

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 9, 1953

FIVE CENTS

British Labor Party and Guiana

... page 3

Two Studies of U.S. German Policy

... page 5

Union Problems in the Locals

... page 7

The Aims of Military Propaganda

... page 6

Over the Table—Sold

There is the famous scene in Chaplin's picture "The Great Dictator" in which Schickelgruber does a dance with the globe of the world.

There is the notorious cliché of radicals about imperialists selling nations over the counter as they dispose of the lives of millions of people.

But truth is stranger than fiction or oratory.

For there is also the following passage from Winston Churchill's new installments on "The Second World War" in which he tells what happened over the table between himself and Stalin, in Moscow, in October 1944, while they were "only dealing with immediate war-time arrangements."

If it were written this way in a heavy "propaganda" novel about the crass-cynicism of imperialist statesmen, no one would have any difficulty denouncing it as a "typical old-fashioned-Marxist crudity." These Marxists! they're still living in the 19th century.

But the following happened in October 1944, as Churchill relates:

"The moment was apt for business, so I said, 'Let us settle about our affairs in the Balkans. Your armies are in Roumania and Bulgaria. We have interests, missions, and agents there. Don't let us get at cross-purposes in small ways. So far as Britain and Russia are concerned, how would it do for you to have 90 per cent predominance in Roumania, for us to have 90 per cent of the say in Greece, and go fifty-fifty about Yugoslavia?' While this was being translated I wrote out on a half-sheet of paper:

"Roumania: Russia 90 per cent—The others 10 per cent.

"Greece: Great Britain (in accord with U.S.A.) 90 per cent—Russia 10 per cent.

"Yugoslavia: 50-50 per cent.

"Hungary: 50-50 per cent.

"Bulgaria: Russia 75 per cent—The others 25 per cent.

"I pushed this across to Stalin, who had by then heard the translation. There was a slight pause. Then he took his blue pencil and made a large tick upon it, and passed it back to us. It was all settled in no more time than it takes to set down.

"After this there was a long silence. The pencilled paper lay in the center of the table. At length I said, 'Might it not be thought rather cynical if it seemed we had disposed of these issues, so fateful to millions of people, in such an off-hand manner? Let us burn the paper.' 'No, you keep it,' said Stalin. So I did."

**IKE: TO BE OR NOT TO BE
A 'PARTISAN' PRESIDENT?**

Two-Party System Or Two Boss Cliques?

By L. G. SMITH

During the past few weeks, President Eisenhower has been issuing statements about the role he proposes to play in American politics. They have been openly contradictory. And the contradictions are at least as much a product of the peculiarly American party system as they are of the president's own confusion and vacillation in the face of pressures applied to him from all sides.

Last month, Eisenhower said that as president he is the servant of all the people, and hence would not back up specific Republican candidates in their electoral struggles. When badgered about this at a press conference, Eisenhower drew the attention of the reporters to the "peculiar" situation of the president of the United States: that he not only has to make decisions for the good of the country, but that he is also the head of a political party.

Finally, his press secretary issued a statement to the effect that the president supports all Republican candidates against their opponents, regardless of who these candidates or their opponents may be.

The first and last statements

have caused something of a flurry among professional politicians in both parties. The Republicans were dismayed at the first one, as they naturally want Eisenhower's support, as long as it is thought the president's backing will help in getting votes. The last one delighted the Republicans who were running for office in several spots throughout the country, but disturbed some who are concerned with longer-range tactics.

On the face of it, it should be a

(Turn to last page)

Churchill Tells How the Big 3 Betrayed the Warsaw Uprising

By H. W. BENSON

Historian Winston Churchill has permitted some new unsavory facts to emerge on the role of the Russian Stalinists in cooperating with the suppression of the Warsaw uprising of 1944, and to some extent on the role of Roosevelt in the same episode. In late July 1944, the Russian offensive against the Germans in Poland brought them to points less than ten miles from Warsaw. The Germans announced the start of an all-out Russian attack to capture the city; and reports filtered into Warsaw that Russian tanks were already penetrating the German defense lines on the east. On July 29, the Moscow radio appealed to the people of Warsaw to rise in revolt.

In London the Polish government authorized General Bor-Komorowski, in command of approximately 40,000 men, to issue a call for an uprising. At 5 p.m. on August 1, the battle began. It was a truly heroic and popular struggle of the Polish people.

But to the Stalinists, despite their hypocritical calls for revolt, it was an unexpected danger. Their support among the Polish people was negligible; the strength of the Polish Stalinist puppets rested upon Russian bayonets; the success of the uprising threatened to shift

power into the hands of the London Government based upon an armed and victorious Polish people.

The story of how the Russian Stalinist army caused in its attack on Warsaw to permit the Germans to defeat and utterly annihilate the rebelling Poles is retold by Winston Churchill in the October 28 New York Times installment of his *The Second World War*.

STALIN SNEERS

Nine years after, he is properly indignant in retrospect; presumably he tells all about the Russians. But about his own role and that of President Roosevelt in paving the way for the victory of Stalinist totalitarianism in Poland he is less than frank.

On August 4, Churchill wired Stalin that British planes were dropping 60 tons of equipment to the fighting Poles and suggested that perhaps the Russians might also help. With Roosevelt he repeated the appeal on August 20. Stalin's replies revealed at once that he wanted no popular uprising and wanted Poland "liberated" exclusively by Russian troops

who would dispense "freedom" on the Stalinist model.

"The Home Army of the Poles," he replied, "consists of a few detachments which they incorrectly call divisions. They have neither artillery nor aircraft, nor tanks. I cannot imagine how such detachments can capture Warsaw for the defense of which the Germans have produced four tank divisions. . . ."

Stalin required of a revolution merely that it be officially decked out in all the accoutrements of a modern army.

Two weeks later he added, "There can be no doubt that the Red Army is not sparing its efforts to break the Germans round Warsaw and to free Warsaw for the Poles. That will be the best and most effective help for the Poles who are anti-Nazis."

(Continued on page 31.)

**But They Don't
Like the GOP . . .**



Democrats Sweep—Halley Defeated

As we go to press the day after the election, the results are in showing Democratic Party victories in some key situations, particularly New York City and New Jersey. In New York, the Tammany-Fair Deal candidate, Robert Wagner Jr., swept in by over 300,000 plurality, with Republican Riegelman second, and the Liberal Party's Halley trailing third. In next week's issue, important discussion is due on the reasons for the relative collapse of the earlier Halley boom, and, especially, on the effect which this campaign is likely to have on the Liberal Party's perspective.

SPOTLIGHT

Nobel Cold-War Prize...Hamburg...Religious States...Zionism

Cold-war Prize

There is a rather new and noteworthy feature about the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to General Marshall which may have escaped general attention.

It is just about the first time since the outbreak of the cold war between the Western capitalist powers and Russia that the peace award has been given to a man whose "contribution to peace" has consisted of his effort to combat the other side in the imperialist conflict.

There can be no doubt, of course (in spite of the fact that the committee in charge does not publish its reason) that Marshall got the prize because of his association with the Marshall Plan; and the Marshall Plan, whatever else one may think of it, was motivated as a means of strengthening the Western capitalism against the Russian threat.

Noting this fact will not disconcert anyone who thinks that anti-Russian and pro-peace are synonyms. The Stalin "peace prizes," handed out on the other side of the Iron Curtain, make no bones about the fact that the "fight for peace"

tion-Democratic Union, the Free Democratic Party, the German Party and the All-German Bloc, all ganged up behind the chancellor.

In the absence of any other information available from the rather remarkably figure-less reports in the U. S. press, it is not possible to say whether, in addition, the results showed—as in September—a rallying of the neo-Nazi vote around the Adenauer camp.

The results do show, however, the precariousness and short-sightedness of the "municipal reform" approach of right-wing social-democracy. The city administration of Max Brauer, the Social-Democratic mayor, has performed a miracle of reconstruction and rehabilitation of the war-torn city. Even bitter enemies

are terribly embarrassed in fighting anti-Catholic discrimination at home by the fact that where their church does have theocratic powers, it clubs rival religions on the head.

This does not embarrass Pla y Daniel. He said that "a fully authorized lecture" given last March 2 in Rome by Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, pro-secretary of the Congregation of the Holy Office, had defended the Spanish Catholic thesis.

The Vatican, he said, "tolerates private worship [by non-Catholics] but forbids public worship and all external manifestations by non-Catholic sects."

"Any public meeting, gathering in the streets, signs on the exterior of non-Catholic chapels, posters, etc., would be external manifestations. We tolerate that non-Catholics who are largely foreigners practice their religion in private, but we do not tolerate that they indulge in proselyting propaganda of their errors to convert Catholics to their sects."

"Thou Shalt Not Criticize Israel!"

Not so long ago we carried a story headed "Thou Shalt Not Criticize Israel!" which pointed out the rather extensive success the Zionists have had in identifying any criticism of Israel with "anti-Israelism."

In this connection the following episode is a worthy follow-up in demonstrating the temper of thought in some Zionist circles, including Zionists who also call themselves "socialists." Anyone who does not share our view that Zionism is basically a form of national-chauvinism will have to propose his own explanation, but we do not believe the phenomena we point to can be usefully ignored by friends of Israel, in the interest of the Jewish people both of Israel and the rest of the world. As summarized by the *Jewish Newsletter* (October 26):

"H. Ackermann, a staff writer on the *Zionist Tog-Journal*, has recently visited Israel and written a series of articles, giving impressions of his visit. The articles, although not critical, were not as enthusiastic as Zionists in America expect their writers to be. As a matter of fact, some of them conveyed a vague suggestion that everything is not perfect in the state, particularly in the *Kwutzas* (the agricultural collective farms), the pride and showcase of Israel.

"A few days after the appearance of the articles, Ackermann received a letter, dated September 15, from Branch 83 of the National Jewish Labor Alliance (Ferbant), a fraternal order with a Zionist ideology, that he was expelled from membership in the branch for having 'insulted the Holy Land of Israel which is the highest ideal of the Ferband.'

"This was not enough. On September 23, the Ferband sent out another letter to its entire membership in New York City calling a round-table investigation meeting to probe 'who is blackening our Israel? What are their motives? And what do they want to accomplish? ... At the meeting the evil men who spread poison and desecrate everything that is sacred to us will be unmasked. After the meeting the unmasking will be carried out in all branches of our government, in every Jewish house. ... Come to the meeting and safeguard our Israel from this vermin.'

"The story is told in the current issue of the *Vekeer*, published by the Jewish Socialist Federation, and raises a number of questions: Are we confronted with a new Un-Israeli Activities Committee which will investigate the loyalty of Zionists to Israel? And will the 'vermin' that will be found lacking in such loyalty be unmasked and purged?

"This is almost too fantastic to be believed if not for the fact that the *Vekeer*,

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.

FRANCO'S FASCISTS MILK SPANISH WORKERS

Spanish workers who cross the frontier every day to work in Gibraltar are now being subjected by Falangist elements to a type of exploitation paralleled elsewhere under the Stalinist regimes.

The workers are obliged, when they return to their homes, to exchange their wages (which they receive in pounds sterling) at an office run by the Falangists, who give them what rate of exchange they think best and who stop the amount of trade-union dues which they need to maintain the Falangist "trade unions." Any worker who refuses to comply with these conditions has his entry permit for Gibraltar taken away from him by the Falangists and is thus condemned to misery.

As the workers are now refusing to carry out the conditions imposed upon them by the Falangist unions, the latter have published a leaflet consisting of a veiled threat to the workers. This leaflet threatens "penalties" for not signing up in time.

This is clearly a case of threats and coercion. As though this were not enough, the Falangist "trade unions" have designated the Spanish general Barroso "first worker of Andalusia" and have decided to purchase for him by public subscription a baton befitting his office. To this end, the Falangists have ordered workers who go to Gibraltar to work to make a compulsory contribution to this fund, at the rate of 5 pesetas per pound sterling earned per week in the case of men, and 3 pesetas in the case of women.

a reputable publication, reproduces the letters sent out by the new Israeli 'loyalty' committees in full, and even gives the name of the new Zionist 'McCarthy' who signed the letter and is evidently to be in charge of the new investigations. He is the well-known veteran Zionist Socialist, Isaac Hamlin, secretary of the Histadrut fund-raising organization in the United States."

Party Line on Love

Over a period of some years before the death of Stalin, *LABOR ACTION* published a half dozen short items illustrating the then line of the Moscow regime in opposition to "bourgeois love" and romance. It almost looked as if the Kremlin thought sex was not here to stay.

Since then we have neglected to mention that this line changed with the demise of the boss and the accession of the new heirs. One such item (which we no longer have on hand unfortunately) appeared in Russia only a couple of months after that event; but here is another—from the Prague literary magazine *Literarni Noviny* of September 5:

"While people loved, quarreled, separated and made up, just because they are people and love each other, literature, film and the theater silently ignored them. It was simply as if love had ceased to exist. This could not go on indefinitely. Young and old alike protested, and lo and behold: there is romance in stories again, and even in movies and plays lovers appear who, gazing raptly into each other's eyes, do not talk of norm-fulfillment or disorders of the lathe. Love is again in favor..."

This is the happiest news we can bring you this week: Love Conquers All.

LOS ANGELES

SUNDAY NIGHT CLASSES

LOS ANGELES SYL
Sundays at 8 p.m.

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

- Oct. 25 Foundations of a Modern Labor Movement.
- Nov. 1 Socialists and Syndicalists.
- Nov. 8 American Labor in World War I and Post-War.
- Nov. 15 (Open.)
- Nov. 22 The Rise of the CIO.
- Nov. 29 Labor During and After World War II.
- Dec. 6 What Road for American Labor?

1433 North Beverly Glen

For information or transportation call AR-8-7941 (evenings)



MARSHALL



ADENAUER

of the Social-Democrats have had to admit that their record in the city was better than unassailable. But you can't build socialism-in-one-city, and the election was decided by national and international issues.

The polarization of every right-wing element in German society around Washington's pet German, Adenauer, carried the day, therefore.

Creeping Medievalism

One of the most oppressive signs of political and cultural regression in the world is the "creeping medievalism" of more than one country where the state is being tied to religion, in a 20th-century approach to theocracy.

The latest sign of this is the decision of the Pakistan constituent assembly to set its country up as an "Islamic Republic"—this in a state suffering from an acute religious-communal problem (Hindu versus Moslem). One of the provisions is that the head of the state must be a Moslem. The Hindu members of the assembly, representing a more than 12 per cent minority, walked out. The sinister fires of communal hatreds and feuds will inevitably be fanned.

To be sure, the Pakistanis have had examples before them. One of the worst is the example that has been set by the state of Israel, which not only proclaims itself to be a "Jewish state" but has spelled out the implications which that holds for its leadership by adopting medieval laws and practices tying national rights to the orthodox Jewish synagogue. It reached its high watermark on this with the passage of the new Marriage and Divorce Law in Israel.

This week, too, the Catholic Church of Spain reiterated its theory and practice of theocracy in the best medieval tradition. The Catholic primate of Spain, Enrique Cardinal Pla y Daniel, announced it was not going to make trouble for Franco's deal with the U. S. in spite of its fears that an influx of American Protestants into the country might taint the people with heresy. But with this obeisance to the needs of the fascist state, it also reiterated more strongly than ever that Catholicism insists on religious monopoly in any country it can control.

The primate claimed the Vatican in support. The pope, he said, has clearly rejected the views of "some misguided United States Catholics" who object to the Spanish suppression of Protestant rights. Many or most American Catholics

is equated with contributions toward strengthening their side of the war line-up.

But for those who think that a meaningful struggle for peace can be conducted only independently of both war camps, the 1953 Nobel decision looks like the asymmetric counterpart of the same pattern.

We are aware that the Marshall Plan has also been touted as an example of America's pure-and-simple humanitarianism and philanthropy, but after all the Nobel Peace Prize is not supposed to be simply a recognition of charitable good works, even aside from the cold-war basis of the plan and the way in which it has actually operated.

Since 1945, when the peace prize went to Cordell Hull, the U. S. secretary of state during the wartime love affair with the Kremlin, the award has gone to recipients whose activities have not been anywhere as clearly simply in defense of one war camp. There were no awards in 1946 and 1947 at all; in 1948 it was given to the American Friends Service Committee; in 1949 to Lord Boyd Orr of England; in 1950 to Dr. Ralph J. Bunche; in 1951 to Leon Jouhaux of France; and this year the 1952 prize was pre-dated to Albert Schweitzer.

Vote in Hamburg

Konrad Adenauer's right-wing bloc of parties has managed to oust the Social-Democratic administration of Hamburg in the vote of November 1, and the dispatches will lead American readers to assume that the Social-Democrats have lost ground in one of their strongholds.

In point of fact, one line in the *N. Y. Times* (and no where else) reveals that the socialists increased their vote both in absolute figures AND PROPORTIONALLY in comparison with the federal election in September. They got 45.2 per cent of the ballots as against 50 per cent for the combined forces of Adenauer's Chris-

LONDON LETTER *Opposition in Parliament Sharpens Up* **BLP Takes Issue on Guiana and Trieste**

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Oct. 28—The pace of political conflict here has increased since the reassembly of Parliament last week.

Two major issues have arisen, and on both of them the Labor Party has forced a division. They are: (1) The suspension of the new British Guiana constitution; and (2) the Anglo-American decision to withdraw troops from Trieste.

The Bevanite organ *Tribune* has taken a relatively consistent line on both these questions.

It has bitterly opposed the sending of troops to Guiana, and has gone so far as to organize a public meeting, together with the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism, to protest the government's action. Unfortunately the fundamental issue of withdrawal of the troops has been somewhat obscured by the *Tribune's* demand for a trade-union delegation to be sent to make an on-the-spot investigation.

The conduct of the Labor Party's parliamentary Front Bench, on the other hand, is deplorable in every respect.

All that Attlee and Griffiths are opposed to is the overhasty suspension of the constitution. They accept by and large the findings of the government White Paper on the activities of the ousted Guianese majority party, the Progressive People's Party.

The only reason that Attlee and Griffiths are opposed to the suspension of the constitution is that they believe the PPP will be strengthened by this "extra-constitutional" move. The principled question does not arise for them at all.

Perhaps at this point it might be of interest to shed some light on the real political complexion of the PPP, as distinct from the tendentious interpretations that have appeared in both the right-wing and left-wing press.

The PPP is definitely a Stalinist-inspired party. It is not, however, by any means, completely Stalinized. It is rather a "Popular Front" than a Communist Party.

More important from the standpoint of a socialist is the fact that far from being an "extremist" party it is the very opposite. Dr. Jagan, the leader of the party, has stated quite categorically that "the PPP is a broad democratic alliance of all classes struggling for the right to self-determination." This Popular-Frontist ideology is the predominant one at the present day.

It is possible, of course, at a later stage, that the PPP, driven underground, would resort to adventurist tactics of industrial and military guerrilla warfare. But this is not the policy of the PPP now.

RESISTANCE IN PPP

Reading the headlines of the capitalist press, one would assume that the PPP was fighting for: (1) The nationalization of the sugar estates; (2) withdrawal from the Commonwealth; (3) non-inclusion in the projected Caribbean Federation. The facts are different, however. This was the policy of the PPP before it assumed office, but not after.

Mrs. Jagan even talked about the progressive role of capital and capitalism in Guiana after accepting office. And Peter Kempadoo, writing in *Tribune* ("Guiana, My Country," October 16), stated correctly that the PPP's program was not "even as socialist as that already known in Britain." In the same paragraph he adds the significant sentence that "It is to be noted that the party has not signified any intention of nationalizing the sugar estates."

It is clear that the PPP is being manipulated by the Kremlin for diplomatic purposes. The last thing the Malenkov government has in mind is the establishment of a planned economy in Guiana without the "benevolent" physical presence of the Russian army units. Guianese economics and politics are quite subordinate to the Kremlin's attempt to embarrass the Tory government with an "international incident" which is good propaganda for Stalinism and against Western imperialism. This determines the policy of the PPP.

However, it would be wrong to assume that there is no resistance to the Stalinist policies. In the leadership itself, the so-called "moderates"—led by Burnham (late minister of education) and Ashton Chase—are opposing the Jagan "extrem-

ists" (more accurately, the Jagan pro-Stalinists). The pure-and-simple Stalinist faction describe the Burnham-Chase group as "Mensheviks."

Whether or not the "Menshevism" of Burnham is just coolness toward Stalinism cannot be ascertained as yet. What is certain, however, is that there already exists the basis for a Marxist opposition in the top ranks of the PPP leadership.

Trieste

The other major question which has been brought to the fore is the Trieste issue, which was debated in the House of Commons today.

It is obvious that the Anglo-American decision to withdraw armed forces from Zone A—without consulting the interested parties or even France, which is presumably one of the Big Four—was motivated by considerations having a direct bearing on the cold war. It was a deliberate attempt (1) to strengthen the shaky Pella government, whose very shakiness is partly due to American intervention in the Italian elections, and (2) to put the Yugoslav regime in its "proper" place.

Despite the Tito regime's backward somersaults to establish "good relations" with the Western capitalist powers, the facts are that Western capitalism has more in common with the capitalist regime of Italy than with the anti-capitalist regime of Yugoslavia.

The Labor Party leadership, both right and left, has undoubtedly been appreciably influenced by Titoist ideas and claims. There is also a general sympathy for the Yugoslav peoples in their struggle against Stalinism within the broad ranks of the Labor movement; at the same time there is a less justified sym-

pathy for the Tito regime, which is regarded by some as a "new road to socialism."

It was, therefore, not surprising that the Anglo-American handling of Yugoslavia was regarded with some misgiving. This was secret diplomacy with a vengeance, and meant that Yugoslavia was being treated in the same offhand manner by the Big Two as it had been dealt with by Russia. The differences were only a matter of degrees of brusqueness and cynicism.

Wage Fight

As far as home affairs are concerned, the most important development has been the new campaign by the Amalgamated Engineering Union and the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions for a 15 per cent rise in wages.

Large demonstrations have been held in all the main cities, and it is certain that this new campaign, representing as it does some three million workers, will greatly influence the course of industrial relations in the next few months.

Moreover, the Confederation is making a systematic attempt to propagandize for its Plan for Engineering, the plan for the nationalization of all the key industries. Arthur Deakin's dismissal of the plan is "mumbo-jumbo," as the Margate conference of the Labor Party, infuriated the Confederation leaders; and when the General Council of the Trades Union Congress meets, we may well have the spectacle of Tom O'Brien lining up with the Confederation leaders against Arthur Deakin—if Deakin attempts to get O'Brien publicly censured.

The strange situation in the trade-un-



Aneurin Bevan

ion movement is that it is the right wing which is at loggerheads with itself, while the left is relatively united.

Liberals' Future

Now, an odd remark about the Liberal Party. Of recent months the polarization of currents within it has reached an advanced stage. The right wing is dominant at the moment, and is led by its essentially right-wing parliamentary group.

However, a strong left-wing current has arisen in the constituency Liberal Party branches and this has expressed itself in (1) the formation of a Radical Reform Group within the party, and (2) the withdrawal of leading Liberal parliamentary candidates from parliamentary contests (for example, Frank Byers, Dinglefoot, and Lady Meagan Lloyd George).

It is quite possible that the Liberal Party will split, one section going to the Tories, the other to Labor. It is certain that they have no future as a separate parliamentary party.

The Betrayal of Warsaw — —

(Continued from page 1)

The real issue of course was not whether Warsaw was to be freed by the Poles or for the Poles but whether it was to be freed by the Poles or "freed" for the Russians. What were contemptuously dismissed as "detachments" held out against the Germans for two months.

British and American planes had been granted the use of air bases in Russia to allow them to bomb Germany, avoid a long flight home and land in Russia. They began to use these facilities for flying supplies into Warsaw. The Russians demanded a halt.

On August 16, Vyshinsky told the U. S. ambassador in Moscow that "The Soviet government . . . decidedly object to American or British aircraft, after dropping arms in the region of Warsaw, landing on Soviet territory, since the Soviet government do not wish to associate themselves either directly or indirectly with the adventure in Warsaw."

ROOSEVELT'S ROLE

What to do? Churchill now relates that he suggested to Roosevelt on August 25 that a sort of ultimatum be sent to Stalin informing him that they intended to use the refueling bases in Russia to aid Warsaw unless he directly forbade it. If Stalin did not reply, he urged Roosevelt, "we ought to send the planes and see what happens."

Roosevelt rejected the idea. The president was undoubtedly already dreaming of an exalted role as super-arbiter of the post-war world dominated by the Big Three; he was perfectly willing for Churchill to offend the Russians over a mere matter like a revolution in Poland; for himself, he would remain aloof.

"I do not consider it would prove advantageous to the long-range general war

prospect," he replied. "for me to join with you in the proposed message to Stalin, but I have no objection to your sending such a message if you consider it advisable to do so."

According to his own story, Churchill was so infuriated at the Russians that he would have liked to cut off all convoys to Russia unless Stalin came to terms. This passing passion he curbed in the interests of the war effort. But his fury and his admiration for the Poles were not potent enough to compel a far more modest move. Apparently he never sent the message which met such diffidence from Roosevelt. He saw no future for Britain in irritating the Russians while the Americans idled on the sidelines. No Polish revolt would force him into that trap.

And so each, for its own reasons, left the Poles to fight on in isolation.

CHURCHILL'S TURN

After six weeks of the fighting in Warsaw, the Russians made a few feeble gestures to allay world opinion. They moved their troops to the very outskirts of the city but there they remained until the Germans wiped out all Polish resistance and slaughtered more than 100,000 people. With this German prepara-

tion, the way was open for the unopposed arrival of a first Stalinist regime.

Poland, its people, its revolt were mere pawns to be manipulated by Russian imperialism: that emerges clearly in Churchill's tale. But before the final victory of Stalinism, Poland was just as cynically manipulated by all the imperialisms: not only Russia, but also England and the United States.

This is absent in Churchill's story for he was one of the participants in the sordid process. Less than a year before the Warsaw uprising, Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin traded pieces of Poland in the secret agreements of Teheran. And some months after its defeat, they met at Yalta to press the Poles into the service of a Stalinist puppet government.

At one stage, reports a former Polish ambassador to the United States, Churchill answered Polish protests with irony. "Well then, there is nothing to prevent Poland from declaring war on Russia after she [Poland] is deprived of the support of the Powers."

With the moral assistance of both Churchill and Roosevelt, who were fascinated by the vision of a world peacefully carved up by the big powers, Stalinist totalitarianism was fastened upon Poland.

THE POLISH PEOPLE WERE THE PAWNS



A great thinker on the problems of American socialism—

Marxism in the United States
by LEON TROTSKY

35 cents Order from:
Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

MARXISM *for* TODAY

V—The Meaning of a 'Transitional' Workers' Government

By HAL DRAPER

We now have before us two obviously different senses in which Marxists have used the term "workers' government."

The first, as we have already pointed out, is the quite common sense that a workers' government is the government of a workers' state. (This, remember, implies that a workers' state exists already.)

But in the views elaborated in the Comintern in 1922 and after (quoted last week), it is clear that "workers' government" is not being used in this sense at all. Here, with or without quotation marks, "workers' government" is used to mean simply: a government set up by a workers' party—whether that party is reformist or revolutionary, whether it is liberal, social-democratic or Marxist, whether it can be expected to or plans to take anti-capitalist action or not, whether "we" support it or not, etc.

Now I think it would be a quite sterile business to argue that one is "correct" and the other "incorrect." That is not what is involved. Is it then just one of those questions of terminology? That might imply that if you make your choice of sense for the term, make clear how you are using it and then stick to it consistently, it doesn't make any difference which sense you choose.

But there is something else involved besides mere arbitrary terminology, and it is very often involved in such apparently "terminological" matters.

WHAT THE NEW APPROACH TRIED TO DO

For one thing, anyone must agree immediately that one set of terms may be more useful than another in clarifying ideas. Thus, if we decided for some strange reason to use only a single word to refer to both apples and pears, there would not exist any "term" capable of expressing the difference between them. Thus also, primitive tribes which count only "one," "two," "three" and "many" do not have any term to express the difference between four and five or higher numbers.

That is the sort of thing which is involved here, to begin with.

The approach taken by Zinoviev in 1922 has the merit of making possible (or at least highlighting) distinctions among different political phenomena which are all thrown into the same bag by Sense No. 1.

According to the latter, you can have a capitalist government (in a capitalist state) or you can have a workers' government (in a workers' state) and that's all there is to it. Then if you proceed to raise the question of the "class character" of a given government (as Comrade Jack Walker did), the answer has to be one or the other.

But do these two cases exhaust the possibilities of real live political phenomena? If they do not, there is going to be confusion in discussing what really exists. The confusion may seem to be "terminological," but it will be due in the first place to the fact that the terms available do not provide useful handles by which to seize hold of different political concepts.

The one-or-the-other disjunction which is posed by Sense No. 1 can be made to work only in "normal" times, when political relations are more or less stable, relatively static—in the sense explained in our first article. But in periods of revolutionary transition, it leaves no room precisely for transitional phenomena. At such times, it becomes merely schematic, and unavoidably sterile.

This was the type of situation which Zinoviev and the Comintern attempted to face by 1922.

THE PROBLEM IN 1922

Right after the end of the First World War, it looked to many, the Comintern leadership and certainly the new Communist Parties of Germany and a number of other countries, as if the revolutionary struggle was posed in very simple and clear-cut terms: the European revolution was rolling ahead irresistibly; capture of power by the new revolutionary parties was around the corner; the barricades were up, and the immediate outcome would either be the defeat of the revolution by all combined forces from the social-democrats rightward, or else the victory of the revolution led by the Communist Parties and the establishment of a workers' state under a Communist government.

From 1917 to about 1921, it looked like "one-or-the-other," in truth. It was a question merely of a direct assault on the citadels and capture-by-storm.

But it turned out that the combined forces of counter-revolution, including the social-democratic leaderships, were strong enough, and clever enough, to stem and turn the sweeping revolutionary tide (given also the immense mistakes committed by the new CPs, which are another story). It turned out that the social-democratic parties, particularly, were able to hold on to the allegiance of a majority of the revolutionary masses—not by convincing the latter to give up their revolutionary aims and aspirations, but by deceiving them, by persuading them that these aims could be achieved more "sensibly" or effectively or cheaply by the social-democrats.

In an immense swath over Europe, the sentiment of the masses was "Bolshevik" and the slogans of "Soviet power" were common coin of the masses in the streets. Yet the new Communist Parties were unable to win a majority of the masses to themselves, away from their faith in the "leftist" talk of the reformist leaders.

A LINE TO BRIDGE THE GAP

In this situation, some of the Communist Parties and their inexperienced though militant leaders were unable to see that it was not enough merely to storm the bastions to have the masses follow in an irresistible upsurge. But by 1922 the Comintern leaders, the Russian Bolsheviks above all, recognized this as an illusion, and set out to turn the helm toward a new course, rejecting adventurism and "ultra-leftist" policies.

They said: "To the masses! Before we can win, we must first win over the masses, above all away from the social-democratic deceivers, for it is clear that the masses are not yet ready to follow the vanguard in an elemental assault. They still have faith that their old leaders, who are now talking out of the left side of their mouths and posing as revolutionists, will lead them to the overthrow of capitalism. We cannot un-deceive them merely by slogans and imprecations. We must go to them, with persistent work among them to shorten the painful process before they find out too late through the course of events that their leaders' promises are false.

"We must fight in the mass reformist trade unions. We must utilize the opportunists of electoral (parliamentary) work, without sowing any illusions about parliamentarism. We must bring about united action between these social-democratic workers and ourselves, even while they remain in the old organizations. We must prove to them in action that their leaders will not take the revolutionary path which they cry for."

How to prove that in action, and not merely by denunciations?

"You, left social-democratic workers, who say you want what we want but that you can win it by sticking to the old party—fight with us for these revolutionary measures, and demand that your leaders fight for them too! Demand, for examples, that the reactionary officers' corps be disarmed—demand workers' control of production—demand that the chief burdens of taxation be put on the shoulders of the rich. . . . We will fight loyally side by side with you social-democratic workers, or groups, or sections of the party, or the party itself which really fight for such a program, and you will see for yourselves whether you need the Communist Party or not. . . ."

THE TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM

These were revolutionary TRANSITIONAL demands: i.e., not merely demands for immediate reforms, and not demands explicitly for socialist measures, but (1) demands which corresponded to the real things the workers wanted immediately, even those workers who did not want a Communist government, while at the same time (2) a genuine and consistent fight for these demands could not but lead outside the framework of capitalism and the politics of the social-democratic leadership.

"You social-democratic workers want to fight for these demands as we do, but you think they can be won without a Soviet state. Very well, let us fight for them together, and see where that inevitably leads. We predict that you will find out that in the struggle for these things, we will have to break with the present state, and with its social-democratic supporters, and set up our own revolutionary government. You do not agree with us on that as yet. Very well, there is only one way to find out, by together carrying on the struggle for what we jointly want. . . ."

This is the basic idea of a revolutionary transitional program, in a situation which is objectively revolutionary but where a majority of the masses are still looking to the reformist leaderships to achieve their aspirations.

This is also the way in which the slogan of a revolutionary "workers' government" was raised, within this context, by the Comintern of 1922.

Thus, the term "workers' government" did not imply an already existing workers' state, but A POSSIBLE FORM IN THE TRANSITION TOWARD a workers' state.

"WORKERS GOV'T" AS A STAGE IN A STRUGGLE

As Zinoviev conceived it at the time, it could mean in practice a coalition of workers' parties (including the Communist Party) to set up a government based on the program of carrying out the transitional demands—a coalition with sections or organizations or split-offs from the social-democratic party, or other workers' groups. It would demonstrate in practice, in action, that a carrying out of the transitional program also entailed carrying out the rest of the Marxist program.

(It should be remembered that the first Soviet government established after the Russian Revolution was also a coalition government, including the left peasant party and Anarchists as well as the Bolsheviks, and that it was some months before this government, unwillingly so to speak, took steps to nationalize industry in order to keep it going after the capitalist owners had fled across the civil-war lines.)

Now, take such a revolutionary transitional "workers' government" and ask Comrade Jack Walker's question about its "class character." Capitalism has not been abolished, though the power of the capitalist class is being attacked. No industries have even been nationalized, as yet; etc. . . . Obviously, the situation is one that cannot long remain so; it is unstable; the social question will have to be resolved one way or the other. If the workers' leadership falters, or a section turns back, and the left wing cannot rally the masses alone, then the transitional government will have proved abortive. If it goes on, then a workers' state will be fully established and consolidated.

What it is, is being determined in the course of the struggle. What it was, will be determined by historians in hindsight.

What is being determined in the course of struggle is: whether or not this government is willing to take measures in the basic interest of the masses regardless of the interests of capital. To us, that may mean necessarily that this government must go all the way to workers' state power. To a revolutionary worker who does not yet agree with our views, that may mean something short of it. The concept of a revolutionary transitional workers' government bridges the gap between how this worker thinks and what he wants to fight for now.

We will next take this very important concept of a transitional workers' government and see how much of it is useful in understanding the case of the British Labor "workers' government."

(Next week: The British Labor Government as a Transition.)

Readers Take the Floor

To the Editor:

Please refer to page 5 of your recent issue, "Is Socialism 'Subversive'?" Does the second paragraph under Interrogatory 38 refer to just that interrogatory or is it a standard clause tacked on to all such documents by the attorney general? If this warning applies specifically to your designating the trials of the Communist leaders as persecutions for beliefs then it would seem to be quite high-handed. Doesn't an individual or paper have the right to interpret political events as he honestly sees it? If anyone can see any real difference between the 1953 version of the Communist Party U.S.A. and its 1943 counterpart then he deserves to be the attorney general.

A WOULD-BE

PHILADELPHIA LAWYER

Philadelphia, Oct. 28.

The paragraph referred to was the closing paragraph of the whole document, and not a part of Interrogatory 38. However, the remark made by our correspondent above is undoubtedly justified in any case, by the inclusion of Interrogatory 38 itself.—Ed.

T-H PRECEDENT SET IN PITTSBURGH CASE

In Pittsburgh a new Taft-Hartley precedent has been set in court by Chief District Judge Gourley when he imposed a \$2000 fine on an AFL union in the Greyhound case, in a consent damage decision.

The damages were awarded to Pennsylvania Greyhound Lines for a 48-hour strike in 1951 when drivers (members of the AFL Motor Coach Employees) reported off "sick" and stopped bus service.

The judge carefully explained that he had fixed on the sum of \$2000 because that was all the union had in its treasury. He was emphasizing this to show how "fair" the company was in agreeing to the figure!

Greyhound had charged that the union fostered the "off sick" strategy. The jury had been deadlocked 11 hours when the lawyers for both sides agreed to the consent verdict.

Greyhound claimed it was suing for damages to its "good will" and for expenses in re-routing passengers.

This is the first time the teeth of the Taft-Hartley Act were sunk into a union, in this area, in such a case.

NOW—IN ENGLISH
THE FAMED "VOLUME 4"
OF "CAPITAL"

Karl Marx's
HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC
THEORIES

PART ONE

Langland Press—337 pages—\$5.00

Order from

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



LABOR
ACTION

November 9, 1953 Vol. 17, No. 45

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, 1879.—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: GORDON HASKELL,
BEN HALL, MARY BELL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

PRESS AGENTS OF THE PENTAGON: THE MILITARY PROPAGANDA MILL—Part 3

THE AIMS OF MILITARY PROPAGANDA

The purpose of military propaganda is so manifold that it would be impossible to define in one sentence. In general, however, the purpose is to sell Congress and the people on the Armed Forces and any policy they want to promote.

One aim is that of building prestige and respect for the Armed Forces.

In the early days of the present public relations approach, the Army set up Advisory Committees and military manpower committees throughout the nation. In setting up such a committee in Des Moines, Iowa, Major Donald Andre listed the following as two of the three main objectives of the program:

"To create in Des Moines a program of building respect for the Army and Army Air Force; to acquaint the people with the fact that the nation's military forces must be backed by public support and united community effort."¹

Somewhat earlier, in speaking to the first class of the Armed Forces Information School, Secretary of Defense James Forrestal told the graduating publicity specialists they would have to overcome traditional American suspicion of militarism and make each citizen and community feel a responsibility to the military.

"It is difficult," he said, "because our democracy and our country are founded upon an underlying suspicion of armies and of the force that they reflect and represent."²

"Part of your task," he added, "is to make people realize that the Army, Navy, and Air Force are not external creations but come from and are a part of the people. It is your responsibility to make citizens aware of their responsibility to the services."³

In the postwar period the Army launched a campaign of "prestige advertising" which "was directed to the general public as well as the possible enlistee." The *Army and Navy Journal* in describing this said:

"To advance the public relations aspect of the campaign, stress was laid upon community relations. A series of luncheons, dinner meetings, and similar affairs was arranged for influential representatives of the press and radio, civic, educational, religious, and similar organizations throughout each Service Command. The purpose of this effort was to gain the wholehearted support of these civic-minded citizens and the large number of people whose thinking they influence. . . ."⁴

HEADFIXING FOR WAR

A second aim is to get the American people psychologically ready for war.

On October 31, 1948 the *Chicago Sun-Times* carried a news report stating "At the suggestion of Defense Secretary Forrestal, the public relations chiefs of three services, Army, Air Force, and Navy, will address the convention of the Public Relations Society of America in Chicago November 17. Their subject will be how to mobilize public opinion in event of World War III."

This emphasis on psychological conditioning of the people was also discussed in the Industrial College of the Armed Forces as a part of the economic mobilization program in 1950. The June 14, 1950 *New York Times* reported:

"Plans for guiding public opinion were discussed by Col. Wilfred A. Steiner of the Air Force as part of courses being sponsored by the Industrial College of the Armed Forces for a group of selected civilians and reserve officers. Colonel Steiner declared that an aroused public opinion was a great check on aggression and that the proper mobilization of the public viewpoint was one of the most important phases of all economic mobilization for war."

Shortly thereafter on June 30, 1950 A. S. Alexander, Under-Secretary of the Army, said, according to the *New York Times*, "The American people are better psychologically prepared for war if it comes, than ever before in peacetime."⁵

GETTING BUDGET MONEY

A third aim is to sell military measures in such a way that the people will be willing to pay for them.

A public relations mission of the Reserve Officers Association was described by the *Army and Navy Journal* in these words:

"One further mission of the Reserve Officers Association, through its membership, will be to direct civilian thought to the priceless value of democracy and the part that every citizen who loves his country should play in insuring its retention by lending united support to a sound military program which will guarantee national security—at whatever the cost!"⁶

The Pentagon's Publicity office, viewing this as a major purpose, has upon occasion gone all-out on the program. The May 21, 1950 *New York Times* reporting the first annual Armed Forces Day celebration, said:

"The need for military preparedness despite its high cost was hammered home in dozens of speeches in the United States and abroad by civilian and military spokesmen for the Armed Services. . . ."

Similarly, Charles E. Wilson, the Defense Mobilization Director, at the annual dinner of the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, commended those present for their publication of—

"millions of words laying down the premise . . . that the free world is in mortal danger. . . . If the people were not convinced of that it would be impossible for Congress to vote the vast sums now being spent to avert that danger. . . . With the support of public opinion as marshalled by the press, we are off to a good start. But the mobilization job cannot be completed unless such support is continuous. . . . It is our job—yours and mine—to keep our people convinced that the only way to keep disaster away from our shores is to build America's might."⁷

The groundwork for the mobilization publicity was

Third installment of sections from the new pamphlet "Press Agents of the Pentagon," by John M. Swomley Jr., published by the National Council Against Conscription.

laid much earlier in Economic Mobilization courses, one of which was held in 1948 in the form of a two-weeks program at the National Broadcasting Company in New York. There—

"Comdr. W. T. Greenhalgh laid stress on the importance of a sound public relations policy to the success of any economic mobilization program. He said that public opinion in a democracy, especially among intellectuals, is suspicious of the military mind but that winning intellectual support is one of the fundamentals to success in such a program."⁸

THE UNREGISTERED LOBBY

A fourth aim is to promote legislation the military wants Congress to pass.

A House committee headed by Rep. Forrest Harness in 1948 found the War Department guilty of "using Government funds in an improper manner for propaganda activities supporting compulsory military training or what is commonly referred to as 'universal military training.'"⁹

The *Washington Post* reported that "Army Secretary Kenneth C. Royall admitted under questioning by House propaganda investigators yesterday that his department has been spending public funds to sell the American people on universal military training."¹⁰

One of the instruments by which the Army hoped to influence legislation was the Army Advisory Committees that were to be set up in at least 600 representative communities with an approximate membership of 9,000 civilians.

The purpose of the Advisory Committee, according to a memo signed by Col. James Pierce, is that of "preparing a favorable reception for Army policy and discovering the things that hamper Army policy; to advise the Army on all community attitudes which are based on adverse reaction to acts, facts, and policies of the Army; to provide channels for the discussion of facts and policies of the Army in a manner so that the public will understand and be completely informed."¹¹

SMEARING OPPOSITION

A fifth purpose is to discredit opponents of military policies.

For example, during the campaign for UMT the Army distributed an "Outline for Veterans' Radio Panels" which stated:

"The opposition to Universal Military Training is generally not based on fact but rather on such generalities as democracy, morals, aggression, education and pacifism. The chief opponents are parents, church groups, educators, subversive groups and a large section of the public which does not think."

Similarly, Comdr. W. T. Greenhalgh, in discussing military public relations, told a group of Reserve Officers, industrial executives and others, of the importance of influencing public opinion. This is particularly important, he said, in view of the number of "unbalanced men, both honest and dishonest, who are pouring false information into the public mind and attempting to discredit honest men on the theory that a lie told often enough will be believed by all of us."¹²

THE HIDDEN AGENTS OF THE PROPAGANDA MILL

[*Press Agents of the Pentagon* next proceeds to discuss the ways in which personnel forces are developed to man the military propaganda machine: recruitment of leading newspapermen to head up the bureaus; the Armed Forces Information School; the program by which officers are sent to schools of journalism; etc. "In addition to officers and civilians who are specifically trained in public relations," it adds, "a host of other military and civilian personnel are used in military propaganda without actually being listed on the payroll as publicity staff." These include special assistants to the Chief of Staff, ROTC instructors in the schools, and to a certain extent every commander of an army post. This chapter continues with an exposition of the role of other elements whose propaganda functions are somewhat less evident.]

Another group of officers expected to do publicity work for the Armed Forces are the chaplains.

The September 1952 *Army Information Digest*, in an article by a chaplain, suggests that the "chaplain's activities are centered in six main fields." The first field listed is "public relations. This widely used and often misunderstood term is officially defined as 'any planned program or procedure which will elicit public understanding and good will.' Here the element of planning is all important, for good public relations do not just happen; they are almost invariably the result of hard work. The chief emphasis in the chaplain's public relations, however, is the contribution he can make to a better understanding of the Air Force by neighboring civilian communities."

Still another group aiding the military in public relations are the "Civilian Aides to the Secretary of the Army." They are "strategically located in all the forty-eight states" and in various communities in these states.

"In private life the Aides are leaders and authorities in their communities and in their respective fields. Some

are nationally renowned engineers, bankers, attorneys, scientists, editors, industrialists, surgeons and educators. Most of them have a military background of their own and are, therefore, acutely conscious of the problems of the local commander. . . . Together they constitute a representative cross section of community leaders across the Nation."¹³

These Civilian Aides are actually enlisted or appointed for two-year terms. Since they function out of uniform and are virtually unknown in their communities as Army representatives, they are particularly effective molders of opinion, for they appear to be objective rather than officers with a vested interest.

The *Army Information Digest* says: "A measure of their success is the fact that few people know of their work."¹⁴

One of their responsibilities is to stimulate "a continuing interest by civilians in Armed Forces problems and needs so that the way may be cleared for unhampered concentration on the Nation's defense." The key word of course is "unhampered" and may mean anything that stands in the way of Army desires.

Another purpose of the Aides is to provide "the Army with a number of highly qualified civilian spokesmen who are able to interpret for the public the reasons for Army policies and practices."¹⁵

"In the postwar period, they took the lead in advocating the build-up of a sufficiently large reservoir of trained personnel to meet any emergency."¹⁶ Thus the Army is in a position to have it appear as if Army proposals for legislation or other policies are really coming from civilians.

SUBTERFUGE

The *Army Advisory Committee* is another group used for public relations purposes.

These committees, which in 1948 the Army planned to set up in at least 600 representative communities with an approximate membership of 9,000 civilians, were the target of attack by Congressmen because "they are expected to go out and spread the propaganda of the Department which gives them the honorary title of Advisory Committees. They are expected to try and influence legislation before Congress. In this last respect it seems a clear violation of the law. It is a subterfuge for the military or any department of Government to say they are doing it to inform the public."¹⁷

The stated purpose of the Advisory Committees, according to a memo signed by Col. James Pierce issued August 26, 1946 is that of "preparing a favorable reception for Army policy and discovering the things that hamper Army policy; to advise the Army on all community attitudes which are based on adverse reactions to acts, facts, and policies of the Army; to provide channels for the dissemination of facts and policies of the Army in a manner so that the public will understand and be completely informed."¹⁸

So important are these Advisory Committees that a special *Army Advisory Committee Bulletin* was printed and issued monthly to keep them informed of the Army point of view.

There are still other groups who work with or for the armed forces publicity system. But the most important of these are the veterans' organizations. The *Infantry Journal* recognized this when it said:

"The widespread public relations of the Armed Services have many aspects, one of the most important of which is the relationship between the Services and their veterans. The feeling of more than fifteen million veterans for their particular part of the National Military Establishment directly affects all other aspects of its present and continuing relations with the American public."¹⁹

The Reserve Officers group, which is almost exclusively a veterans' group, has its own publicity set-up. For example, the Elizabeth, N. J. *Daily Journal* reported the appointment of seven North Jersey Army Reserve Officers to the 153rd Publicity Service Training Battalion. The primary objective of the unit is to publicize Organized Reserve Corps activities. The officers chosen for the corps were on active duty during World War II and are experienced in newspaper, advertising or public relations work.²⁰

"BROTHERHOOD" IN ARMS

The Chaplains Committee of the Reserve Officers Association of Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1952 wrote a letter to the pastors, priests and rabbis of Greater Washington urging them to use "Brotherhood Week" in February to support National Defense. The chaplains wrote:

"In a time when we are drawn together with thoughts of brotherhood, let us be drawn together as well in thoughts of the defense of our Nation which, in its very inception, vouchsafed that freedom and equality among all men which we love. We respectfully urge all ministers, priests and rabbis of the Washington area to take due cognizance of the period February 12 to 22 as a time for prayers and sincere concern with the basic virtues of our 'American way'—Justice, Brotherhood, Freedom, Truth, that our lives might be more perfectly used in NATIONAL DEFENSE."

The letter concluded:

"Last year, National Defense Week was combined with Armed Services Week in May, but this year, the Reserve Officers Association, as sponsoring group, has thought it practicable to move the dates forward. This group, your citizen soldiers, sailors, and airmen, voluntarily banded together as a potent force for preparedness, through its Chaplains Committee, respectfully requests your consideration of this matter and suggests that this National Defense emphasis be brought into Sabbath observances in our synagogues on February 16th and into our church services on February 17th.

(Continued bottom of next page)

Evaluating a Study of the Labor Movement—

Trade-Union Problems on the Local Level

THE LOCAL UNION, by Leonard R. Sayles and George Strauss.—Harper and Brothers, New York, 1953.

By W. J.

Perhaps the first important study of the local union and its place in the industrial plant is this work by two members of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University.

As a textbook for a class in union structure and function it is commendable. As a contribution to a full understanding of the dynamics and import of unionism it falls short of its own stated goal. For while its description of the local union and its operation is good, its analysis is superficial. It does not take into account trends and times and social atmospheres. It views local unions statically, not as ever-changing and fluctuating institutions, reflecting vaster social changes.

This point is illustrated best in the two chapters on grievance procedure and the decline of the steward. Using as its basic criteria the well-known UAW-CIO motto, "the stewards are the backbone of the union," the authors describe how the stewards have declined in importance. But the basic factors behind this phenomenon, which also account for the decline in the importance of the local union, are given scant attention.

Most of the 20 local unions surveyed by the authors, with the assistance of a research staff, belong to international unions which are established, powerful and hardened in terms of structure, leadership and policies. Local unions reflect this; and are circumscribed by this association. In the past 15 years, bargaining procedures became more and more stratified, with arbitration or umpires' decisions or previous rulings determining the fate of most grievances.

This is in great contrast to the early days when the ability of a steward to mobilize the ranks behind him determined the amount of concessions he won

from plant management. "Company security" clauses and the whole complex structure of bargaining tradition and history are the causes of the decline in the importance of the stewards (or committeemen).

The relatively high mortality rate among stewards and local union officials in local union elections, which the authors show statistically, flows from this basic change in the significance and weight of stewards and local union officials. Since neither the ranks nor the local union politicians understand the limitations within which the local union functions, the campaign promises become hollow mockeries, and the ranks take out their bitterness and frustration on the one force they can make a scapegoat, the elected officials. Many local union candidates, who won with the best of intentions to improve things, find themselves as hog-tied by the contract as the previous incumbents whom they denounced for inaction.

SENIORITY AND OVERTIME

The failure of the two authors to emphasize the different weight that different but perennial local union problems have in different times precludes a genuine understanding of the impact of these problems on the local union leadership, not only in terms of election results but in the functioning of the union throughout the year. To illustrate, let us take the seniority and overtime problems.

When the local unions first came along in early CIO days, seniority was mainly the answer to bosses' favoritism in picking jobs and in layoffs. A variety of seniority systems covering promotions, changes in classifications and degree of seniority in terms of plant structure (department, division or plant-wide seniority) were worked out, depending on pressures from the ranks and exigencies of production. In a period of relative steady employment, i.e., capitalist prosperity, the irritations from the inevitable conflicts on seniority within a plant remained minor, for the basic value of seniority, job security, did not seem to be involved.

But as the threat of increasing unemployment and social insecurity faces the workers in many industries, like auto, clothing and steel, the seniority system

becomes all important. Each pressure group within the plant seeks to perpetuate or create a seniority system that assures it of a job. Seniority becomes a life-and-death question, and many local unions today are being torn apart by this question. Every department resists older seniority men coming into their setup. As companies change production locations, new local unions resist transfer of unionists from other plants who have more seniority. "Fence-building" is the road to popularity, if also ruin.

In a period of short work-weeks, local union officials find themselves plagued with the question of a 40-hour week guaranteed to top seniority people, with demands for layoffs of the younger seniority people to assure a 40-hour week. But the younger people resist. "We don't pay dues to get ourselves laid off. We need jobs too." Trying to answer problems like this within the framework of routine unionism is like fighting fire with gasoline. It merely inflames both pressure groups.

After watching dozens of meetings devoted to the subject of overtime, we think it is safe to make the generalization that at a time when fear of unemployment is an important factor in the thinking of the worker, and when high prices are squeezing him, the only good system of over-time work is one in which the individual works. Any other system, be it straight seniority, classification seniority, on-the-job picking, or group division, is rejected by the individuals involved. Gone are the days when overtime did not matter. At model change-over time in the auto plants, this question plagues most local union leaders.

Now an interesting question arises from the description of the perennial "headaches" mentioned by the authors and briefly illustrated by this reviewer. Why hasn't the union movement been able to work out a systematic set of generally accepted answers for the ranks on these issues? Here, indeed, is one of the failures of the union movement, taken from the standpoint of operational development. If the authors had devoted more of their time to research on the whys, they would have added not only to the stature of the book but also to the development of the local union officials interviewed.

In the section of the book on local

union leadership, its selection, its reason for union participation, its effect on the ranks, the authors make many good observations, including the role that language groups, pressure groups within the plant, and the general level of the ranks play in this process. Here too, however, the failure of the authors to emphasize the completely dominating role the international union plays in deciding important policy makes their understanding of the local union elections less than satisfactory.

PROGRAM SOFT-PEDALED

The fact that most, if not all, local union groups these days agree with international union basic policy, that political dissidence is a rare animal in unionism today, gives greater weight to other vote-getting appeals in elections. Personalities rather than program dominate. In practice this means appeals to prejudice, nationality blocs, skilled versus unskilled workers; elements that played minor parts in times of big issue struggles become all-dominant in times of political agreement.

The increasing wealth and pay of local unions adds another factor. Men run for office to make more money. The over-all social atmosphere, the acceptance of business-unionism as the right way, changes and has changed the character of leadership selection and election in most industrial unions, including by far the most democratic, the UAW-CIO. The privileges rather than the responsibilities become primary leadership motivations.

The crux of the local union problem, however, is actually the vital issue of union democracy, as the authors recognize, and they devote four very interesting and valuable chapters to its examination. That the first important study of this problem comes from two university scholars, rather than any part of the trade-union leadership in America, speaks for itself.

It is worthwhile to quote some of the ideas of the authors on this subject. "Definitions are always a problem, particularly where the term is tied up with as much emotion as 'democracy.' A common approach to this subject stresses the union's constitution. According to this view, every union is democratic if its constitution provides machinery

(Turn to last page)

Aims of Military Propaganda—

(Continued from page 6)

In addition to this message which will be circulated among the clergy of our major religious groups, there will be posters, window displays, moving picture trailers, meetings and talks in various high schools and colleges to further bring this matter to public attention."

AGIT-PROP INSTRUCTIONS

The Regular Armed Forces stimulate Reservist efforts in the publicity field. The following letter was sent by an Air Force General to college and university presidents in 1948:

"Dear Dr. ——:

"The United States Air Force, in an effort to prepare for the security of our country, has created the Air Defense Command. Its mission is to consolidate and train an efficient Air Reserve Force to be employed in conjunction with the Army Ground Forces and the Navy in case of another emergency. The importance of this task is obvious to all of us; but its accomplishment rests heavily on the goodwill, interest and cooperation of the people.

"We believe that, among the people, the collegiate group is of the utmost importance in furthering this task. Because the future leaders and molders of opinion are now on your campus, we believe it is imperative that they be sympathetic with and willing to promote our program. This cooperation cannot be achieved unless steps are taken to inform both faculty and students about our methods, aims, and developments.

"To this end, it is our desire to secure the voluntary services of university and college faculty members holding commissions in the Air Reserves. These officers would act as liaison representatives between the Air Force, the faculties and the students. The participation of such officers would be most helpful because of their intimate knowledge of both military and educational policies and problems.

"A brief outline of the proposed duties of the unofficial liaison officer is presented below:

"To present the Air Force point of view to their colleagues in faculty meetings should the occasion warrant such action.

"To write articles for the college and local newspapers to inform the faculty, students, and public of current Air Force policies and practices that would be of interest to civilians.

"To secure publication in college and other news-

papers of items released through the Public Information Officer, this Headquarters. To aid the Air Reserve Officers Training Corps staff, where such exists, by interpreting the academic viewpoint of faculties and administrations and reconciling them with military requirements. Stimulate interest in the Air Reserve and encourage enlistment of Reservists.

"Speak before local groups to emphasize the axiom that 'Air Power is Peace Power.'

"Maintain small stocks of pertinent War Department forms for distribution to student Reservists. Establish contact with other officers of different institutions in order to form liaison units. These units could work together and facilitate the duties of individuals.

"Reserve officers who volunteer for this duty will receive inactive duty training credit for time spent on the project. Your cooperation is requested in encouraging the participation in this activity of Air Reservists and other interested members of your faculty. Such participation will aid materially in the maintenance of a well-informed and efficient Air Force Reserve.

"We will furnish the faculty member or members who volunteer for this duty with material with which to implement this program.

"Sincerely,

(signed) T. J. Hanley, Jr.
Major General
United States Air Force"

LINING UP VETERANS

Not only Reserve Officer groups but other veterans' groups are expected by the Armed Forces to serve as public relations branches. General Eisenhower was quite specific at this point in telling an American Legion Convention in 1944:

"There is, in the relationship between the veteran and the Army, a two-way responsibility. For the veteran must have a continuing interest in the Army. He understands the Army's problems and owes to himself and his country the duty of putting these clearly before his fellow citizens. The veteran, representing as he does virtually every powerful influence in America, can exert a powerful influence in molding public opinion based upon public knowledge and understanding, without which no program of national security can be fully effective."²¹

The American Legion has consistently advocated universal military training in line with Army requests that it do so.

One such request, for example, was made by former Secretary of War Robert Patterson to a Legion Convention in San Francisco in October, 1946. Speaking of UMT, he said: "Your Army asks you to raise your voice in behalf of its program, that you may safeguard in time of peace the freedom you have maintained for America in war."

General Hershey and others at the same convention made a plea for a Legion campaign for UMT, stating: "The American Legion will not falter in its obligations nor fail in its responsibilities." It is common knowledge that the Legion did begin in 1947 a campaign that was intensified in 1948 as a result of further Army appeals.

Another illustration of the way in which veterans' organizations follow the Army line, is seen in the action of the 1947 national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Although Congress had as a matter of national policy decided upon civilian control of atomic energy, the Army was never content with the decision. Army agitation for military control continued behind the scenes at such a tempo that President Truman finally had to stop it.²² The VFW followed the Army position, and as part of a four-point national security resolution, voted for return of atomic energy control of the military.²³

(Next week: The Propaganda Mill's Techniques.)

1. Des Moines Tribune, March 1, 1949.
2. Army and Navy Journal, August 14, 1948.
3. New York Times, August 5, 1948.
4. Army and Navy Journal, August 14, 1948.
5. New York Times, July 1, 1950.
6. Army and Navy Journal, August 21, 1948.
7. New York Times, April 27, 1951.
8. Ibid., April 15, 1948.
9. House Report No. 1510, 80th Congress, second session, July 24, 1947.
10. Washington Post, January 15, 1948.
11. Congressional Record, January 19, 1948.
12. New York Times, April 15, 1948.
13. Army Information Digest, November 1952, p. 13.
14. Ibid., p. 13.
15. Ibid., p. 18.
16. Ibid., p. 17.
17. Congressional Record, January 19, 1948, p. 320.
18. Ibid., p. 319.
19. Infantry Journal, October 1948.
20. Elizabeth, N. J. Daily Journal, July 18, 1949.
21. Proceedings of the 28th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, 1944.
22. New York Times, July 25, 1948.
23. Ibid., September 9, 1947.

Two-Party System? — —

(Continued from page 1)

matter of course that the leader of the Republican Party should want his own party members elected to office as against all Democrats or others. But the actual fact of the matter is that whatever bits of a program have been put forth by the White House during the past year have had to rely for passage as much on Democrats as on Republicans. This is just another way of saying that as far as a political program goes, both the Republican and Democratic Parties are split wide open.

Thus, if the president's program (whatever that may be) means anything to him, he cannot afford to be as partisan as his last statement implies that he is. This would make it easy for many a Republican to buck his programs without fear of losing his support when election time rolls around. It would also tend to force the Democrats who have been supporting various presidential measures and proposals to think twice before continuing to do so.

POWER BLOCS

Is all this of interest only to people who are running for office, or does it have some meaning for the rest of us? The deepest meaning of it to all of us is simply this: the American people cannot hold either major political party responsible for any program they may adopt before elections, for both parties are fundamentally irresponsible combinations of special-interest power-blocs.

Since they have no unifying principles, this means that while they are not responsible to the electorate who put them in power, they are and must be responsible only to those power-groups which are in continual operation between elections. Obviously the chief ones among these are the great corporations and industry associations, and secondarily the patronage-machines which make up the backbones of the parties themselves.

Another illustration of the basic nature of both the Republican and Democratic parties was presented in the recent mayoralty elections in New York City. When Robert Wagner Jr. was nominated by the bulk of the New York City Democratic machine (corrupt to the marrow and deeply involved with the underworld), his candidacy was endorsed by most of the major New Deal Democrats in and out of the city.

Senator Lehman, Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., Eleanor Roosevelt, Harry Truman and Adlai Stevenson all endorsed Wagner. When confronted with the anguished cries of their New Deal colleagues in the Liberal Party, or those who were supporting that party's candidates as independents, these people could only justify their actions on the basis that it is important to keep the Democratic organization in New York intact, regardless of how corrupt that organization may actually be. Most of them had supported Bill O'Dwyer in his day, on the same basis.

FUTILITARIANISM

Is this attitude "cynical" on the part of these prominent liberals? Of course, in a certain sense it is. It certainly makes a mockery of the claim that they are people to whom principles have any meaning in politics, even if these principles be no more vital than the support of "clean government" on the municipal level.

Actually, it is not a matter of personal cynicism. They have simply been caught up in the same confusion and contradiction as the president who would like to be above politics, but who, when shown the hard facts of party life in the country, ultimately has to back even those sections of his own political machine which are guaranteed to torpedo his program after they are elected.

The defenders of this peculiar American political system often say that it is in this very looseness, this very irresponsibility, that its chief merit and strength lies. They claim that if political parties were divided along class lines it would

only lead to bitterness and divisiveness in the country.

Of course, the present setup also makes for bitterness and divisiveness, but it is guaranteed to turn these feelings into futility and indifference to politics as a whole.

When people vote for a change, they can have no real idea of what kind of a change they are going to get. The Negroes can be pretty sure that whichever party they elect, their situation will be affected far more by the general economic conditions in the country than by any governmental protection from discrimination. The workers can feel that the Democrats are not as intimately tied up with the industrial giants of the country as are the Republicans, but they know that their interests will be traded around by them on the basis of pressure and expediency. And as long as they are divided and unorganized politically, they can be pretty sure that the pressure they can exert will be minor compared to the pressure of their economic enemies.

BENSON TO THE WOLVES?

There can be no doubt that however much President Eisenhower may want to think of himself as the non-political choice of the American people, in the long run he will have to accept responsibility for whatever happens under the Republican administration.

At the moment, it seems that the farmers are hardest pressed, and are raising the biggest rumpus. The attempt is being made to throw responsibility for low farm prices on Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and thus to throw him to the wolves. If things continue to go badly, he may be sacrificed. But as that is not likely to bring about much of a change it will eventually be-

Trade-Union Problems —

(Continued from page 7)

whereby the members can change their officers and determine basic union policy. By this criterion, few unions are undemocratic!

"Another approach is to look at union democracy from the point of view of participation in union politics. This approach considers questions such as: How many candidates are there in elections? How often is there a turnover in officers? How much disagreement is there at meetings and what is their average attendance? Were locals required to meet all these criteria, we would find few democratic.

"Both approaches are somewhat limited. Both are concerned only with the superficial or most easily measurable indicators of democracy. Many people unconsciously evaluate unions in terms of the small town meeting. They feel that unless everyone participates actively there is no democracy. Yet, as we have seen, in most locals the important decisions are made behind the scenes, in meetings of the executive and grievance committees, at informal discussions among the officers, and during casual contacts between the officers and the rank and file in the plant. The local meeting is primarily a ceremony to ratify decisions made as elsewhere.

"From the point of view of our study, union democracy can best be measured in terms of the responsiveness of the officers to the demands of the members."

Not the least of the reasons why international union officials ignore the basic problem of union democracy is the happy misunderstanding they have of the words democracy and constitutional. By making them identical, so many disturbing problems are removed.

UNION DEMOCRACY

At the risk of using an extreme example, almost an unfair one, we can easily show what is wrong with the authors' criteria of union democracy. There have been many strikes, walkouts, etc., against employment of Negroes or upgrading of

come clear that it is not merely a question of government policy, but also of the economy itself. And if the economy goes down-hill next year, the Republicans will be in for it—all of them.

Yet the choice the people will then have will be to return the Democrats to office once again. But it is hardly likely that this would bring back the Fair Deal—it would much more likely bring back the Dixiecrat-GOP coalition. And if such a vicious circle were repeated in the presence of an economic recession, the inevitable consequence would be to seek to break it, in one way or another.

That will be the real test of the American labor movement, and also of American democracy. For it is precisely in such circumstances that the cry arises for a strong man, for an end to democratic confusion and futility. And the cry can only be stifled if an end to confusion is made by democratic means.

But in such circumstances the only democratic means available would be to break out of the vicious "two party—no party" system, and to seek to organize the American people politically along class lines. In a time of crisis the class struggle will not be the muted, business-unionism thing it is today. It will break forth in open and naked forms, and will require a political channel for its most clear and fruitful expression.

That is why independent socialists, even today, call for the more advanced sections of the labor movement to raise the issue of the formation of a labor party in an educational manner. Even now, as many workers as possible should be brought to think along these lines. Then when the formation of such a party becomes an urgent, crying necessity, much of the spade-work will have been done in advance.

Negroes. Would one call a local union that responded to that kind of a demand from the ranks a democratic local union, with the leaders "responding to the demands of the ranks?" Or last year, when many secondary UAW officials resisted pressure of the ranks to kick out the Stalinists during the red hysteria in Detroit, what was that an example of?

Union democracy does mean participation of the ranks in their own destiny: this is a basic criteria. Of course a mere mathematical report on attendance is not by itself decisive but it is symptomatic. Response to the demands of the rank and file on many questions is a factor. But certain inalienable rights, as stated in the constitution of the nation, also are a required factor in judging the democracy of a local or international union.

Our authors do a good job of reporting on the miserable lack of participation in local union affairs by the ranks. Their charts are good. What they fail to understand is why the trend in American unionism is in that direction: control over the ranks through substitution of constitutional rules for rank-and-file participation and vote as the guiding star of union operation.

BUREAUCRACY GROWS

Like the AFL bureaucrats of the early 20s, most CIO leaders have learned that a quiescent or non-active rank and file is far more easy to control than a vigorous, militant membership demanding more results from the leadership. What was once fashionable to denounce in the CIO as a dirty Communist trick, "control by a minority by reducing the incentive of the ranks to attend meetings or participate," has become a blessing in disguise for routine-minded local union leaders. Especially is this true in an epoch of the check-off and union shop, which strengthen the union organizationally but tend to harden it bureaucratically.

Of course, these considerations merely touch the problem of union democracy. At best they are one-sided, for their other half deal with the relations of a local union to an international union in terms of "local autonomy," the influence of the international union over the locals, and the problem of a democratic life in the international union itself. At a time when conformity is viewed as an imperative necessity throughout the entire structure of the international unions, it hardly seems likely that the course of events on the lower level would be different.

Perhaps Professor Sayles and Researcher Strauss will devote themselves to a study in that direction. It could be invaluable.

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!

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

The standard biography

KARL MARX

by

Franz Mehring

\$3.50

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