

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

APRIL 6, 1953

FIVE CENTS

That 'Victory' Over McCarthy . . .

. . . page 2

The Goal of Einstein's Equations

. . . page 4

University Heads Bend Before the Storm

. . . page 2

S. African Labor Defies Malan's Jim Crow

. . . page 3

Schedule N.Y. Rallies Against Franco

A public meeting to commemorate the founding of the Spanish Republic will be held on April 15, 8:15 p.m. at Freedom House in New York City. Sponsors of the meeting are the International League for the Rights of Man and the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims.

The meeting will not only acclaim the Spanish Republic, but will be a demonstration against Spanish fascism and the tyranny of the Franco regime. Among those invited to speak are James B. Carey, secretary of the CIO, Matthew Woll of the AFL, Norman Thomas, and Dr. George Shuster, president of Hunter College.

The Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims, of which Norman Thomas is chairman and Rowland Watts of the Workers Defense League is secretary, has called for picket lines in front of the Spanish Government Tourist Office on Madison Avenue and 51st Street. Picketing will be held on Monday, April 13, between 12 noon and 1 p.m. and on Tuesday, April 14, between 5 and 6 p.m.

Readers of LABOR ACTION are called upon to support these two expressions of anti-Franco solidarity. Be sure to attend the public meeting on April 15, and participate on the picket lines on April 13 and 14.

Help make the anniversary of the Spanish Republic the occasion for a great protest against the bloody Franco regime and Spanish fascism, in behalf of the hundreds and thousands of trade-unionist, republican and socialist victims of that brutal tyranny.

SPOTLIGHT

Anything Goes

On March 29 the Italian Senate approved the De Gasperi government's "electoral reform" bill after a stormy debate which lasted for 72 hours. In the course of the debate fists and missiles flew, and the 330-member body finally approved the bill by a vote of 174 to 0, as the opposition parties left the chamber before the vote was taken.

This "electoral reform" is one of the most brazen and scandalous measures ever to be imposed by a majority in a country which still maintains the forms of political democracy. In its essential character, to be sure, it is no more anti-democratic than the apportionment of most of the U. S. state legislatures which give the rural sections of the states far larger proportionate representation than the cities. These American practices have grown up traditionally, but in Italy what is proposed is rigging and representation in parliament in such a way as to increase the power of the dominant bloc out of all proportion to its support in the country.

In brief, what has been passed is a law which will give any party or combination of parties which get 51 per cent of the popular vote in the next elections 384 out of the 590 seats in the Chamber of Deputies. A popular majority of 51 per cent will be reflected by a two-thirds majority of deputies in the Chamber.

The government is proposing this measure because it feels very sure that De Gasperi's Christian-Democratic party and its governmental allies will get 51 per cent of the vote. We can imagine the uproar in the American press (and particularly among the "liberal" journals such as the *New Leader* and *Commentary*) if this proposal were being made by Stalinists in a country where they were sure of getting 51 per cent of the vote at the next election. As far as we can tell, they have had nothing to say about this "blow for democracy." As usual, the attitude seems to be that when it is directed against Stalinism, anything goes.

Malenkov's Amnesty

In our first issue after the accession of Malenkov, we wrote that in the immediate future "it is not at all unlikely that

the new set of masters may prefer to ease up on purges and terrorism for a while, as long as their problem is still consolidation."

It seems this hit the immediate future on the nose. This past week the Malenkov regime made the play to convince its people that the new Autocrat of All the Russias intends a "liberalized" regime. An amnesty was decreed for "criminals" jailed on minor charges—like coming late to work, etc. It specifically does not ap-

(Turn to last page)

Cold War

Washington Powerless to Seize Initiative as

Kremlin Presses On with Peace Drive

By GORDON HASKELL

With each week the Stalinist "peace offensive" widens its scope and steps up its pace. Whatever may be its ultimate objectives, it is now clear that the ruling group in the Kremlin has decided to convince the world that it is doing everything in its power to ease world tensions, with chief emphasis, at the moment, on reopening the truce negotiations in Korea.

Last week LABOR ACTION pointed out that except for the reference in Malenkov's speech to the Supreme Soviet to the possibility of settling all major differences with the United States peacefully, most of the conciliatory gestures had been made to America's military allies.

Since then, however, the chief emphasis has been shifted to Korea. It is evident that the current strategy was worked out in Moscow between Chou En-lai, China's foreign minister, and the Russian rulers. The policy now being put forward in Korea is a co-ordinated world Stalinist policy.

Its primary motivation may be the Kremlin's need for an easing of world tension in order that the new rulers in Moscow can devote themselves to internal consolidation and stabilization. Or its motivation may come from the Chinese side of the Moscow-Peiping axis, representing Mao Tse-tung's reference now that Stalin's death has given him a freer hand and more independence of judgment

'Reutherism' Marks Time on Main Issues At UAW Convention

By BEN HALL

No explosive or spectacular events interrupted the course of the United Auto Workers convention in Atlantic City, March 22-27; and this gives the meeting of more than 2,600 delegates a special significance. Walter Reuther's administration has been in unchallenged control for seven years; in the calm of 1953, we can judge its policies and see what kind of union it hopes to build.

The UAW unquestionably is and will remain the most progressive and most democratic union in the United States. The convention underlined this fact despite its failure to adopt or even to consider a program capable of arousing and re-orienting the American labor movement. When the social climate of the country is conservative or calm, and the labor movement as a whole hesitant and timid, "Reutherism" displays its weakest side; and we face just such a period, with the unions poised uncertainly before the new Republican administration.

Nevertheless, as it grappled with

the key questions of the day, the Reutherite leadership displayed its distinctive character as the most radical wing in the labor movement.

The Guaranteed Wage

In a 104-day strike against Chrysler, the UAW won a pension plan soon extended to the entire auto industry. The next goal is the guaranteed annual wage.

This slogan, once an ultimate objective, now becomes an immediate demand. The convention decided to begin the fight in 1955.

(Continued on page 6)

within the Stalinist empire. (It is to be noted that, this time, the initiative for the new truce came directly from the Chinese, unlike the last time when the opening of negotiations was broached by Vishinsky in the UN.) These two motivations are not at all in contradiction with each other and may both be operative.

The opening move was Molotov's offer to the British to assist in the release of several British civilians who had been captured by the North Koreans some time ago. A similar offer was then made to the French government. This was followed immediately by a statement by North Korean Premier Kim Il Sung and Chinese General Peng Teh-huai that they are prepared immediately to exchange sick and wounded prisoners of war under Article 109 of the Geneva Convention. This was in reply to a letter sent them on February 22 by General Mark Clark.

CHOU MOVES IN

Not only did the Stalinist generals agree in principle to such an exchange to be carried out immediately, but they added that "we consider that the reasonable settlement of the question of exchanging sick and injured prisoners of war . . . should be made to lead to the smooth settlement of the entire question of prisoners of war, thereby achieving an armistice in Korea. . . . Therefore our side proposes that the delegates for

armistice negotiations of both sides immediately resume the negotiations at Panmunjom. . . ."

It is evident that the American military and civilian authorities were quite unprepared for such a favorable reply to their suggestion. The chief point which seemed to stump them was whether the Stalinists were making an exchange of sick and wounded prisoners conditional on reopening Panmunjom truce negotiations, or whether this was just another among the repeated suggestions that these negotiations, which were abandoned by the Americans last October, be resumed.

While the American authorities were still deciding how to reply, the initiative was taken by Chou En-lai in a broadcast from Peiping. The Chinese foreign minister suggested that both sides return all prisoners who insist on repatriation, and hand over the others to a neutral state "so as to insure a just solution to the question of their repatriation."

Chou stated that the North Koreans always had held, and continue to hold, the view that the only solution to the prisoner question was to repatriate all of them. But in view of the fact that the exchange of prisoners now is the only barrier to agreement, he said that the Stalinists are "prepared to take steps to eliminate the differences on this question

(Turn to last page)

That 'Victory' Over Joe McCarthy . . .

By WALTER JASON

As if to answer its own fears and perplexity, the New York Times published on March 20 two articles on the McCarthy problem. The one was from Paris by C. L. Sulzberger, its chief foreign correspondent, and the other from Washington by William S. White.

Sulzberger, using European editorials as his take-off point, views with the usual N. Y. Times alarm the effects of McCarthyism abroad. He quotes a London newspaper on the Bohlen case: "How long will America stand for this?" "The technique of character assassination reminds me of the way the Nazis took over our own foreign office twenty years ago," Sulzberger has a German official say.

The answer to these fears and doubts is contained inadvertently in the White dispatch from Washington. It is the typical cautious approach which speaks volumes for the mentality of the Times. McCarthy lost a battle, according to White on the Bohlen case. The "victory" over McCarthy consisted of the fact that an innocent man was found not guilty! Such are the standards of the times, and apparently of the Times.

REMAINS IMMUNE

By such standards neither the methods nor aims of McCarthyism can be questioned. Suppose that Chip Bohlen, the diplomat in question, had once upon a time (say in the 1930s) expressed a mild sympathy for Russia! McCarthy's case would have been "proved," no doubt, and it is quite likely that his nomination for ambassador to Russia would have been withdrawn.

What about McCarthy's slanders and vile implications against Bohlen? McCarthy remains immune from any action against his methods.

On what issue will McCarthy attack the right-hand man of that "traitor" General Marshall, for his role under the

Roosevelt administrations? We refer, of course, to the still-silent President Eisenhower.

Among other recent illustrations of the power of McCarthyism, as well as its frenzied mentality were: (1) the investigation of the use of the union song, "Solidarity Forever," by the Voice of America, as "Communist propaganda"; (2) McCarthy's obvious attempt to frame and jail Earl Browder, the ex-Stalinist leader; (3) the pitiful confessions from ex-Stalinists like Langston Hughes and Edwin Seaver, who repudiated the very books and works that gave them their reputations in scenes reminiscent of the atmosphere of the Moscow trials; (4) the exposé of an American printing firm which does business with Iron Curtain countries in Washington, D. C.—but why not all banks, shipping companies, book stores, export and import houses too, which do any business with Russia?

NEW VICTIMS READIED

That there is no limit is self-evident. And that it is a blind, irrational fear-hysteria of Stalinism needs to be repeated a hundred times, for its victims grow in numbers, and increasingly include ex-Stalinists and liberals. The latest purge victim in Washington on the Voice of America is expected to be Liston M. Oak, who has handled labor broadcasts. His public blast at McCarthy, made at the auto workers convention in Atlantic City, suggests he has seen the handwriting on the wall.

Soon the time will come when McCarthyism cannot be dismissed any longer by anyone as a momentary irrationality of a few misguided politicians. Its strength flows from and gains in the tension of a cold war in which one nation, America, increasingly depends on military might instead of ideas to combat Stalinism. Its logical culmination as a foreign-policy expression is war, for after all, isn't the only good Communist a dead one?

University Heads' Statement Bends Before the Purge Storm

The Association of American Universities, representing the administrations of 37 leading universities and headed by top educators, has issued its statement on academic freedom, declaring its position on the key question of "Communist teachers." It is clear that it is standing up against the witchhunt in the college world "like a lettuce leaf to a rabbit."

What is significant about its humiliating capitulation to the pressures of the purge system is that this is the first time that such a responsible body, speaking in the name of America's universities, has given official endorsement to a system which is alien to every principle it is supposed to espouse.

The university presidents who lead it are no doubt heartsick over the "excesses" that have cropped up but they are going along with the crowd, while repeating their ritual phrases about academic freedom.

While giving out the old words about the scholar's right to "open challenge of popular prejudice in times of tension such as those in which we live," they denounce "non-cooperation" with McCarthyite investigations into their campuses.

While repeating the prayer for "open competition" of ideas in the search for truth and the scholar's right to question "existing institutions," as if telling beads on a rosary, they plump for the firing not only of "members" of the Communist Party but also of wider categories.

Of phrases about academic freedom their statement has enough. They are for "investigation, criticism and presentation of ideas in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual confidence." But they cannot spare a word to comment whether such an atmosphere exists any longer today among instructors in America—and why it does not.

They say: "To censor individual faculty members would put a stop to learning at its outlet." That is in Part II. But in Part IV they approve of the censoring of individual faculty members.

They say that "a university does not take an official position of its own either on disputed questions of scholarship or

on political questions or matters of public policy." But (this time in the same part of the statement) they lay down the rule that faculty members "are," and presumably must be, loyal not only to the ideal of learning, and the moral code, but also to the country's "form of government." The latter elastic phrase is not defined by the scholars who authored the statement, even though they are undoubtedly aware of the manner in which it is interpreted by patrioteers and witchhunters.

WIDE OPEN

In fact, they themselves give reason to believe that they equate "form of government" with capitalism, for they add: "Free enterprise is as essential to intellectual as to economic progress." In another part of the statement we learn that the university's "intellectual capital [is] as essential to our society as financial capital is to our industrial enterprise."

They say that "So long as an instructor's observations are scholarly and germane to his subject, his freedom of expression in his classroom should not be curbed." That is for the Department of Pious Generalization. In the later Department of Practical Expediency, however, we find that scholarly and germane observations are very much to be curbed indeed, along with their observers, "if an instructor follows communistic practice. . . ."

What is "communistic practice"? Continuing the above quotation, it is defined as follows: "becoming a propagandist for one opinion, adopting a 'party line,' silencing criticism or impairing freedom of thought and expression in his classroom."

This is so loosely worded (for university presidents, at any rate) that it is wide open, and there is little reason to doubt that it is purposely left wide open. For the prexies hardly believe that the danger today is that the menacing "Communist instructors" are going to throttle off conservatives in their classrooms. On the basis of the AAU statement they will be hard enough put to keep their jobs even if they seal their own mouths, if a congressional committee heaves in sight. And when does an instructor become a "propagandist," considering that the universities are full of professors who have an ideological ax of their own to grind, and grind it?

This is not the only wide-open language. Besides members of the CP, others are to be purged in case of "adherence to such a regime as that of Russia and its satellites." The strangely used word "adherence"—which can scarcely be interpreted literally—must mean "adherence to the views of."

DELICATE REMINDER

Although the very first ground for purging an instructor or professor is membership in the CP, the statement insists illogically that "the university [itself, not the political authorities] is competent to establish a tribunal to determine the facts and fairly judge the nature and degree of any trespass upon academic integrity, as well as to determine the penalty such trespass merits."

The university presidents are deceiving themselves, to put it in its best light. They are in no position to ferret out membership in the Communist Party: that is work for the cops. They are trying to make themselves believe that, even though accepting the purge rules, they can keep the implementing apparatus of the purge within the campus as an intramural affair. Or perhaps they are ready to hire private detectives, as a Western university did recently.

All of this is voted in, together with a not very delicate reminder to the universities about certain practical matters not connected with democratic abstractions:

"The state university is supported by public funds. The endowed university is benefited by tax exemptions. Such benefits are conferred upon the universities not as favors, but in furtherance of the public interest. They carry with them public obligation of direct concern to the faculties of the universities as well as to the governing boards."

The "public obligation" of the universities which the statement hints at is not the obligation to stand up to a purge climate which casts a pall of fear over intellectual life. The statement was written, rather, to bend before the witchhunting storm and go along with it, while repeating soothing generalities.

LONDON LETTER About That Central African Constitution — Labor Opposes Tories' Policy on Africa

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, March 24—Britain's African problem is still acute.

From Parliament today came the rumblings of distant battle. The Federation of three British territories in Central Africa was being discussed.

For the Conservatives, Lyttleton argued what manifest advantages in the economic field would be attendant upon the union of these territories. An amalgamation of 6,000,000 Africans and 300,000 Europeans would enable these potentially rich areas to produce their best. Most people, he thought, were agreed upon the desirability and necessity of partnership between Europeans and Africans for the future of Africa.

When the Labor Minister for the Colonies, Jim Griffiths rose, he was a trifle embarrassed. He had, so to speak, to disown a baby of his own conception. He argued that it was early to try to impose a scheme which was opposed by the majority of those to whom it applied; all African opinion bitterly opposed it.

Labor used the opposition of the peoples to urge delay. The Conservatives—who thought that much of the resistance was inspired from England—interpreted African opposition now as showing how necessary it was to push ahead; otherwise there might be more racial strife. They also thought that the Standing Committee which they had proposed to deal with African problems would be sufficient to safeguard their interests.

Griffiths had harsh words to say on this. In the original proposal, a Minister for African Affairs, with Cabinet rank, had been proposed. This had been whittled down. Not only did the Africans have none of their own representation, but the Standing Committee would really be only of an advisory nature.

In theory, the Africans could protest through the High Commissioner to the Queen in London. Since, however, he would be chosen with local European consent, he would probably not be a person particularly well disposed to dealing with Africans' complaints.

What was even more dangerous was that the Central African Constitution would require a two-thirds majority to be changed. As the Assembly would be overwhelmingly white, while the Europeans represent one-twentieth of the population, no constitutional changes could ever take place to the Africans' advantage. Such a so-called partnership could only militate, in Labor's opinion, to increase racial tension and bitterness. The Conservatives were building on a volcano.

Nevertheless, the bill was passed by 304 to 260.

The situation in my opinion will now enter into a severe chronic phase. Africans will be impelled into a position of taking extra-parliamentary action, which will in itself be "illegal." They will feel that none of the so-called democratic expressions will be allowed.

The passage of this bill represents a real regression. In Southern Rhodesia, for instance, there was a definite movement to racial equality which will obviously be stopped. The few Africans high

in the Civil Service will find themselves in a very unenviable position.

DIFFICULTY

News this week from England is about the relaxation of import restrictions into Britain from Europe. Until recently, this country had accumulated a vast debt (\$1,000,000,000) to the European Payments Union—which is the clearing house for all West European currencies. Since last year, when the foreign travel allowance was \$70, and there were many import quotas, the balance in the EPU has been favoring Britain, at the expense of France and Italy.

As the latter are both in a sore plight with the Payments Union, and would soon have to start cutting imports from Britain, the government decided to abolish many import quotas and licenses, and increase the foreign travel allowance to \$104 per person. The news illustrates the economic embarrassments of Western Europe.

CHICAGO

Public Meeting
Wednesday at 8 p.m.
April 8

MAX SHACHTMAN

National Chairman, ISL

will speak on

After Stalin — What's Ahead?

and

The New Stalinist Anti-Semitism

ROOSEVELT COLLEGE, 430 So. Michigan
CHICAGO

LABOR SCOPE

SOUTH AFRICA

S. African Labor Defies Malan Jim Crow Policy

The most important development so far in the fight against South Africa's racist policy took place this week when the organized trade-union movement, for the first time, adopted a position of opening the unions up to Negro workers on an equal basis "irrespective of race or color."

This is by far the biggest break in the racist solidarity of the white population of the country, and gives the native resistance movement its most powerful support.

The reaction of the Nationalist white-supremacy party of Malan was to warn that "there will be no place in South Africa for whites" who do not go along with their own barbarism.

The South African Federation of Trade Unions and the South African Trades and Labor Council, plus several subsidiary organizations, directly challenged the regime's policy that "there should be no intermingling" of the races in the labor movement.

They declared: "Experience has shown conclusively in many industries that there can be no adequate safeguards against lowering of workers' standards of wages and employment conditions other than total organization of the workers concerned, irrespective of race and color, on the basis that the rate for the job is the uniform minimum rate of wages for each occupation."

They added: "The inevitable result of forcing non-Europeans out of existing trade unions will be to create competition among workers in the same occupation of an unhealthy and anti-social character. In sheer self-defense the non-European will form his own organization and claim the right to bargain with his employer on his own terms."

In recent years many unions have been taking in Negroes, but this is the first time that organized labor has directly challenged the government policy head-on.

A Union Local Investigates the 'Attitudes' of Its Membership

By ROBERT MAGNUS

*Union Solidarity** is a social study of the attitudes of the membership of Teamsters Local 699 in St. Louis. This local, under the leadership of Harold Gibbons, has made a name for itself in the past by its relatively progressive policies in the realm of union democracy, race relations, education, etc., and has now taken the lead in furthering "outside" study of union conditions.

This radical departure from the traditional distrust of "longhaired scientists"—a hangover from business-union know-nothingness—is not accidental. It is evidence of the security of the local leadership, its prior knowledge that nothing was likely to be turned up which would prick the susceptibilities or harm the authority of the leadership.

In this sense, it stands in vivid contrast to the methods of King Joe Ryan who was forced to employ the New York police force and a private goon squad instead of the scientific survey to "discover" the attitudes of "his" union membership.

But for precisely this reason, the results of this survey must be utilized with a great deal of care.

Attitude studies in general, of course, suffer from a number of serious defects which are inherent in their very methods. Assuming that the sample itself is representative of the entire membership, and that the questionnaire does not load the answers, the survey only tells what the member's attitude was at that moment of time and gives little indication of the direction of development. The fact that the union is itself unusual and unique thus reinforces the uncertainty of the results when they are applied to the entire labor movement or even to its most progressive sector.

In spite of these and other difficulties, this type of information, if combined with a grasp of the dynamics of the class struggle and the history of the labor movement, can still prove invaluable to the present union leadership as well as to socialists.

It is to be hoped that similar surveys can be made of other types of locals in various localities. An objective and truthful examination can never harm the labor movement as a whole, although it could certainly cut holes in the glorious self-image of its pie-card contingents. (There is certainly no excuse for the UAW not taking the lead in such studies.)

WHO'S "LOYAL"?

The aim of the study was to examine solidarity in the sense of the psychological attachments of the workers to their specific local union. This more or less ruled out in advance any real examination of class-consciousness even in the mild form of inter-union solidarity.

Further, the author's general schema views the unions "as a means of regaining the security, recognition, and self-expression . . . lost because of the growth of modern capitalism and the Industrial Revolution."

Despite all of the blown-up and highly touted general objectivity of the American social scientist, it is evident from the schema used that an attitude study today will fail to show class-struggle ideology and would inevitably come to the conclusion that "In concrete terms, loyalty to the union does not mean disloyalty to the employer." (Even this grandiose conclusion hardly follows from the questionnaire. Solidarity with the union must involve some "disloyalty" to the boss—from the point of view of the boss, at least.)

In short, Rose wants to leave the impression in the minds of his readers that

"the union movement is a buttress for the free-enterprise system." The fact that the trade unions have been the chief force for undermining the capitalist system in every other modern industrial country without exception—this kind of evidence is not even mentioned to offset this impression. This kind of thing is called "industrial sociology." Truly the attitude study has its limitations!

It is impossible to go into all of the conclusions of the study, but here is a section dealing with union democracy which bears some mention.

The study concludes from its data that "Their worker solidarity and their loyalty to this union in particular seem to rest on two bases: (a) their high degree of participation in union activities (coupled with a desire for democratic control); (b) their feeling that the union is successful in achieving its purposes—purposes which are important to them as workers."

The second conclusion is hardly novel but the first—high participation and desire for democracy—should come as a blow to the job-trust ideal of the business unions.

These unions and their bourgeois defenders are the loudest boasters about the dividends of purely business-unionism and the practical payoff that comes from viewing the union as a mere device in the hands of the leadership. This study concludes, however, that "A desire for democracy in the union is one factor back of the high participation. . . . Those whose desire for democracy is frustrated, because they believe that major union policies are set by the director or the stewards' council rather than by the rank and file, are relatively the poorest attenders at union meetings."

This statement should be branded across the broad rump of the trade-union bureaucracy and is certainly an aid in answering those who scream about "politics" (anything but their own pro-capitalist politics) or "excess democracy" in the unions. An undemocratic union is a weak union; an increase in democracy actually strengthens participation and loyalty, a fact stressed for years by the socialists.

Another conclusion is not less important: "Loyalty to the union does not pre-

clude criticism of specific policies or of specific union leaders. In fact, the more active participants in union activities are the ones who are most critical on selected counts." (My emphasis.)

To those union leaders, and they are myriad, who "view with alarm" any criticism of them or their policies and see in a passive and subdued membership proof of the "maturity" of the union and the "statesmanship" of its leaders, should pause over the above. The extent to which real and vital criticism exists ought to be a measure of the real loyalty to the union as a whole.

HALF FOR LABOR PARTY

An apathetic membership doesn't criticize—it votes with its feet by refusing to come to meetings, attend functions, or participate in activities. An active membership, vitally interested in all of the affairs of the union, is precisely the one which will most vociferously disagree on specific policies now and again. This is not an indication of the disintegration of the union but of the real concern of its members. Woe to those unions and those leaderships which cannot understand this dialectic of social participation.

There is other useful information in the book especially on the effects of the progressive race policies of the leadership, but the results of the study on the question of a labor party should be stated.

The "total membership was divided approximately half-and-half in answering the question whether the union should 'help to start a labor party sometime in the future.' This was the lowest favorable response to political participation running from encouraging members to go to the polls on the one hand to collecting a dollar on the other."

The lowest percentage (35 per cent yes) was for: "advise members how to vote." If half of the old members of this union are in favor of a labor party while following the leadership in voting for Truman (this is 1948), then what could not be done if a great campaign for this kind of action was undertaken by sections of the labor movement?

The idea that labor must continue as a fifth wheel in the cart of the Democratic Party is certainly a little shaken by this study alone.

ISL FUND DRIVE Four Weeks to Go!

If You're Below 75%—Wake Up and Give!

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

Although we have passed the halfway mark in contributions, we were far below the weekly pace needed to complete the Fund Drive in the time that remains. Only \$643 came in this week. According to the figures of the box score, we will need an average of over a thousand dollars a week to reach the national quota by the first of May.

As a result of the drop in payments there was no great change in the standings. The Socialist Youth League made the best percentage showing, moving up from eleventh place to sixth in the stand-

ings, passing Chicago and New York. Readers will remember that a year ago the SYL led the campaign. We have been chiding the youth for the slowness of its drive, but in recent weeks they have been moving up fast.

The units of the SYL stand as follows: Chicago \$325; New York \$275.50; General \$71; Los Angeles \$35 and Berkeley \$19. The Chicago SYL is again leading the youth in the Fund Drive, as was true of every campaign in which the youth have participated.

This week only New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and Philadelphia came in with respectable contributions. We did not hear from most other areas. Seven places are still below the 50 per cent mark, while

altogether thirteen hover around that percentage. This is far too low at this stage of the drive.

A real pickup is needed in the next four weeks, especially from those areas below 75 per cent. It is true that many branches of the ISL are counting on May Day celebrations to help them complete their quotas, but that can be done only if a sufficiently large part of the individual quotas are met before May Day.

Box Score

	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$11,500	5861.50	50.9
Streator	25	30	120
St. Louis	25	25	100
Detroit	500	400	80
Pittsburgh	150	112	74.6
Reading	50	35	70
SYL	1,250	725.50	58
General	1,075	620	57.6
Chicago	1,800	997	55.3
New York	4,000	2025	50.6
Cleveland	200	100	50
Oakland	500	235	47
Philadelphia ..	250	93	37.2
Los Angeles ...	600	221	36.8
Buffalo	650	200	30.7
Newark	250	28	11.2
Seattle	200	12	6
Akron	50	0	0
Indiana	75	0	0
Oregon	50	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)

*Arnold Rose: *Union Solidarity*, Minneapolis, 1952. \$3.00.

**Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!**

**Read
The
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review**

YOU and SCIENCE

The Goal Behind Those Equations by Dr. Einstein

By PHILIP COBEN

A hundred years from now, it may be, the only news item of this past week that will still be in the history books is the announcement by Albert Einstein. Einstein published a last step in his attempt to provide a mathematical theory which will integrate gravitational and electromagnetic phenomena—that is, bring together (eventually) all the known phenomena of the physical world under a single set of fundamental laws.

The conception itself may be a bit obscure even to many educated laymen, as the content of the conception is to this writer. What deserves mention in this column is, however, not quite that obscure at all, although it is something of a side-debate taking place alongside Einstein's project for developing a "unified field theory." In the course of his announcement Einstein pointed out that his effort is also directed to countering the philosophical implications which most scientists have drawn from the concepts of modern physics.

"I must explain," writes Einstein, "why I have gone to so much trouble to arrive at this result."

"The contemporary physicist cannot, without such an explanation, appreciate this; for he is convinced, as a result of the successes of the probability-based quantum mechanics, that one must abandon the goal of complete descriptions of real situations in a physical theory."

Einstein seeks to restore that goal, and as such has been the leading figure in the scientific world who has sought to present the concepts of the "new physics" within the general framework of the materialist world view. Not without inconsistencies, that has clearly been his viewpoint, though he avoids the term materialism because of what has been done to it by both its "friends" and its enemies.

NO COSMIC DICE

Among physicists-turned-philosophers, whose number is legion, it has become almost an article of belief that the quantum theory has destroyed "determinism"—the explanation of events in terms of causes rather than accident, to put it in oversimplified fashion.

Within the field of science, it has been a reaction to the great extension of the unknown, as the advance of physical knowledge has gone on. This statement is paradoxical only on the surface: the great conquests of knowledge by modern physics have had as a by-product the opening up of vast stretches where the scientist stares into darkness. Just as the savage peopled his own darkness and ignorance with myths, gods and fables, so the modern scientist has tended to retreat to a similar comforting notion: where the facts say only "This is unknown," he translates "This is the Unknowable."

Perhaps the most vital field of the struggle between materialism and philosophic idealism has been over this retreat to the Unknowable, for it is only in the Unknowable that the modern sophisticated mind can still find room for gods, absolutes, and the supernatural. Today one of the few nooks and crannies in which scientists claim to find the Unknowable—as distinct from the unknown—is in the "indeterminate" world inside the atom, which is in-

vestigated with the aid of quantum mechanics.

Einstein is directing his attack upon this Unknowable.

"I cannot believe," he is quoted as writing, "that God plays dice with the cosmos." He is referring to the fashionable belief of scientists that individual events cannot be predicted but that all knowledge is based merely on the statistical laws of probability.

Of course, to a materialist, prediction can be based on statistical laws (e.g., so many people will die of TB this year). But he also asks: "What in turn are these statistical laws based on? He looks on them as reflections of determinate events in a complex chain of causality. (E.g., if certain conditions change, if a new drug is discovered, or the level of nutrition and recreation improves, the statistical "law" of the rate of TB will change too.)"

EINSTEINIAN VIEW

Last year a disciple of Einstein's point of view, the physicist David Bohm, published an incisive discussion of the present fashionable interpretation of the quantum theory, in the *Physical Review* for January 15, 1952, in an article entitled "A Suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of 'Hidden' Variables." Leaving out his technical mathematical treatment of the question, his general point of view is that the quantum theory should be regarded merely as a way of handling a statistical situation which we cannot yet handle by any other means, but should not be interpreted so as to exclude the possibility of discovering the "hidden" (undiscovered) variables which lie behind this statistical situation.

"As a matter of fact," he wrote in his article, which had been written in consultation with Einstein, "whenever we have previously had recourse to statistical theories, we have always ultimately found that the laws governing the individual members of a statistical ensemble could be expressed in terms of just such hidden variables. For example, from the point of view of macroscopic physics [dealing with situations above the atomic level], the coordinates and momenta of individual atoms are hidden variables, which in a large-scale system manifest themselves only as statistical averages. Perhaps then, our present quantum-mechanical averages are similarly a manifestation of hidden variables, which have not, however, yet been detected directly."

Present quantum theory as usually interpreted, he points out, in principle makes it impossible to make any application to dimensions smaller than the fraction of a centimeter represented by 1 over 10 quadrillions. But it does this because of its assumptions—assumptions, he argues, which are not even subject to experimental evidence. The assumptions are accepted by physicists because they lead to results which agree with much experimental evidence; but are these the ONLY assumptions which can do so? The mathematical core of his paper is devoted to suggesting an alternative. His case does not rest upon the validity of his particular suggestion, however; his question still stands even if his own suggestion is rejected.

OVERCOMING A STAGE

The development of the usual interpretation of quantum theory stems from the philosophic ideas of Mach and his successors, he says, but—

"... the history of scientific research is full of examples in which it was very fruitful indeed to assume that certain objects or elements might be real, long before any procedures were known which would permit them to be observed directly. The atomic theory is just such an example. . . . Certain 19th-century positivists (notably Mach) therefore insisted on purely philosophic grounds that it was incorrect to suppose that individual atoms actually existed, because they had never been observed as such. The atomic theory, they thought, should be regarded only as an interesting way of calculating various observable large-scale properties of matter. Nevertheless, evidence for the existence of individual atoms was ultimately discovered by people who took the atomic hypothesis seriously enough to suppose that individual atoms might actually exist; even though no one had yet observed them."

He suggests the quantum theory is now in that stage. What Einstein has now said is that he has "gone to such trouble" in order to make possible the overcoming of this stage.

There is little doubt that Einstein would agree with the way Professor Bohm summarized his own hypothesis, as opposed to that of the positivism of the physicists-turned-philosophers:

"This hypothesis," wrote Bohm, "is based on the simple assumption that the world as a whole is objectively real and that, as far as we now know, it can correctly be regarded as having a precisely describable and analyzable structure of unlimited complexity. The pattern of this structure seems to be reflected completely but indirectly at every level, so that from experiments done at the level of size of human beings, it is very probably possible ultimately to draw inferences concerning the properties of the whole structure at all levels. We should never expect to obtain a complete theory of this structure, because there are almost certainly more elements in existence than we possibly can be aware of at any particular stage of scientific development. Any specified element, however, can in principle ultimately be discovered, but never all of them. . . ."

As science has made its modern conquests, it has progressively pushed the borders of the unknown farther and farther. Thus it makes its attack on philosophic idealism's fetish of the Unknowable. The importance of Einstein's work to the materialist (aside, of course, from its importance to the scientists as such) is that it sets the goal of driving the Unknowable out of one of its last hiding places.

The Home Front

Peace Scare Hits Wall Street

"There's a 'peace scare' in Wall Street today—arising out of Red China's latest series of conciliatory moves and renewed hopes that the Korean war may be ended in the very near future.

"There's chilling debate about the possibility of a 'Malenkov depression' behind the closed doors of America's leading corporations today—arising out of the fear that peace in Korea finally might 'shock' us into the long-anticipated downturn.

"There's frightening discussion as to whether this peace prospect will force the administration into risking a sharply reduced rearmament program—thus making a recession later in 1953 a virtual certainty.

"Stocks retreated on a broad front in Wall Street yesterday as news of the Chinese compromise proposals reached here. Hundreds of millions of dollars in paper values were wiped out; at times, the stock ticker ran late as selling mounted; many stocks were down \$2 and \$3 a share.

"Commodity prices fell back. Losses were general in cotton, wheat, rubber, cocoa and ran right through the world markets.

"Speculators moved to the sidelines. There was a general atmosphere of 'get into a safe position, wait and see.'

"The nervousness was apparent in nearly every market in the Western world—New York, London, Paris, etc.

"Peace in Korea seems closer than at any time since mid-1951, when Jacob Malik first proposed truce talks."

—Business Columnist Sylvia Porter, N. Y. Post, March 31.

Reading from Left to Right

FOOTNOTE TO THE MARTY-TILLON AFFAIR, by Paul Barton.—*Masses-Information* (Paris), Jan.-Feb. 1953.

Paul Barton, whose informative periodical specializes in Czechoslovak affairs, presents a viewpoint on the French Communist Party crisis in France around André Marty and Charles Tillon:

"Most observers commit a serious error in interpreting the Marty-Tillon crisis within the French Communist Party which has become public since September 1952. It is common knowledge that at the origin of this crisis is the question of the conquest of power at the end of the last war. André Marty and Charles Tillon severely criticized the team Thorez-Duclos for having participated in a coalition government and liquidated the military organizations of the party, instead of taking advantage of the revolutionary ferment in order to take power immediately. According to the official explanation of the Stalinists, the plans of the Marty-Tillon clique were rejected at the time in consideration of the Americans.

"In general, the commentators believe that this actually was the motive behind the policies of the Communist Party of France at that time. This is completely wrong. The resolution of the Cominform against Tito and the attitude long maintained toward the victories of Mao Tse-tung have revealed Stalin's hostility to any assumption of power by his disciples if the country in question has not been 'liberated' by the Russian army. In addition, the experience of Czechoslovakia has demonstrated that even in the case of military occupation Stalin is opposed to the conquest of power, as long as there

exists a serious revolutionary effervescence in the country to be won. This is, as a matter of fact, the only explanation of the 'general line' imposed on the Czech Stalinists in 1945. The liberation of Czechoslovakia took place at the time of the collapse of the Third Reich; it was therefore no longer possible to fear a 'reversal of alliances.' At the same time, the population cherished such illusions about the Stalinists, in May 1945, that they could have taken power without firing a shot, by proceeding to parliamentary elections as quickly as possible. A 'bloody reply' on the part of their adversaries was therefore excluded.

"The Russian experience, furthermore, explains sufficiently the refusal of Stalin to allow the conquest of power by his epigones in the midst of revolutionary ferment. Since the Bolsheviks were carried to power by unleashed popular aspirations, it took the present master of the Kremlin more than twenty years to liquidate the strivings of his subjects and to put his regime on a solid foundation. Not to understand his point of view in this matter amounts to the insinuation that he takes seriously his own propaganda, meant to fool the simple-minded. As nothing could be further from his mind, he orders 'direct action' only where his followers are acting in the midst of a general apathy of the 'masses.' As soon as the latter begin to be honestly aroused, the Stalinists receive instructions to make a 'national front,' a 'popular front,' a 'national and democratic revolution,' in short, to enter into a coalition with adversaries. The moment this became clear to him, Marty rebelled, after having executed so many turns with docility."

'THE NEW INTERNATIONAL'

is the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, internationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world.

SEND 35 CENTS FOR THE CURRENT ISSUE
OR SUBSCRIBE AT \$2.00 A YEAR

New International, 114 West 14 Street, New York City



LABOR ACTION

April 6, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 14

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

From the STALINIST JUNGLE

SOME EXAMPLES OF THE MYTH OF 'PLANNED ECONOMY' IN STALINLAND

One of the important tasks for a serious study of how the Stalinist economies work is an investigation of the myth of the "planned economy." The plans are there, of course, but what happens to their execution under a totalitarianism which excludes any check on them from below and which makes the upper bureaucrats inviolate from criticism and correction from inferiors?

Here are some symptoms.

The Polish organ *Glos Pracy*, wrote for example on November 4 last:

"In all the socialized trade shops, one finds as many ties of as many kinds and colors as one could wish. But it is not so good where clothes generally and winter underwear are concerned.

"However, in September of this year the Hanka Savicka Cooperative at Cracow, which had 6000 metres of flannel for the manufacture of children's clothes, laid this whole length aside in order to manufacture 20,000 neckties from another stock! Why did they plan the production of this particular article? They wanted to execute a plan the value of which could be calculated in money. Ties were very suitable for that. Why then go to the trouble of producing children's clothes at all, with all the extra and more careful work which it requires—for far less money?

"Production cooperatives seem to prefer, regardless of what is needed by the buying public, the manufacture of articles which enable them to realize plans measured by standards of value."

There are countless ways, of course, in which the bureaucracy will attempt to remedy such a state of affairs. All of their ways will be based on the imposition of further bureaucratic controls from on top. Democratic planning is impossible for them.

So it is that in the wintertime one reads in the Warsaw press that bathing suits and sunglasses are being displayed in the shop windows. This is not the result of excessive imagination but simply due to the fact that the store happened to have those articles on hand. At the same time, galoshes will be unavailable.

CONTRADICTION

The factory manager's aim is to produce his quota according to the plan. If he does not, his neck is at stake. It is much less important to produce anything that will stand up. In such conditions the contradiction between totalitarianism and planning, which is inherent in the Russian totalitarian economy, leads to an unsolvable problem of how to maintain quality. The problem fills the Stalinist press, with "exposés" every now and then which cast a spotlight on what goes on all the time.

So the Moscow evening newspaper *Vechernyaya Moskva* published a letter from a housewife, a Mrs. A. Voronova, about the experiences of two families:

"The New Year began with a cheerful celebration for the Gudikhia and Razumovsky families. They had at last managed to get a flat in a newly built block at 4 Parkovy Street. But soon their enthusiasm was damped. The whole building showed signs of careless work. In the kitchen pots and pans had to be covered to prevent ceiling plaster from falling into them. Draughts came in through all the windows. Dirty stains appeared on the walls and ceilings, showing the poor quality of the plumbing in the flat above. . . . It became impossible to live in the new flat."

The newspaper said: "Ministries and departments do not carry out their obligations to the city. During a recent inspection by State Architectural and Building Control, hundreds of incomplete—although already occupied—buildings were counted. There they stand, with ugly façades, steel girders sticking out instead of balconies, badly designed courtyards and unassembled lifts."

NO COORDINATION

The same story is told in Poland by the Stalinist organ *Trybuna Ludu* (Nov. 10 last) about the town of Muranow, a settlement "planned to house 60,000 people when completed in 15 years' time." The story it laments over is that of the tenants of "C" block of workers' flats, given not as an isolated instance of mismanagement but as an illustration of the rottenness of the building administration.

The tenants of "C" block have been living there for three years, yet "look down from the window, and you will see an excavated road and slabs of stone lying about among lime, sand, planks of wood and far too much mud. And they will tell you a little story, which it would not amuse them at all to read as satire!

"A year ago," they say, "workmen came here and dug the courtyard to lay a lawn. A month later other workmen came and they dug the lawn to erect lampposts. Three months later came another lot, to dig up the lawn to lay a cable. Then yet another lot came and destroyed the previous work to build a radio junction. And then another lot came. . . ."

"Hermanowicz, director of No. 2 Housing Construction Association, has become used to it," continues the newspaper. "Recently he himself saw a lawn being dug up and he wondered who was responsible for it without his own knowledge.

"There are too many responsible authorities [the newspaper then lists them], some subordinate to the Ministry of Town and Settlement Planning, others to the Ministry of Communal Economy. What we do not understand is why their coordination seems to encounter such unquarable difficulties. Could not the Housing-Construction Association bring all the authorities concerned together on the site?"

"DISEASE"

Describing in some detail the "mournful" picture of the whole site, including "B" block (which, like "C" block is still

incomplete though inhabited), *Trybuna Ludu* says that "in the absence of sewage plans for "A" block, its building has now begun without them."

Referring to the "infantile disease which besets our building trade," *Trybuna Ludu* distributes its blame far and wide. "The fault lies in the absence of decisive instructions from the Ministry of Building and in the inertia, and in the lack both of independence and initiative, of most building enterprises. . . . The problem concerns not only Muranow."

Here a key point is unwittingly brought out: the managers refuse to take the initiative for independent decisions—for a mistake can be considered "sabotage," with its inevitable consequences under the terroristic regime. And the newspaper fails to mention one obvious explanation for the lack of coordination: the fact that the coordinators are always liable to disappear suddenly without a trace, while the same fate is likely to befall their successors.

It is a "planned economy," but no economy can be planned completely from the top down. Yet no other alternative is possible under bureaucratic totalitarianism in the Stalinist system. In a genuinely planned economy, democracy is an economic necessity.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

A Difference Between Capitalism and Stalinism

To the Editor:

Hal Draper in his March 16 article left a few generalizations floating around that need some clarification. This situation was caused partly through his use of a professorial writing style.

After stating that government in a capitalistic society acts as a class executive committee in that it resolves conflicts among the various ruling sectors, he points out that "it is not the government which basically [?] integrates these conflicting interest sectors into a functioning system. It is not the government which regulates the smooth functioning of the system as a whole [?], at bottom [?]. . . . The society is held together not by the intervention of the government . . ." however important it is in solving various defects but is "fundamentally [?] held together by the capitalists' control over economic life," blind forces, etc.

Society has reached a stage where "blind" forces don't operate in their ideal pattern in bringing the economy smoothly toward an ideal equilibrium. The dynamics of our present capitalist culture has forced the executive committee into "the" crucial role as the arbiter. Granted that the government doesn't regulate every aspect of society as a whole, still its sobering actions in the strategic segments of our economy along with the contending factions it compromises and the defects it tries to iron out, have been so crucial that it has enabled the system to survive till now.

In the event of a return to a peacetime economy, however, the real situation of resultant unemployment and overproduction (ineffective demand) will be beyond the possible class and institutional adjustment of capitalism, as we have known it till now. This would further seem to emphasize the functional role of integration that the present government plays, be it a class tool or not.

Stanley BLACK

Capitalist society never had a stage "where 'blind' forces . . . operate in their ideal pattern in bringing the economy smoothly toward an ideal equilibrium."

That is, capitalism never operated in the model (or "ideal") fashion which Marx analyzed in his three volumes of *Capital*. Marx consciously abstracted the fundamental laws of motion of the system, in order to analyze them first in "pure" form, as the basis for subsequently taking into account the forces which modify, limit and distort the functioning of the system into the way it actually behaves.

(If you wish an analogy: the orbits of the planets are ellipses only in an "ideal" situation which doesn't actually exist; in actual fact, other forces operate on their orbits and modify the ellipse. The astronomer, however, cannot even begin to

account for what actually happens without first setting up the "ideal" situation and then understanding the rest as deviations from this norm—deviations, however, which do not negate the decisive role of the basic determinants of the planet's orbit.)

This is the context in which to understand the greatly increased role of the state in today's capitalism. It is superimposed upon the laws of motion of the capitalist system.

But there is a qualitative difference between this and the Stalinist system. In the latter, the action of the state is not merely a supplement, modification and correction for the otherwise "blind" operation of the market in regulating the economy. Under Stalinism, the economy is regulated by the conscious action of the bureaucracy. This was the distinction behind the discussion in my article.

Abstractly speaking, it is possible for the level of a capitalist government's intervention in the economy to rise to the point where, here too, the conscious action of the government bureaucracy could be said to negate the laws of motion of the system. In real life, this would mean the transformation of capitalism into a species of bureaucratic-collectivism. But this is as yet an abstract possibility, not even seen in Nazi Germany, where the process went farthest.

Meanwhile, the qualitative difference between the social system of capitalism and the Stalinist system should not be obscured by pointing merely to the phenomenon of state intervention.

Comrade Black mainly misses the following point, I think: he speaks of the modern capitalist state as becoming more and more an "arbiter" (which can be taken roughly as true) but the Stalinist state is not an "arbiter." It does not arbitrate in the social system, it controls it; it is not arbiter but master. It is itself the "owner" of the economy, unlike a capitalist government which is an agency of the class which owns—albeit an agency which nowadays has greatly increased and increasing powers and functions, all directed toward saving the owning class for as long a time as possible from the consequences of its own gravedigging.

Hal DRAPER

Riverboat Slim Says He's Bored

Fellow Worker:

In the 2 March issue of *LABOR ACTION* I counted the word *Stalin* and its derivatives and synonyms, *Stalinist*, *Stalinism*, *Communist*, 114 times, while *capitalism* and *capitalist* appeared 22 times. The words *Russia* and *Russian* appeared 32 times not including your synonyms *Moscow* and *Kremlin* nor provinces and geographical sub-divisions of Russia. These would probably have tripled the count.

Socialism and *Socialist* were mentioned 54 times including the initials *ISL* and

Forecasts Iron Grip On Labor in War

"TIGHT LABOR CURBS DUE FOR NEXT WAR," was the headline in the press on March 31.

Source of the statement was a talk before "400 military and civilian leaders yesterday at an Economic Mobilization Course at the Astor Hotel," given by Comdr. John W. Seager of the U. S. Navy.

So long as manpower demand exceeds supply, he told the 400 "leaders," "national controls would be advantageous. Our past deferment policies for military service will more than likely be in for drastic revision.

"In the civilian labor force, a probably first step will be to freeze everyone holding an essential job. Secondly, it is probable that we will control movements from job to job. As a third step, we are likely to require everyone to use only the local employment offices in filling manpower shortages. All of these steps were lacking in World War II, with the result that serious labor shortages developed in a number of critical fields."

He estimated that "if full mobilization should come, for example, in 1955," a labor force of 73,400,000 would be needed. The total labor force for that year will only be 71,900,000, leaving a deficit of one and a half million.

SYL. *Labor* followed with 46 mentions including the name of the paper and a long dissertation on the problems of the British Labor Party. *Union* or *trade union* appears 13 times exclusive of UAW, ACTU, CIO. *Marx* and *Marxism* are mentioned 10 times, *class struggle* is mentioned once, and *independent Labor Party* (U. S.) is mentioned once. Over 5000 words were devoted to Jews as a separate group. The only interesting article was one called "Bank Robber as Sociologist," which made up for its shortcomings by being short.

It is really not necessary to be so pretentiously intellectual nor to "analyze" to such an unholy degree. Why not print a few items straight and let the readers analyze them. Moreover, when articles are printed which deviate from the opinions of the editors, it will not damage the purity of the paper if the editors refrain from taking three times as much space as was occupied by the original article to criticize the deviations. This is just dull.

I realize that the preoccupation of the *ISL* with Stalinism borders on the pathological, and that there is probably no hope for a reform in this direction: *LABOR ACTION* will outdo the *New Leader* or bust. But on the other hand, there is no need to compete with the *Proletarian News* in attempts to be pretentiously boring. They have you beat, hands down. It might be a good idea to write a paper that would interest class-conscious workmen and save the stuff you print for the *New International* or a discussion bulletin, or just to banter among yourselves at bull sessions. This would be easier on you and easier on the readers.

Now I have no doubt that you can analyze hell out of this letter and can prove that the writer is either (1) an anarchist, (2) a Republican, (3) a Russian spy, (4) a Mongolian tourist, or, (5) J. Edgar Hoover. But none of these is the case. The truth is that in order to read your paper I have to be benighted up to the gills to keep from falling asleep. Afterward I have to wait six to eight hours for the effects to wear off, then I am not worth a damn the following day.

Fraternally,
RIVERBOAT SLIM
2422 N. Halsted
Chicago, Ill.

We appreciate Fellow Worker R. S.'s word-counting project, all the more since reading *LA* is so painfully boring to him. We don't get such attention even from unbored readers. We regret the pain it must have caused him, not to speak of the benighting it must have taken. The next time he wishes to sacrifice himself in this way we would suggest an improved word-count system, however. Meanwhile we reserve our longer and duller discussions on questions raised in letters for those cases where political problems are raised. And regards to our Wobbly friends at 2422.—Ed.

'Reutherism' Marks Time at

(Continued from page 1)

If achieved, it would establish the principal for the first time in any decisive sector of industry and it is hard to see how it could be won without a bitter struggle. James Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical Workers, and David MacDonald, president of the United Steel Workers, who addressed the auto delegates, looked to the UAW for leadership in the fight.

Reuther intends to lead the way, reminding us once again of Reutherism. The run-of-the-mill officialdom that curses American unionism moves toward uncharted new objectives only when the pressures and discontent of the membership become irresistible. If the UAW preserved the guaranteed wage as a sanctified, never attainable, dream and settled for a modest wage increase, events would continue their placid course. The employers shrug off such ordinary demands; the membership, which has not been pressing its leaders for a big fight, would be satisfied.

But Reuther, in his own way, understands that the working class must strive for far-reaching social gains. Over and over he reminds the ranks that they must fight for more than "a nickel in the pay envelope," that their aims must appeal to the whole labor movement and to all society. He views the task of the labor movement as the steady and continuous achievement of successive goals in all spheres of life, slowly but persistently won over a period of years in strike battles, negotiations, and political action.

In this sense, like the old social-democracy, he speaks, as he did at this convention, of the "historic mission of the labor movement." While the UAW prepares to fight for the guaranteed wage as a contract demand, it does so from a standpoint that goes beyond pure-and-simple unionism.

Foreign Policy

LABOR ACTION has already commented (last week) on the convention resolution on "International Relations." In foreign policy, the Reutherites find themselves in a tragic contradiction; they look for a new democratic foreign policy but they cannot repudiate the directly opposite line which was pursued by Truman and is now being essentially continued by Eisenhower.

"We must demonstrate that there is a democratic alternative to Communism," reads the convention resolution. "We must prove our belief in the right of all people to win freedom from despotism, whether it be imposed by other nations which bind them to a colonial status, or by foreign corporations which extract their wealth without just recompense, or by their own ruling classes which monopolize their land and exploit their workers. 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. . . ."

A brilliant study
of the labor movement,
Now out of print—

"THE UAW AND WALTER REUTHER"

by Irving Howe
and B. J. Widick

\$3.00 A Random House Book

Order from

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

But has the United States pursued such a policy? The convention is not informed.

Little of the chauvinist spirit permeated this convention, far less than in 1951 when the Korean war was still young. In passing came the expected endorsement of the Korean war but it did not intrude into other questions—except the 30-hour week, which is a separate story.

With all its contradictions and evasions, Reutherism represents a pressure for a more radical, democratic foreign policy.

Political Action

The 1951 Cleveland convention met while the United Labor Policy Committee led a walkout from all war boards and demanded a change in Washington's policies, Emil Mazey was denouncing Truman; the delegates cheered denunciations of the Fair Deal Democrats; one-third of them voted for a hotly debated resolution for the formation of a labor party.

But the mood of Atlantic City in 1953 was different. A Republican administration holds power; the labor movement is uncertain about what is to come.

The political-action discussion was shunted into a corner; the leaders had nothing new to say; the delegates were impatient with discussion which seemed unnecessary and fruitless.

Paul Silver, president of Local 351, a member of the Resolutions Committee, was expected to present minority reports on several questions but played no role here or anywhere else. In 1949 he had presented a minority resolution on political action. In 1951 he organized and led a small group in opposition to the Reuther administration. But he appears to have made peace with Reuther and abandoned his criticisms.

This time he pronounced a few unintelligible phrases to indicate that he had learned an impressive lesson as age brought wisdom: America needs, he said, not a party of labor but a party of all the people. This unique contribution ended in confusion: did he favor the organization of a new party or not?

Only two speakers were heard from the floor before discussion was cut off. A delegate from Ford Local 400 explained that Eisenhower's victory was a protest of millions of people against the Democratic Party and that a new party was urgently necessary to give them alternative leadership. But there was little interest.

STANDSTILL

Roy Reuther reporting for the Political Action Committee delivered an impressive speech exhorting delegates and members to mobilize in a mighty crusade "not just for the CIO but for all the people." Unfortunately, it was somewhat lacking in content and vague in direction.

The resolution itself, which went almost unnoticed, marks time and changes nothing in UAW policy, which moves neither backward nor forward. Its special Reutherite line becomes apparent when we compare it to the resolution adopted by the recent CIO convention:

(1) The UAW resolution sharpens up the attack on Eisenhower.

(2) It criticizes "elements in the Democratic Party" who "propose to reorganize [it] around the very anti-civil-rights bloc that dishonored that party's 1952 platform." It opposes the surrender of the party to the Southern bloc. And it obviously points to a struggle inside the Democratic Party between the liberals and conservatives.

(3) It reiterates the call of the UAW for a "new realignment of the political forces in America. Out of this, there can come a clear demarcation between political parties standing for people and progress as opposed to a party representing property, privilege, and profits."

(4) It proposes the convocation of "a national conference of labor, farm and other liberal forces in the spring of 1956 prior to the convening of both party conventions" to prepare for the presidential elections, and similar state conferences every two years.

In 1948 Walter Reuther declared himself for the formation of a new political party to bring about a new alignment. The call for a new party lived its brief

moment and died; but the quest for a political realignment continues.

The UAW now looks toward radicalizing American politics within and through the two-party system. But Reutherism is neither a worked-out theory nor a clear-cut political program; it is a political and social tendency in the working class with vague principles and shifting tactics, tentative, amorphous and changing with the winds of the times.

In its own groping fashion it seeks to expand the influence and power of the labor movement in the political life of the nation and looks toward a political regroupment that would make labor, in fact if not in theory, the challenger of the bourgeoisie for political dominance. Even when it stands still or moves backward, this aim breaks through.

Reuther's biggest weakness is not that he fails to adopt someone else's program (ours, for example) but that he fails to clarify his own program or to fight for it in the labor movement.

INTERNAL PROBLEMS

A surprisingly large percentage of the convention's time was occupied with internal union problems. This might seem puzzling in view of Reuther's smooth control and the virtual non-existence of opposition.

In the past, internal questions became the subject of caucus disputes, clear, public. But as organized groupings disappear, the open struggles are replaced by subtle and elusive difficulties in the relations between the top leaders, its staff, the secondary leadership, and the rank and file. In settling the faction fight, conclusively and finally, the Reuther administration faces a new and different internal problem.

An ordinary union bureaucracy, having established unchallenged control and eliminated effective opposition, is satisfied and content to relax in the enjoyment of the commonplace, material perquisites of victory. But not the Reutherite leadership. Its distinctive character has been created in the experiences and struggles of the auto workers against giant monopolies. The more it tightens and solidifies its control, the more it becomes aware of the peculiarities of a new stage in the development of the UAW.

In reporting what happened at the convention under the next four headings the nature of this new stage becomes clear:

(1) The rout of the Stalinists and the disappearance of caucuses.

(2) The growth and influence of conservative moods among new sections of the membership.

(3) The locals and local leadership.

(4) The paid staff.

Caucuses and the Democratic Spirit

Opposition caucuses have not been illegalized or suppressed; they have died off.

A semi-opposition remains in the powerful Ford Local 600 whose president, Carl Stellato, an unpredictable careerist, unites an unreconstructed Addes-Thomas group with ultra-conservatives. Reuther has been totally unable to absorb them or to wipe out their influence.

In part, Stellato was compelled to maintain his oppositionism in sheer self-defense against an intransigent drive conducted against him by Reuther at the last convention on the dues-increase issue. But it remains purely a local phenomenon, and signs already point to an attempt by Reuther to bring it into line with a soft, conciliatory policy.

Does the disappearance of organized

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.

factions signify the beginnings of repression? This is a question that has disturbed many militants, and understandably so. In the National Maritime Union, Curran's fight against the Communist Party was followed by the violent crushing of all criticism and the expulsion of dissidents, Stalinist and anti-Stalinist. (A complete report, signed by Norman Thomas, is in the possession of Walter Reuther.) This convention has gone a long way to demonstrate that the UAW is not and will not be like the NMU.

Its sessions were marked by a greater tolerance and democratic spirit than prevailed two years ago when Coburn Walker of Flint Local 659 and Stellato were provoked, baited, and booed.

Tracey Doll of Hudson Local 154, who had been expelled at the 1949 convention, was reinstated at this convention upon recommendation of the International Executive Board. He came as a delegate and nominated an opposing candidate for regional director on the West Side of Detroit.

CAUCUS FORMED

Upon the call of large Agricultural Implement locals representing 40,000 members, a caucus of 150 delegates met to map out a convention fight against a recommendation of the top leadership that would restrict the number of council meetings. They were pro-Reutherites; they passed out leaflets and handbills in the good old UAW tradition. The issue in itself was comparatively not of great importance. But it was a test of UAW democracy. Would the leadership react with pressure and intimidation to this organized dissent from its authority, or would it view the movement as a simple expression of the normal workings of democracy?

The AI locals were successful in voting down the recommendation on the floor of the convention; but they were far more inspired by the free and fair atmosphere of the discussion than by their own victory.

On the third day, the low point of the convention was reached with the report of the Resolutions Committee on the "30-Hour Week." Several locals, including Ford Local 600, had proposed that the UAW make the thirty-hour week an immediate contractual demand. The convention committee maintained that this demand was inopportune as an immediate fighting slogan and should remain a long-range objective. If nothing else was involved, the discussion would have caused hardly a ripple; the advocates of the demand quickly reinterpreted their own position and retreated. Nevertheless, the convention resolution is a sorry document that should be buried and forgotten.

30-HOUR WEEK

In brief, it finds that shorter hours are incompatible with higher living standards. We must make a "choice between an immediate 30-hour week with a reduced living standard and the security and high living standards that will come from" a guaranteed annual wage. "The compelling need is not for more leisure but for more goods," the resolution maintains. "The shortening of the work-week . . . will become an immediate, practical, and urgent issue as soon as it becomes possible to produce in less than 40 hours the goods and services needed to provide high and satisfactory living standards."

These are the classical arguments of corporation apologists and have always been dismissed with contempt by labor. By fighting for shorter hours and higher standards of living through higher wages the labor movement puts constant pressure upon the employers to increase productivity by modernization and improvement of productive capacity. Cheap labor at long hours tends to restrict productivity; high-paid labor and shorter hours tend to increase it.

Fortunately, we know that the UAW will never take its own arguments seriously. The committee was so zealous in proving that the demand was being pressed by Communists that it seized upon any old random thoughts. ". . . Certain political forces outside our union," the resolution maintains, "choose this time to inject . . . the impractical and unrealistic demand for a 30-hour week now." And a five-paragraph diatribe against the Communist Party follows.

The delegates voted for the resolution but speakers on both sides expressed their

Auto Workers' Convention —

distaste for dragging "Communism" into a discussion of union tactics. Everyone knows that the fight against the CP in the UAW has been finished and that the party has been utterly and completely routed. As the discussion proceeded, the leadership felt impelled to modify its position, stress the legitimacy of the 30-hour week and withdraw the implied charge of "Communism." A tirade against the Communist Party is no longer an adequate substitute for a discussion of serious issues.

The Case of Ford Local 600

Only in the UAW could we have witnessed a discussion as full and as democratic as the debate on the case of Local 600. It was the convention highpoint. Delegates came at 9:30 a.m. to start the day's sessions and remained until the close at 9 p.m.

Five hours were devoted to the appeal of five accused Stalinists in Local 600 against a decision of the International Executive Board barring them from running for local office and to a parallel but independent appeal from the local itself. The UAW constitution bars those who are "members of or subservient to the Communist Party" from holding union office but does not bar them from union membership. This provision was adopted in 1941, but this is the first instance of its actual enforcement.

Dave Moore represented the five and Stellato spoke for the local. They both received unlimited time; Stellato spoke for about an hour and a half.

One year ago, when the House Committee on Un-American Activities, agitated Detroit over "red domination" in Ford Local 600, the International Executive Board lifted the local's autonomy, placed it under administrative control, and removed five minor officers as Stalinists. Stellato and other top local officers retained their posts. The five had already been tried by a local trial committee and had been exonerated by the local general council. The technical aspects of the appeals are somewhat complicated; essentially they challenged the right of the International Board to supersede the local and to overturn its decision without pursuing other channels within the UAW constitution.

STELLATO'S ZIGZAGS

The background of this case, however, devious and intricate as it is, is essential for an understanding of Stellato's erratic and opportunist line on the one hand and the ineffectual, panicky administrative procedures of the International on the other.

The Reutherites, properly so-called, have never been able to establish a popular base in Ford Local 600. In the earliest days of the faction fight, the CP-Addes-Thomas control over the local was challenged only by ultra-conservatives who were easily defeated. After Reuther's final victory, he appointed the most popular and able of the former Addesites to his payroll but while they became his followers, their local influence immediately vanished and the situation was no better than before.

This political impasse could have been settled in a constructive way only by a duplication in the local of the ideological campaign that had won the victory in the International. But the new International administration was now wary of such campaigns and sought to, by-pass the real problem by reliance on its powers of appointment to the paid staff and finally by administrative intervention. This policy collapsed when applied to Local 600.

Stellato was elected president of Local 600 in 1950 as a conservative pro-Reutherite, campaigning on an ultra-anti-communist platform, intending to ride the wave of anti-Stalinism. On taking office, he forced local officers to sign a loyalty pledge. When the five Stalinists signed, he initiated charges against them demanding their removal from office under the terms of the UAW constitution. He launched his career as the man who would bring Local 600 into the Reuther camp by simple and vulgar Stalinist-hunting.

But in 1951 his campaign backfired. He ran into the brick wall that broke the head of every conservative in Local 600.

While his charges were pending, new elections took place. The old unreconstructed Addes group (by now the real Stalinists were weak and decimated by defections) took control of the local General Council. Stellato himself was re-elected by a greatly reduced majority.

When he saw the tide running against him, he threw off allegiance to Reuther, entered into a bloc with his former opponents, and began a savage attack on the policies of the International to restore a new local base.

UNLIMITED TIME

The new Stellato began to flirt with Stalinist fellow-traveler committees and, in line with his new position, carried on a campaign against the dues increase in 1951. But in 1951 the Reutherites were determined, to the exclusion of every other consideration, to win a dues increase at the '51 convention. They attacked him mercilessly as a union-wrecker, using him as a whipping-boy to bring the convention into line (Stellato was booted off the floor of a Reuther caucus meeting). But in 600, he used these attacks to increase his own popularity and in self-defense began an even more extreme campaign against the International.

When the House Committee came to Detroit and the International took over the local, Stellato quickly dropped the CP. By a campaign of simultaneous denunciation of the CP and of the International, he was able to unite virtually the whole local behind him and was re-elected president in 1952 with no opposition after the International had withdrawn.

Stellato's appeal to the convention was consequently not a defense of the five but a device for defending himself and presenting his own criticisms of Reuther to the convention. And for this, he received unlimited time.

(He was a candidate for regional director on Detroit's West Side and turned his appeal into a campaign speech. He was defeated, retaining the support of the Ford Local 600 delegation but only winning a sprinkling of votes from other locals.)

John W. Livingstone, UAW vice-president, presented the case against the five; a more uninspiring defense of the International could have been thrown together but not without tedious effort.

LIVINGSTONE RECITES

He spoke as a prosecutor, pure and simple, proving by a seven-year accumulation of newspaper clippings that the five were in fact CPers or subservient to its line. He illustrated the drastic emergency in Local 600 by an excerpt from an article written in the CP press by one of the appellants on Stalin's 1950 birthday. The following gem deserves to be immortalized as an insidious example of the underground Communist technique of weakening the American labor movement; we would die laughing:

"Several photos of Joe Stalin were hung on the bulletin boards in the Motor Building. On the time clock of one department a large picture hung all day. Shortly before lunch a worker invited me to eat my lunch with a group of workers near the machines. When I got there, I found them sitting in a semi-circle. I sat on a box reserved for me in the center. All of a sudden all heads came together and a song began. There between the machines—in low but firm voices—they sang 'Happy Birthday dear Joe; happy birthday, dear Joe; happy birthday, to you.'"

For twelve years, the UAW constitution barred Communists from holding office; Livingstone had made no effort to justify this clause or to explain why it had to be enforced after gathering dust all these years. It is hard to understand why he was assigned this task unless he insisted on the pure joy of it. He is totally incapable of arousing the militant, progressive, democratic, anti-totalitarian sentiments of UAW members against Stalinism. The convention voted overwhelmingly to support the Board; but it was not a token of sympathy for Livingstone's performance, which was forgotten before he had finished, but of uncompromising hostility to the CP.

Dave Moore, representing the five, was heard by the delegates, who listened patiently, politely, and tolerantly, but without sympathy. He could not make an impressive case; he did not try to prove that they were not Stalinists; nor did he succeed in making a case for their right

to hold office if they were Stalinists; he appealed for defense of democracy and opposition to McCarthyism, but no one was moved; a spokesman for Stalinist totalitarianism can hardly arouse enthusiasm for democracy.

STOLE THE SHOW

For Local 600, Stellato denied that any emergency justified the intervention of the Board, pointing out that former local officers now on Reuther's staff never acted against the CP. The Board moved in, he insisted, only because it could not bring him, Stellato, into line. He defended the right of Ford Facts, official local paper, to criticize international policy, and summarized his position as follows:

"Brother Reuther must be told by this convention that his authority is clearly defined and limited by the constitution of the UAW; and the fact that today he is riding high in a political sense . . . must not mislead him into setting a precedent that the president of our organization has super-dictatorial powers. Such a precedent once established, would destroy our union."

At the same time, Stellato boasted that it was he and no one else who initiated the charges against the five. He claimed, moreover, that Livingstone's bulging briefcase of clippings was supplied by him from the Local 600 trial records. His own democratic intentions were delicately formulated as follows:

"If they [the Ford workers] thought for one minute that the president of our local union was Communist-dominated and Communist-controlled, not only would they defeat him at the polls but they would tar and feather him—and he should be tarred and feathered if he is controlled by the Communist Party."

The International won the vote but Stellato stole the show. In the hour and a half at this disposal, he wove arguments that appealed to militants and democrats together with those that endear him to conservatives. Even those who voted against him and rejected his arguments welcomed a public discussion of his dispute with the International. This was a democratic union deciding an issue after a genuinely democratic discussion.

Conservative Moods In the Ranks

The union constitution authorized the International Executive Board to "direct members to leave the plants in which they are employed for a limited period of time in order to participate in demonstrations. . . ." This clause was deleted, not because the Board intends never to call demonstrations, but because its text has been quoted demagogically by employers and rival unions to frighten unorganized conservative-minded workers from joining a radical UAW. This points up the new situation implicit in the growth and progress of the union.

When Reuther defeated the Addes bloc in 1947, the membership of the UAW stood at 800,000. Since then, it has experienced a phenomenal increase, rising to more than 1,300,000 in 1953, with prospects ahead for greater gains. The men and women who came up with the union from the days of the great sit-ins and who participated in the democratic faction fights are now in a small minority, outnumbered by the majority of new, inexperienced, relatively raw new members, including thousands of simple card-holders.

Reutherites are keenly sensitive to the changing composition of the membership. At a pre-convention mass meeting, Reuther regretfully reported that many members, unaware of the union's early struggles and sacrifices, are convinced that their rights and conditions are the philanthropic contributions of enlightened management and not hard-won gains wrested from stubborn bosses. He appealed to the assembled delegates to turn their memberships into real union men, dramatizing the task in a slogan: "First we organize them, that's the easy part; then we must unionize them, that's the hard part."

At this convention, more than ever before, conservative moods were expressed confidently and openly as their spokesmen, for the first time, found a responsive audience and were raised to the level

of respectability. On "International Relations," two delegates objected to the sympathy for "revolution" in the official resolution. On "Education," delegates rose in defense of parochial schools and demanded equal treatment from the government; on the "Thirty Hour Week," one poor Southern slave announced that his plant was working 60-70 hours a week and he didn't think it was too much. Elsewhere, one original thinker bemoaned the passing of old traditions which kept women at home with the children and left breadwinning to men.

RIGHT WING ACTS UP

The elections recorded what top Reutherites consider the first major victory for conservatism. All top officers and regional directors were re-elected with little opposition except in Region 8 (the South). Here, Tom Starling, former director, was defeated by an unknown named Ciampa.

Starling was, with Gosser, first of the old UAW Board members to support Reuther. Ciampa, who defeated him by only 7 votes, is considered to be a supporter of Vice-President Livingstone, the conservative and outspokenly anti-socialist enemy of all "longhairs." The top Reutherites are now infuriated by a well-founded suspicion that Livingstone had intervened to maneuver Starling's defeat.

In accordance with a new protocol of mutual self-protection, the top leaders have always come to the aid of one another when opposition arises in their respective regions. Serious movements have arisen from time to time against Kerrigan in New York, against McCusker in Detroit, and against Greathouse in Illinois. In every case, opposition came from the more militant pro-Reutherites who wanted to replace conservative incompetents by a more aggressive, more effective, more authentically pro-Reutherite leadership. In every case, Reuther intervened on the side of the incumbents to protect them from Reuther's own progressive followers.

This is the first time that an old Reutherite has been cut down by the conservative wing. Starling was left without top support while Livingstone moved in for the kill. Ironically enough, many of Livingstone's opponents in Region 8 were momentarily sucked in to the movement to elect Ciampa. Since in every previous case, the top leadership sought to defend the status-quo, they assumed that Ciampa's candidacy represented a certain independence and rank-and-fileism. Only too late did it become clear that he was dependent upon Livingstone.

The Reutherites were taken by surprise. At regional parties following the elections, a pall of gloom hung over their celebrations. Reuther visited several gatherings to remind his real followers—and console them—that he knew who the genuine Reutherites were. The custom of excluding the ranks from knowledge of the issues involved in their regional elections has boomeranged against the Reutherites.

(Concluded next week)

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

Kremlin Peace Drive —

(Continued from page 1)

so as to bring about an armistice in Korea."

Chou's proposal, on its face, is very close to the one made by the Indian delegation in the United Nations last winter. That proposal had envisaged turning over the prisoners who do not want to go home to a neutral commission made up of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Sweden and Switzerland, and included a timetable for repatriation, after which the final disposition of those still left in the hands of the commission was to be turned back to the United Nations as a whole.

Chou's proposal is that "those captured personnel of our side who, under the intimidation and oppression of the opposing side, are filled with apprehension and are afraid to return home, be handed over to a neutral state." While they are in neutral custody, Chou added, "explanations be given to them by the parties concerned, thus ensuring that the question of their repatriation will be justly settled and will not obstruct the realization of an armistice in Korea."

U. S. RELUCTANT

It is quite evident that this represents a major shift in the officially expressed attitude of the Stalinists on the prisoner of war question. At the last session of the United Nations, the American delegation regarded the Indian truce proposal with suspicion, and forced a number of concrete modifications in it which were quite distasteful to the Indian and some other delegations. Yet it was the Russians who rejected the whole scheme outright, and insisted on the return of all prisoners of war, regardless of their own wishes in the matter. It is virtually certain that, following Chou's statement, Vishinsky will not repeat the same line in the UN now.

But does this mean that the problem is as good as settled, and a truce in Korea is assured?

That remains to be seen. Chou's speech may reflect a decision on the part of the Stalinists to end the active fighting in Korea promptly if the Americans are willing to make this as easy as possible

for them, while maintaining their basic position on repatriation. On the other hand, it is still not excluded that the strategy might be to give every appearance of wanting to end the war in Korea, while seeking new arguments with which to throw the blame for the continuation of the war on the Americans.

By the time this issue of LABOR ACTION has reached its readers, it is quite likely that the Eisenhower administration will have made public its reply to the Stalinists on the question of the sick and wounded prisoners, and possibly even on reopening negotiations at Panmunjom. It is evident, however, that at the moment they are weighing their moves very carefully. And they have good reason to.

In recent weeks American generals have been giving American public opinion the impression that at the time the truce negotiations were first opened the United Nations forces in Korea were in a position to win a swift military victory, and that they were only prevented from doing this by the "ill-advised" truce negotiations. In the past week, however, the limited successes of the Stalinist attacks in Korea have once more demonstrated that the Chinese and North Koreans are not at all in a position of suing for peace out of weakness.

Such a demonstration of strength was probably the real reason for launching these attacks. But the American administration which has to answer to the belligerent know-nothings in Congress may be reluctant to appear to be willing to reopen negotiations under the blows of a Stalinist military offensive.

EFFECT ON WEST

The actual course which negotiations will follow remains to be seen. But it is evident that if the Stalinists are really set on ending the shooting war in Korea, this confronts the Eisenhower administration with a number of very ticklish questions.

The very first effect of the statements by Kim Il Sung and Chou En-lai was to drop the value of stocks in the war industries on the American stock exchange. Spokesmen of the administration have

hastened to assure the nation that even if the Stalinists are anxious to cool off the war in Korea and elsewhere, the government will not cancel a single order for guns or planes and will not slow down the draft by a single man.

Such words will, of course, be blown up in print wherever the Stalinists have a printing press. They express a real dilemma for the American government.

On its lowest level, the problem is a very serious economic one: how to keep the signs of economic softening from growing more widespread if the cold war lets up, even if temporarily. And on a world level the problem is even more difficult: how to keep the American bloc of nations building up its military might and increasing its political and economic cohesiveness if the Russian threat seems to be diminishing?

In its basic terms the problem touches at the heart of America's world position. The United States has been able to lead and drive the rest of the non-Stalinist world not because it has offered a new principle of organization, a positive vista of a better world which could enlist the enthusiasm and support of large masses of people in all lands; America's success has been based on the impoverishment of the rest of the world, and above all, on the Stalinist threat to the continued existence of capitalism in Western Europe and those parts of Asia where it still exists.

If for any reason the size and immediacy of this threat is or seems to be diminished, all the disintegrative and centrifugal forces in the American bloc will be strengthened. It is quite likely that if the Stalinists persist in their "peace" offensive one of the motivations is precisely a calculation on these disintegrative forces.

From the socialist point of view, an easing of the cold-war tensions would be a positive gain. But this will only be so if the labor and socialist movements all over the world utilize such a "breathing spell" to strengthen their own independence, both organizationally and programmatically. They can offer a positive principle to the peoples of the world which a dying capitalism cannot.

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)

ply to political prisoners, who in the mass fill the slave-labor camps.

The gambit is as old as the institution of monarchy—the king is dead, long live the king who will remedy the evils of his predecessor. The tsars knew all about it. Notwithstanding, we seem to hear a murmur of talk about this step foreshadowing a real liberalization of Stalinism—not a loud murmur, to be sure, but merely enough to show that there are people whose capacity to be duped is never damped.

The amnesty testifies to the precarious position that the bureaucracy feels itself to be in. A new king always sighs to be loved by his people; the Kremlin masters can hope only to be endured, but even this has to be bought at a price.

One of the tasks before Malenkov, if he is to establish himself in Stalin's niche, is also to re-establish the distinction which Stalin worked to implant in people's minds, between the No. 1 boss, who is fundamentally kindly and genial if only he knows what is going on, and the scurvy underlings who commit crimes

against the people behind his back. There is many a bureaucrat who will have to be slapped down in order to prove to the people that the oppression they suffer under is sternly resented by the Boss whenever he happens to find out about such misconduct. Just write a letter to Pravda. . . .

Tammany on the Hunt

In New York City politics—while a wordy battle is taking place among the city's leaders over Governor Dewey's plan to soak the New York-transit rider—Tammany is openly shopping for a mayoralty candidate. DeSapio, the incumbent Tammany leader, has made it known that he will support anyone who he thinks has a chance to win, and, in winning, refurbish the old club's halls at the same time. Figuring prominently among those whom DeSapio is thinking of tapping are a number of "liberals," including Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., though whether they would accept the honor is another matter.

One city political commentator has already mentioned that the Tammany sachein would not even be averse to supporting Rudolph Halley, present City Council president who was elected by the Liberal Party. It is not impossible, from both sides. Tammany has no love for Mayor Impellitteri; and Halley, although put in office solely by the Liberal Party, has made it quite clear that he is not a Liberal Party man. Some Liberals even feel he has gone out of his way to thumb his nose at the party.

This is only one of the aspects of the preliminaries to the next mayoralty election which may put the Liberal Party on the spot. Its record of tortuous deals with both Democrats and Republicans in the city may trip it up: what, for example, if the GOP runs Rep. Javits, whom the Liberals have supported in the past. . . .

One reason why DeSapio has room to maneuver is that the Liberal Party does

not say: We will run our own candidate for mayor, against both the GOP and Tammany.

Uncle Bountiful

To people who think the U. S. is running a give-away program with its Marshall aid and Point Four "handouts" throughout the world, the action by Burma last week must seem fantastic. Here a small Asian government declines to take some millions of good American dollars, and—strangest of all—Washington is reported to be "unhappy" about it! Lady Bountiful wants to force her alms on the poor but proud recipient. Why? In all the press reports that have appeared on this episode, there is one bit of information so obviously missing that it signals its existence in loud tones.

Can the explanation be merely the complaint of the Burmese that the U. S. is aiding the Chinese guerrilla bands of ex-Chiang Kai-shek troops who roam within her border to make forays on Stalinist China? Well, just possibly; in that case, presumably, the Burmese are "punishing" the naughty Americans by refusing to accept their money! Maybe it's the Oriental mind. . . .

A more sensible explanation cries for attention. We venture to doubt that Prime Minister U Nu has any objections to accepting U. S. money. We venture to suggest that what he is rejecting are the strings that go along with the money.

He wants a free hand to prosecute his case against Chiang's guerrillas in the UN or elsewhere; and what threats have the Americans made, directly or indirectly, to convince him that he should leave Chiang alone and tolerate his bandits?

Understandably U Nu has not spoken out about this, not wishing to antagonize the Western giant any more than he has to, but we would be interested to know why the State Department is so terribly anxious to tell Burma, "Oh come on now, take the dough. . . ."

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

by

Max Shachtman

A Basic Primer on the ideas of Independent Socialism!

\$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

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