

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 8, 1953

FIVE CENTS

LONDON LETTER

A Labor View of the Coronation: 'The Crown and the Cash'

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, May 27—The excitement over the Coronation here is working up to a pitch. Every daily newspaper, including the Stalinist *Daily Worker*, has had long and boring features about the ceremony or the fuss associated with it. Even the Labor Party has joined its "loyal greetings" to those of the Tories.

It is for this reason that a pamphlet *Crown and Cash* by Emrys Hughes is particularly opportune. Emrys Hughes is a Welshman repre-

senting a Scottish constituency for the Labor Party. He is one of the old school of reformist socialists and has often aroused the conscience of his more capitulatory Labor colleagues. There is little doubt of his sincerity, but he has often been had for a sucker on Stalinist "peace" movements. He is always one of the first to respond naively to Stalinist maneuvers, although he is certainly too independent to be a real fellow traveler.

This time, however, he has done a real service to the Labor movement in attempting to expose the Coronation show for what it is.

He starts by examining the attitude of the English people to their monarchs. He shows that even a respectable writer like

(Continued on page 7)

Rhee's Blackmail Underlines The Ironic Plight of Korea

By H. W. BENSON

For one week, Syngman Rhee, reactionary South Korean president, reminded the world of the existence of his government by publicly rejecting the latest U. S. truce proposal and threatening to begin his own war. And he made his pronouncements in such bellicose language and in so many forms that for a brief moment it seemed that he was not simply interested in extracting concessions from the real military rulers of South Korea, the U. S. army, but was preparing a fantastic adventure.

His ultimate, almost last-minute, backtracking freed the United States of an embarrassing encumbrance. But the momentary crisis in relations between Rhee's regime and the United States serves to underline the ironic plight of Korea: the only thing "Korean" left in the Korean war, as far as the real principal confederers are concerned, the U. S. and Stalinist blocs, is its geographical location.

For three years a war is fought ostensibly for the defense of democracy in Korea; we must, we are told, support the existence of the great "democratic" republic of South Korea; for this is our way of life; we must maintain the true representative of the South Korean people, Rhee, against aggression from totalitarian dictators. And in this noble crusade we demonstrate our respect for the rights of small nations and for their truly representative governments.

SWINDLE

The State Department and American military authorities helped to create Rhee and, for the consolation of our own liberals, portrayed this police dictator as a true friend of democracy. It is not in fashion to demand too much from American foreign policy; but this much we should expect: that an honest swindle be perpetrated according to the rules of the game; that if they expect us to swallow the story, at least they must go through the prescribed motions of make-believe.

Then truce negotiations reach a delicate stage and a climax nears. Resistance to U. S. policy becomes evident among

its allies; it confers with governments and their representatives; it hears the opinions of high-placed statesmen of many nations; and then it modifies and reworks and reconsiders until at last the "final" offer crowns its efforts. In all this, one body, presumably recognized as a government, is simply overlooked; one might even say, shrugged off with contempt, its views ignored; its opinions not wanted: the great "democratic" republic of Korea, representative (by its own say-so and that of the United States) of the people of Korea.

If Rhee does represent Korean democracy (and of course he does not), then the United States shows its utter disdain for those whom he presumably represents. And if he does not, and he deserves to be

(Turn to last page)

Who Was 'Shocked' By Taft's Speech?

By GORDON HASKELL

Senator Taft's now-famous speech on foreign policy has been denounced by all the liberal supporters of the government's cold-war policy who have been able to get into print. And there can be not the slightest doubt that they are right in showing that his conclusions are reactionary and would be disastrous for the world if they become the accepted policy of the government.

Yet the plain, unvarnished truth of the matter is that on almost every point where he stuck to a description of American policy, he was telling the truth—and telling truths which the administration conceals behind phrases and which the liberals rarely dare to face.

The over-all truth which Taft's speech brought out, in this case unwittingly, is the bankruptcy of the present policy of Washington, which is essentially the same policy as was pursued by the Trumanites. The statement which is boxed on this page is one of the most striking public acknowledgments of this that has been made by a prominent figure in recent times.

Therefore Taft did some thinking-aloud about a different policy—which would be worse. But (also therefore) the American people have to think about a different policy, too.

TAFT'S TRUTHS

In summary, this is the picture Taft drew for his audience and for the world: "Certainly," he said, "our policy has not been based on any reliance on the United Nations or on any other country." To make sure he was heard he soon after repeated: "Again I point out that this policy [of opposition to Communism] is not a policy of working through the United Nations, but is a policy of military alliance." It is a policy designed to "provide arms for all those nations which are sufficiently free so we can be reasonably certain or reason-

"I cannot tonight discuss all the other problems of foreign policy, but as I hear them discussed in the Foreign Relations Committee and at the president's legislative conference, I am impressed with the tremendous difficulty of all of them and the fact that in no case does there seem to be a satisfactory solution."—Sen. Robert A. Taft, Cincinnati

ably hopeful that they will use their arms to fight the Communists if they are attacked."

The UN cannot prevent aggression, he told his audience (a gathering of the National Conference of Christians and Jews), because of the veto power. "The United Nations was based on the theory of a five-power control of the world," and if these five overlords fall out, war cannot be prevented by the UN structure. Since the U. S. and Russia are enemies, the UN can only serve minor purposes in world affairs which are valuable "but not as an effective means to prevent aggression."

He casts "some doubt" on whether the UN even had the right to call for troops from members against North Korea, "because the charter clearly requires the af-

(Continued on page 2)

Reveal New Link in Trotsky Murder

By J. M. F.

New data on the assassination of Trotsky is contained in an article by Julian Gorkin, which appeared in *Le Figaro Littéraire* of Paris for May 2, 1953. Gorkin is a former leader of the Spanish POUM and co-author with General Salazar of the book *Murder in Mexico*, detailing the story behind the assassination.

The identity and role has been established of one of the participants who figured prominently in the first attempt on Trotsky's life, referred to in the dossier of the case as "the French Jew," name unknown.

Gorkin now states that he is the not-known doctor Gregory Rabinovitch, who is of Russian origin, and once headed the Russian Red Cross in Chicago, which was used as an NKVD blind. Following the failure of the attempt he fled to the United States, narrowly missing being picked up by the Mexican police.

"In the Mexican capital remained his principal collaborator: Vit-

torio Vidali, an old agent of the Comintern and the NKVD, known in Spain during the Civil War as the commandant Carlos J. Contreras. He exercised great influence in Mexico from 1928 on. He knew Mexican, Cuban, Spanish, and North American Communist activists very well; it was he who

chose those who were to participate in the first attempt. . . . He is today the head of the Communist Party of Trieste."

ORLOV'S MEN

Technical details of the attempt on Trotsky's life were handled by two NKVD officers, a colonel and a lieutenant-colonel, sent to Mexico by Beria. "Both had worked in Spain during the Civil War, notably in Valencia during the time that the Republican government was located in that city. They held no military post whatever but had power over officers of even the highest rank who had been sent from the USSR and were controlled from there. Terrorism and espionage—these were their jobs. They were in permanent contact with the commandant Orlov, a special representative of Stalin and head of the NKVD in Madrid. (This Orlov along with Vittorio

(Turn to last page)

Who Was Shocked by Taft? —

(Continued from page 1)

firmative vote of all of the five controlling nations, and I don't think that absence [Russia's absence because of its then boycott of the Security Council] provides an affirmative vote."

Attempts have been made to get around the charter by substituting the General Assembly for the Security Council. Aside from the clear illegality of this, "it is very doubtful to me whether we would be wise to try to set up and develop any such power. In an Assembly where we have one vote out of 70, it can be easily turned against us in the future." (And so it seems that, for Taft, it is not really the veto power in the Council which is the trouble; in the Assembly, where there is no veto power, THAT is the difficulty for U. S. purposes!)

Therefore "we might as well forget the United Nations as far as the Korean war is concerned." Further on he makes it more general: "as far as the prevention of aggression is concerned, it [the UN] might as well be forgotten for the present."

ANYBODY SHOCKED?

In anticipation of the comments on his speech, he said:

"But no one should be shocked at my suggestion about the United Nations in Korea because in Europe we have practically abandoned it entirely. When we adopted the North Atlantic Treaty, we did not ask the United Nations' leave, and we did not consult it."

Maybe NATO is possible under the charter, but "to my mind, it is the complete antithesis of the charter itself, and while it may not violate the charter, it certainly substitutes a military alliance for the United Nations as a means of preventing Soviet aggression. NATO, following the Greek and Turkish agreements and the contemplated arrangements with Spain, is clearly a military alliance of the old type." "So today . . . we are really

trying to arm the world against Communist Russia. . . ."

How many of the commentators who claimed to be "shocked" bothered to refute Taft's plain statement of the facts about present U. S. policy?

So, Taft continued, we have had to make old-fashioned military alliances, and to subsidize our allies. But we find that we have no secure allies who will follow wherever the American government leads. The countries of Europe badly need to trade with the East, and they are resisting our efforts to prevent such trade. They want to make some kind of a political deal with Russia which is contrary to the American view of what should be done. Hence the best thing is to tell them that they can go their way, and we will go ours.

THE TAFT LINE

This was one aspect of Taft's speech. In the other one he insisted that American land forces can win a war neither in Asia nor in Europe. "I have always felt that we should not attempt to fight Russia on the ground on the continent of Europe any more than we should attempt to fight China on the continent of Asia."

Although Taft did not say, it is clear from positions he has taken previously that the United States is to build up its air force for atomic attack on Russia and China and for defense against their atomic attack on the United States, and let it go more or less at that. As he proposed to break off all peace negotiations in Korea if the present effort fails, it may also be assured that he proposes to bring Stalinist China to terms by blockade, bombings and the like.

Within two days of Taft's speech, President Eisenhower had to make his reply at a press conference. The furor caused all over the world by the senator's remarks was such that even the great compromiser could not avoid expressing disagreement with Mr. Republican.

True to his nature, the president avoid-

ed any but the most general statement of disagreement, and delivered a lecture to the press on the art of keeping an alliance together. "If you are going to go it alone one place, you of course have to go it alone everywhere," he said, and "no single free nation can live alone in the world. We have to have friends. Those friends have got to be tied to you, in some form or another." Finally, he had a few words to say against "discouragement, frustration or resentment" in the difficult days that lie ahead.

OUT OF BALANCE

Taft's speech was indeed an expression of "discouragement, frustration and resentment." As such, it reflects in one form the same sentiments which led to the election of the Eisenhower administration in the hope that it would find some way out of the blind alley in both foreign and domestic policy into which the country had been led by the policies of the Democrats.

But instead of coming up with some brand-new approach, the Eisenhower "team" has only been able to continue those same policies on the foreign field with one difference: it is even less aware of the social dynamic of Stalinism than was its predecessor, and the problems themselves grow with time instead of disappearing.

The Stalinist "peace offensive" has thrown the whole foreign strategy of the government, based as it is on dominantly military considerations, out of balance. The pull of the Western allies toward a policy of making some kind of deal with Russia and China increases as such a policy seems to have some prospect of success, and as the economic plight of their governments worsens. And as neither they nor the American government can adopt any other, positive, policy with which to meet Stalinism in the political field, the result is inevitably a feeling of frustration which goes deep in the American people.

The disintegrative strains in the American alliance are only at the beginning. At the moment, the United States is at the peak of an unprecedented economic boom. The rest of the capitalist world is enjoying a much lesser degree of prosperity, but on all sides the fear is strong that even this prosperity is fleeting, and will be followed by much worse conditions.

NOTHING TO OFFER

The political effects of any downturn in the capitalist economic cycle are likely to be so dangerous as to make most supporters of capitalism prefer to think about other things. But when it comes, the alliance will be strained to the limit, and may split at its less durably welded seams.

Taft and the powerful men who think as he does, and the millions who think as they do, have already decided that they have had enough of propping up a world which is neither so thankful nor so dependent that it has to bow to every American whim. The liberals in both the Republican and Democratic Parties and in the country at large are fearful of what lies ahead, but have nothing different to offer. Even among them the tendency is to deplore the lack of "understanding" of America abroad as the chief stumbling-block to an effective anti-Russian world policy. That is the way they express their frustration at the failure of American foreign policy to create a real mass pro-American, pro-capitalist sentiment throughout the non-Stalinist world.

But the root of the difficulty lies far deeper. The real problem is not that the peoples of Europe and Asia "don't understand America." It is that they do understand their own capitalist systems well enough to have little if any confidence in them. And as America's only policy is to prop up these systems and prepare them for World War III, they cannot help feeling hostile toward America also.

WHERE'S LABOR'S LINE?

Thus the frustration with the failure of American policy which Taft expresses sharply and clearly today is expressed by the liberals in another way, and will be expressed even more clearly as time goes on. But unless a different foreign policy is put forward by powerful political forces in this country, this frustration can only have consequences as reactionary as those which Taft now proposes.

Even Taft recognizes that it is very difficult, if not impossible, for the United States to impose its will on its allies in the long run. "There is another difficulty," he says, "about maintaining the general policy of a unified world-wide opposition to Communism by all free nations: we have to have not only the written word, but the real sympathetic support of our allies in that job."

Taft thinks in terms of the ruling classes, the governments of other countries, as American allies. It is high time that the labor movement in this country began to think of the working people of other countries as ITS allies, and not just in holiday speeches, but as a real basis of ITS foreign policy.

And where these people are concerned, it is not so much a matter of getting their "real sympathetic support," but of giving them real sympathetic support in their own struggles against the foreign imperialists and domestic exploiters who oppress them. Such "real sympathetic support" can only be offered in opposition to the present government which supports their masters. That is the beginning of wisdom for a genuinely democratic labor foreign policy for this country and for an end to the frustration which is driving America into internal hysteria and eventually to foreign adventures.

Everest as a Coronation Gift

By PHILIP COBEN

The height of the world on Mt. Everest has been attained by two men, which means it has been "attained by man," as the saying goes out of courtesy to the whole human race. It is therefore a pity that an anonymous Buckingham Palace spokesman has claimed the achievement as a "coronation gift" for the queen.

This ant's-eye view of a great conquest may be pardoned in a functionary who is undoubtedly all wrapped up in the minutiae of organizing his little show; but surely it was in the worst possible taste. Man has conquered the crown of the Himalayas, and this is not another tinsel bauble to sparkle at the crowning of a young lady who otherwise appears to be of unobjectionable character.

It tempts us to point out that Edmond Hillary is a New Zealander and Tensing Norkay is a Nepalese Sherpa—these being the men who actually reached the top among the "British party." Were it not for that palace spokesman, we would not wish to stress this aspect to an impolite extent, since it was indeed Britons who organized, financed, led, and shored up the expedition in an effort that depended on teamwork and not merely individual courage or brilliance.

But—a "coronation gift" for the queen? We note with some approval that the *New York Times*, in its news index for the day, listed the event not under "foreign" news but under the rubric "General," which we are willing to take as symbolic.

ABOUT THE SHERPAS

Then, not to cavil with the British over the claim of a royal flunkey but to point up an interesting fact about the world, we note that it has been a long time since that year when a certain British expedition to Everest sought financial backing in England on the plea that a successful conquest of the mountain would serve to "impress the natives" and bolster British colonial prestige in India and Nepal. We don't think that Norkay, the great native Sherpa climber, did it to "impress the British," but—it would seem that the tables have been turned, wouldn't it?

If there is to be any nationalistic connotation at all attached to the conquest, we would prefer to put the spotlight on this aspect of native self-determination.

That is quite aside from the private view held by some that, as far as concerns the human qualities needed rather than the economic, the Sherpas could conquer Everest unaided by Westerners but not the other way around.

In 1931, when the 25,447-foot Himalaya peak Kamet was climbed by a party of four including one Sherpa, to become the highest then attained, the three Britishers (Smythe, Shipton and Holdsworth) gave the Sherpa, Lewa, the honor of going ahead first to set foot on the summit. That was a touch that honored the British too.

Indeed England has every right to be proud that it has produced the men who made up Colonel Hunt's party and without whom the New Zealander and the Sherpa could not have made it. These men, in turn, were standing on the shoulders of others. They were standing on the shoulders of George Mallory, Frank Smythe, Eric Shipton and the other pioneers of the Everest adventure, including the Swiss climbers of the last expedition, all who went where others did not dare. Not merely because they had reconnoitered the mountain, valuable as that was, but because they had shown the way in spirit and will.

"PSYCHOLOGICAL OBSTACLE"

Spirit? We are not talking about the supernatural. It has been almost a platitude in Everest lore that perhaps the biggest obstacle for the climber is psychological. Most immediately, it is the psychological effect of high altitude which seems to rob men of their will-power and induce apathy, pessimism and indifference to their mission. How much of the previous record of failure has been due to the topographical obstacles, cold and weather, and how much to the fact that the rarified air of the high places of earth drains men's will to fight? Others have suspected that victory was possible before this, that men had to conquer themselves before they could conquer the summit of the world. ("Have we vanquished an enemy? None but ourselves," said Mallory, in the most oft-quoted post-mortem on the mysterious how and why of mountain-climbing.)

The strangest true story in the history of mountaineering is that of the first ascent of Mt. McKinley's north peak in Alaska. In 1903 Judge Wickersham's

party had been turned back by unscalable walls of ice and he decided that the summit would never be reached except by airplane or balloon. In 1906 the notorious Dr. Cook made a stir with a faked claim that he had reached the top. In 1910 a group of sourdough prospectors and miners from around Fairbanks, who had heard tell of Cook's claim, snorted and decided to do it themselves. None of them had ever been on a mountain in his life. With a stake of \$500 put up by a saloonkeeper, with no experience, no training, no plan, no leader, no scientific knowledge, no proper equipment or clothing, no series of camps, no porters, they started up. For weeks they hacked steps up the Muldrow glacier, bridging crevasses, surmounting thousand-foot seracs, till they got to the head of the glacier and the base of the climb proper, with the top towering almost two miles into the sky above them. At 2 a.m. on April 10 they started for the summit with the equipment and food one would take for an average picnic, and climbed the fearsome barriers of ice and snow to the north peak and back, all in the same day. Their only mistake was that they should have turned off to the south peak, which was 300 feet higher. After they got back to Bill McPhee's saloon, they never went back to rectify their little error because after all they had to earn a living.

The only reason they were able to perform this incredible feat was that they didn't know it was simply impossible.

There is perhaps no special virtue in the fact that it was Alaskan sourdoughs who conquered Alaska's own highest mountain. More important, they were men who were fired by the need to conquer their own world, with the indomitable courage to follow their path to the top despite the advice of the safe, sane, sensible burghers in the lowlands who know what's good for them and are much too discreet to stick their necks out into the cutting winds that blow around high endeavors.

After all, it is probably not so much Everest that has been conquered as a big component of the "psychologic obstacle." Henceforth men will know: it has been done; therefore it can be done; men like us have stood at the top and therefore we can do it again; we will win because we can win.

Orwell's personal account
of the Spanish Civil War

HOMAGE TO CATALONIA

by

George Orwell

\$3.50

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street New York City

POLITICAL KALEIDOSCOPE IN NEW YORK CITY

I—O'Dwyer: from City Hall to Mexico

By WALTER BARRON

The month of May in New York City is mostly the time when the Yankees, Giants and Dodgers begin to show the fans how they shape up in the pennant race (the order of the teams is strictly coincidental). Baseball fever is about as ever this year but another race is bidding for attention also—that of the several hundred citizens who are prospective mayoralty candidates this year.

That the campaign has begun so soon is a product of a very general, if usually diffuse, indignation at the state of city affairs, the importance of New York City politics in state and nation, the "wide-openness" of the race, and, probably most important, the fact that the old structure of political machines and local political loyalties is all but shot.

New York City politics is in a state of flux and cannot be discussed merely in the traditional terms. An example of how not to do it was provided by the *New Leader* a couple of weeks ago, in an article presumably analyzing the local political picture. The point is that it might have been just as well written in 1900. Its tone was: everyone wants "good government" but few work for it throughout the year, while the Tammany machine politicians are on the job every day, etc., etc., with a few sideswipes at corruption.

These are the pat clichés of municipal reform (the editors of the *New Leader* get scornful only of the "pat clichés" of radicals), but the clichés have to be re-examined nowadays. For our part, we think a detailed discussion of the present situation can be best understood after a presentation of the recent history of New York politics of the last few years.

We begin this in the present article, the development of the situation and the current state of affairs to be taken up in subsequent articles.

Auspicious Start

This historical discussion best begins not so long back—just four years ago, when the last previous municipal election was in the offing. However, for the politics of New York City in recent times that is a long while ago. One remembers with some difficulty the summer of 1949 when William O'Dwyer, the incumbent mayor, played on-again off-again in his decision to run for reelection.

To this day what was behind all the maneuvering is still unknown. The Democratic political leaders of the different counties within the city were to nominate District Attorney Frank Hogan after O'Dwyer seemed to have withdrawn himself. Then, at almost the last minute, O'Dwyer announced his willingness to run again. What prompted this decision, what was behind the coolness of the Democratic bosses up till then? Both the background of his administration and the subsequent events suggest some answers.

Until the entire story of the political career of William O'Dwyer is written, one can only summarize what his regime meant. As a person, he symbolized his era as much as Fiorello LaGuardia had symbolized the previous period and Jimmy Walker the one before.

At the time mentioned, the Democratic Party in the city seemed in its healthiest state in many, many years. The Truman upset victory of 1948 had revealed that the country remained Democratic nationally. O'Dwyer, who had originally opposed the Truman nomination at the convention, was actually considered a representative of the "true New Deal" wing of the party. His vigorous public denunciation of the Taft-Hartley Act, something not typical of municipal officials, had endeared him to much of the labor movement.

O'Dwyer vs. Machine

Thus, the likelihood of support from the labor movement was possibly an essential reason why the Democratic leaders consented to his renomination. It proved correct when he received the official backing of both the AFL and CIO in the city. O'Dwyer thus went into the campaign of 1949 with substantial support from the New Deal-Fair Deal supporters.

The typical "machine vote" also seemed "regularly" his. But he also had something else. He could, and did, claim, with great justification, that he had carried out many of the practices of the previous LaGuardia reform administrations. He had kept LaGuardia's police commissioner, maintained and extended the various official positions of Park Commissioner Robert Moses. He had brought in "experts" from other parts of the country to staff important top positions in several departments. Furthermore, he could boast that his administration had begun probably the greatest building program of public projects, including housing, in the city's history.

Much of this he detailed to the Kefauver Committee; that it was irrelevant to the investigation does not change the record. But O'Dwyer had one more asset in the public eye: he presented the image, again with much justification, of being an anti-organization man.

O'Dwyer was hardly a "bossed" mayor; from all evidence he

himself substantially ran the show. But he was apparently not satisfied with controlling the administration. Out of self-defense, ambition, or some other unclear motive, he tried to intervene in the Democratic Party structure itself.

His big effort was the attempt to reorganize the control of the official, "Tammany," New York County party. The leadership was, at that time, rumored to be the "Costello wing" of the machine, symbolized by Manhattan Borough President Hugo Rogers; the men behind the throne supposedly were two dapper old-time politicians, Clarence Neal and Bert Stand. By maneuverings with various district leaders, O'Dwyer was able to secure a change in leadership, which officially passed to the "insurgent" Frank Sampson.

The Opposition

But the new leadership did not last for long. The old group soon maneuvered its way back into the saddle, and the conflict was continued between City Hall and the neighborhood club-houses, extending to the most sacrosanct of political organization prerogatives—patronage. The Tammany chairmanship later went to their most vigorous leader in almost thirty years, Carmine DeSapio, but that is another part of this story.

In his own borough of Brooklyn, O'Dwyer attempted the same intervention but with little success. The leader there was Borough President John Cashmore, a "solid" organization man. O'Dwyer backed candidates who ran for district leadership against the incumbents in several primaries, but who were generally beaten. Most of this occurred after 1949; it helped foster the "compromise" Brooklyn leadership of Frank Sinnott, and had much to do with later developments in the second O'Dwyer administration.

But to get back to 1949: the opposition of the Democratic leaders to O'Dwyer in the early part of the year was probably opposition to an anti-organization man. Once nominated, this would help his appeal, especially since his original reputation came from his "gang-busting" prosecution of Murder, Inc. as a Brooklyn district attorney. But some of that opposition may have come from other sources—the leaders may have known many things that the public did not then know and may still not know to this day, even though some of the dirt has been brought to the surface. Even in 1949, according to the Kefauver committee, O'Dwyer's decision to run may have been influenced by the agents of Costello, whose supposed cohorts in the party were his greatest opponents. The full story of those events are also still in limbo.

The 1949 Campaign

Once nominated, O'Dwyer, with his different types of support and appeal, seemed to face a comparatively easy victory for himself and his slate, and a possible further political advance to some other office. The same year also saw a special senatorial election in New York State to fill the vacancy created by Robert Wagner's resignation. The likely electoral strength of O'Dwyer and his ticket was considered a big asset for Democratic candidate Herbert Lehman.

Opposed to O'Dwyer for mayor was the combined Republican-Fusion-Liberal slate headed by Newbold Morris, and also the American Labor Party ticket headed by Vito Marcantonio.

Morris was a perfect contrast to O'Dwyer. President of the City Council in two of LaGuardia's administrations, he had run for mayor in 1945 on an independent label and secured a surprisingly high vote. A descendant of one of New York City's "oldest families," he was, and is, an amateur figure-skating star, chairman of the board of the drama and music City Center. He appears to have the perfect background and look of a traditional municipal "reformer." Known as a "boy scout" by some of the professionals, his finesse in politics is much less than on the skating rink, as revealed by his head-long rush to "clean up" Truman's Justice Department last year.

The Republican leadership in the city, with the wires to Thomas Dewey's office in Albany ever hot, saw this "do-gooder" as the right candidate, but was not enthusiastic about the campaign. It remained for the Liberal Party, backed by the unions that did not support O'Dwyer, to do most of the work.

He Seemed All Set

This proved fairly awkward, for the Liberals were also supporting Lehman for senator. Somehow they were able to combine applause (at Republican rallies) for Morris' daily charges of corruption in the Democratic Party with applause (at Democratic rallies) for Lehman's attacks on the reactionary Republicans.

Morris and his ticket did better than many expected. Apparently the combination of old-time wrath against "Tammany" and Liberal Party support could command enough votes to show that the Democratic Party's automatic hold on the city's voters was too easily assumed. With Marcantonio's vote the last really sizable vote that the ALP has pulled, O'Dwyer's total was only a little more than a majority.

Yet he had received a majority in a three-cornered race, he had been re-elected, the appeal of his administration was apparently very wide, and he was not "tied down" to the "machine." The political future of the mayor and his party in the city appeared, indeed, very bright in November 1949.

One should now announce—preferably in the throbbing voice of a radio narrator—that now, at a time when O'Dwyer's second term should still have some six months to go, he is not only out of City Hall but indeed virtually a fugitive from the country. And his Democratic Party is in a weaker position in New York City than at almost any previous time since Aaron Burr led its first campaigns in the 1790s.

What happened in-between in O'Dwyer's second administration will concern us in the next article.

(To be continued)

Auto Workers

Era of Happy Relations?

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, June 1—"Unless something unexpected happens," said Walter P. Reuther, CIO and United Auto Workers president, "we can look forward to a long period of happy relations between management and the auto workers."

This was his reaction last week to the modifications in the current five-year contracts which Chrysler, General Motors and Ford have agreed to, with many other smaller companies also falling in line.

The assumption that a one-cent raise in the annual-improvement factor for the vast bulk of auto workers who are on the production lines will create happy relations between labor and management in the shops is at best poetic license.

How does this square, for example, with the recent warning that Reuther made about impending layoffs due to the excessive rate of production among the auto manufacturers? Or the many speed-up fights which continue in the shops?

CLOUDS ON HORIZON

Current events at the Borg-Warner plant in Muncie, Indiana, likewise suggest that all that glitters is not gold. Local union leaders refused last week to submit to the membership of the Borg-Warner plant a settlement negotiated for them, on the ground that it did not solve the basic issues in dispute. The UAW-CIO took the very unusual step of calling a mass meeting over the heads of the local union leadership to settle the strike.

Emil Mazey, UAW secretary-treasurer, was sent to Muncie to speak to the rank and file on the settlement. His plans for a meeting were reported to be canceled when a meeting hall for that session was declared not available. It was expected that he would speak to the membership over the radio.

On another front, two important corporations, International Harvester and Allis Chalmers, announced two-cent wage cuts beginning June 1 to its employees under UAW contract. This creates quite a crisis in that important field.

THE SCARE BOOMERANGED

Unquestionably, the modifications in the major contracts, no matter how small they may seem, have given a boost to the steel workers in their contract demands. At least, that is how one important steel corporation official viewed the situation. He bewailed the fact that such a reasonable man as David J. Macdonald, steel workers' union president, would not dare be so reasonable now.

In terms of long-range effect, the "solution" of labor-management relations by direct negotiations, such as appears likely in all major industries now, makes the CIO's dire predictions of the immediate results of the Republican victory somewhat less than prophetic. In fact, it will tend to make the CIO's political claims subject to more suspicion in the future.

Not the least of the reasons why the ranks in the shops accept quietly, almost thankfully, any bread crumbs from management in the form of modifications of the contract is that they had been hardened to expect the worse. Anything less seems much better.

THE BENDING CROSS

A BIOGRAPHY OF EUGENE V. DEBS

by

Ray Ginger

Now, while they last only \$1.00

Order from:

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

"SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY"

LABOR ACTION'S special pamphlet-issue of May 4, entirely devoted to the subject of Socialism and Democracy, is still available in single copies or bundles—10 cents in single copies. There is no better statement of the question for contemporary socialists. Order from:

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

Youth and Student Corner

NEW YORK COLLEGES HEADED BY McCARTHYITE

By ELI RUBIN

The choice of a fervent McCarthy supporter, Joseph B. Cavallaro, as the new chairman of the Board of Higher Education, policy-making agency of the four New York City public colleges, may mean a new phase in the fight for academic freedom in the city and points up a lesson for liberals.

As a result of Cavallaro's victory statements supporting the investigations of congressional committees into the city colleges and welcoming another purge, students and liberals must prepare themselves to convert their fight for academic freedom from mere literary excursions into active struggle.

The election of Cavallaro came as a shock to liberals who had blinded themselves to what was actually happening to the composition of the board during the O'Dwyer and Impellitteri regimes. At the time of the election of Ordway Tead, the board's last chairman, in 1949, there were only two abstentions, one of them being Cavallaro's. Since then, the appointments to the board by Impellitteri have consisted almost exclusively of reactionaries supported by the American Legion or kindred groups.

With the increasing witchhunt atmosphere and the high-pressuring of the Americanism Committee of the New York County American Legion and Rabbi Schultz's Joint Committee Against Communism, Tead's vacillating, middle-of-the-road leadership was pushed more and more into a corner. When Tead, unable to withstand the pressure, announced his intention to resign, his supporters selected another half-hearted liberal, senior board member Charles H. Tuttle, as their candidate.

JUMPIN' JOE'S STYLE

Tuttle, a 76-year-old religious leader and president of the National Republican Club, could offer no leadership and, in a stormy session, withdrew to make Cavallaro's victory unanimous.

With Tead storming out angrily and several board members grumbling about the "blitz," Cavallaro accepted the congratulations of the Legion and Rabbi Schultz, his supporters, and called for a new investigation into the colleges. In typical McCarthy style, he announced his inability to differentiate the views of his critics from those of the *Daily Worker*: "I do not know which came first."

It was these remarks which prompted indignant attacks from such groups as the Public Education Association, Liberal Party and Teachers Guild, as well as the liberal press. Unfortunately, the failure of such liberal groups to take a firm and uncompromising stand for academic freedom and against the witchhunts have been important components of this setback.

The Cavallaro case is a clear-cut example of the fact that McCarthyism can-

not be stopped until its opponents build up pressure for academic freedom which can stem the tide against it. This is a lesson which liberals have apparently not yet learned. The appointments to the board by O'Dwyer and Impellitteri did not receive the active rebuke they deserved, yet they were responsible for producing the majority which elected Cavallaro. For the umpteenth time, the liberals have shut the barn door after the horse has galloped away.

WANTS MORE POWER

Nor have the liberals built up a lobby sufficiently strong to combat the shrill screechings of Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, coordinator of the McCarthy lobby known as the Joint Committee Against Communism. Schultz, who describes Cavallaro as "an intimate friend of mine," has long been notorious for his attempts to "fight communism in the Board of Higher Education." That Tead's resignation "for personal reasons" was a result of his refusal to acknowledge the communications of Schultz's committee is no secret.

Working with David Clark Cabeen, Americanism Committee chairman, whose American Legion post authorized him to extend Cavallaro "the group's best wishes if he were elected," the know-nothings have raised the loudest voices both in the board and in City Hall. Cavallaro, who also believes there should be "some emphasis on religion in city colleges," serves as their puppet.

Whereas the Board of Higher Education has never had the centralized power of Jansen's Board of Education, Cavallaro's continual comparison of himself to Jansen indicates that he intends to take on more power for himself than Tead was willing to accept. This means that he intends to infringe more and more on the prerogatives given previously only to the four city college presidents.

But while the liberal organizations and press "express concern," students must gird themselves to prevent further attacks on their professors and themselves.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Speaking His Mind

To the Editor:

I've just read the "Socialism and Democracy" issue of LABOR ACTION, and I think it's a fine issue, well-balanced and easily the most definitive thing of its kind in recent times; it makes me feel that my contribution to the Fund Drive was well-spent. I was especially glad to see Shachtman's admission of Bolshevik mistakes, which is all too seldom included in refutations of the critics of the October Revolution. I was happy, too, to see you write of a readaptation of Marx for the present time, an idea not far from my plea for a reconstitution of Marxism in modern terms.

I should like to say, though, that I think it is unfortunate and unpurposeful that the ISL continues to cling to the memory of Trotsky so much. I do not wish to minimize his importance, but I think the whole school of Marxism beginning with Lenin represents only one line of thinking, important more because of the events connected with it than for any really valuable contributions to socialist thought as it may be applied today. I number Lenin and especially Trotsky among my revolutionary heroes, but I believe equally as much if not more can be learned from the British socialist writers, particularly Cole and Tawney, and I think their reasoning is better suited to a country of democratic traditions.

In your article "What to Learn from Stalinism" you pose the question of democratic vs. undemocratic state ownership and control of industry. Certainly, as an only alternative, democratic state ownership is to be preferred. But I am at this stage convinced of the necessity for a greater diversification of power; democracy functions best in a community sharing similar interests, that is, it tends to have a better prospect of success in inverse proportion to the number of its participants. One of the many reasons for the failure of Bolshevism and the rise of Stalinism was the apathy of the masses after the strenuous years of the Civil War and the failure of the German and Hungarian Communists to take and hold power. Why this apathy? I believe it is in large measure aided by the remoteness of the government and its pattern of nationalization, with everything centralized in far-off Moscow.

Economic efficiency is only served up to a certain point by centralization, and democracy to an even lower point. To illustrate the latter, it suffices to compare

local and international elections in any labor union. You vote for the head of your local on a basis of knowing the candidates more or less personally, and for the president of the union on the basis of other people's recommendations.

I have learnt much from Bertrand Russell's *Roads to Freedom* and Tawney's *The Acquisitive Society* to supplement the observations of common sense—and, I might add, the *Aktionsprogramm* of the German Social-Democratic Party, adopted last year. Some of the key features of this thinking are: Local self-government to the greatest possible extent, especially on matters immediately concerning individual communities but not directly affecting others. Socialization is not always best achieved by nationalization; only national basic industries should be nationalized, others should be municipalized or, where it is feasible, cooperativized. The important primary aim in every case is to remove profit-making as the determinant factor in social relations, replacing it by a variety of forms of democratic non-profit or profit-sharing (minus of course the capitalist conception thereof) enterprises.

You will say that none of this is new. Granted; I have told you where the ideas come from. They don't come from Marx, Lenin or Trotsky — which is nothing against them. But I do think these are important concepts, perhaps more important for the attraction of Americans today to the cause of socialism than the rather abstruse questions of the Russian Revolution and the meaning of Marxism which understandably engage the attention of socialist intellectuals. I first came to the ISL with the view that it is more important to make people socialist-minded than to instruct them in a particular ideology, and I still maintain this view—and I also still think the ISL is the most likely to succeed of all the socialist tendencies now in existence.

Do not mistake my intentions. I do not disapprove in any important key with the viewpoint of the ISL, except its too narrow adherence to Marxism and particularly its Russian expression. What I do want to see is a broadening of interest, a widening of your scope of ideology to include such influences as I have mentioned, and especially a concern with practice—"If we were in power now, we would promulgate, &c. . ."

I hope you'll receive this in the constructive spirit in which it is intended. I don't expect to change the world or even the ISL overnight, but I'd be a poor socialist if I didn't speak my mind.

Roy HOLLISTER

BOOKS and Ideas

'End of a Revolution' by Fritz Sternberg

Sternberg Takes One Step Forward and Two Back

THE END OF A REVOLUTION, by Fritz Sternberg.—John Day, N. Y., 191 pages, \$3.

By HAL DRAPER

Sternberg's new book is, all in all, a disappointment, even given the reservations about his competence which we made a year ago in reviewing his previous opus, *Capitalism and Socialism on Trial* (LABOR ACTION for April 14 and 28, 1952). His strong points, which we pointed to in that review, are now a good deal weaker; and his weak points are no better.

The *End of a Revolution* is a slim book, hardly more than a large pamphlet in hard covers, and perhaps it should not be judged by the ambitious-looking program for it which is set out in its table of contents; since it turns out that each of the very interesting subjects in that table is "covered" by a few pages, sometimes very desultory pages. But this points to one of Sternberg's troubles. What exactly was he trying to get into this small scope? A social-economic analysis? It isn't there. A rounded description of the Stalinist society? It would have been unfair to expect it of him. A theory of the nature of Stalinism? What there is of this could have been put on one page, and would be better in less.

His forte is economics but (a) he mainly leans heavily for much of his material on other recent books, particularly Harry Schwartz's *Russia's Soviet Economy*, and (b) his sketchy remarks are mainly descriptive, inadequately so. If he could have made any contribution on the subject of Stalinism, it would have been in

this field, but as far as we can see he did not even try.

Sternberg's strongest point up to now has been his political program for fighting Stalinism. He still writes in a vein which counterposes socialism to the Stalinist system, but no longer explicitly. The program for a "Socialist United States of Europe" which he has vigorously advocated now appears as a reference to a "free United States of Europe," and precisely for him, this eliminates the whole point of his previous program and his arguments for it, which rested on the idea of matching the Stalinist dynamic with a progressive social program.

Instead, his emphasis is now merely on a Reutherite Point 4 program for Asia, and a pious recommendation that Western rearmament (which he is now for with lively enthusiasm) should be organized "in such a fashion" that European living standards . . . are not still further depressed."

RETROGRESSION

Last year we noted how his view on Stalinism had changed from book to book and analyzed his then current one. The new book represents a further change, though as before unaccompanied by any real analysis. Whereas he had represented Stalinism as a mixture of "progressive" and "reactionary" elements, implicitly balancing one against the other, now we find that Russia is the "most reactionary state in the world," period. If this merely represented the loss of his remaining pro-Stalinist illusions, it would be one thing; actually, it is plain that it is the other side of an increasing reconciliation with capitalism and its war program. As a matter of fact, withal, he still insists that there is no necessary

drive to expansionism within the Stalinist system; since presumably he still believes (or does he?) that imperialism is inherent in capitalism, this would enforce some conclusions on his part, but his only conclusion from it is the possibility of peaceful coexistence.

With regard to any theoretical analysis of Stalinism, Sternberg is entirely up in the air, except for the conviction (previously announced in *Capitalism and Socialism*) that it is neither capitalist nor socialist. On page 12 he prelates this to the Russian Revolution itself, which introduced this "new kind of social system." But on page 10 he had said that the revolution "after a while . . . began to degenerate"—but, if page 12 is true, from what? The terminology about "degeneration" is an unthought-out hang-over for him. In fact, on page 12 itself, we read that "in the years which followed the Revolution," there was "a fundamental change in the social structure of the country"—again, from what? There is much more of this sort of thing, and very little else on this question.

The *End of a Revolution* is Sternberg at his very weakest, unfortunately.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

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

LABOR ACTION
June 8, 1953
Vol. 17, No. 23

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

The New Crisis in the SWP—IV

Roots of the Confusion in the SWP

By ALBERT GATES

The SWP majority and its "theoretician" Hansen, as we saw at the end of last week's article, refuse to draw the political logic of their estimate of the nature of the Stalinist states, thereby pulling back from a line which leads inexorably to an orientation toward Stalinism. The minority is willing to push along this course.

How did Hansen get out of the dilemma? By inveighing against "the slipshod identification of Stalinist parties with Stalinism in general," and trying to establish the character of the Russian bureaucracy by half-truths lodged in false theory. Note the following utterly fantastic assertions which are at odds with the truth about Russia:

"The Soviet bureaucracy is composed of first and second generation White Guards, Mensheviks, former capitalists, degenerated Bolsheviks and fascist types, together with a small passive minority that reflects the social interests of the workers. This counter-revolutionary grouping governs through the Bonapartist dictatorship of Stalin. By Bonapartism in this case we mean a counter-revolutionary regime resting on property forms that are the product of revolutionary conquest. While defending these, it does so through political forms that are the antithesis of those seen during the rise of the revolution. The usurpation of power by this caste represents the first stage of the bourgeois restoration in the degenerated workers state.

"The caste has all the vices of a ruling class and none of its virtues. It clings to its social position, its material privileges, with a desperation and fury exceeding that of any ruling class yet known. Viewed politically it is counter-revolutionary to the core, its methods paralleling most closely those of the Nazi regime. It is no exaggeration to say that the oligarchy headed by Stalin as semi-crowned emperor is the scourge of the Soviet Union. Only capitalist counter-revolution based on the destruction of the present property forms could prove worse."

Late Discovery

When Hansen writes that a capitalist counter-revolution would be "worse," he is indicating once again the official Cannonite view that they must defend, against capitalism, this "scourge" which is "counter-revolutionary to the core" and whose methods are like those of the Nazis, etc. That is the point of his raising the question of which is the "worse" of these two evils. This view is that defense of Russian Stalinism is the "lesser evil." This choice results from making a fetish of nationalized property forms. That is why Hansen has discovered, 35 years after the revolution, that the bureaucracy is composed not only of second-generation White Guards but first-generation as well: that it is composed of former capitalists, Mensheviks, etc.—everyone except those who really compose it, the original Stalinist gang and a whole new generation of authentic Stalinist types who grew up and were educated, trained and conditioned by the new Stalinist society.

We are not yet through. For we still have to account for the "revolutionary" course of the counter-revolutionary regime.

"The objective frame of Stalin's politics," says Hansen, "is determined by the interests of the caste. The limits are set by the new social relations in the Soviet Union. . . . It is true that representing only the first stage of the bourgeois restoration, the horde of rapacious, gangster-minded bureaucrats constituting the caste is still forced to operate through property forms that are socialist in principle. This is its basic contradiction. It has progressively undermined these property forms inherited from the October Revolution until today they are extremely weakened and from the viewpoint of socialist content scarcely recognizable. Nevertheless, it has not destroyed these forms up to now, and, in pushing beyond the frontier of the Soviet Union under the impact of World War II, has even exported them. . . . Viewed from the interests of the Soviet Union as a whole, the politics of the Kremlin appears irrational, even 'fantastic,' as I heard one comrade say. . . ."

" . . . It fosters the tendencies within the Soviet Union toward bourgeois relations. It is in violent contradiction to the planned economy, to the needs of the soviet masses, and to the interests of the international working class. Insofar as it defends the remains of the October Revolution against imperialism its sections have a progressive content but we do not place this aspect on an equal plane with its counter-revolutionary role. . . . The counter-revolutionary pole is the active and predominant one. Even this does not quite give the full picture, for counter-revolution permeates Stalinism, so that everything it touches becomes contaminated. Even such actions as can be considered progressive in and of themselves are infected by counter-revolution and in relation to other factors are not progressive."

From the Same Theory

Although the minority accepts much of the "objective" analysis made by Hansen, it can and does, on the basis of a similarity of theory, arrive at other conclusions. Both agree that the bureaucracy is a caste, not a class, and that it rests upon progressive property forms. But where Hansen will grant the bureaucracy a measure of "independence" from these "socialist" property forms in order to invent an argument that bureaucracy is destroying them at a rapid rate, the minority, on the basis of their common views, annihilates Hansen's arguments. Frankel writes, for example:

" . . . it would be more correct to say that the inter-relationships between the major classes determine the course of the Kremlin, than to put it the other way around, as Hansen does. Kremlin politics do not and cannot have an independent and self-sustaining character precisely because of the very fact that Hansen takes such pains to conceal in his earlier section, namely: that the Kremlin is not a class but a parasitic growth upon a class which expresses the interests of its social foundation in a distorted way, and in a way which furthermore reflects through itself the interests of alien classes. The Kremlin does not make independent policy, but mirrors it in a crooked glass, showing us therein both its social foundation and the pressures of the major classes. This has always been our conceptions. . . ."

"The key to this riddle is not so difficult as might seem at first glance. The bureaucracy has its own permanent and independent interests but it does not possess its own permanent and independent class forces corresponding to those interests. Thus it must try to give expression to its own interests by dependent and conjunctural policies by trying to adjust them to the interests of the two major social classes. The interests of the bureaucracy drive it to pursue the will-of-the-wisp of bureaucratic self-preservation through unstable and shifting policies in accordance with the possibilities left open by the class struggle." (Emphasis in the original—A. G.)

Oriented on Stalinism

According to Hansen's point of view, there is no reason why the bureaucracy should not re-establish capitalism—absolutely none. It is counter-revolutionary, anti-socialist, has completely undermined the property relations, which only set "limits" to the conduct of the bureaucracy. It should be clear, however, from Hansen's own analysis of the state of affairs in Russia, that nothing except the lack of "desire," without any good reason, keeps the bureaucracy from re-establishing capitalism. The minority, however, grants little or no measure of independence to the bureaucracy, insisting that it acts in all important respects on the basis of the control and influence of the property forms and the class which produced it!

There you have it! If you don't understand all of this, it is because you don't grasp the dialectics of the Fourth International and the SWP. The bureaucracy, which both groups have agreed to take as "a class starting point," has its base in the petty-bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie inside and outside Russia. But its base is also the socialist property forms which have been "undermined" and are "scarcely recognizable!" It is independent of the working class of Russia and the property forms, yet it cannot tear itself from these two forces. Finally, the bureaucracy, which represents the "first stage of bourgeois restoration," tries to make deals with the world bourgeoisie, but is driven to make the revolution as a result of pressure from the working class and the colonial masses. So, it is both counter-revolutionary and revolutionary . . . from a socialist point of view! The majority emphasizes its counter-revolutionary character, while the minority emphasizes its revolutionary ability, driven forward by the revolutionary masses!

In hailing the Stalinist revolutions as the force simultaneously undermining Stalinism and advancing socialism, the minority urges the movement to enter the Stalinist and Stalinoid organizations to act as a "left wing" in these circles on the ground that the "world and the position of Stalinism in it have altered sharply." Where the majority urges a cautious attitude toward the Stalinist revolutions, the minority and the Fourth International warn the world Trotskyist movement to change its attitude toward these revolutions or face peril.

Hansen issues the note of caution, quite out of line with these theories, that "As for the Tito regime, it has revealed that an education in the school of Stalinism does not exactly constitute a guarantee that the graduates will follow a revolutionary course even if, under mass pressure, they take the road of independence from the Kremlin and come to power." This means that the Tito regime is judged to be politically counter-revolutionary.

"The unfavorable turn in Yugoslavia after the promising beginning . . . should serve to remind us to be doubly cautious about China. There the relations between Peking and Moscow remain enigmatic and the leadership of the Chinese revolution up to the present stage has far from made clear what its ultimate program will turn out to be. I for one am not yet prepared to give them a vote of political confidence—that does not alter my recognition of the colossal significance of the Chinese revolution and its world-shaking potential."

Cannonites Hesitate

We are now getting closer to the real difference between the factions. It is this attitude of the majority which the minority finds most reprehensible. Although the majority agrees with the minority on the rise of the "revolutionary curve," it accepts this "fact" hesitatingly, not quite certain of this position. It emphasizes the counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism; the minority emphasizes the "revolutions" and the contradictory nature of Stalinism, ending up in an apology for Stalinism. The minority has made a vicious, Stalinoid attack on those Trotskyists who retained the traditional position of Trotskyism in countries where the Stalinist counter-revolution triumphed, by denouncing their intransigent attitude toward Stalinism.

In the official document of the minority, it wrote: "It remained for the developments in Eastern Europe, the Yugoslav events and finally the Third Chinese

Revolution to pose the question in all its sharpness and clarity. That what was involved was not some abstract theoretical problem but the fate of our movement itself was demonstrated by the catastrophe that had overtaken Chinese comrades. Mired by out dated slogans and conceptions they failed to recognize the Third Chinese Revolution when it happened, viewing it as another betrayal of the 1925-27 variety, and were left completely on the sidelines in the midst of the greatest upheaval since the Russian October."

In attacking "Stalinophobia" and defending what is aptly called the minority's "conciliation to Stalinism," Frankel elaborates the above view:

" . . . Hansen failed to see the existence in the party of tendencies which to this very day refuse to recognize the overturn in Eastern Europe which created new workers' states [already the word "deformed" is dropped, and to quote a contemporary, not by accident—A. G.]. Has he failed to see a trend of thought which wants to pretend that nothing has changed, that there has been no left turn by the Stalinist movements [could anything be clearer as to what the minority's position really is?—A. G.], which believes that we can meet the Stalinist movement today in exactly the same way we met it in its past period? Does he not recognize that this trend of thinking has prevented many of our movements from comprehending reality, and has led to disaster in a number of important countries? He does not have so much as a single word to say about this matter!"

Improvised Policy

If Hansen hasn't a single word to say about this slander of the Chinese and other Trotskyists it is because the theoretical position of the majority has paralyzed it because its fight against the minority is completely pragmatic, improvised and instinctive, and is barren of principles. For what the minority is saying is that the Trotskyists have been wiped out in China by the Mao regime, in precisely the same way that the Stalinist regime in Russia wiped out the Opposition, because they remained critical opponents of the Chinese Stalinist movement and the Chinese Stalinist revolution. According to the minority, the Chinese Trotskyists should have supported Mao and his Stalinist revolution, critically to be sure (whatever that may mean in a social upheaval), but supported it nevertheless.

Because the Chinese Trotskyists did not recognize the "left turn by the Stalinist movements," reflected most particularly in the "third Chinese revolution," they succumbed and . . . it was really their own fault! They should not have opposed the Mao movement.

This is a slander of the victims of Chinese Stalinism as it is of the victims of Stalinism in all other countries. The one who first gave voice to this slander was Michel Pablo, the spokesman of the Fourth International. The minority are popularizing the slander. But why the majority has remained silent is comprehensible only on the basis of their own feeble position.

The dispute between them is not left at that point. In the case of Korea, which both sides have described as being the scene of a civil war, a "revolution" promoted by the North Koreans and which ought to be defended, the minority takes exception to Hansen's position that he would tell the North Koreans that their leadership is counter-revolutionary. Frankel is against this kind of caution, asserting that the task in Korea is to give the same kind of support to the North Korean Stalinists as they would to a strike led by a conservative union bureaucracy!

The Majority's Difficulty

Frankel also attacks the kind of caution expressed in the *Militant* which printed, during American-Russian negotiations in Germany, a cartoon "placing Moscow on an equally reprehensible level with Washington." The minority, you see, is against all caution in reference to the support of the Stalinist revolutions and the Stalinist movements. That is why it has developed its American policy of conciliation toward Stalinism.

When Hansen attacked Bartell's statement that the American CP "could be said to be rife with Trotskyist conciliationism" as an error, Frankel demands that Hansen, "give his own appraisal of the situation in the Stalinist ranks. He confines himself to pointing out what others say. What does Hansen say? That nothing has changed in the relation between the Stalinist ranks and ourselves? Or that perhaps there has been a considerable change, but Bartell exaggerates? We may be able to arrange a compromise with Hansen if only we can get some idea of his estimate."

But Hansen's attack on Bartell is sufficient to establish what his position is, namely, that Bartell's estimate is wrong. At least, neither Hansen nor the majority agree with it. If this difference does establish clarity about the views of the majority, there is no doubt whatever about the position of the minority.

The difficulty of the majority, as we have already said, is its completely false position on Russia and Stalinism, a position which it formally holds in common with the minority. It does not see that the bureaucracy in Russia is a new class resting upon a new social foundation of nationalized property. It does not see the Russian society as a new exploitive system with a new, but destructive class character.

The nationalized economy under the conditions of class disfranchisement, the destruction of all organizations of the workers and peasants, the destruction of any and all forms of democracy, have raised the bureaucracy to the position of a new kind of ruling class. This bureaucracy did not weaken the property forms of Russia, as Hansen contends, but has strengthened them immeasurably despite the pages and pages of nonsense

(Continued on page 7)

How the GPU's Orlov Framed Up

This is the second installment of a section from the recent sensational book, published in Mexico, by a former top leader of the Spanish Communist Party, Jesus Hernandez. The part we are publishing deals with the role of the Russian GPU in organizing the frameup of the POUM and the murder of Andres Nin. Translated from La Batalla, the POUM's organ.

Orlov, the organizer of the GPU in Loyalist Spain, has since then himself broken with Moscow, and, from hiding, published a series of articles in Life magazine on "Stalin's crimes." It would be interesting to have his version of the story here told by Hernandez!—Ed.

In the government Dr. Negrin had assigned me two cabinet portfolios, public education and health. Prieto was in charge of national defense; Zugazagoitia, a Socialist, of public administration; Colonel Ortega, Communist, of the General Security Administration.

Two or three days after the formation of the new government, I was awakened at dawn by the insistent ringing of the phone.

"Who's that? . . ."

"Hello! Ortega . . ."

Then:

"No warrants. Let him come see me at the ministry."

"I expect them at 10."

The NKVD was in operation. The simian face of "Marcos" came back to my memory. I remembered that he had told me: "Orlov and Bielov will lay it all before you."

Ortega had just told me that Orlov had shown up in the General Security Administration asking for some arrest warrants against various leaders of the POUM, without telling the ministry anything about it.

Punctually, as precise as a chronometer, Orlov came to my office at 10 sharp in the morning.

Orlov at Work

He was almost six and a half feet in height, with elegant and refined manners. He spoke Spanish with some facility. He was not more than 45 years old. At first glance, no one would have suspected that behind that seeming air of distinction was one of the most intransigent and sectarian NKVD operatives. He held the rank of commandant and functioned as immediate aide of "Marcos," whom I had not seen again after our interview with Rosenberg at the Soviet embassy in Valencia.

With the breeziness of men who were accustomed to command fear and respect, he extended his hand to me by way of greeting and took a seat with easy familiarity.

"Comrade Hernandez," he began, in a tone of admonishment, "you've delayed our work this morning."

"Pardon me, my friend Orlov, but I didn't know what was up—and I don't know even now."

"But you knew it was our agency that had asked for the warrants of arrest—" he said in an inquiring tone.

"I knew you were one of those that had asked for it, but what I didn't know was why and against whom these warrants were asked, and also why you had to by-pass the ministry."

"A while ago 'Marcos' informed me that you understood the nature of our job and were ready to remove official difficulties for us."

"Marcos told me a story about espionage and I offered, if necessary, to bring the case into the Council of Ministers. That was all."

The Plot Takes Shape

Orlov looked at me somewhat ironically and, all the while lighting and extinguishing a handsome cigarette lighter, he exclaimed:

"What's that—the cabinet? Exactly the contrary. The cabinet must not know a word about it until everything has been finished."

"But what's up?" I asked.

Orlov was silent for a moment. I lit a cigarette and prepared to listen.

"Are you with our agency?" he asked.

"No."

Orlov made a gesture of surprise. I went on: "Not now or ever."

Orlov lit and extinguished his lighter.

"I thought you were one of us. But no matter," he said between his teeth. Then he began to talk:

Since a while back (he told me) he had been following the trail of a Falangist [Franco fascist] spy network . . . POUM elements were mixed up with it. Hundreds of arrests had been made. The most important figure caught, an engineer named Golfin, confessed everything . . . Nin [Andrés Nin, the POUM leader] was seriously compromised . . . Gorkin . . . Andrade . . . Gironella . . . Arquer . . . the whole Trotskyist gang. . . One Roca acted as liaison man between the POUM and the Falangists in Perpignan. . . A valise full of documents was captured in Gerona from one Riera. . . Also, the proprietor of a hotel named the Dalmau was convicted and confessed. . . Everything was being gotten ready to strike. . . I had held it up. . . The cabinet must know nothing. . . Not even the minister. . .

By the Throat

"Tell me, Orlov, why are you afraid of the cabinet's intervention?"

"The enemy is everywhere," he replied coldly. And then he added in explanation:

"From the beginning we have rejected intervention by the official police."

"But the government can't be unaware of an affair of such scope," I said.

"Zugazagoitia is a personal friend of some of those who had to be arrested," he replied.

"When you present all that evidence—"

"He will do nothing," Orlov cut me short.

"He's anti-Communist enough."

"In this case, it's a question of fighting the enemy and not of pleasing the Communists."

"We'd run the risk of spoiling everything," insisted Orlov.

"In some way or other he'll have to be drawn in and it will always be better to prepare him for it rather than surprise him."

"I know what I'm talking about, Hernandez."

"And I know what I'm doing," I answered.

"Now is the ideal moment to deliver an annihilating blow against this gang of counter-revolutionists. We have them by the throat," he said confidently.

"I don't doubt that you have them by the throat, but I think this whole story will end in a big political scandal."

"What's that? You don't believe the story?"

"That's not it, exactly, but it's pretty close to what I'm thinking," I declared.

"We have a mountain of evidence, crushing proof."

"May I speak honestly, Orlov?"

"Yes, Orlov."

"My impression is all these proofs are a cleverly prepared photomontage, but I doubt whether they will stand up in evidence before a legal tribunal."

"We have the scale-plan which shows the military emplacements of Madrid, identified by its maker, Golfin. On this plan there is a message written in invisible ink and addressed to Franco. Do you know what name is signed to this message?" he asked in a triumphant tone.

"By Andrés Nin!"

I broke into a spontaneous and natural burst of laughter.

"What are you laughing about?" he asked, annoyed.

"Man, you can't be serious! Please don't tell such a nonsensical story around here, because people are just going to get a good laugh. In the whole country you won't find a single citizen capable of believing that Nin is such an idiot as to write messages to Franco in invisible ink—in the era of radio."

"You don't believe it?" he asked angrily.

"No."

"Then you suppose it's all a lie?"

"All—no," I answered coldly. "I think the plan exists, Golfin exists, that you have state-

The Revelations of Jesus Hernandez—II

ments, I believe in everything divine and human. What I can't believe is the simplemindedness of the message."

"It's Nin's!" he roared in a rage.

"I don't believe it," I insisted, serenely.

"You don't believe that he is a counter-revolutionary Trotskyist, a spy, an agent of Franco?"

"Whatever he may be, the one thing he isn't, because I know him, is an idiot. I've had dealings, more or less with all of them, Nin, Andrade, Gorkin, Maurin and the rest, and I don't believe they're capable of such stupidity."

"But if we have mountains of papers and documents signed and sealed by the POUM!" he shouted in anger.

"Then I believe it even less."

The Kremlin's Interest

Orlov made a gesture of impatience.

"My friend Orlov," I said, "let's talk seriously. You people want to put on a big trial against the Trotskyists in Spain, as a demonstration of the reason you had to shoot the opposition in the USSR. I know the Pravda article, of almost two months ago, in which it was announced that the 'purge' begun in Spain will be carried through with the same vigor as in the Soviet Union. So I understand your interest, perfectly. But let's not complicate life, which is already complicated enough. If you wish, we can devote a special page in our newspapers, every day, to denounce them as a gang of enemies of the people, but let's not get up fierce showpieces, because nobody will believe them."

"But if we have the proofs!" exclaimed Orlov.

"If I know your 'apparatus,' I'm aware they are able to manufacture dollars out of rag paper."

"That's nonsense—and an impermissible opinion," muttered Orlov, obviously angry and annoyed.

"If it annoys you, then consider that I've said nothing," I said ironically.

"You have said, and you are saying, very serious things," he threatened.

"You are a specialist in matters of espionage and counter-espionage? What would you do with an agent who sent you documents of the greatest importance written on official stationery, signed with his name and, to cap it all, validated with a stamp which said GPU?"

Provocateurs and Idiots

He looked at me a bit perplexed. Rallying, he answered:

"They don't have our techniques or our experience."

"Almost all of them are acquainted with illegal work and lived through the underground period of the Communist Party. If they had committed such a simple indiscretion as signing their name to an unimportant communication, we would have expelled them as provocateurs, or as imbeciles. How do you expect me to believe that in the midst of war they sign documents addressed to Franco?"

"We have the testimony and statements of the arrested men themselves," he replied.

"If you managed to get these confessions, for me they have no more 'legal' value, no matter how you got them, than the written, signed and sealed documents."

"All these documents and all these statements will go to the court trial, and there will be reason enough and evidence enough to hang all of them."

"In any case, I insist that the procedure be to get an order from the minister to finish this job. If I'm needed for that, I'm at your service."

"That way, we'll lose everything," he grunted in a bad temper.

The POUM in Spanish Civil War

"By the way you want, there'll only be a scandal, a scandal which will hurt our party, which is already sufficiently abused."

"You promised to help us," he said, indignantly.

"I am ready," I declared.

"There's no need to go on," said Orlov. "I'll talk to José Diaz."

"It seems to me quite proper," I said, to irritate him, "that the secretary of our party should know what's going on in Spain."

Rising, still holding the lighter, Orlov did not see, or pretended not to see, the hand I held out to him in farewell.

With a nod of his head as sole greeting, he went out, face dark as a cloud.

Spiritual Death

"All men are equal," I told myself, seeing him go out stiffly and elegantly. "At bottom and openly they despise us and try to humiliate us. They act as if they were in a conquered country and behave like masters to serfs."

I immediately went to the private home of our party secretary. I found him in bed, surrounded by a litter of medicines. His duodenal ulcer had him down.

In a few words I informed him of my interview with Orlov.

With that strong Andalusian accent of his, Diaz confided his thoughts to me in more detail than ever before:

"I feel nauseated, nauseated of myself and everything. My faith is failing. . . ."

I looked on his wasted, drawn face, where moral suffering and physical pain had sunk

their claws. I felt sorry for this shattered man. It was a reflection of my own self-pity.

"I would rather have died than have to survive this spiritual death. I've been a man who gave himself with fanatical enthusiasm to the USSR. You know that . . . I was a bakery worker. My revolutionary restlessness pushed me toward anarcho-syndicalism. I joined the action groups because it seemed to me that in this way I was giving more and sacrificing more for my ideals. I was always ready to die for what I believed, for what I had faith in. Later the Soviet Union, Stalin, triumphant socialism, drew me to Communism. I devoted myself with passion, without reserve, convinced that the USSR was our ideal goal. I would have sacrificed my wife, my daughter, my parents. . . . I would have killed, assassinated, to defend Russia, to defend Stalin. . . . And today . . . what? . . . Everything crumbles, everything in ruins at my feet. . . . What purpose has our life? . . . I've made efforts to convince myself that I'm mistaken, understand? . . . Because I want to believe, because I can't admit that everything is a lie. To come to that conclusion is the end . . . nothingness. . . ."

He took two pills out of a bottle and swallowed them with a sip of water.

Moscow's Sepoys

"When I think of all that," he said, "I feel worse."

"Pessimism and despair won't help us, Pepe," I said, to encourage him.

"I know. But the reality crushes my heart. I can't help it."

Then he continued: "These days while I suffer in bed," he said, "I've permitted myself to think carefully about our situation. The conclusion I arrived at is not consoling. The 'to-varichi' meddle in the Political Bureau as they please. I have a feeling that they will try to get rid of us, you and me, using any of the thousand means at their disposal. It will not be immediately, because no one—not they in the first place—is interested in provoking a crisis of leadership by differences with the methods and policies of the USSR. But they will finish with us. Question of time, and tactics. As for me, using my illness as their excuse, they don't even take the trouble to keep me informed about what is taking place in the leadership. To find out what's happening I have to call in one comrade or another, and always it's the same: 'We are doing this because Codovilla directed it . . . because Stepanov ordered it . . . because Togliatti advised it . . .'"

"It's more than an invasion, it's a colonization," I said, with little gayer.

"The Kremlin's sepoys [native soldiers used by the British colonialists in India]—that's what we are," he said in anger. "I have gone over the whole Central Committee in my mind, and I don't find more than a half dozen men capable of taking a firm position at our side. A half dozen against 300,000 members! And against the tradition. And against the prestige of the Soviet Union," he added, disheartened.

We remained silent. The figures weighed on our hearts like lumps of lead. They crushed us.

(Continued next week)

The Roots of the Confusion in the SWP — —

(Continued from page 5)

that has been written by the theoreticians of the Fourth International and the SWP. Everything that has happened in Russia and outside under the direction of Stalinism has been exactly opposite of the analyses they have made.

Under Stalinism the nationalization of property and the collectivization of agriculture and land has been completed. Production has been raised to heights hitherto unknown by Russia. In strengthening the economy, the Stalinist regime strengthened its own class rule. And in strengthening the economy at home and its own class rule, it has extended its base and its economy through the establishment of other states in the image of Russia. While it is true that the expansion of nationalist Stalinism has increased its world contradictions, that factor does not and cannot invalidate the facts about Stalinism.

COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY?

The Kremlin made the "revolutions" in Eastern Europe. They would never have occurred in the immediate post-war years if it depended upon the small and discredited native Stalinist organizations. No, these "revolutions" were carried on the bayonets of Stalin's army. The so-called Chinese revolution may have had a significant measure of independence, but it was carried out in complete agreement with, and in a large measure under direction and choice of the Stalinist regime in Russia. These "revolutions" were Stalinist-inspired, organized and led. This is the truth, the incontrovertible truth.

The SWP factions argue over whether Stalinism is "counter-revolutionary through and through" (majority) or whether it is both "revolutionary and counter-revolutionary" (minority). On their part this part of the dispute is a sterile confusion on both sides. Of course Stalinism has shown itself to be "revolutionary" if we use that term to refer to its anti-capitalist revolutionism, for it does indeed overthrow capitalism wherever it can in order to install its own exploitive system. It is

counter-revolutionary with respect to the only progressive revolution of our times, the socialist revolution; the victories of Stalinism are in no sense a victory for the working class or for socialism anywhere, but are defeats for the workers. What is decisive for the socialist attitude toward Stalinism is its counter-revolutionary role.

The strength of Stalinism rests on the weakness and confusion of world capitalism and of the socialist movements. The Kremlin became strong not, as Hansen and his friends believe, because it made compromises with capitalism or sought them, but insofar as it pursued an independent course of taking advantage of the difficulties of the West, because it strengthened the nationalized (Stalinized) property forms, rather than undermined them. In undermining the revolu-

tion, however, the Stalinist system emerged as a new class power based precisely on the property relations at hand. What is proved by this is that nationalized property by itself is no guarantee that a workers' or socialistic state exists. It can prove, as in the case of Russia, that at least one other social form is possible on the basis of nationalized property. Thus, we have a "Soviet Union" without soviets, a "democracy" under a totalitarian police regime, a "degenerated workers' state" without independent workers' organization, trade unions and cooperatives capable of intervening in the economy, a type of planned economy with an immense slave-labor system and without workers' control, and, finally, a cruel, barbarous regime, the most retrogressively nationalist we

have seen in modern times.

The best that the Fourth International and the SWP can summon up in the world present situation is to identify the Stalinist victories with the socialist revolution. No wonder they prepare the capitulation of their movement to Stalinism. If the majority in the SWP hesitates on this course, prefers its own caution to the minority's "daring," it is not because it understands why. The reaction is instinctive.

But they cannot effectively counter and defeat the minority's tendency to orient toward Stalinism and yield to it unless they first break with the theory which binds them to the minority, the theory of the "progressive" nationalized property forms which make "workers' states" out of the totalitarian regimes of Russia and its satellites.

A Labor View of the Coronation — —

(Continued from page 1)

Thackeray showed unequivocal dislike for the Georges, but that since then their retired respectability and withdrawal from politics has made the monarchy much more popular.

The next point he makes is, I believe, the most important one in this pamphlet. Keir Hardie, the great British socialist, was avowedly hostile to the monarchy at the beginning of this century. But Keir Hardie, the first Labor MP, was a socialist first and a republican second. He said:

"In this country loyalty to the Queen is used by profit-mongers to blind the eyes of the people; in America loyalty to the flag serves the same purpose. . . . Therefore, until the system of wealth production be changed, it is not worth while exchanging a queen for a president. . . . The king-fraud will disappear when the exploiting of the people draws to a close."

BLP's ATTITUDE

Emrys Hughes continues, after examining the attitude of George V. and George VI, to point out that a partisan president—probably hostile to Labor—might be much more of a nuisance. These Georges had personally behaved in a manner beyond reproach as far as political legislation went. They had signed legislation without question which their father would have considered, with Lord

Cromer, as "the end of all things."

He puts his finger accurately on Labor's pulse when he declares:

"If there had been a Labor government in power it certainly would not have abolished the monarchy, although it might have reduced its cost."

It seems an extraordinary thing that R. A. Butler, the Tory chancellor of the exchequer, has expended so much political energy and time to make cuts in expenditures on schools, adult education, museums, etc., as contrasted with the \$1,300,000 a year it costs to keep the monarchy. Even more startling is the \$5.6 million dollars which the Coronation will cost officially. (This does not include the vast sums spent by private firms and businesses to demonstrate their "loyalty.")

TWO PREDICTIONS

Various attempts were made to modify the profession. Was it necessary—asked James Glanville, the Durham miners' MP—to have a purely military parade? Could it not include some industrial workers? "We must have color and pageantry," was the answer to his plea that the industrial workers be "permitted" to demonstrate their loyalty to the crown along with the military.

Emrys Hughes contrasts the pomp and expense of the British monarchy with that of Holland, where "the royal family mixes freely with the people and the young princesses all attend the ordinary

day school in the village near their home."

After stating the expense of a new royal yacht which is supposed to be convertible into a hospital ship, Hughes cites Eisenhower's example of using his yacht, the Williamsburg, as a convalescent home for the Red Cross. "No doubt wounded ex-servicemen appreciated the presidential gesture," he observes.

One cannot help feeling that despite all the ballyhoo and high-powered propaganda associated with the monarchy, Charles was an ominous name to choose for the young prince. Ex-king Farouk thinks that "in fifty years' time there will only be five kings left in the world—the king of Britain, the king of clubs, the king of hearts, the king of diamonds and the king of spades." I doubt it.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City
specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Read
The
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review

Rhee's Blackmail Underlines —

(Continued from page 1)

shunted aside, then we have been somewhat misinformed in the past by our own State Department.

When the truce proposals were announced, Dr. You Chan Yang, South Korean ambassador, told the State Department that they were "completely unsatisfactory." In more stringent terms, the South Korean armistice representative, General Choi Duk Shin, called it "nothing but violating the sovereignty of the Republic of Korea and utter surrender of our side to the enemy." "I cannot find any words in the new proposals," he said, "that reflect the opinions and recommendations of the Korean people." ("Korean people" is simply a code-word for the Rhee regime.)

WHY RHEE OBJECTS

And most annoying of all, the terms of the truce offer were made known to Choi and to Rhee only one hour before their submission to the Stalinists. Korean democracy was not consulted by U. S. negotiators, but neither was it consulted by Rhee—for one simple reason at least: its emergence has been effectively prevented by the Rhee government and by the course of the Korean war.

Rhee's objections to the UN offer stem from his own aim of uniting Korea under his own authoritarian regime and he is irreconcilably opposed to any compromise on this score. But he is utterly dependent upon U. S. arms and money; and at the moment, the U. S. seeks a deal with the Stalinists in Korea. Rhee can only hope for the disintegration of truce negotiations and the outbreak of the all-out Third

World War. Meanwhile, like Chiang on Formosa, he seeks enough concessions to keep him alive and waiting.

Choi boycotted the Panmunjom sessions in violation of orders from Rhee as a protest against the Allied offer. Rhee later hailed his move as the act of a great patriot. Rhee and his representatives, before their final capitulation, threatened to withdraw from the UN command and to continue the war, to resist the landing of troops and police of the five-nation neutral commission. The South Korean defense minister visited every Korean armed unit, presumably to sound out their commanders on continuing the war. Meetings were held with newspaper editors, ostensibly to organize a rally for war. And posters were put up appealing, "Young men, hold on to your arms and advance north."

"ORIENTAL MIND"

General Choi, who was calling for a war for "freedom" and against "communism," wrote to Lieutenant General Harrison, senior UN truce delegate: "I assume that the Korean, representing the Oriental mind, is in a better position to judge the Communist belligerent in Korea than any other Western people." There is other evidence to show what Choi means by "communism." The same letter refers to India as a "pro-Communist" nation. In India, the democratic, socialist and labor mass movements which alone can defeat Stalinism among the masses, are flourishing and powerful, a hope for all Asia and to the world. Here too Choi and Rhee see a "communist" menace in movements like these

whose emergence they have prevented in South Korea.

The reaction of Washington was prompt in this case. Eisenhower warned Rhee that the U. S. would not be swayed from its course; and told him, according to the New York Times, that "the security of the United States and other members of the United Nations in Korea was the first consideration"; this was an open threat to use armed force against recalcitrant Rheeites.

SECOND STRING

Meanwhile, in the United States, thoughts turned to the possibility of stimulating a palace overturn of the Rhee regime if he forced a showdown. "The United Nations command hopes it has an ace in the hole in the person of General Paik Sun Yup, 32-year-old South Korean chief-of-staff, who is now visiting in the United States . . . due back in Korea shortly and if he is willing, he might stand up to President Rhee with some success." Had need arisen, Paik, or any similar, might have been decked out by the State Department as the latest, and this time genuine, representative of the Korean people to replace a doomed Rhee.

As it turned out, however, it proved unnecessary to manufacture another free, democratic, representative government. Rhee understood that he has as much chance of maintaining himself without the support of American bayonets as his Chinese counterpart Chiang Kai-shek. He finally bowed to the iron facts of life with the announcement: "We must accept anything that the United States president wants."

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!

New Link in Trotsky Murder —

(Continued from page 1)

Vidali, organized the kidnaping, torture, and death of my Comrade Andrés Nin, former secretary of the International of Red Trade Unions at Moscow and former minister of justice in Catalonia . . ."

(At this point in Gorkin's narrative it is now possible to interpolate that Alexander Orlov fled the NKVD service in 1938 while in Spain. He recently came to public attention in the U. S. through a series of four articles published in the April issues of *Life* of this year and dealing with the purges of the Bolsheviks in the '30s. Fully in consonance with known data, the *Life* articles provide a ghastly and obviously first-hand behind-the-scenes view of that terrifyingly tragic period. Needless to say, neither Orlov, from whom it would be too much to expect, nor *Life*, whose moral limits in this case are bounded on one side by a simple anti-Communism and on the other by circulation requirements, identifies this butcher as much beyond "a diplomat, representing Stalin to the Spanish Republic during the civil war." Orlov's ac-

tivity in Spain was further revealed by Jesus Hernandez's revelations, now being published in *LABOR ACTION*.)

HOSTAGE

After the failure of the first attempt Rabinovitch set Jason in motion on the job for which he had been so long trained. Of all that Jason pretended to be or said, Gorkin believes that the only true statement was wrenched out of him when Trotsky's guards fell upon him after he had dealt the blow: "But I am at their mercy! They are keeping my mother prisoner!"

The reference, of course, is to the standard practice of the NKVD in holding relatives of agents who operate abroad as hostages in Russia, whenever it is possible.

Tentative but fairly certain identification of Jason by means of a scar on his left forearm was made by Spanish refugees in Mexico who had known him in Spain as a Catalan Stalinist rank-and-file named Mercader. Other evidence has been subsequently unearthed.

"The mother of the assassin is, in fact, still alive, and her maiden name was Eustasia Maria Caridad del Rio Hernandez. She was born at Santiago de Cuba on March 26, 1892, and not in Catalonia as I believed until recently. On January 7, 1911, at Barcelona, she married Pablo Mercader, who had been born in the Catalan capital on August 26, 1884. Since that time she has been called simply Caridad Mercader. She later lived for several years in Belgium and in France, and it was in these countries that she raised her five children—four boys and a girl. This is the reason that they all speak French fluently. And it is also the reason that Trotsky's assassin, the third son, in assuming the identity of Jacques Mornard who . . . lives not far from Brussels, could pass as a Belgian."

CARIDAD'S CAREER

According to a former cultural attaché of the Russian embassy at Paris, her relations with the NKVD began in 1928. She was sent on several confidential missions to Cuba and Mexico. At the same time, she and her daughter Montserrat worked in the fifteenth section of the Paris Socialist Party, where former members remember her very well. During the Spanish Civil War she was active in the PSUC—the Unified Socialist Party of Catalonia—which was integrated into the Stalinist structure. She also worked more directly on NKVD jobs.

One of the most important agents she worked for was "Pedro," a former agent in Paris and Brussels, operating under the name of "Pierre" who, having fled to Moscow at the end of the Spanish war, immediately became the collaborator of Manuilsky and Dimitrov in the Comintern. This "Pedro," who was also known as Guéré . . . removed Antonov-Ovsey-

enko, the Soviet adviser at Barcelona and revolutionary who took the Winter Palace in 1917. He was named commissar of justice, no doubt to force him to return to the USSR; he disappeared upon arriving at Odessa and no one has ever heard him spoken of again. . . . 'Pedro' now bears the name of Erno Gerö—he is also known as Singer—and heads the Ministry of Economy after having headed the Ministry of Communications. He is in reality one of the most powerful representatives of the MVD in Hungary, where he played the principal role in the preparation of the trial and in the execution of his former collaborator Rajk. About three months ago he was named first vice-president of Hungary. . . ."

It was during this time that she actively introduced her children into NKVD work. Ramon Mercader del Rio, the third eldest child, born in 1904, was destined to be the assassin of Trotsky.

INFERNAL CIRCLE

"Along with his sister Montserrat he was always the spoiled child of his mother; following her example he became a docile instrument of the NKVD. He entered into the service of Stalinism more out of corruption and a love of adventure than out of ideological conviction."

Caridad Mercader and her two children, Montserrat and Louis, lived in Moscow from 1940 to 1944. Through Spanish refugees formerly in Russia in whom she confided, it is known that she became disillusioned with Russia while she was resident there. By personal appeals to Beria and to Stalin himself she succeeded in getting out of the country in 1944, leaving her youngest son behind her as a hostage, however.

She and her daughter Montserrat lived in Mexico from October 1944 to November 1945. They were, naturally, in contact with the assassin. Through the intermediary of a judge and a lawyer, Caridad Mercader tried to reopen the case on the basis that her son struck Trotsky in self-defense—a plea which, if successfully sustained, would have secured a reduction in the assassin's sentence.

In the meanwhile, observes Gorkin, Ramon Mercader lives like a prince—but is constantly watched over by a permanent commission of NKVD agents.

"Stalin, Beria, and the MVD know what the feelings of Caridad Mercader must be today after a stay of several years in the USSR. They do not liquidate her, however, for they fear that Ramon, a prisoner in Mexico, would discover the truth. If they liquidated Caridad they would also have to get rid of Montserrat, Georges, and Louis. And it is certain that if Ramon, who has become embarrassing, is not liquidated it is out of fear of his mother and his brothers. It is a sad bargaining between life and death. An infernal circle."

Pamphlets by LEON TROTSKY

The first eight pamphlets listed are by Trotsky, and are editions published in Ceylon by Lanka Samasamaja Publishers.

- Revolution in Spain 5.25 (January 1931)
- The Lesson of Spain: the Last Warning .25 (Dec. 1937)
- Marxism and Science .15 (Speech, 1925)
- Against Social-Patriotism .10 (1916)
- Europe and America .30 (Speeches in 1924 & 1926)
- Whither Europe? .15 (Speech of 1926, included in the above)
- I Stake My Life! .15 (Speech on Moscow Trials)
- In Defense of October .15 (Speech, 1932)
- The Zimmerwald Manifesto .10 (The famous anti-war declaration of 1915)
- The Last Words of Adolf Joffe .10

Package price for all 10 pamphlets—\$1.50

Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C. (Remittance must accompany all orders)

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