and comfort."

## Marshall's Position

This was James Marshall, a former president of the New York Board of Education, whose viewpoint we have not yet mentioned.

We have emphasized, as Hook himself kept emphasizing, that his proposal for ousting CP teachers was primarily based not on the holding of Stalinist views (as long as they are honestly held, as the man's own conviction, not as the dictate of a party line). Hook was for ousting teachers who are members of the CP, because membership—he argued—entailed intellectual submission and forced conformity to an outside brain-fixing authority.

**Marshall's position was for dismissal on ground of views.**

"The very fact of believing in party doctrines means you are not a free teacher," he said. We should fire those who "follow the Communist Party line," he said. (My italics.)

Fortunately, perhaps, the discussion made it perfectly explicit that Marshall did indeed mean dismissal for views, not only for membership. This was twice brought out through remarks from the floor in the question period. (1) A member of the audience started off a question by implying that both Hook and Marshall were in favor of firing teachers with pro-CP opinions. Hook immediately interrupted to set the record straight, reminding the speaker that he had argued only about membership. The question was then redirected to Marshall alone, who assumed responsibility for the viewpoint. (2) Taking the floor in discussion Rose Russell, legislative agent of the Stalinist-controlled Teachers Union, charged that Marshall had changed his position under the pressure of the witchhunters: two years ago, she claimed, Marshall had made membership the criterion. Marshall's reply was to insist that his present views were also held by him then.

There was simply no doubt about it: Marshall was for firing any teacher who arrived at opinions favorable to Stalinism.

This is the crux, but it was not all. Marshall's presentation was peppered with sentiments which could only send a chill up the spine of men like Hacker, whose whole line of thought was directed to defending the special role and meaning of freedom of intellectual inquiry:

(1) Civil liberties, argued Marshall, don't mean that anyone can perform any job; there are conditions laid down, aren't there, for lawyers, plumbers, etc. . . . ?

The reader can think over this amalgam between the teacher's need for freedom of intellectual inquiry and the conditions of employment for plumbers. . . .

(2) "Academic freedom is a right of the community, not a personal right of the individual," was another aphorism thrown out by Marshall. It is a pity he did not pursue the thought further. Surely, by his own standards, he would have lost the right to teach in the schools, for the idea leads straight to the heart of the Stalinist "party doctrine" on the role of the teacher in society. . . .

(3) "The government," argued Marshall, "has the right to insist on an employee's [a teacher's] loyalty, just as any other employer has the right to insist on an employee's loyalty to the interests of the firm."

This is really classic. It is difficult to imagine a cruder denial and negation of all the concepts of the teacher's role in society which were treated by Hook as platitudes so obvious that he resented emphasis upon them by Professors Hacker and H. H. Wilson.

## Silent Partner

"The issue is not freedom of inquiry," said Sidney Hook impatiently as he began his own presentation, speaking after Marshall.

There, right before him, was a wonderful opportunity to show what his "fight on two fronts" meant. There, right before him, was the need to counterpose his own position to the two "extremes" which he decried. Right before him? Nay, rather, challenging him, making it mandatory for him to speak out not only against Hacker but against the Marshall position which violated all his general and particular beliefs about academic freedom.

**The most damning fact about Sidney Hook's role in the debate was that he never uttered a word of criticism of Marshall's "cultural vigilantism."**

One might think, perhaps, that his own views would force him to denounce Marshall; pillory his standpoint, attack him unmercifully. Let us not be too demanding. Let's merely wonder why he did not stand up against Marshall at least as vigorously as he attacked Hacker.

Perhaps even that is too much to ask: we can be even more reasonable. Surely the least we could expect is that he explain to the audience why he disagreed with Marshall. . . .

But even when he interrupted the questioner from the audience to point out that his own criterion was membership in the CP, he did not find it necessary to say a word about Marshall. (This was plainly not due to his terseness, since on every other occasion during the question period he spoke at such great length that finally a good part of the audience burst out with complaints to the chairman about his monopolization of the panel's time. . . .)

Or perhaps Hook was following the precept that one must spend all one's time on the main danger? Perhaps he considered that the peril represented by Marshall's viewpoint was so unimportant, whereas Hacker's views were such a clear and present danger to the well-being of the nation and its teachers, that even slapping Marshall gently on the wrist would have been an unwarranted digression for a valiant fighter for academic freedom.—But no, this possibility must be put aside; for we risk doing what we must not do, namely, question Hook's integrity or intelligence. After all, it is Marshall's stand which is actually in operation in the city and in the nation; whereas Hacker was perhaps lucky that he could still remain on as a dean at Columbia. . . .

At one point, indeed, Hook mentioned that Hacker himself was evidence against those misguided persons who "exaggerated" the educational witchhunt: for had not Hacker disagreed with his ex-president of Columbia, Eisenhower, and yet remained as dean? He did not raise the question whether Hacker could last for 24 hours as a school supervisor under ex-President of the Board of Education Marshall.

But let me not give the impression that Sidney Hook said nothing about his fellow panelist who lined up with him against Hacker and Wilson. Not at all. He made several references to Marshall in his presentation, as a matter of fact. They were all complimentary—that is, an approving reference to this or that statement by Marshall, etc. One would indeed have had to be alert to figure out that this Marshall represented one sector of one of the "fronts" which Hook conceives himself as fighting.

## The Anti-Snooper

So, as we were saying, Hook is no "cultural vigilante" and no "McCarthyite," but an enemy of both. He merely directed his powers as a "brilliant analyst," his prestige as a kind of liberal, and even his professorial invectives not against the danger from the witchhunters but against the "danger" from the proponents of academic freedom. He is no witchhunter—oh, not at all: he is merely an anti-anti-witchhunter.

How firmly Hook is opposed to witchhunting can be seen from an argument of his which we have not yet

mentioned. It went like this: A teacher's supervisor can visit his classroom and observe his techniques; but how are you going to detect "slanting and indoctrinating"? This can be done skillfully. How is a supervisor going to check on this? Question students, etc.? This is degrading. Better nip the danger in the bud by firing teachers who are CP members to begin with, for then we know in advance that he is going to "indoctrinate," and we don't have to wait for evidence of what he actually does. Otherwise—

"Otherwise," said Hook, "you would have to engage in using degrading snoopers to check on teachers."

This man thinks snooping on teachers is degrading. Good. He vowed that, as chairman of the Philosophy Department at NYU, he would not dream of stooping to such conduct in his own department.

All this is really excellent. A happy glow is likely to last until another question occurs to us:

Hook does not want to "snoop" in order to find out if a teacher is actually violating the intellectual and professional responsibilities of the teaching community. He prefers to anticipate misconduct by firing teachers who are members of the CP. But how is he going to find out if the teacher is a member of the CP?

Ask him, perhaps? H'm . . . no, they're infernally "conspiratorial" anyway, and unlikely to admit it.

Ask the CP? Not likely to get cooperation there.

And yet one must find out somehow, to avoid being forced into the degrading practice of snooping around the teacher's classroom, hiding in the closet, installing a microphone and recorder, or disguising oneself as a student.

**What is Hook's solution for this dilemma? It is terribly embarrassing, but it must be stated frankly. It is: to snoop around the teacher's private life, his neighbors, associates, affiliations, friends, enemies, relatives, and EVERYTHING ELSE EXCEPT his actual behavior in the classroom.**

It must be stated even more frankly: it is to use devices like informers, stoolpigeons, professional finger-men, FBI agents, and other assorted cops and tools of cops.

## On Professors and Cops

Isn't that so? Why, of course, except that it isn't Hook who would be degrading himself. In all respect for him, we are sure that he would not lower himself to act as a dick in order to get the goods on one of his despicable "indoctrinators," who is such a terrible menace to the health and virginity of his students' minds. No, there are people whose job is to do such things: there are cops, informers, and stoolpigeons who exist in order to save the self-respect of undegraded citizens, just as there are executioners who have the stomach to pull the rope while the perfumed representatives of authority avert their eyes.

Only recently, for example, at the University of Colorado, an instructor, Morris Judd, was let go because he refused to answer questions about past political affiliations. An investigation by the ACLU established that "the investigation conducted by the Regents into the present and past political beliefs and affiliations of members of the faculty . . . by private detectives constituted an infringement of academic freedom." (My italics.)

Would Hook hire private eyes to snoop around his instructors' associations outside the classroom, since he is tender about their rights inside the classroom? We fear he would consider it degrading too.

**What then? The truth is that Hook neither has to snoop around the classroom or outside it. Others are doing it for him. And what they are doing is indispensable to him, that is, to put practical meaning into his proposition that CP members be kept from teaching posts.**

Who is going to do this indispensable snooping, if not the appropriate agencies of the government's loyalty witchhunt? Who is going to do it for Hook if not the very agencies, committees, investigators, dicks, stoolpigeons, informers, finger-men and cops who are doing it?

In point of fact, Hook is apparently satisfied with a little less than proof of CP membership. Of all the New York teachers fired from the city's schools in the current purge (said Marshall), only one was fired because of membership. All the others (the authority is still Marshall, speaking right at Hook's side) were fired for refusing to answer The Question about their past affiliations. In practice, for all of Hook's insistence that his criterion is "membership," the criterion he accepts is based on this inquisition into the teacher's life by governmental agencies.

At this point, we must remind the reader again: Hook is against McCarthyism. But it was not only Hacker who raised the question of "aid and comfort." The New York Times' publisher, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, told an audience last January 14:

**"There has been dropped upon utterance and thought a smokescreen of intimidation that dims essential thought and essential talk and begets a fog through which we wander uncertainly. Nor is it the superzealots who bother me so much in all of this—it is the lack of plain, old-fashioned guts on the part of those who capitulate to them. Surely, such actions must be of great aid and comfort to the Kremlin; these capitulators are, in effect, a sixth column which does not even require payment. . . ."**

There are the McCarthys (and Marshalls et al.) and there are the anti-anti-witchhunters who capitulate to the McCarthys. Let no one make an amalgam between the two. McCarthyism would not be what it is if it could not feed on the capitulations of people who despise McCarthyism.

"McCarthy doesn't even know me!" said Sidney Hook. The grim irony of it is: Why does he need to?



# Crisis in the French CP:

By SAUL BERG

The chronic state of crisis of the French government and the French economy is well-known to our readers.\* Less familiar is the chronic state of crisis of French Stalinism; yet actually the chronic character of the crisis in each case is due to the inability of each side to resolve the situation that produces the crisis.

So long as France's "homeless left" remains largely disorganized and apathetic, the French bourgeois state and the French Communist Party will continue to face each other as mortal enemies that are, however, incapable of dealing a death-blow to each other.

In LABOR ACTION we have studied the nature of the French capitalist crisis and the problems of socialist regroupment. Let us now fill out the picture by studying the situation of the French Stalinists, beginning with a sketch of their past development.

One of the bitter lessons that revolutionary socialists have absorbed since the 1930s is that the working class remains very stubbornly attached to its traditional organizations and leaders, once these organizations and their leadership cadres have been painfully established over the years. The Bolshevik party in Russia, for example, experienced a phenomenal rise in influence during 1917 because of its skillful exposure of the "compromisers," but this was possible only because at the very beginning of the 1917 struggle the Bolsheviks already had quite substantial cadres, whose reputation had been established, in the urban centers at any rate, as far back as 1905.

In the case of the French Stalinists, there is prevalent a superficial tendency to ascribe their tremendous strength after the 1944 liberation to their activities as a disciplined group in the Resistance, but this overlooks the fact that they went into the Resistance with cadres that were the product of twenty-five years of working-class leadership. We will correctly appreciate the depth of attachment of hundreds of thousands of workers to this bureaucratic machine only when we grasp the fact that in their factories the CP militants have represented the workers for more than a whole generation.

## The Stalinists' Base

France was the only country whose Socialist Party, in the period after the First World War, passed over officially to the Communist International, compelling the social-democratic minority to reconstruct an organization from scratch. *L'Humanité*, the central organ of the Communist Party, proudly carries on the masthead the name of Jean Jaurès as its founder. Nowhere else is the Communist Party able to pose so well as the continuator of socialist tradition.

In addition, the wave of enthusiasm that followed the Bolshevik revolution overcame the anti-Marxist and anti-statist bias of most of the best factory militants, who in France were not socialists but syndicalists. The former syndicalists were the foundation of CP leadership in the plants.

Though the reconstructed reformist Socialist Party reached a point where it once again was a stronger electoral force than the Communist Party, the Socialists never at any time had factory groups on the scale of the latter. Except, therefore, for the small devoted groups of revolutionary syndicalists who have constituted the opposition in the French labor movement ever since the early '20s, the Communist Party has been the leader of the industrial workers. With certain regional exceptions, the Socialists were influential only among the white-collar workers and state employees.

There is no parallel to this development elsewhere in Western Europe. Between the two world wars the social-democracy remained the dominant force among the factory workers everywhere except, for a brief period in 1923, in Germany. In Italy, the only other Western European country with a Stalinist-dominated labor movement, the background of this situation is to be sought not in a long history of massive Stalinist influence, but rather in the political vacuum created by Mussolini's destruction of the free labor movement at a time when communism still represented the workers' revolution of October 1917.

When the mass sit-down strikes of May-June 1936 took place in France, the trade unions grew from 1,000,000 to 5,000,000 members in a few weeks. For the first time (in this respect also French trade union history differs from that of other Western European countries in the 20th century) the unions of civil-service employees, teachers and skilled trades lost their numerical majority in the CGT (General Confederation of Labor) to the unions of factory workers.

The CP cadres in the plants ceased to be merely the militant spark plug of a largely unorganized mass, and became the dominant force in the trade-union movement as a whole.

The tremendous burgeoning of Stalinist influence and power in this period could not be canceled out by the period of Stalinist unpopularity while the Hitler-Stalin Pact was in existence. The party organization became a skeleton of fanatic devotees, going down to

a figure as low as 20-30,000 during the first part of the Nazi occupation; but our readers need not be reminded how powerful an organization such a figure represents under such dangerous and illegal conditions of activity.

## Post-War Letdown

Nevertheless we do not contend that the Resistance period did not bring new forces over to the side of the Stalinists. The Stalinists consolidated their hold over the working class, but also, because they were the best organized Resistance network over the whole country, recruited many middle-class elements into their Resistance militia, the *Franc-Tireurs Partisans*, and into their Resistance propaganda groups, known as the *Front National*.

When the war ended, their movement was so strong that, with the aid of those social-democrats still afflicted with illusions about the nature of Stalinism, they very probably could have taken power if the relationship of forces within France had been the sole consideration involved.

Such a move, however, was not on Stalin's timetable. He wanted no complications that would frighten his Anglo-American partners at the very time that they were busy dividing the world with him. For the time being, Eastern Europe, soon to be followed by China, was enough.

The French Communist Party, therefore, had to play the role of partner in coalition governments with the two other parties that had emerged surrounded with the aura of Resistance activity—the Socialists and the Catholic MRP.

Participation in coalition government had a twofold effect on the party. On the one hand it attracted hordes of careerists eager to secure the posts that a government party could bestow. On the other hand it little by little drove into demoralization and apathy broad strata of workers disillusioned by the inevitable failure of the coalition government to make fundamental changes in French society.

When the sharpening of the cold war, combined with an upsurge of genuine rank-and-file strikes, caused the expulsion of the Stalinists from the cabinet, they took a sharp turn to the left. But the frenzied campaign of so-called "Molotov strikes" that they then carried out, only a few months after their 1945-1947 campaign against strikes, merely demonstrated conclusively to those workers alienated from them during the coalition period that the Communist Party based itself on considerations of Russian foreign policy and not on the needs of the French workers. As for most of the middle-class elements attracted by the Resistance, their disillusionment turned them quickly in the direction of new quick remedies, especially those offered by De Gaulle's RPF.

The Stalinist movement, therefore, subsided in France to a level still somewhat higher than it had ever reached organizationally before World War II, but well below its 1945-1946 peak. More important, however, than any diminution of size was a consciousness among its members and sympathizers of being in a blind alley.

## Party Cliques

Since 1947, for the first time in their history, the Stalinist-controlled movements face a solid wall of hostility on the part of other movements within the working class. So cynical and hopeless is the attitude toward the endless calls for political strikes and demonstrations that generally most of the party members do not even participate. Every index of activity has fallen much more sharply than the formal rite of registering one's party membership.

The movement maintains itself nevertheless for two reasons: the deep-rooted cadres, far stronger than any rivals up to this date among the proletariat, and the inability of the French regime to reconcile the working class to its miserable condition.

The prevailing state of discouragement of the Communist Party ranks has seemed to accentuate cliquism in the organization. Genuine factions within the party are impossible, of course, given its bureaucratic and monolithic character. Nevertheless the party leadership has been generally considered as divided into a number of groups.

Three of these are: the "hards," André Marty and Charles Tillon, standing presumably for emphasis on the role of the proletariat, and its leader, the Communist Party, in a direct struggle for power; the "softs," Jean Duclos and Etienne Fajon, standing for a policy of emphasis on legality and operation through broad non-class front organizations; and a center group of Maurice Thorez, François Billoux and Auguste Lecoq.

A fourth group, made up of the CGT leaders, seems to stand aloof from the struggles between the others. Complicating the situation is the fact that the party leader, Thorez, has been in Russia for two years, presumably for treatment by medical specialists.

Since all the party leaders on all occasions publicly endorse unquestioningly whatever line is approved by Moscow, and since Central Committee decisions are always unanimous, the existence of cliques in the leadership becomes known only through the tendency of each clique to line up men lower in the party apparatus on a basis of personal loyalty, and also on the basis of a common approach to party problems and a common distrust of the leadership qualities of the other clique leaders.

A peculiar set of circumstances combined, however, to place Marty and Tillon in a position where they actually pursued, with considerable repercussions on the French scene, an independent course of activity that conflicted with official party directives. These activities, which we will describe, created divergences in the party leadership which ultimately led to their expulsion.

But first, who is André Marty? Both Marty and Tillon appeared on the political scene in 1919 as participants in the French Black Sea naval mutiny. Like

some others of the mutineers, they were anarchists at the time; but on their release from prison they were swept up, like many other young anarchists and syndicalists of the period, in the tide of sympathy with Russian Bolshevism, and became Communists.

There are anarchists in France today, also participants in the famous mutiny, who will tell you that Marty was far from a leading spirit in the situation; but in any case, whatever his actual role, the French Communist Party built up an enviable reputation for him as a martyr of the struggle against anti-Soviet intervention.

## Rise of Marty

The leadership of the French CP turned over many times in the 1920s as its Stalinist bureaucratization took place, but Marty was one of those who knew how to remain on the right side, that is to say, the side that obeyed Moscow; and when the process was complete he sat on the party's Politburo.

With the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War he became the leading Stalinist hatchetman in the International Brigades, known to all readers of Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* as a maniacal character whose thirst for the blood of imaginary fascist agents within the Brigades was insatiable. Before the end of the civil war he became an official of the Comintern.

But his unique opportunity in the French party arose when World War II broke out, and the party secretary, Thorez, was drafted.

Marty became the acting leader of the party at the time that it was driven underground in 1939-40, and went to Moscow, leaving behind him the liaison network necessary for directing the underground cadres. Thorez soon after arrived in Moscow as a deserter from the French army, still the party's titular leader, but without any connection with the technical preparation for underground work.

Under directives from Marty, his old associate Tillon organized the first armed groups of the FTP (*Franc-Tireurs Partisans*). But in violation of the wish of Thorez to emphasize the propaganda work of the party, Tillon concentrated all possible forces in the FTP.

In 1943 Marty was designated as CP representative to the De Gaulle headquarters in Algiers. Thorez could not enjoy any such favored vantage point because of his status as an army deserter.

As CP representative, Marty was supposed to do everything possible to cement close relations with the non-Communist groups in accordance with Stalin's desire to obtain the greatest possible aid from the U. S. by demonstrating the sweet reasonableness of the Communists. But Marty, armed with reports from Tillon that the DeGaulle forces consistently boycotted the FTP by failing to parachute arms and supplies to them, kept up a constant barrage of criticism of the De Gaulle policies, while the FTP, under Tillon's leadership, extended its activities and became, by the time of the Allied landing in Normandy, the strongest Resistance force in France.

## On the Skids

If, therefore, the French CP had any possibility of seizing power in 1945, it appears to have been because of a refusal to execute the policy ordered by Moscow.

It can be conjectured, therefore, given the monolithic nature of the Stalinist machine, that the expulsion of Marty and Tillon, which took place at the end of 1952, was already inevitable and perhaps even decided upon more than seven years ago. But the expulsion, of course, had to await the whittling-down of the power and prestige with which Marty and Tillon emerged from the war in 1945.

During the period of 1945-1948, therefore, no overt acts were committed by either side. Marty and Tillon would not and could not publicly criticize the coalition policy of those years, because, as always, their own prestige as Stalinist leaders depended on maintaining the traditional façade of the unanimity of the leadership, and, still more important, on maintaining the notion of the infallibility of Moscow.

On the other hand, it would have been foolhardy for the party leaders to attempt to punish Marty and Tillon at a time when the bonds of Resistance leaders throughout France to Tillon were still so fresh and strong. Marty remained, therefore, in the Politburo and Secretariat, Tillon occupying a seat in the cabinet and a place in the Politburo as well.

One cannot with any certainty assign significance to the fact that at the Central Committee meeting of July 1948, shortly after the Tito-Cominform break, Marty was the only member of the Secretariat who failed to take the floor with a diatribe against Tito. Nevertheless, shortly after this plenum, Marty and Tillon were step by step stripped of important assignments.

Marty was replaced by Mauvais as director of the Commission of Cadres and director of the party security services. Casanova replaced Marty as director of the party press control services. Tillon, meanwhile, was replaced as director of the party's military services by Villon and Joinville-Malleret.

Thrust somewhat in the background, Marty seems to have played no role until early in 1952, when he delivered a series of criticisms of the decline of party activity and combativity, and the tendency to liquidate militant activity in favor of Stockholm petitions, etc. At the time, such criticism was accepted by the public merely as signifying a tactical turn by the party. When a turn is to be made it is often done through bringing to the fore someone who has had relatively little public responsibility for the previous policy. Such an interpretation seemed reinforced when Billoux brought back from Moscow recommendations from Thorez which echoed Marty's position.

Looking back, however, it seems highly possible that

\*See especially LABOR ACTION for last Sept. 29, "France in 1952."—Ed.



# The Marty-Tillon Affair

Marty's criticisms were not prepared by the leadership as a whole, but that the leadership, because Marty's remarks had found an echo among the party militants, decided to adopt his line and dispose of Marty himself as soon as possible.

## Zero Hour

But just as Thorez's absence in Moscow had undoubtedly delayed action against Marty so the arrest early in June, of Duclos thrust Marty still farther forward momentarily. On May 28 and June 4, 1952, the Stalinists ordered anti-Ridgway demonstrations in France (in accordance with the recent Thorez-Billoux turn toward "militancy"). These demonstrations were a miserable failure, but instead of serving to discredit Marty for pushing such action, it was Duclos who was discredited.

The party general secretary, with incredible light-mindedness, had all sorts of secret party documents in his pockets, while directing the demonstration from an auto! When Duclos was arrested and his criminal carelessness exposed, his lieutenants, paralyzed by the sudden developments, assented to Marty becoming acting general secretary!

This proved to be the zero hour, so far as Thorez and Moscow were concerned. As soon as Duclos was a free man, Marty and Tillon were brought up on charges of secret factional activity, and it was demanded that they recant their "crimes."

At the Central Committee plenum of September the unexpected occurred. Marty and Tillon, instead of the customary unconditional recantation, interlarded their self-criticism with criticisms of the other party leaders and a rejection of some of the charges.

The charges themselves, as elaborated in the floor discussion at the Central Committee, make interesting reading.

From the speech of Léon Feix: "Is it not so, Marty, that you criticized to me the January 1945 decision of the Central Committee to hand in all arms, and to accept the integration of the FTP and FFI into the regular army? . . . Not once did you mention the name of the Stockholm appeal when we were in the midst of our campaign for signatures."

From the speech of André Souquières: "Marty declared, textually in 1946 that it is particularly necessary to see whether certain candidacies of comrades who, during the war, were not in the Paris region, and did not take an active part in the Resistance, will not cause us a loss of votes. He specifically mentioned the pro-

posed candidacy of Jeannette Vermeersch [Thorez's wife!]"

Théodore Vial: "Comrade Marty spoke at the party's 30th anniversary meeting in Lyon before 5,000 people. Not once did he pronounce the name of general secretary Maurice Thorez."

(Vial should be up on charges himself: "General Secretary Thorez"—how pedestrian! He really means "the great leader of our wonderful party, the son of the people, the hero of the working-class and of all time patriots, Maurice Thorez.")

Fernand Dupuis: "In his course at the school of cadres on the formation of the party, Marty never pronounced the name of Maurice Thorez. . . . In discussing the Congress of Tours [1920], at no time did he mention the battle Thorez led in the Pas-de-Calais [coal mine region in the north of France] for affiliation to the Third International."

And now, for the crowning charge, listen to Yvonne Dumont: "When I was secretary of the Seine Federation, the Union of French Women [Stalinist front outfit] organized every year, on the occasion of the Festival of Jeanne d'Arc, a demonstration in which we joined the memory of the two heroines of the struggle for national independence—Jeanne d'Arc and Danielle Casanova. But in 1950, in the week preceding the commemoration leaflets were brought to me announcing that on the same day, at the same time, the FTP of the Seine would hold a demonstration, with the participation of André Marty, in honor of Suzanne Masson, a member of the FTP, who had participated in the armed struggle of the Resistance. One can clearly see in this disagreement with the policy of unity, the policy of national independence of the party!"

If Marty were not himself such an unsavory character, with so ruthless a past, the charges would be perfectly calculated to make us sympathetic to him!

The failure to recant fully ensured Marty and Tillon's expulsion, but it still took place with unparalleled slowness. The Stalinist press was filled with denunciations of Marty for four months before the action of expulsion formally took place in his local unit, to be ratified formally by the next party congress.

The party's caution was perhaps justified by its experience in dealing with Georges Guingouin, a close associate of Tillon who was expelled a few months earlier. Guingouin, CP mayor of the important city of Limoges after the liberation, had been the regional FTP leader

previously. Guingouin was accused of being a premature anti-fascist!

Do you remember the Stalinist howls (quite justified, of course) against the U. S. government for its threat to lift the citizenship of anyone who volunteered to fight in the Spanish Civil War? After the U. S. went to war to "fight fascism" the Stalinists proudly proclaimed that they had been punished for being premature anti-fascists. Guingouin also acted prematurely—i.e., he resisted the Nazi conquerors before Hitler invaded Russia!

## Finished?

In any case the party took too much for granted—without any campaign of vituperation it brought him up on charges in his party unit, only to have the unit refuse to expel him. He was then tried in a unit to which he had never belonged and expelled, but the smell left by this procedure has done the Stalinists' reputation in Limoges no good.

One can assume that it was Tillon's record as leader of the FTP that made the party move even more slowly against him than against Marty. It was not till a month after Marty's expulsion that Tillon was made to resign his last post, that of mayor of Aubervilliers, a Paris working-class suburb.

Shortly after this, his expulsion finally took place. Only after the expulsions did the CP campaign of vituperation replace the charges of factionalism and indiscipline with the charge that Marty and Tillon were "police spies."

Recent reports state that Marty is founding an Independent Communist Party. If this is true, not much perspective can be held for such a party. Marty's prestige was that of a militant among Stalinists, and no major breakaway from Stalinism will take place simply because of an individual's expulsion, however prominent his position. Nevertheless the whole Marty-Tillon affair is another factor, added to those described earlier, which tends to weaken French Stalinism.

Could Marty and Tillon possibly be part of a socialist regroupment in France? The first requirement for this is naturally a genuine ideological break through a fundamental re-evaluation of the nature of Stalinism. But even then it is difficult to see how a man with the blood of Spanish anti-fascists on his hands can collaborate with democratic revolutionary socialists. In any case, for a certain number of militants, the Marty-Tillon expulsion will be the signal for their definitive disillusionment with Moscow.

# Russian Peace Maneuvers — —

(Continued from page 1)

til this moment. Again, it was the British government which was the beneficiary of this Stalinist "generosity."

Then on March 23, the Russian and Czechoslovak delegates in the United Nations took turns in blasting the U. S. government for organizing espionage, subversion and fifth-column activities in their countries. Chief target in the Stalinist attack was the Mutual Security Act of 1951 which authorized the expenditure of \$100,000,000 for the aid of "selected persons who are residing in or escapes from" the countries behind the Iron Curtain. In support of the charges, Gromyko, the Russian delegate, read off a number of statements made by John Foster Dulles, Governor Thomas E. Dewey, Mutual Security Administrator Harold Stassen and others advocating "subversion" in Stalinland.

## RIPOSTE BY LODGE

Lodge, the American delegate, replied by pointing out that the Stalinists had taken over a number of countries by sub-

version and force, in the first place Czechoslovakia and Poland. He claimed that the statements read by Gromyko had been made by these people in their capacity as private citizens, and do not necessarily reflect the actual policy of the United States, which can be voiced only by the executive arm of the government.

As Gromyko had quoted a number of prominent senators (Taft and Alexander Wiley, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, among others), Lodge insisted that on foreign policy "Congress represents the outside check, the independent audit, the capacity of the free people to judge its own government, an institution, by the way, which is a great source of national strength and an unknown feature of life, I gather, in the Soviet Union."

The battle of charges and counter-charges continues as LABOR ACTION goes to press. Both sides will no doubt be able to make an excellent case against each other, although the Russian case is more likely to score heavily in proving intentions rather than achievements by the American government.

(The Stalinists, of course, are quite capable of quoting from the "confessions" in the trials held recently in Czechoslovakia and other countries to "prove" that American money had bought up some of their former most prominent leaders, though they may think better of it as Lodge seems more capable of handling such matters in debate than did some of his predecessors in the UN.)

## ALLIES UNDER PRESSURE

The point, however, is that opening up such charges against the United States now seems to give further weight to the idea that the Stalinists are working on the theory that their best chance lies in splitting the American bloc by hitting at the United States while making overtures to its allies.

The pet American idea of "fomenting" revolution behind the Iron Curtain by cloak-and-dagger methods has never found much favor among European governments, which are both more aware of the realities of political life outside the United States and more sensitive to the Russian military and political potential than are the men who have power in the

United States.

If these allies can be made to feel that there is a possibility that Russia wants to come to some kind of terms at the moment, and that what is standing in the way is the belligerency, in one form or another, of the Americans, they might very well apply greater pressure to the United States to talk and act more softly.

The Russian campaign seems to point in the direction of such a "splitting" policy. A tendency toward a policy of this kind was already indicated in the turn toward some form of "popular-frontism" imposed on the French Communist Party several months ago.

## LONDON LETTER

# Tito Visits England—at 40 m.p.h.

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, March 18—Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia arrived in Britain on Monday. He was 12 hours early in the Thames estuary, and was greeted on arrival by the Duke of Edinburgh, Winston Churchill, Anthony Eden and many others. Nine bridges across the River Thames had been cleared, in case anyone wanted to drop a bomb or perform some other unpleasantness upon him. Wherever he went he traveled at 40 miles an hour, in a bullet-proof car, escorted by 16 motorcyclists.

On his arrival the area was cleared for 50 yards. But so far the only demonstration of emotion toward him was the discharge of one magnesium flare, which might or might not have been really an exploding photographer's flash-bulb, but which served to alert the police.

Frankly, the English people as a whole were ready to be friendly, considering that he comes as an ally in the cold war against Moscow. That has been more important in determining the attitude of the press, the general public and officialdom than any of Tito's shows of "democratization" in Yugoslavia.

As soon as he landed, Tito made a very pleasant and platitudinous speech—in

English, which was thought of as a great courtesy. He laid the usual wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior, and besides sightseeing presented a check for \$2600 to the chairman of the London County Council for "war orphans."

It must, however, be said that the English people have not fallen for Tito, even though he lunched with the queen mother, the queen, Philip, the Churchills, the Attlees, and others.

Throughout his business here, he has been arriving ahead of schedule everywhere, as a precaution. The extraordinary security measures taken, the 200 police, the 16 motor cycles, the lightning entries and exits from buildings—all these have served to impress the people with the picture of a scared dictator, in spite of anyone's willingness to forget events in Yugoslavia.

It is interesting to surmise that the same good disposition would be extended to Malenkov if he came to a deal with the West to stop the cold war.

Meanwhile, there is the important question of the more serious business on which Tito came to London. On this very little of importance has been made known, and if there have been any significant agreements we shall have to wait for the future to find out.

## Read about Independent Socialism

in the special pamphlet-issues published by LABOR ACTION—

10 cents each

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.

Independent Socialism and the Third World War.

The Fair Deal: A Socialist Criticism.

Order from:  
LABOR ACTION  
114 West 14 Street, New York City



# Now McCarthy's Victims — —

(Continued from page 1)

a high government officer to be completely above suspicion, he now has to be cleared not only by the FBI, Central Intelligence, the security officer of his own department, the head of his department, the president of the United States, all citizens with a sixth sense, but also by Whittaker Chambers.

Even modest silence by the latter may now pass, if not as proof of guilt, at least as a suspicious circumstance. (We note, not without interest, that Elizabeth Bentley is still to be heard from.)

## "IF THIS GOES ON . . ."

The stage has been reached at which even the editorial writers of the New York Times, usually models of dignified and restrained journalism, are, as the British say, getting their tails up. In an editorial on Sunday, March 22, they wrote that "We cannot indefinitely have these arrogant upstarts prying into matters which are no affairs of theirs, including the private opinions of our citizens."

That is a little strong, and very, very late. The Times now denounces the "practice of accepting hearsay as evidence and vindictive gossip as proof of guilt." It deplores the "attempts to push investigations into fields where they are not permissible, such as the churches or the independent institutions of higher education." (There is no mention, we regret to say, of the dependent institutions of lower education.)

"Let this sort of thing go on long enough," thunder the editors, "let the resulting dictators be enforced, and the difference between the tyranny of Russia and the tyranny of our own jealous, arrogant, conceited little men will be narrowed by just that much."

It is gratifying to note that the Times is so vigorously against McCarthy. In fact, it is so gratifying that we are almost tempted not to ask just how long "long enough" might appear to be to the worthy editors, and not to read the editorial to the very end, where we find that the man personally appointed by the Times to slay the dragon before he has got too long is none other than President Dwight D. Eisenhower. (We seem to recall that within the memory of men still living this same Eisenhower was seen campaigning on the same platform with this same McCarthy.)

One of the effects of McCarthy's most recent victory in the Bohlen case (it should be noted that Joe has never claimed that he could actually defeat Bohlen's appointment) may be to throw open the FBI files to men like himself. If Taft and Sparkman can look at them to "reassure the Senate," why not McCarthy to "reassure" himself or even the Chicago Tribune? Although it appears that McCarthy has had enough access to such files in the past without any open permission, there is little doubt that if he should get official sanction to go through them his head-hunting will be happier than ever.

McCarthy's forays, and the evident power of the group which surrounds him, have a devastating effect on the country's political life. He is setting the tone, while his Republican and almost silent Democratic "opponents" are confined to counter-punching.

The weight of the extreme right wing of the Republican Party has now developed to the point where Senator Taft stands at the center of effective American policy making, and has to yield constantly to the right in the absence of any serious pressure from the liberals inside and outside his party.

## THAT "RUSSIAN" FEELING

Of course, the most direct impact is being felt at the moment by the State Department and the whole foreign service of the government. A survey by Seymour Freidin, foreign correspondent of the New York Post, starts:

"A creeping paralysis is crippling the American foreign service in all the key Western European capitals." The mood which is spreading at all levels of the service is motivated by the consideration that "if a career foreign service officer of Bohlen's stature can be cut down, or even delayed along the route of assignment, what can happen to those of lesser stature?"

"I have seen in several capitals," writes Freidin, "foreign service officers who today will not consult with visitors and people within their own department unless someone else was present. Have a handy witness around seems to be the prevailing thought of self-preservation."

This kind of thing, he continues, has been standard procedure in Russian diplomatic circles for a long time. But it has reached a point at which foreign governments are getting very cautious in

dealing with the American representatives abroad, and find increasingly that no one is willing to take responsibility for decisions which might backfire on them later.

As socialist critics and opponents of this government we do not feel that it is our responsibility to protect organs of the government from attack by other sections of the government in the interest of a more effective application of policies which we are against. We are concerned with the general intimidation and demoralization of the country by McCarthy and the very powerful social and economic forces which make him possible.

## LIBERAL SUBSTITUTE

We certainly do not rely on President Eisenhower to save the country from McCarthyism, although we are curious to see how long he and the rest of the administration will permit themselves to be insulted, denigrated, bulldozed and subverted by Joseph M.

What really concerns socialists, as it should all real democrats, is the question of how long the democratic forces of the country will remain immobilized in the face of the forces behind McCarthy.

Many voices have been raised against the junior senator from Wisconsin. They have come from the churches, the academic world, the labor movement, and the organized liberals. They are appalled by "McCarthyism" in its rawest form, as incarnated in McCarthy himself. But for some time it has been evident that their opposition to McCarthy has come close to being an excuse for their failure to resist the whole ideology which is behind the senator's "excesses." It has become a substitute for their inability to find a positive policy with which to fight Stalinism, and even more, with which to give leadership to the American people.

If the foreign service is being paralyzed by McCarthy, the Democratic leadership in the Congress is petrified in a posture of abject support to Eisenhower and his helpers in the Senate, led by Taft. The Democratic Party outside of Congress shows no greater sign of life. Its great leader, Adlai Stevenson, hasn't helped any either (see "Spotlight" in this issue).

## WHERE ARE THE DEMOCRATS?

But the forces which make McCarthy a menace are not resting. They are on the offensive in every field, all over the country.

In Los Angeles they banned all UNESCO materials from the schools. In New York they have just imposed a scandalous financial policy which will bear down on the poor. All over the country the FBI is "prying . . . into the private opinions of our citizens," and not because of McCarthy. The whole federal housing program has been delivered into the hands of a man who is an avowed, vicious opponent of all public housing. And the Supreme Court has just rendered a verdict in a Virginia picketing case which can be a real body-blow to the whole labor movement.

While this is going on, the labor movement and its liberal allies are immobilized by their dependence on the paralyzed Democratic Party. They pass excellent resolutions against McCarthy and all his works and in favor of a domestic and foreign policy which has many commendable features to it. But the Democratic Party does not fight, or even squeak, for the measures which it advocates. Yet it is the breakdown hack to which labor has hitched its star.

That is the real danger which faces the country. McCarthy has the initiative because the labor movement and the rest of the democratic forces in the country have condemned themselves to the impotence of the Democratic Party. At the moment, McCarthy and his broad national backing may seem like a mere distasteful accident in the Republican Party. But the failure of the administration to stop McCarthy shows that what he represents is far more dangerous than that. It is the almost inevitable strengthening of the extreme right when the other forces in society are stalemated.

It is high time that the labor movement and its liberal allies pondered this problem, and deeply. A hue and cry over McCarthyism will not solve the problem, any more than the shapeless "anti-fascist" movement solved it in Germany in a time of much more acute crisis.

What is needed is a counter-force which can give positive leadership, real answers to the American people. And a prerequisite to this is a clean break with the Democratic Party, which has amply demonstrated that it is organically incapable of giving such leadership and such answers.

## The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

# SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

The best advice we can give to Stevenson's friends and admirers among American liberals is: For god's sake, keep the man away from Madrid!

## War Scares and Budgets

For the American people at large, the most salutary speech of the week was the one by Republican Senator Ralph E. Flanders of Vermont, last Friday. It is a speech to be kept in mind for all the weeks to come of the cold war.

Flanders charged the air force with "waging psychological warfare on the people of the United States." What this meant was that the air force was deliberately whipping up war hysteria with a dubious story about the Russian MIG attack on that U. S. "weather plane" from Alaska.

That the Russians are capable of making such armed attacks on innocent plane flights is something we know. We also know that the government's claim of MIG attacks in Europe may also be true.

The third thing we know is that the American military are perfectly capable of making up, blowing up, or distorting an incident for propaganda purposes. Flanders gives us all excellent reason not to jump to conclusions when one of these affairs makes a splash in the papers.

That U. S. Alaska-based plane was supposed to be on a "routine weather reconnaissance flight" off Kamchatka. Said Flanders: "The story is preposterous. There is no need to go within 25 miles of Kamchatka to look for weather."

He told the senators that he had reliable information that weather reconnaissance flights normally were made from the Bering Straits to Attu, a course that did not come within 400 miles of Kamchatka. "That reconnaissance bomber just was not there on weather business," he asserted, adding, "It may never have been engaged on a useful mission."

He said the presumed Russian fighter pilots "appear to have been discreet" in warning the U. S. bomber away from Russian territory. He asked whether the U. S. air force would have acted in a similar manner if its planes had met a Russian bomber 25 miles off the coast of California.

"The serious thing about this incident," said Flanders, "is the false report given to the American people by the air force. It tended and probably was intended to influence public opinion by making the incident into an act of aggression. . . ."

"There are two honest and honorable courses open in a case of this sort. One is for the air force to tell the truth. The other is for it to say nothing. It had better do one or the other."

The case in which Flanders advises the air force to "say nothing" is, of course, the case where the military have really been caught on a mission intended to violate Russian air space. This is the only interpretation that can be given.

We are not shocked. Grownups in America ought to know that the U. S. services are as eager to engage in spying activities as their Russian counterparts, and that in this ancient art of governments only he who gets caught is in the wrong. What the people have a right to resent is the hypocritical and self-righteous propaganda which attempts to whip up "patriotic" indignation at claims that the other side is trying to do the same thing.

But there is another factor involved. The National Council Against Conscription, an anti-militarist group headed by prominent liberals, has for years been documenting the coincidence that every time the armed services' budget is up for consideration, there is a sudden rash of war scares.

Is it an accident that this outbreak of war scares coincides with a determined attempt by the new administration to cut the war budget?

## Get Acquainted!

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

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

## The Handy Way to Subscribe!

### LABOR ACTION

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

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2.  New
  - 6 months at \$1.  Renewal
  - Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....