

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

## THE SHAMEFUL SILENCE ON THE DJILAS CASE

... page 6

## HOLLYWOOD FALSIFICATIONS:

I—"ON THE WATERFRONT"

II—REHABILITATING BIG BUSINESS

... page 7

JANUARY 24, 1955

FIVE CENTS

## SPOT- LIGHT

### Trap

Something of a climax was reached in the gruesome farce called the Ladejinsky case when President Eisenhower — who had been freely credited with slapping down Secretary Benson and getting Ladejinsky his new job with the Foreign Operations Administration — told newsmen that the FOA had hired the man on its own responsibility. FOA head Harold Stassen would be responsible if the move turned out bad. He, Eisenhower, was keeping hands off. He saw nothing wrong with one department firing a man as a security risk and another department hiring the same man to save South Vietnam from the Stalinists. . . .

The Alice-in-Wonderland flavor of all this overlays another odor, with a slightly less pleasant smell. The liberals who are chortling over the (at least partial) victory in the Ladejinsky case have already been caught asking themselves in an undertone whether all this is not a prelude to a real disaster.

For Ladejinsky's assignment in South Vietnam is an assignment to desperation. It will take more than a liberal agricultural policy to stave off the pressure of the Stalinist north. Caught between the Ho Chi Minh regime and the continuing hold of French imperialism it will be an undeserved miracle for the Western bloc if this truncated country can be kept out of effective Stalinist control, or kept together. In any case, there is the ever-present danger of complete rout.

Who will be the goat? Ladejinsky may be walking into a trap — not necessarily one that anyone has set deliberately. He is like an officer who has been released from court-martial only in order to be sent to a suicidal part of the front.

In washing his hands of any responsibility, however grotesquely, Eisenhower is holding himself aloof from any catastrophic eventuality.

### Playing It Safe

The Ladejinsky case was the kind that the liberals are looking for nowadays, in order to relieve their pent-up fears about the police-state atmosphere. It was the kind they could use to give tongue

(Continued on page 3)

## Mission to Peiping Points Up Washington's Blind China Policy

By GORDON HASKELL

Dag Hammarskjold has returned from his mission to Peiping. The secretary general of the United Nations came back with a diplomatic pouch as empty as it was when he left to fly around the world to negotiate with a government whose existence is formally denied by the organization which he heads.

But though he was able to do nothing to release the Americans who have been imprisoned by the Chinese Stalinists on charges of espionage, what his mission did do was to underline again the impossible position in which the American government remains as a result of its policy in Asia.

The United States government is one of the two most powerful governments in the world. It has a vast military establishment at its disposal, including the most terrible weapons ever devised by man. It leads an alliance which stretches across the world, and its industrial and financial resources are such that almost every country outside of the Stalinist bloc is subject to its influence or pressure.

Nevertheless, this government is completely powerless to negotiate the freeing of eleven men whose release it has decided to make a major issue in world politics. Further than that, it is incapable of even proposing a line of action which

might rally to its support other governments who could put substantial pressure on the Chinese Stalinists to release the prisoners.

The failure of Hammarskjold's mission is of itself a matter of tenth-rate importance. But it once more places under a spotlight the conception of the world on which American policy is based, and the fact that this conception is not seriously challenged by any important or powerful group in American politics.

Actually, Hammarskjold's mission was a triumph for Stalinist policy. Not that the Stalinists were responsible for his trip. That was the result of American insistence that the United Nations do something about the American airmen imprisoned on charges of espionage.

The right wing of American politics headed by McCarthy and Knowland were howling for a blockade of the China coast. Eisenhower, and just about everyone to

the left of McCarthy in both parties, were clucking nervously and urging caution. To avoid the possibility of anything more irresponsible being done, the majority of governments in the United Nations voted to condemn the Chinese Stalinists for their action, and to ask the secretary general to use his good office ("unremittent efforts," the wording was) to obtain release of the prisoners.

### NOTHING TO OFFER

It is impossible to know whether the Stalinist leaders in Peiping had any clear idea of what might come of their public announcement of the conviction of the American fliers. But they must have rubbed their hands when they read that Hammarskjold himself was coming to "negotiate" the release of the prisoners.

Just what was actually discussed over the long table in Peiping is still unknown to the world. That is, the details have not been released. But the total result is clear enough: Instead of Hammarskjold putting pressure on the Stalinists, they have used him to put pressure on the American government to change the "mutual defense" pact just initiated with Chiang Kai-shek's government in Formosa, or at least to publicly interpret it in such a way as to render it fairly innocuous.

(Turn to last page)

## CP Is Down to a Shadow, but Still FBI Gets \$88 Million for More Snoops Per Subversive

By BERNARD CRAMER

Subversion has been smashed, stamped on, suppressed, squashed, shattered, and scuttled by the Smith Act and McCarran Act and the cooperative courts from the Supreme Court bench down, but the government is still yelling for more laws, more penalties, more prisons, and more FBI agents to take care of fewer and fewer subversives.

One layer after another of the Communist Party's leadership has been put into jail, which ought to make Democracy breathe easier now according to theory, but Attorney General Brownell has just called on Congress to double the maximum penalties for advocating sedition and similar sins.

The police-state club has been wielded for years now against all kinds of Stalinists, non-conformists and radicals, but the FBI now needs \$10 million more a year than it did before to uphold the tottering ramparts of the republic against overthrow by force and violence.

In the new budget, the FBI is allotted \$88 million for the 1956 fiscal year. Using the figure of 25,000 remaining members in the CP, this means \$3500 in order to police each one, taken individually.

That does not count the number of CP members who are already acting as FBI stoolpigeons, either at agents' salaries or on part-time pay or out of sheer uninhibited idealism.

The budget for the FBI also is in addition to the expenses for: the Immigration Bureau's snoop serv-

ices; army and navy Intelligence; the invaluable researches into passport applicants by the Passport Bureau of the State Department; the Central Intelligence Agency, which is not supposed to function inside the country but which (it is reported) doesn't always do what it is supposed to; and the various and sundry miscellaneous and unsorted loyalty boards, review boards, security boards, subversive control and disinfectant boards; plus the various agencies that are supposed to coordinate the work of all of these, plus the coming expense of the investigating committees and survey teams that will set out to coordinate the coordinators.

The budget message incidentally reveals that whereas the FBI has to groan along on a budget of only \$88 million, the whole federal court system will wallow in all of \$33 million. That is, these are the figures proposed by Eisenhower, though Congress is likely to chop down the money for the courts.

In asking for an increase in the penalties for sedition, Brownell complained that the Puerto Rican Nationalists who shot up Congress could be given only six years. On the strength of this horrible example, he implied that stiffer penalties are also necessary against (say) selling the Communist Manifesto. He called for 20 years.

Brownell perhaps expects congressmen and others whom he regards as weakminded to believe that, if not for the Smith Act and other witchhunt laws, shooting up Congress would not be a crime.

Brownell is also the man who once told an interviewer (from *U. S. News and World Report*) that the Communist Party has become more dangerous as its leaders are put in jail, because it has gone underground and is harder to find. The weaker the Stalinist movement becomes, the more demanding become the witchhunters for a bigger red-hunting apparatus. One might almost suspect it isn't the Stalinists they're after.

## LONDON LETTER

## A Little Man Challenges Monopoly

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 13—Illustrating an aspect of the creaking of capitalism is the case of Mr. Horace Mendelsohn, car accessory dealer of Stockport, Cheshire.

In the middle of last year, Mr. Mendelsohn decided that he could sell his tires, batteries and other accessories at one-quarter to one-third less than the list prices. He openly and publicly did this, and his business went on quite well, until one day last November, he was invited to appear before an illegal "court" of the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders, of which body he was not a member.

At the hearing at which he was not allowed to be legally represented, the charges of undercutting his rivals were made. He admitted selling cheaper, but said that he thought the 50 per cent profits made on some articles were excessive, that his price cuts were made publicly, and that anyhow he was not a member of the society.

This rather infuriated the old boys of the "ad hoc" court, who found him guilty. He was then put on the "stop list" which forbids manufacturers of his stock to sell to him.

The astute Mr. Mendelsohn then communicated with the press. He told them how an investigator of the society had, as an "agent provocateur," bought a tire from him. He told the press of the secret court and the ruling.

Of course the society did not like the world to know that it uses ex-policemen to track down people—not members—who try to give a square deal to the public. It maintained that very many precedents had established the legality of the fixing of retail prices by manufacturers; but, said Mr. Mendelsohn, no such pricing appeared on the articles.

In the next round the persistent man from Cheshire appealed to the Monopolies Commission, which said it would investigate the matter.

Meanwhile, he intends to go on selling at the low prices; the publicity he has received from his stand has done his business the power of good. The society's investigators are busy trying to find out who supplies Mr. Mendelsohn in order to put them on the "stop list" as well.

The issue has had repercussions. The Conservatives have always said, somewhat hypocritically, that they dislike monopolies. However, their candidate for the bye-election at Twickenham, Middlesex, is a director of the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders.

The Labor candidate has challenged this monopolist to a debate, in which the latter will have the uncomfortable task of proving his monopoly is not a monopoly, or embarrassing his party.

As Marxists we know that reaction in politics is in continuum with reaction in religion. Twenty-seven years ago the powerful British Broadcasting Corporation was given authority to diffuse pro-

grams on religion, politics and economics, subject to the discretion of the Director General.

Last week, an assistant lecturer of psychology at Aberdeen University started the first of three well-thought-out, quietly spoken talks on "Morals Without Religion." Mrs. Knight described herself as "an unbeliever."

In her first talk, she said that orthodox Christianity was no longer intellectually tenable, and that it was time that parents and teachers evolved more healthy educational methods.

Needles to say, the next day there was a flood of abuse, particularly from the extreme reactionary *Daily Telegraph*. Most of the papers, however, did not have the courage to deal with the subject editorially, but just slanted the reports maliciously.

They hoped thereby to embarrass the BBC into not finishing the series of three. However, this sometimes heroic body allowed her to give the second talk in which she said, among other things:

"We can tell children that some people now don't think there is really a God—any more than there is really a Santa Claus."

"Children should read and listen to the New Testament stories as they do to the stories of Greek mythology."

"We don't now believe that he [Christ] was the son of God and of a virgin, or that he rose from the dead."

"All I urge is that he [the child] should hear them treated frankly as legends."

"I don't want to pull down Chartres [Cathedral] any more than I want to pull down the Parthenon. But I should like to see them treated at a different level."

Needless to say, the ecclesiastical pundits as well as the newspapers lambasted Mrs. Knight. The Bishop of Coventry called her "bossy and complacent." All the newspapers gave headline prominence to a protest of a council (of less than 10) officials of a small church in London.

However, the BBC admitted that of the large volumes of letters there were as many for Mrs. Knight as against her. The protests will assure her of a large audience for her third and last broadcast next week.

## BOLIVIA

## 'Imitation Revolution' in a Blind Alley

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Jan. 6—Although the Bolivian "Workers Congress" [reported on in Jan. 10 issue] acted as an instrument of the government, an instrument of the petty-bourgeois Nationalists' control over the working masses, the congress was still obliged to speak in "workers' language" and to work out an ideological platform in order to answer the "left" critics of the POR (Trotskyists) and the CP.

Thus the Bolivian revolution was defined as a "peoples revolution," neither a bourgeois nor a socialist revolution. In this way the Nationalist workers' bureaucracy, led by Lechin, tried to evade the political problem of the hour and to deceive the workers with phraseology. They want to convey that the workers should not bother their heads about the character of the revolution, nor demand a socialist program, because the revolution is going forward under the leadership of the revolutionary government.

According to this ideology, this government is a revolutionary "democratic dictatorship" of three classes: the middle class, the peasants and the workers; since the revolution is a "people's" revolution, in general, there is no place for a workers' and peasants' government, but only for a "democratic dictatorship" of the three classes.

It is very characteristic that Lenin's old slogan of "democratic dictatorship," which was passed over in the Russian Revolution, is now used by the Stalinists as well as every other restorationist tendency, as a weapon against the revolutionary aspirations of the proletariat. The concept of a "people's revolution" was very well known in Russia, to be sure, to the Narodniks as well as to Plekhanov. It was just a synonym for the bourgeois-democratic revolution, in Russia, as in Bolivia. The difference is: in Russia there was a genuine democratic revolution, which was passed through in the first stage of the socialist revolution,

THEY WANT TO KNOW HOW  
FBI INFORMERS ARE MADE...UAW Resolution Denounces  
Witchhunt in Lupa Case

DETROIT, Jan. 11—The UAW-CIO International Executive Board this week called upon Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson and Secretary of the Army Robert Stevens to review the security proceedings against John Lupa and restore him to his job at the Detroit Arsenal with full back pay.

Lupa was suspended from his job on security grounds last summer and was finally discharged after a decision of an army hearing board, finding him innocent, had been reversed, without a further hearing, by the Army Review Board.

"The proceedings against Lupa are a frightening demonstration of the peril confronting every worker engaged in the production of defense items," the UAW board's resolution declared.

The resolution also called for the Armed Services and Judiciary Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate "to make a searching examination of the security systems as administered in all departments of the government to the end of recommending legislation designed to avoid the stupidities, injustices and cruelties that are so manifest in the proceedings against John Lupa..."

## EMBARRASSING QUESTIONS

Six "grave questions" about the case are raised in the UAW resolution.

"(1) . . . That the specific charges against Lupa, even if true, should outweigh, in his case at least, a record of over 12 years voluntary service in our Armed Forces, including voluntary service for two years in the anti-Communist war in Korea, is in itself a grave indictment of the intelligence, fairness and good judgment of the persons administering the security system of the army.

"(2) To what extent is the FBI recruiting informers among persons immediately threatened with economic and social ruin by being charged as security risks, on the

implied or actual promise of immunity and protection? How much reliance can be placed on the testimony of informers operating under such life-time pressures? To what extent are workers and other citizens exposed to private vendetta by the anonymous testimony of people of such character and in such circumstances?

"(3) Why is so much weight attached to isolated incidents, even of a character which might be suspicious if occurring today, but which in fact occurred years ago and under radically different circumstances and no weight or importance attached to the positive and overwhelming evidence that the accused is at the present time beyond any suspicion of doubtful attitudes, associations or conduct?

"(4) Why is the accused denied at his so-called 'hearing' every element of due process except the single right to produce voluntary witnesses?

## HIT INFORMER SYSTEM

"(5) Why does there appear to be no differentiation between cases or particular charges in respect to the actual production for cross-examination of the witnesses supporting the charges? Is every informant on every item charged against every alleged security risk, a confidential agent of the government? Does the system positively encourage malicious and false reports by extending an unwarranted and universal guarantee of privacy?

"(6) Why do the security procedures provide that the decision of the Hearing Board which examined the accused and heard the witnesses and has full access to the confidential file of the government is not communicated to the accused before it is 'reviewed' by a Review Board? Why do the procedures permit the Review Board, without further hearings, without notice to the accused, and even without opportunity for oral argument, to set aside a finding of the Hearing Board in favor of the accused?"

but in Bolivia there has been only an imitation of revolution.

[It can also be added that to Lenin, the slogan meant a workers' and peasants' government, precisely what Lechin rejects.—Ed.]

In reality the government of Paz Estenssoro in Bolivia is not a "revolutionary democratic dictatorship" of three classes but only the Nationalist bourgeoisie's dictatorship over the workers. And the "Workers Congress" was also an instrument of this bourgeois dictatorship—the dyke erected to hold the wave of the workers' movement within the capitalist limits of the National regime.

## WORKERS DOWNCAST

There was no more talk at the "Workers Congress" that the Paz government was a "workers' and peasants' government," as used to be true; such empty talk was no longer necessary; the slogan was no longer needed, because the workers' movement is on the decline. The organ of the POR writes that "the workers are sitting with downcast heads, they are silent, they make no criticisms, because they are waiting for the bureaucrats' offensive to pass over." (*Masses*, December.) Only a new offensive by the masses could raise the initiative of the revolutionary workers.

The "Workers Congress" was prepared by the bureaucrats, and its composition was selected so carefully that even G. Lora of the POR, who writes for the Nationalist regime, was excluded from the congress as a danger in discussion. At this "Workers Congress" not one word was said about workers' wages, which have gone down, in order not to embarrass the government with any new problems.

Although Lechin controlled the majority, the general nationalist sentiment of the Lechin caucus could not eliminate the voice of the POR and of the CP. Its criticism of Stalinism was transformed into an offensive against the totalitarian methods of the Russian bureaucracy and

a severe attack on Stalinist policy generally, as we have already reported. The international policy of the congress defined the position of the Bolivian workers as opposed to the two imperialist blocs, for socialist peace and victory.

On the one hand, the congress was a big defeat for Stalinism and Stalinist policy among the masses; on the other, the congress was a sounding board for Lechin's caucus in the fight against the Nationalist right wing, but here Lechin was on the defensive, not on the offensive, because he organized the congress at a time of his decline, not of his victory.

If he wishes to organize an offensive against the Nationalist right wing, then he will have to go it together with other genuinely left forces and parties, form a united front of the masses and make a determined criticism of the regime. But he is incapable of doing this, for he would have to begin with a criticism of his own policies, while the pressure of the mass movement has receded.

As far as Paz Estenssoro is concerned the "revolution is over and now the period of construction begins." This sums up the situation. The farce of the Nationalist imitation of a social revolution is over and now the period of bourgeois restoration begins. The Nationalist Party will itself be the bearer of this restoration and the hangman of the workers' movement, which conquered power for it.

## There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—  
Subscribe now!

## RR Strike Is Off

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 13—Very suddenly but not unexpectedly, the long-heralded strike of the railwaymen was called off last Thursday, three days before it was due to begin.

A meeting of the cabinet decided that the government could not afford a national strike. It recommended superannuated General Sir Brian Robertson, head of the Transport Commission, to start talks on wages at once.

The Executive of the National Union of Railwaymen agreed to call off the strike if the basis for discussion were to be the commission's promise to meet the full 15 per cent wage increase, and on condition that there would be "no quibbling."

The cabinet found it easy to tell the commission to accept the claim, which will cost about \$25,000,000 a year, but it did not say where the money was to come from. The worthy general said that, as the cabinet had made the decision to increase the wages, it would have to find the money.

He did not like, and he thought that the Railway Nationalization Act of 1947 did not intend, that the taxpayers should subsidize the industry, he said. So he has passed the buck back to Churchill.

It is extraordinarily unlikely that the dividends on government bonds paid to former owners in "compensation" will be decreased, so the public awaits the increase in railway tariffs.

# Brutality in Kenya By British Military Is Still Going On

By BERNARD DIX

LONDON, Jan. 11—For 27 months a "state of emergency," as it is politely called, has existed in the British colony of Kenya. Practically every day of these 27 months has brought fresh stories to London of the brutality and bloodshed which reigns in the colony.

Latest available figures show that no less than 765 Africans have been hanged in Kenya in just over two years—476 of these taking place within the last six months of the period. The crimes alleged to have been committed by those executed vary widely in character, as the following record shows: 248 were executed for murder; 290 for "unlawful possession of arms"; 163 for "consorting with terrorists"; 8 for "acting with intent to further terrorism"; 45 for "administering unlawful oaths"; 2 for "procuring supplies for terrorists."

In addition to these executions 6,741 Africans have been killed by "Security Forces," 17,629 are in prison and 47,562 are in detention camps. The cost of these activities is around 1,000 pounds a month and employs some 35,000 British and African forces.

The most recent story of Kenya at present figuring in the British press concerns allegations made by Sir Henry Dalrymple-White, a district officer and farmer in Kenya, that two European officers of the Kenya Police beat him up because he reported one of them for kicking an African prisoner in the face. These charges were made by Sir Henry when giving evidence in a trial which is at present taking place in Kenya where the two officers, an inspector and chief inspector, are charged with assaulting Sir Henry at a Home Guard post.

## ATROCITY TRIAL

According to the press Sir Henry reported to his divisional officer that he had seen one of the police officers kick an African and that the other officer had threatened to take the African outside and shoot him. When they learned of this report, Sir Henry alleges, the two officers came to his hut during the night and beat him up; he stated that during the fight one of the officers struck him about the face and head with an empty beer bottle and as a consequence he received deep cuts in the face and a scalp wound which required 15 stitches to close it.

This is the second occasion within a few weeks that the British press has carried reports of Europeans being tried in Kenya. The previous case, early in December, concerned the court-martial of a British soldier in the Kenya Regiment who was charged with three offenses against a Kikuyu woman named Wambui. The charges were: causing grievous bodily harm with intent to maim or disable, indecent assault, and disgraceful conduct of a cruel kind.

The prosecution in the case alleged that the soldier had struck Wambui, who had been taken to a police post for questioning, and had sent an African for a beer bottle with which he later indecently assaulted her. It was further alleged that Wambui's feet had been attached to the floor and her ears, which had been pierced in accordance with tribal custom, had been attached to the

wall; finally, it was alleged by the prosecution, Wambui had been lowered into a pit and told that she was to be buried alive.

The accused admitted that he had used threats of violence against prisoners when questioning them, but added: "I never had any intention of putting my threats into effect—it was only a method of frightening the prisoners into giving information." He further admitted that a string had been passed through the tribal holes in Wambui's ears and that he had threatened several times to pull the string if she refused to give him information.

The defense argued that the allegations against the soldier were a "Mau Mau conspiracy" and that the evidence against him was based "almost entirely on the evidence of Mau Mau criminals."

After three hours deliberation the court announced that the accused was not guilty of any of the three charges brought against him and he was acquitted.

## IMPERFECT POLICE

Interest in Kenya is further aroused by a report published today by Justice Hugh Holmes, a Kenya Supreme Court judge, in conjunction with Colonel Young, former police commissioner in Kenya.

Colonel Young recently resigned his post after differences with the government concerning the status of the police in the colony. These arose when last August the East African Appeal Court quashed convictions against four Kikuyu for murdering their employer. In quashing the convictions the Appeal Court made certain criticisms of police methods and said: "We think it deplorable that the authorities concerned should tolerate as a general practice anything so obviously unlawful." The present report of Justice Holmes and Colonel Young is intended to answer these criticisms.

The report admits certain failures by the police in that too long was taken in reporting the facts of the investigation to the attorney general; that the four Africans were not cautioned before interrogation; that the interrogation was too persistent; and that no proper records were kept. The report states, however, that it can find no justification for the belief expressed by the Appeal Court that the Kenya police was tending to become "a law unto itself." Colonel Young adds: "No police are perfect but I am certain that the police in Kenya are doing their best in circumstances that can only be appreciated by personal experience."

## EXPLOITATION IS THE BASIS

Behind all the bloodshed and brutality the background of economic and social conditions which gave rise to the present situation remains unchanged; the five-and-a-quarter million Africans, who comprise 97 per cent of Kenya's population, live in an atmosphere of misery and squalor. They are denied political rights and have little access to educational facilities. They have six representatives to the Legislative Council who are nominated by the governor—they have no elected representatives.

The Asiatics, numbering 90,528, have six elected representatives. The 24,174 Arabs have one elected and one nominated representative. The 29,660 Europeans have 14 elected representatives. Constitutional "reforms" introduced in April last year provide for two Asians and one African to be appointed as ministers and one Arab and two Africans to be appointed to the Executive Council.

Last year Oliver Lyttelton, then colonial secretary, gave figures showing that the amount spent in 1953 (after deducting fees payable) on primary education of a European child in Kenya amounted to £34. 6s plus £12. 6s. for board. The sum spent on the primary education of an African child was £2. 5s. These startling figures are a reflection of the per capita incomes of £5. 18. 0. for Africans and £205. 14. 0. per year for non-Africans, as shown in a United Nations publication in 1953.

While these conditions remain there can be no end to the "state of emergency" in Kenya and the British press will continue to print horrifying reports which may yet stir the British Labor movement to determined action.

# SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

to all their apprehensions . . . safely.

For it was not really any civil liberties issue that they made of the Ladejinsky case. It was their present-day ersatz for civil liberties issues—the case of mistaken identity.

It is "safe" to denounce the excesses and mistakes of the security program which implicate innocent men. It is "safe" to protect from the witchhunt men who are not political dissenters but who have only been mistakenly or maliciously attacked as such. Even the American Legion has gone in for this kind of civil liberties issue.

We do not at all wish to derogate the useful and necessary efforts of liberals and others who defend, and have to defend, men from slanders. It is a good thing, for example, that the CIO has joined in the Peters case defense. And when non-Stalinists or anti-Stalinists are persecuted, it is right and proper to point out the facts.

What is typical of the times, however, is that insensibly the concentration of even the better liberal voices has been in the direction of speaking up only on cases of mistaken identity. The effect is to cede the whole real field of civil liberties to the witchhunt.

Here's a picture, to put it metaphorically: The witchhunt is a wave that has lapped further and further up the shore of democratic institutions in this country. Every time the wave reaches new and untouched ground, there are still good liberals who set up a hue and cry; but as the dark waters of the purge system sink in deeper and deeper, the ground that they claim is given up for good, and nothing more is heard, until a new and extreme point is reached still further up on the shore. . . .

Thus there has been little outcry when the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the McCarran Act and the registration of the CP. Name the last liberal protest you've read against any witchhunting measure taken against real Stalinists, not just somebody mistakenly accused of being a Stalinist!

The liberals, even the better liberals, understandably but not wisely, have been beaten down to the point where what they are attacking, most of the time, is not the anti-democracy and police-state climate of the times, but rather they are attacking the more stupid and irresponsible of the government's acts. The legitimacy of the witchhunt begins to be taken for granted. The stupid and irresponsible can never be so accepted, not even in a totalitarian police-state.

Thus, it is stupid and irresponsible for a competent anti-Communist official like Ladejinsky to be pilloried and discredited by ignorant fools hired by Benson. But when it is accidentally revealed that the Post Office put a "mail cover" on a senator, no one particularly is appalled.

This relatively mild form of government espionage, it turns out, was invoked against Senator McCarthy. It seems to be an open secret that it is a habitual practice of the Post Office with regard to private citizens. The fact that McCarthy is himself a witchhunter has nothing to do with the question, of course.

## Symbol

The main interest of the travel restrictions which Washington has imposed on Russian citizens is symbolic. The restrictions themselves make no sense. They are not supposed to make sense.

The symbol is clear. In order to fight the enemy totalitarianism we will adopt their methods.

The symbol is that the U. S. thus concedes that these methods are worth imitating, and worse, that it has no better methods with which to fight.

As someone has pointed out, a country which had confidence in the fighting power of democracy, as the U. S. claims to do, would rather take special steps to bring flocks and herds and hordes of Russians on trips to this country to show them the world. If it wished to take the offensive on this question, it would hurl proposition after proposition at Moscow to bring its citizens, students, workers, officials over here on trips in order to see that wonderful capitalist system for

themselves. In contrast, the restrictions imposed on foreigners within Russia would be a discredit. This would have something to do with the much-talked-about "battle for men's minds."

But the consistent framework of U. S. thinking is to put no trust in any kind of political offensive, even the mildest kind. On the big arena of international politics, the U. S. foreign policy is to brandish the power of the H-bomb. On this little arena, it is to give up every bit of political credit by answering Russia's totalitarian measures with American-made imitations—imitations which cannot even do for the U. S. what the originals can do for Russia.

## Bright Spot

The second Youngdahl decision in the Lattimore case gives a splash of different color to the national scene. As in his first, Judge Youngdahl has thrown out the government's indictment on grounds of vagueness. He argued that the charge "following the Communist line" could not be given any specific and definite content for purposes of decision by a jury.

The significance of the whole case has nothing to do, of course, with what one may think of Lattimore's political, past or present. It mainly clusters around the consequences of making a crime out of "following the Communist line." This goes somewhat beyond even making a crime out of belonging to the Communist Party!

We can go further, to illustrate a not unimportant point, and say that the case is quite independent of whether one does or does not think that Lattimore really did follow the CP line for a whole period. It is one thing to say this as a political judgment, a political estimate. It is another thing to try to make it a legal category, with penalties attached, through the device of trial for perjury.

One of the outstanding features of the Youngdahl decision is his reference to the climate of the times:

"With so sweeping an indictment with its many vague charges, and with the existing atmosphere of assumed and expected loathing for communism, it would be neither surprising nor unreasonable were the jury subconsciously impelled to substitute its own understanding for that of the defendant."

It stands in welcome contrast to decisions of the Supreme Court majority (for example, Vinson on the Smith Act) and even of Judge Learned Hand (on the Feinberg Law) in which reference was also made to current history—in these cases, to the cold war and the international Stalinist danger as a justification for the witchhunt.

## Tic-Tack-Tactic

When the Democratic Party liberal caucus met and decided, under the leadership of Humphrey and Morse and against the pressure of Lehman, to do nothing about an anti-filibuster rule at this session of Congress, liberals were scandalized.

No doubt so were the CIO's braintrusts. But would they let on? Not they. They gritted their teeth, set their faces in a rubbery grin, and wrote the following in the CIO News (Jan. 10), muttering under their breath at the hardships of earning an honest living in the pursuit of what is called labor journalism:

"Senate liberals took a new tack when Congress convened last week, and for the first time in several years failed to propose a curb on filibusters."

"In a last-minute decision, based on party unity desires, Democratic liberals decided not to press for an anti-filibuster amendment. . . ."

"Nevertheless, Sen. Humphrey (D., Minn.) and other lawmakers indicated they will press later in the session for enactment of civil rights legislation. . . ."

One might almost think Humphrey was the hero of the occasion. Lehman apparently wasn't around. It was just a tack they took. A disgruntled person might say that they can take this tack and sit on it.

The headline, written in the spirit of the occasion, was: "Senate Liberals Shift Tactics, Drop Fight on Filibusters." The potentialities of this approach are immense. For example: "Reuther Shifts Tactics, Comes Out for Lower Wages" or "CIO Adopts Tactics of Supporting Eisenhower to Ensure Defeat of Republicans"—things like that. We're sure the fellows on the CIO News could hammer this line out and nail it down with a tack or two.

**Have You Read  
Labor Action's  
Pamphlet-Issues?**

**No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.**

**No. 2—Independent Socialism and War.**

**No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis.**

**No. 4—Socialism and Democracy.**

**No. 5—What Is Stalinism?**

10 cents each

# YOU and SCIENCE

## SOME OF THE YEAR'S ADVANCES IN SCIENCE

By CARL DARTON

The past year contributed its normal share of important advances in science and technology. Among the most notable can be listed the conversion of atomic energy directly into electricity as well as the innovation of solar batteries for the same purpose; the fuller understanding of the photosynthesis process whereby solar energy is converted to plant energy; the use of radioactive tritium to trace the age of water in rain and elsewhere; and the successful use of the international language Interlingua in scientific journals.

Many more developments could be listed illustrating man's unending progress in securing control over his material environment. We cannot become as enthusiastic when we consider the past year relative to the social aspects of science.

First of all, scientists in and out of the government continue to be harassed by the federal "security" program. Though the Oppenheimer case was the most sensational it was but one of many instances where scientists' rights were ignored and their opportunity to practise their profession jeopardized.

At the year's end Dr. E. C. Condon, former Bureau of Standards director, resigned from his post as director of research at Corning Glass from frustration over repeated accusations and suspension of his security clearance. While he was able to retire to private research and on a retainer from Corning, other less known scientific and technical workers faced a less favorable economic future from forced suspension.

Favorable for the future was the manner in which the Engineers Association, a trade union affiliated with the Engineers and Scientists of America, successfully fought for the reinstatement of an Arma

engineer who had been suspended without hearing or pay for security purposes. The continued growth of the Engineers and Scientists in 1954 to a total membership of 40,000 within two years of its founding is a hopeful sign. It looks now as if the engineers and scientists can put some teeth into their struggle for security rights.

Likewise at the year's end the American Association for the Advancement of Science at its yearly meetings in California took a strong position against government's restrictions on science with its secrecy and security programs.

Even more disturbing as to the adverse social effects of science was the danger to human beings of radioactive fall-out from atomic weapon tests; not only to those in immediate proximity to the test area, as were the Japanese fishermen, but to all of us and our children throughout the world as the result of radioactive buildup from repeated tests. The government still has given inadequate answers to the fears of scientists for the future of mankind from adverse radioactive-induced genetical changes.

Almost as foreboding for the worker in 1954 was the continued growth of automation, the trend toward automatic factories and the specter of increased unemployment. The automobile industry in 1954 more than ever retooled on the basis of automation. This rightly received the attention of the CIO which sought for its members their share of the machine-increased productivity through the demand for the guaranteed annual wage.

The year ahead will see further advances in science but the social effects of its use and misuse will continue to be of ever greater significance. Unfortunately, not until the political tide changes in favor of the worker and the scientist will science and technology find their rightful social application.

To the Editor:

Hearty congratulations for your story, "The Attack on the American Indians," in the Jan. 10 issue. Unfortunately, the American radical movement pays little attention to the problems of the native population. With the exception of your recent article and one other you carried some years ago, it is only in the *Industrial Worker* and the *Catholic Worker* that these problems have been occasionally aired. Our radicals usually know more about the Kalmuks of Asia and the Bantu of Africa than they do about the Iroquois or the Menominee at their back door. Nor do they seem anxious to learn. At a recent summer camp held by a socialist youth organization I was asked to speak, but when I at first suggested a talk on the American Indian today, I received the kind of look I might receive if I had proposed to orate on cosmic rays or lunar craters.

Possibly the reason for this might be that we are afflicted with the disease of quantityitis: since the Indians number less than a half million we turn our attention to the Negroes who are thirty times as numerous. Also, the Indians for the most part are less visible, being usually situated remote from the centers of radical activity. There is certainly no dearth of information on Indian problems, and there are numerous Indian and bi-racial organizations with which the left should keep in touch. The strongest and most intelligent of these is the National Congress of American Indians.

There are some aspects of Indian problems not mentioned in your article which I should like to discuss.

### NO FREE CHOICE

First is the destructive program called "voluntary relocation" which was first initiated two years ago. The government encourages rural Indians to move to the cities. It will give them a one-way train ticket and three weeks sustenance in order to switch to a way of life completely foreign to them. In that short space of time, they are expected to acquire a job, a place to live, and settle down to the white man's grasping, competitive, acquisitive way of life.

Their traditions and values, however, are more often those derived from a cooperative, communal life in a rural environment. At least half of them can't take it and go back home. Family and tribal ties are important to the Indian; he does not always fare well when torn from them.

The government claims it is only trying to open doors for the Indian, and to offer an alternative to the poverty of reservation life. His free choice should be preserved, according to Indian Commissioner Glenn Emmons. But there is no free choice at all when the government will do nothing to help make a decent life possible for those who would prefer to remain on their tribal domain.

Thomas Segundo, chairman of the Papago tribal council and lately a student at the University of Chicago, declared in a radio discussion: "In spite of our years of efforts to get a development approval by Congress, we were somewhat forced to accept the relocation program in place of the development program which I think is a way of relieving the burden, but perhaps not the first choice of the Papago tribe."

Much of the Indian land could be made productive by means of irrigation. Education and health services would make life better, yet progress in these fields is constantly stymied by niggardly appropriations.

The reasons for the government policy are not hard to find. D'Arcy McNickle, a Flathead, author of *They Came Here First*, points to the large number of Indian claims pending before the Indian Claims Commission for treaty violations, land steals, and the like which took place in the past.

"That may explain why in Congress at the present time," he states, "there is such indecent haste about liquidating Indian tribes, who, so long as they remain intact, are potential plaintiffs."

The Wheeler-Howard Act of 1934, which was a "New Deal" for many Indians, and the first real reversal of the

labor and pro-labor organizations. Then we'll be able to make the branch into an organization that represents the basic interests of all the working people of Brooklyn."

Richard STARK

## Washington on Warpath Against Indian Rights

previous policy of extermination or liquidation, is now being cut to pieces piecemeal by current legislation. The enemies of this act, McNickle has written, "are the aggressively superior white men who would have no native people anywhere in the world, except as almsmen paying for their bread by praising their masters."

Another motive for the current campaign, in the view of former Indian Commissioner John Collier, is the desire of avaricious profit-seekers to get their hands on Indian timber, mineral, and grazing land. From the time of the Dawes Land Allotment Act of 1887 until 1934, about 100,000,000 acres of land passed out of Indian hands and 100,000 Indians became landless. This process was arrested in 1934, but the present administration is trying to set it in motion again.

Removal of federal trusteeship is one of the most ominous steps in this direction, and has already been accomplished for several tribes in the past two years, over the protests of most of them. Despite the opposition of the Indians, Eisenhower has signed a bill to transfer the Indian Health Service from the Indian Bureau to the U. S. Public Health Service. Indians believe this will result in the closing of smaller Indian hospitals. (The acquisition of the merchant marine hospitals by the USPHS resulted in the closing of several of those.)

In 1953 Public Law 280 authorized any state to assume criminal and civil jurisdiction over Indians within its borders without further action by the federal government. A move to transfer agricultural extension work from the Indian Service to the Department of Agriculture was finally defeated due to Indian opposition, but it may be revived again. Meanwhile, relocation continues, and so does the elimination of federal trusteeship from tribes, one by one.

### FOR SURVIVAL

Much of this is glorified in such organs as the *Readers Digest* as measures to "emancipate" the Indian and place him on an equal footing with whites. Most Indians rightly consider this utter nonsense. The NCAI rightly proclaims: "The phrases can mean only one thing to Indians—taxing of trust lands. Other than exemption from these taxes, we are legally in the same status as all other citizens."

Preserving the functions of the Indian Bureau and opposition to their transfer to other agencies or to the states is of course no panacea. It is only the lesser evil, but it is better than subjecting the Indians to the tender mercies of state governments in such states as Arizona and New Mexico, for instance, which legislate against further acquisition of land by Indians, whose population is growing (the Navaho number 80,000), and which bar Indians from schools and social services.

The answer to Indian problems is not a forced merger with white society. Indians are of course free, and have been for some sixty years or more, to leave the reservations. But those who desire to remain there and preserve "a way of life that works" should not be starved and browbeaten into urban slums.

The Wheeler-Howard Act pointed the right way. Tribal governments were recognized and empowered to borrow money for development; revolving loan funds were set up; individual land allotments, which led to eventual alienation to whites, and which divided the communal land into tiny and uneconomic units, were stopped. The Arts and Crafts Board revived declining Indian crafts and turned these to economic gain for the Indians.

The cooperative Indian societies have important lessons to teach our money-grubbing whites. Most of all, as John Collier has pointed out, they preserve a respect for human personality and basic values which the white world has long lost. It is important that they survive somewhere.

Victor HOWARD

### 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.

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

To the Editor:

On Thursday, January 6, the first election in 9 years for officers of the Brooklyn NAACP was held at Holy Rosary School Auditorium, Brooklyn. It was more than just an election, however, because it represented a climax of a year-long struggle for the control of the branch between liberal pro-labor elements on the one hand, and conservative less liberal forces on the other.

The liberals supported Warren Bunn, CIO organizer for Gas, Coke and Chemical Workers Union, for president; and the Rev. O. D. Dempsey, youth leader, for vice-president. Conservative interests backed Norman Johnson, lawyer, and alleged Republican Party errand boy, for president, and Judge Myles Paige for vice-president.

Johnson also had the support of the Pioneer Civic Association, of which he is a member. The "Pioneers" have insinuated themselves into Brooklyn politics during the last 5 years and have lately become consistent supporters of Republican Party candidates in local elections. During the presidential elections of '52 Pioneer petitions favoring Republican candidates in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area were prominently displayed at the branch. The retiring president, James Powers, also an active member of the

Pioneers, vigorously supported Johnson and his slate.

Despite an alliance of young adults and older liberal members in support of Bunn, Johnson's supporters were able to squeeze through a majority of 26 votes to take all elective offices and most of the Executive Board seats. They were successful only because they managed to corral 45 new members just 5 weeks before the election date, and because many of the old members, disgusted with the tactics and policies of the old leadership, simply did not come out to vote. (The vote went: Bunn 55, Johnson 81.)

Johnson was more than anxious to grab the office of president of the largest NAACP branch in New York, a position that carries considerable prestige and influence in the area. Up to the last day, almost, he and his supporters scurried feverishly around town to get their "new" members out. Almost a dozen lawyers, assistant DAs and detectives hustled themselves inside the hall with their membership cards. Members of Johnson's family, including in-laws, were pressed into service to assure the "people's choice" his majority.

That Bunn had the solid support of proletarian and white-collar liberal elements of the branch was indisputable. The only trouble was that they were outnumbered by the "new" members.

In spite of their election defeat Bunn's supporters were optimistic about the future of the branch. Their attitude was summed up by a spokesman for the liberal wing:

"After all, these people (who supported Johnson) came out only because they had a personal interest in seeing him elected. They have no principled interest in advancing the program of the branch, and less than fifty per cent of his supporters will ever be seen at membership meetings—where organizational policy and program are made and voted upon. We controlled the Nominating Committee (which selected Bunn to run) and the Elections Committee (which drew up the ballot) precisely because our people attended membership meetings consistently and in large numbers.

"Johnson and Powers (the former president) may control the Executive Board but if they don't bring those 26 votes to meetings every first and third Thursday in each month, we'll run them right back across the street to the Pioneer Club. What we have to do now is recruit more members from the ranks of organized



## LABOR ACTION

January 24, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 4

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## ACADEMIC FREEDOM on the HOME FRONT

We are indebted to the Reading Labor Advocate of January 14 for the information contained in the following items from the academic freedom and civil liberties front.

High school students in Payette, Idaho, the home town of McCarthyite Senator Herman Welker, voted to substitute the word "colleagues" for "comrades" in their school song.

"We do not want the school song to imply that any student or friend of Payette High School is a Communist," the student petition asking for the change declared. "We hope to avoid investigation by the Congress of the United States."

Muhlenberg College of Allentown, Pennsylvania has been conducting a cultural series on the development of the motion pictures. Several years ago this would have been innocent enough. But given the more advanced stages of the witchhunt, presenting the history of the film is not without its attendant difficulties, should one want to present the history of the film as it actually happened and therefore include some Chaplin films in the repertory. After all isn't or wasn't Chaplin a . . .

The Allentown Post of the American Legion pointed to Chaplin's "anti-American record of recent years" and formally protested the inclusion of one of the comedian's early films in the series. The college quickly withdrew the film. Later, after protest by the American Committee for Cultural Freedom and others, it decided to "permit" the viewing of the film in a special private showing. This "victory" will undoubtedly be hailed in some quarters.

We are moved to wonder, however, if henceforth Chaplin movies are to be shown under the heading of "The Secret, Hitherto Unrevealed History of the Film."

### CHICAGO PUBLIC MEETING

The Chicago YSL presents

### FENNER BROCKWAY

British left-wing Labor MP; founder, Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism; writer for London Tribune

on

### DISSENT FROM THE COLD WAR: GROWTH OF A THIRD CAMP

Chairman: KERMIT EBY

Wednesday, Feb. 2 — 8 p.m.

JUDD HALL

5835 South Kimbark

# Young Workers Leading Fight In Germany Against Rearmament

By SHANE

Now that the U. S. State Department has succeeded in extorting from the French National Assembly its ratification of the London and Paris agreements for the rearmament of West Germany, our ruling class and its kept press jubilantly assure us that the last serious obstacle separating it from its precious 12 (to start with) German divisions has been overcome. And certainly, from the superficial viewpoint, this claim appears highly justified. No one has more than the faintest hope that the final acts of ratification in France, Germany, Italy, and the U. S. will be prevented.

Indeed, if the only problems confronting the American military planners were parliamentary in nature, a German army, with all its attendant disasters, would be assured.

One major factor has been left out of this picture: the militant opposition to rearmament by West German labor. And among the most vigorous and determined foes of rearmament has been German youth, led by the working-class youth movement.

The force and solidity of this movement were amply shown by the recent convention of the Trade Union Youth, where delegates representing 700,000 members adopted a resolution opposing German rearmament without a single dissenting vote. This action was one of the major pressures which forced the Frankfurt congress of the West German trade unions finally to take a position categorically opposed to rearmament.

The main center of youth activity against rearmament during the last two months of 1954 has been the state of Bavaria, where the Social-Democratic Party scored sizable gains in the recent state elections. When the minister of defense of the Bonn government, Theodor Blank, made a series of campaign-speeches during the pre-election period, he was repeatedly singled out as the target for "wild demonstrations" against rearmament, and on one occasion was physically beaten.

### THIRD CAMP SLOGANS

The trade-union youth movement followed up with an impressive series of demonstrations against rearmament. To quote an eyewitness account in *France-Observateur* of December 16:

"On November 19 last, five lorries, a sound truck, and 100 bicyclists carrying placards and leaflets made a procession through the streets of Munich and Augsburg. A large panel showed a grandfather in the kaiser's uniform, the father in that of Hitler, and the grandson in mufti, declaring 'I want to stay a civilian.'

"One could read on a leaflet 'We want to defend neither the millions of Mr. Pferdemenges nor the State Mansion of Mr. Pieck.' Another panel showed Germany torn in two by an American hand and a Russian hand. By this last symbol, these demonstrators sought to show that their

action has nothing in common with that of the Communists, with whom any opponent of rearmament is lumped by rightist propaganda.

"A young trade-unionist explained to passers-by why youth was opposed to being mobilized, and invited them to a discussion on the next Monday. An identical demonstration, similarly followed by a discussion, took place on November 27. More than 800 youths crammed themselves into a room to protest against the military service whose imposition upon them is being attempted, demanding a popular referendum on the subject.

"Despite the silence of the press, the young Bavarians who had organized these demonstrations received letters from all Germany requesting advice and materials to organize similar demonstrations."

How striking is the contrast between these bold Third Camp slogans, condemning Stalinist as well as capitalist exploiters, denouncing Russian as well as American imperialism, and the timid reliance on big-power negotiations of Ollenhauer and the SPD leadership!

### THEY WON'T SERVE

Although the clearest, most consistent, most militant opposition to rearmament is found in the labor and socialist youth movements, opposition is by no means confined to them. In truth, it represents the attitude of the vast majority of German youth.

This fact is borne out in an article by Norbert Muhlen in the *Reporter* magazine of January 13. It is doubly impressive since the article is written by a supporter of rearmament who does not hesitate to slander the whole of German youth as "apolitical men," who can say that "in their rejection of rearmament, the young Germans tend to ignore the claims of the community and their responsibility to it," thus identifying the claims of the "community," a divided Germany whose first need is unity, with the requirements of U. S. imperialism and its West German allies, whose political course would make unification under any democratic conditions impossible.

Muhlen summarizes the attitude of German youth, basing himself on what he evidently considers an accurate opinion survey, thus:

"In December 1953, when the establishment of EDC was taken for granted, a reliable German opinion-research organization called E.M.N.I.D. questioned a cross section of young Germans. A large majority said they did not want to serve as soldiers, but nearly one out of two said that 'under certain conditions' he would be willing to serve; twenty-eight per cent said they opposed service under any conditions. In November 1954, with EDC defeated in the meantime, the percentage who opposed service under any conditions had jumped to forty-four.

"But between the minority who will refuse to serve at any price and the minority who would gladly serve, there still remain the many young Germans who will serve in the new national army under certain conditions. These conditions, in descending order of importance are: if an enemy invades the country; if there is a universal-service law, if full equality among the national armies prevails; if military service is humane; and finally if certain personal advantages for the soldier accrue from the service."

In sum, before the defeat of EDC, over

three-fourths of German youth opposed rearmament, while 28 per cent were unwilling to serve under any conditions and many others would serve only if the country were invaded.

Today all these figures are admitted to have increased, and if the increase of 57 per cent in the proportion of those unwilling to serve under any conditions is at all typical, the "minority who would gladly serve" must be small indeed.

### STRANGE ARGUMENT

The only reasoned argument Muhlen advances in condemnation of the attitude of German youth is a strange one: that the projected German army will be a "new-style" democratic army, and that these democratic reforms can be preserved and the recrudescence of militarism avoided only if German youth enthusiastically accepts military service. This is what he says:

"Most Germans, as befits *Unpolitische*, will follow orders from the authorities whether they like them or not. But their passive, non-cooperative attitude toward their future army can be dangerous. This danger, which seriously worries Dr. Adenauer, is the infiltration and eventual control of the lower and middle army echelons by former Nazi and pro-totalitarian elements. The safeguards envisaged by the West German government against this contingency can be effective only if the people cooperate. Although the loyalty to the republic of the required sixty generals will be carefully scrutinized by a joint commission of the government, the Bundestag, and the trade unions, this procedure can hardly be applied thoroughly to the ranks from colonel downward, since thousands of such officers will be needed the first year. The controlling civilians of the Bundestag and its committees cannot alone assure a democratic army. It can be assured only if a sufficient number of loyal young Germans apply for the positions of junior and non-commissioned officers instead of standing sulkily aside; and if, furthermore, the majority of the people and their organizations cooperate in watching the performance of the army and all its members, instead of condemning them on principle ahead of time the way the Socialists, and in particular the trade-union leaders, are doing today."

### NO CONFIDENCE

What is noteworthy about this argument, aside from the fact that it arrogantly begs the entire question of rearmament in treating the "future army" as a *fait accompli*, which it assuredly is not, is that it completely ignores the reasons why German youth profoundly distrust the "new" army and its entire leadership.

The facts are that Adenauer's regime is riddled with "former" Nazis, right up to the cabinet level; that Adenauer's chief military adviser, Spiedel, was close to the Nazis and received a high military decoration after the July 20 bomb plot, when anyone even as independent of the Nazis as the reactionary Prussian officers who organized that abortive putsch was under the most extreme suspicion; that the entire officer corps on which the "new" army would have to draw was formed by the Nazis and was always loyal to them; that openly militaristic veterans' organizations, some of them subsidized by the government, have enjoyed an alarming resurgence.

Under such circumstances, what reason is there for confidence in a watchdog committee, two thirds of which will be named by the government and the Bundestag—that is to say, the Adenauer coalition? The German working class and German youth are right in thinking that a German army can be prevented from becoming a reactionary and authoritative.

(Turn to last page)

### The New York YSL Presents a Seminar-Class in 9 sessions on TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF MARXISM

1. Marx and His Time. (Speaker: Max Shachtman)
2. Historical Materialism.
3. Economics of Marxism.
4. Economics (continued).
5. Class Struggle and Society.
6. State and Revolution.
7. Approaches to Marxism.
8. Concepts of Democratic Socialism.
9. Marxism as Method.

The opening session will take place on Tuesday, February 1, 7:30 p.m. at the YSL office, 114 West 14 Street, 3rd floor. Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, will speak and lead the discussion on "Marx and His Time."

The basic work to be read for the class is Sidney Hook's *Toward the Understanding of Karl Marx*. The class will be conducted on a seminar basis, with each student assigned a report based on his readings. For further information, including a Prospectus and Reading List, write the YSL national office.

## WHY NO WORLD OUTCRY FROM SOCIALISTS AND LIBERALS?

# The SHAMEFUL SILENCE On the DJILAS CASE

By HAL DRAPER

The shameful silence of liberals and even socialists on the persecution of Djilas and Dedijer by the Tito government is only second in importance to the persecution by Belgrade itself.

Superficially this silence is amazing. It would seem that, whatever one's viewpoint on Titoism or socialism or Djilas's ideas, it would be incumbent on anyone who pretends to hold a half-democratic standpoint to come to the defense of the rights of the Yugoslav democratic-oppositionists as against the totalitarian claims of his enemies. After all, the only "crime" which is charged against them is that they dared to criticize the regime and ruling party.

We cannot recall that even the Kremlin has ever so crudely and overtly flaunted its totalitarian system. By this we mean that, in concession to its myths and forms of pseudo-democracy, Moscow's purges have been based on charges other than mere criticism. This was hypocrisy and mere lip-service to the forms of democracy, of course, but it was the hypocrisy which is the tribute that vice pays to virtue. The Russian Stalinists have never quite dared to come out brashly and openly with the declaration that it is a crime merely to criticize the regime. In order to frame up a crime, they had to stage "plots" and "conspiracies."

The Yugoslav Titoists have been franker and cruder, in the Djilas-Dedijer case. We can give them "credit" for this, if anyone so insists.

### Embarrassed Liberals

**But what about the credit of all those forces in the world—liberal, democratic, radical and socialistic, who are so extremely interested in Yugoslav developments, moreover, and who are critics and enemies of Stalinist totalitarianism—who are confronted by this challenge of the Belgrade rulers and who have remained silent?**

In point of hard fact, the reason for the amazing silence is only too, too clear. For the villain in this case is not any of the Stalinist tyrannies that are the imperialist enemies of the Western bloc, but is the Stalinist-type totalitarianism which is the ally of the Western bloc.

Tito is "our friend." His army is "defending the West." He is getting dollars and aid from "us." We must be interested in the stability of his government, so that he can remain a bastion of "Western-democracy" in Europe.

**So the Djilas-Dedijer case is embarrassing. Not the least of the elements embarrassed are many pro-war liberals who are torn between their undoubted desire to sympathize with Djilas and their desire not to embarrass Tito. They remain silent for the same reason that their counterparts, the Stalinoids, remain silent about the crimes of Moscow even if they are dismayed by them.**

### Painless Whitewash

In this country no cudgels have been taken up for Djilas and Dedijer in the liberal weeklies. The *New Republic*, which last January went out of its way to whitewash the Tito purge of Djilas, has said nothing.

The liberal *N. Y. Post* is another case in point. In a January 10 dispatch from its European correspondents, Freidin and Richardson, a scandalous coat of whitewash is applied to the Tito regime. "Painless Punishment the Cry in Titoland," says the headline. "Silencing Milovan Djilas . . . and muzzling Vlado Dedijer . . . are temporary expedients," say the *Post's* foreign experts. Tito intervened for them, but "many of the party officials" were "restive," and when Tito left on his trip for Asia, "that

left the more dogmatic, doctrinaire men behind in charge of the state apparatus."

After this fairy tale, they go on to assure their readers that this push by the doctrinaires "should not be confused with rebellion against Tito's leadership and, simultaneously, a bound toward Moscow and coexistence." It's merely that "if a Yugoslav Communist Party is to remain Communist, basic orthodox doctrine must be observed. That does not leave room for criticism considered injurious to the best interests of the party."

In all this not a word of sympathy for the two victims, not a syllable to indicate even agreement with their aim to democratize the regime, by these foreign correspondents of the *Post* whose dispatches are always free-wheeling essays in opinion, rumors and exhortation.

### Belgrade Squeals

Have any voices been raised on behalf of Djilas in Europe, by socialists or democrats?

**An item in the *N. Y. Times* for Jan. 15 reports one. It is an important voice too, to be sure. The organ of the West German metal workers' union, *Metall*, came out with the declaration that it was the "combined duty" of workers to help Djilas and Dedijer. This union is a pillar of the left wing of the German socialist trade-unionists, and a powerful arm of the labor movement.**

The dispatch reporting this, however, came from *Belgrade*, for "the Yugoslav government's official spokesman" directed a blast against the German metal union for daring to stand up for Djilas. The government in typical Stalinist fashion linked the German socialist reproach with circles allegedly engaged in "an organized campaign" against Yugoslavia.

What this indicates is the extreme sensitivity of the Belgrade rulers to international socialist criticism. The Titoists have long been courting European social-democracy, for their own purposes. Most particularly they have been anxious to make way for their state-controlled trade unions into the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which has properly rejected them. The Titoists have soft-soaped and wooed not only left-wing elements in European socialism but right-wing social-democratic leaderships, seeking points of support for their existence within the Western alliance.

They are highly vulnerable to pressure from international socialists. That is why they have squealed like stuck pigs against the declaration by the German vanguard unionists.

But one German union is only one case. Where have been other socialist voices in Europe? We hope and trust there have been some others, but so far we have heard of none. Perhaps we can conclude with some confidence, and greater regret, that up to now the bulk of European and world socialists are also remaining silent in embarrassment, like the American liberals.

If further steps are taken by the regime against Djilas and Dedijer, this may well change. Measures like the ISL's appeal to world socialism (reported last week) will help.

### Aftermath of Illusion

**Perhaps not unimportant in bringing out this reaction of silence and even bewilderment to the attack on Djilas is the fact that so many European socialists and radicals have been completely disoriented up to now by the false claims of Titoist "democratization." Many of them, in the course of the last several years, sincerely swallowed the bunk about how Yugoslavian national-Stalinism, after the break with Moscow, was being transformed into a socialist**

democracy, through workers' control and all that.

Now they find it understandably hard to make out what is happening—that is, to open their eyes to what is happening. If it is true that Titoland has really been democratized right along, even if more slowly than one might wish, then perhaps Djilas is only a troublemaker and who-knows-what-else? What's he complaining about?

An echo of this can be seen in one organ which at least does take up the Djilas case, the weekly of the British pacifist movement, *Peace News*. This organ is often filled with Stalinoid jottings as well as Third-Campish stuff, with Titoist conceptions included in the mélange. In a January 7 item, the paper comments on the "forlorn news from Yugoslavia," which "has taken a sad and disappointing turn." The regime, it says, has had the "intention" to liberalize itself, and "The culmination of this intention . . . was in the hopeful news that a party in opposition to the government was to be formed and that it was to be tolerated." (!) Too bad that Mr. Djilas, who was taking the lead in this, is now under charges. . . .

*Peace News* obviously has the facts of the case garbled, but the context of the whole item points to a typical case of wishful thinking about Titoist liberalization and head-shaking regret over its "retreat."

### Stalinoid Gambit

A case of an entirely different sort is represented by another European organ which has managed to say something on the Djilas-Dedijer case. This is *France-Observateur*, Claude Bourdet's weekly with a heavy Stalinoid cast, but which also includes pro-Titoist and anti-Stalinist elements and which in any case typically supports Stalinoid conceptions with independent arguments of its own kind.

***France-Observateur's* write-up is designed to smear Djilas and to put a lily in the hands of both Tito and Malenkov at the same time, thereby pleasing a maximum of the magazine's customers. What is extremely interesting is that, in order to smear Djilas, the magazine seizes precisely on the fact that he had used the *N. Y. Times* as his world mouthpiece:**

"The present ideas of Mr. Djilas about the two-party system in a socialist regime are worthy of consideration, and freedom would certainly be the gainer if they could be defended in Yugoslavia, like any other opinion. But the fact that this interview was published, and perhaps-solicited, by the big American newspaper, instead of being given, for example, to a foreign socialist newspaper, is probably not accidental, and gives these declarations the character of a lecture addressed to the Yugoslav government by the State Department."

The present writer pointed out a couple of weeks ago that Djilas had unfortunately opened himself to this smear by his tactic, and that pro-Titoist apologists could be expected to make the worst of it. The line taken by *France-Observateur* is exactly of this sort, obviously addressed to pro-Titoist sympathizers in extenuation of Belgrade's action. The magazine plainly believes, not without reason, that this approach is best suited to confusing the primary issues in the Djilas case.

For the rest, *France-Observateur* develops the theory that the State Department had gotten wind of talks between Yugoslavia and Russia for closer relations; that if a deal was struck, Djilas would be the sacrificial goat; that Washington was worried, "hence the sudden interest manifested in Djilas's theories." . . . But it doesn't say that Djilas was acting as an American agent.

### 'New Leader' to the Rescue

**The other side of the coin, back to back with the Stalinoid *France-Observateur*, is represented here by the *New Leader*. It is not as curious as it may seem, though certainly intriguing, to find the *New Leader* printing an article on the Djilas case which essentially endorses the whole Stalinoid case AGAINST Djilas while purporting to defend him.**

We cannot complain, certainly, that the *New Leader* has failed to see its duty plain to speak up for the democratic opposition to Tito. All we can hope for is that no such second blow should be struck against the already bedeviled men.

In the first place, it must be pointed out that

(Turn to last page)

## Hollywood Rewrites Current Labor History —

# 'On the Waterfront' Is a Falsification

By BEN HALL

You have to see the movie "On the Waterfront." It received the reviewers' accolades and was certified as the year's best by New York film critics. You'll want to puzzle over that one. And it is a commentary on dramatic current events. You should discover for yourself how a "stark" and "realistic" style can warp and distort the truth to suit the whim of the censor.

**We say this although the story begs for sympathy, portraying the victimized New York dock workers terrorized by a gang of ruthless union racketeers.**

*The plot:* Terry (Marlon Brando), underprivileged orphan-home young fellow who acts tough but who yearns underneath for a little kindness, is being groomed for a spot in the gang which runs the pier and union by murder, kickback, shape-up, loan-shark rackets. His brother Charlie is a big-shot "brains" for the union-gangster leader John Friendly. Terry sets up a former pal, Joey, to be murdered by the mob. When Joey is tossed off a roof, Terry is disturbed: he thought they were just going to rough him up a bit.

Joey's sister, beautiful and blonde, home from convent school on the night of the murder, abjures nuns and books to swear vengeance on her brother's killers. She falls in love with Terry; Terry falls in love with her. She, and a Catholic parish priest, press him to break with the mob and expose the killers. (Later, when he has broken, she swings abruptly into a "let us flee from all this" routine.)

Terry is confused. The gang senses that he is wavering. Brother Charlie is ordered to straighten him out or have him killed; but when Charlie can't convince his kid brother he finds it impossible to turn him over to the murderers and lets him escape. The gang shoots down Charlie. That does it for Terry.

Vengeance for his brother, love, the priest, and old personal resentments combine. Terry testifies against the gang at the Crime Commission; exposes the murderers. But he finds himself blacklisted at the docks.

While a crew of longshoremen watch passively, he hurls defiance at the gang. They beat him almost to death while his fellow workers look on. But as he lies in his own blood, the beautiful blonde and the priest arrive in the nick of time. The longshoremen now refuse to go to work without Terry. Sister and priest help him stagger to his feet. Dripping with blood he stumbles and sways toward the pier while the men look on. He makes it! They fall in line after him. The gang is broken. Curtain.

Considered as a "work of art," to use a term we critics respect, the film ranks above the Hollywood average. But that is not saying much. Although this review is not devoted to that aspect, a dissent from the critics who showered it with praise should be recorded. Some of the climactic scenes, especially the concluding sequences, are embarrassingly crude and childish. But enough of that.

### DISTORTIONS

As a commentary on current events, and it is that which is our principal interest, the film deserves credit only for this: it shows the union-gang bosses as the exploiters and murderers they are, so that every sin-hating citizen can throw with indignation at a dramatization of what he has already read in the newspapers.

**Apart from this, the picture is a deliberate and calculated distortion of the picture of waterfront crime, a misrepresentation that sugar-coats and whitewashes the guilty.**

Nothing of its "realism," its accurate portrayal of the gang's brutality, its physically authentic shots of the New York waterfront changes this.

These gangsters have a free hand until the priest comes in to stimulate a little opposition in the union. In this era of Hollywood's romanticizing of the Catholic priest, it is hard to get aroused over such an inaccuracy. It is true that members of the Catholic ACTU participated with courage in the struggle against gangs in the ILA and they were undoubtedly advised (whether well or badly is unknown) by priests. But resistance to the rackets from the rank and file, and mass wildcat strikes against the rotten union leadership, arose before and without the priests.

**What irritates us is not so much that it**

**overplays the role of the priest but rather that it strains to belittle the role of the longshoremen. The men appear like cattle, bowed, submissive, afraid of the local mob. They remain passive until the priest comes along and even then only one man screws up the courage to speak out and he is murdered.**

### COWARDS AND A HERO

As the mob is beating hero Marlon Terry near to death, a crowd of uneasy dock workers look on without moving to his assistance. Even when one man shouts out: "What are we waiting for?" they move forward but a menacing glare from two thugs is enough to frighten them off and they continue to stand about. Only the priest and the blonde beauty have courage enough to go to him. It is they who urge the tottering hero to his feet so that, blood bespattered, he may lead the milling masses to work.

As our screen story ends, a representative of the shipping company stands at the entrance to the dock, arms akimbo. When gang-fighter and hero Terry leads the men up the wharf the company man, just a neutral, steps aside, crying "Let's get to work," to let him take his place as the new leader. But in real life, the shipping company and their agents were in cahoots with the thugs. This is no captious quibble.

To return for a moment to the priest. His role is idealized but only if we watch his story-book actions in the story-book situation. But if we judged his role in the

picture with what existed in real life, he would be a stupid man indeed.

This priest spends all his time exhorting the poor longshoremen to do something. Exactly what is never clear unless it is to testify truthfully at a Crime Commission hearing. At any rate, it is a simple problem with a simple solution. These gangsters terrorize these workers. And the longshoremen should act. And that is why the dock workers seem so cowardly and ineffectual. Is it possible that so large a body of men can be held in check by a few thugs, however ruthless?

### WHAT HE WOULD LEARN

**But an honest, fearless, intelligent priest determined to speak out for true Christian brotherhood would quickly learn what our screen priest never suspects. He would learn that this local group of union-thugs base their rule on the support of powerful and respectable men in all walks of life. He would discover that the shipping companies want the gangsters because it's good to do business with men who offer guarantees against legitimate union demands; that politicians little and big and police are all interlinked in the gangster empire and offer the thugs protection for a price; that the same man whose machine is built on murder in the union builds a political machine inside the ruling Democratic Party.**

And such a priest would not confine himself to preaching to the victims; he would thunder against the criminals in industry and government who shield the criminals in unions. And he would realize why this group of local workers, faced by such a coalition of mutual assistance, is so helpless. None of this emerges in "On the Waterfront." Not because the writers and directors are ignorant. All this is common knowledge.

In the book *Murder, Inc.* Burton B. Turkus, assistant district attorney under

Tom Dewey, summarizes the story of gangsterism this way: "The menace that must be obliterated is the blueprint. And the blueprint for national crime calls for a foundation built upon political connivance and official corruption. Organized crime could not last forty-eight hours if every official charged with law enforcement—municipal, state or national—were incorruptible!"

### SOPS TO TRUTH

The creators of this film have a delicate private conscience. They are well ware of all the facts and offer their own sensitivities a few sops in the form of obscure and very subtle references which the censor allows to slip by because they are so obscure and so meaningless to the moviegoer.

In one scene, which lasts perhaps a few seconds, a shadowy figure is watching a television broadcast of a Crime Commission hearing when gang leader Friendly is accused of murder. Says the unidentified figure, "If Friendly calls I am not in . . . ever." Who is this man? He is there only for the authors, not the audience. Only the authors know that he represents all the highly placed respectable people who do business with thugs.

In another fleeting scene (less than seconds) the camera pauses momentarily on a portrait of Friendly with his arm about a well-dressed gentleman. Only the authors know that this is their own charade within a movie.

Turkus can explain it to you in his book: "One mob baron, in fact, 'moved in' to the extent that he had his picture taken in a 'he's my pal' pose with a candidate for the vice-presidency of the United States. When it was published, it won for him considerable authority."

To repeat, none of this emerges in the film. The secret digs against men of influence prove only that the basic distortions in this picture are deliberate.

## FILMS and Ideas

# Rehabilitating Two Oppressed Minorities

By PHILIP COBEN

Hollywood seems to be engaged in a duel rehabilitation effort, to bring back to public favor two downtrodden minority groups: the American Indians and big-business.

There is a rash of films portraying the maligned Indians in a rosier light than usually allowed in Western shootin' films. Sitting Bull has become a Good Guy; the truth, or a part of the truth, is told about the ruthless betrayal of the Indians by the encroaching white men; the Indian point of view is given play in films like *Apache* and others. All this, it goes without saying, is excellent.

At the same time, there seems to be an outbreak of films showing that big-businessmen are, after all, human beings. We do not claim that this point of view is reactionary, either.

A double feature which we saw recently brought both rehabilitation movements together. A Western hoss-epic, "Yellow Tomahawk," had a white army major as the villain of the piece, persecuting unoffending Indians; but the edge was somewhat dulled when we found out at the end that the bad major massacred Indians because he was part Indian himself (Freudian stuff — real deep). "Sabrina," an otherwise pleasant Cinderella story, suddenly broke out into a speech (by tycoon Humphrey Bogart, playing shaven) in which it is explained to playboy William Holden that high financiers go through their grueling daily grinds not out of desire for filthy money, nor even for power or prestige, but only in order that barefoot boys in Puerto Rico might be able to buy shoes for themselves, or words to that effect.

Holden, who in "Sabrina" is on the receiving end, does a little job himself in that *Little Men* of the movies, "Executive Suite." There is a contest for control of the corporation. The Villain, who is on the point of Grasping All, is an old-fashioned type who naively thinks that the job of a corporation is to make profits for its stockholders and officers. Silly! William Holden, sets the board of directors straight with a speech in which he expounds the gospel that the idea is to Produce Better Goods. He is elected by acclamation, thereby (and simply in

passing, as it were) curing Barbara Stanwyck's neuroses.

An ironic thing about both rehabilitation movements is that while Hollywood is burying the hatchet with the Indians, the government is engaged in attacking the last strongholds of Indian rights. And while Hollywood is giving the people saccharine speeches about Finance Capital's high ideals, there never has been an administration which has been so openly dominated by corporation profit-grabbers and tax-dodgers. Life refuses to imitate art, and vice-versa, if you can call it art.

### JOKERS ON TV

While on the subject of the entertainment world, two other sociological notes are in order, in re TV comedians.

Unemancipated from snobbism as we are, we own no TV set, so we can boast of no extensive knowledge on the merits of the various toilers in the world of humor. All we can testify is that on Christmas Day we found ourselves sitting before somebody else's TV and made the acquaintance of Jackie Gleason and George Gobel, the two comedians currently enjoying an avalanche of publicity.

This was right after Gleason had made his nationally famous deal for \$11 million, which was soon followed by another haul for \$5 million; and since he was not trying to be funny that night (just putting on a show for the kiddies) we had time to wonder. How funny was he going to be on the little screen for millions of viewers who, in the foreground or background of their minds, remembered that these quips were supposed to be worth \$11 million? How funny does Humor become when it becomes big business? How rib-tickling is the comedy manufactured by Jackie Gleason Enterprises Inc., rather than by Jackie Gleason?

The implied doubts are probably vain, but persistent.

George Gobel had a special Christmas story to tell in the course of his program. As we have read everywhere now, his brand of humor does not stand repeating, so we can only give the substance of the tale.

It was his "most memorable Christ-

mas." He and a buddy were in a foxhole during the war, across from the German lines. The Germans were singing the Schnitzelbank Song (*business of Gobel singing a few bars of the song to illustrate*). His buddy is annoyed. He explains: it's Christmas, good will to men, we're all brothers after all, etc. His buddy is still annoyed by the singing (*business of singing a few lines of the song again*). The punch comes when the buddy ups and throws a hand grenade over (*business of starting the song up again and throttling off to show the effects on the Germans as the hand grenade explodes*). End.

Now, this bloody little tale has some obvious shortcomings from the point of view of appropriations on Christmas Day, as against (say) *A Christmas Carol*. It does not reek of Christian charity, exactly. It is somewhat bewildering even to try to imagine what was supposed to be funny about it, but perhaps some Gobel enthusiast can enlighten us about that. But apparently the station was not swamped with protests.

### World History—Year by Year

## The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-53.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

# Mission to Peiping — —

(Continued from page 1)

Is it Hammarskjold's fault that his mission resulted in pressure being put on those who sent him rather than on those to whom he was sent? Not at all.

Aside from arguments about humanitarianism and justice (arguments which diplomats reserve for public speeches but spare each other in the cynical atmosphere of the bargaining table), what did he have to offer? *American policy made it impossible for him to offer anything.* And if he actually did try to speak about justice and the like, he could not win the argument. For what he would then have had to justify is the contention that Chiang Kai-shek has the right to rule the whole of China.

That argument can be made in Taipei, Formosa, and even in the halls of Congress in Washington. It can be made at political gatherings where the speakers can bank on the ignorance of their audience, especially in the United States where years of

official and unofficial propaganda have convinced quite a few people that Chiang heads some kind of a "democracy" and that he represents the legitimate government of China.

But few will listen to this argument with a straight face in Europe. In no country in Asia in which freedom of speech is tolerated can such an argument be made with safety. And in Peiping—well, we doubt whether it occurred to Hammarskjold to mention the matter.

Yet this country is stuck with a policy based on this idea. It has led to failure after failure in every situation in which the United States has sought to confront the Chinese Stalinists with anything except sheer military force. And the area in which the United States can even do that without risking its complete isolation from its allies has now been narrowed down to the Strait of Formosa.

The idea that Chiang Kai-shek represents the "rightful," "democratic" government of China is not just an isolated

notion, some eccentricity of Dulles, Eisenhower or even Knowland. It is part and parcel of the whole conception which dominates the thinking of the capitalists and their political representatives in Washington which leads them to support any and all *pro-capitalist* governments and movements in Asia no matter how reactionary, imperialist and discredited they may be. It flows from the idea that these governments and movements must be supported, at any cost, against the revolutionary anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist tide in Asia. And this is precisely the idea and policy which tends to deliver the whole of Asia over to the Stalinists.

## GRIST TO THE MILL

Since the idea is fundamentally false, all actions based on it are bound to lead to helplessness or disaster. That was demonstrated in Korea, it was underlined and capitalized in Indochina, it is being proved once again in Malaya.

Hammarskjold brought another lesson in the futility of American policy back with him from Peiping. Knowland and McCarthy are quite right when they say that his mission has failed and that there is no reason to think that he can do any more in the future to get the release of the Americans than he has done this time. But the important question for Americans is: Has this additional failure done anything to shake liberal and labor opinion in this country in its support of the basic assumptions of the government's foreign policy?

Independent socialists have been among the first to oppose the Stalinist victory in China. They continue to denounce the totalitarian regime which prevails in that country, and to seek to aid in the mobilization of political forces in the rest of Asia against any further extension of Stalinist control.

But they recognize that Stalinism can only be beaten back by popular movements which offer the peoples of Asia a revolutionary solution to their problems along democratic lines. Any policy based on support of the status quo is bound, in the long run, to be grist to Stalinist mills.

America could do much to aid and foster such movements. But that will not be done (in fact, just the opposite will be done) as long as the government in this country is in the hands of people who are willing to sacrifice this country and the world to the perpetuation of the capitalist system.

One need not be a socialist to recognize the futility and danger of this policy. In one way or another it has been seen and described by men like Justice Douglas and many others. What liberals and the labor movement must recognize, however, if they are to begin to extricate this country from the impossible position in which the government's policy has placed it, is that support of this policy, however critical or grudging in detail, is a disservice to America as well as to the cause of democracy everywhere.

A first step would be to demand the end to the support of Chiang Kai-shek's dictatorship as the keystone of American policy in Asia. As long as such support is accepted by the liberal and labor movements there is no road out of the blind alley into which Hammarskjold stumbled in Peiping.

# Shameful Silence — —

(Continued from page 6)

this *New Leader* atrocity is by Bogdan Raditsa. That should be enough. Raditsa is one of the few organic beings—animal, mineral or vegetable—who continued for years after 1948 to insist that the Tito-Stalin break was a fake, a put-up job. (This was also the line of the Yugoslav monarchist émigrés, who come under the head of mineral, being far enough underground.)

Raditsa, expertizing for the *New Leader*, "reveals" that the crackdown on Djilas-Dedijer is part of "the continuing effort by the Yugoslav Communist leadership to reach an accommodation with Moscow." (It would seem, therefore, that he has finally given up the theory that no break had really occurred in the first place.)

According to this authority, whose past record of political wisdom and comprehension of Titoism is so impressive that he can still persuade editors to pay cash for his pearls of analysis, the "Kardelj wing" is pro-Soviet, and the "Djilas-Dedijer wing" was opposed to this orientation, presumably fighting to stay with the Western alliance; this is what the fight is about. He does not mention by a word the existence of an issue about socialist democracy.

But what is especially raw about Raditsa's treatment is the reiterated implication that behind Djilas are rallied, not the Communists who want a democratic Communist system, but rather the "anti-Soviet" and anti-Communist forces. In Yugoslavia, this means largely the forces pointed toward bourgeois restoration.

"... Djilas and his associates have won increasing sympathy from the Yugoslav people at large. Non-Communists generally, as well as the anti-Soviet element in the party rank-and-file, look to Djilas for leadership," writes Raditsa. And: "Now that organized anti-Communist opposition has vanished in Yugoslavia, meaningful opposition can come only from within party ranks. And it has come." Perhaps unwittingly, but not accidentally, Raditsa here paraphrases for his own purposes a point which is made by the Titoists: any conflict in the ruling party must reflect anti-Communist capitalist-restorationist pressure from the outside, since there is no other place for this pressure to apply itself, therefore "objectively" any such conflict is counter-revolutionary. . . .

Defense of Djilas and Dedijer by pro-capitalist sources and organs will cer-

tainly not do the Yugoslav "heretics" very much good. It is precisely the aim of the regime to make them out in the eyes of the Yugoslav people to be mouthpieces of bourgeois restoration. The people may not quite believe that Djilas and Dedijer are "foreign agents"—at least not "subjectively"—but it will be enough for the purpose if the belief is rooted that, agents or no, the two men took the stand they did only because they drifted back to the outlived bourgeois system and its conceptions.

## TIME FOR PRESSURE

It is this fact, and no other, which underlines the importance of socialist intervention into the case, and which motivated the ISL last week in issuing its appeal for world socialist protest.

It is a good thing, for example, that one organ here that has spoken up for Djilas is *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, which has not taken the same line as *France-Observateur*. (Incidentally, it may be mentioned that the *Cannonite Militant* seems to be just as tongue-tied about the Djilas case as the liberals. Only two-line news notes have appeared in that sterling organ. A year ago this paper heaped a load of mud on Djilas when he was purged, but, what with things happening in the so-called Fourth International, these people have not yet decided what they ought to think.)

The only possible excuse for socialist and liberal apathy that can be made, however quickly, is that they are waiting to see whether the Tito regime will really go through with its plans to put Djilas and Dedijer in the criminal's dock. But this does not justify abstention even from expressing an opinion—the clearly indicated opinion which flows inevitably from all socialist and democratic conceptions.

Once the totalitarian machinery against them is rolling, it will be hard to stop it, for the regime will lose face. Right now is when the regime is most subject to pressure, indeed thin-skinned and acutely responsive to world socialist demands, for its own sake. Right now is the time to speak up.

# Young Workers Lead Fight — —

(Continued from page 5)

rian, if not actually Nazi, force only by preventing that army's very existence, under the present conditions.

But the conditions under which they could correctly support a form of "rearmament," i.e., a worker's militia under trade-union control to be formed by a socialist government, are most unlikely in the near future. This is so for two reasons. The Western camp is not interested in such a German army—and Germany is still essentially an occupied country. Secondly, the SPD leadership has no such program, and shows no signs of developing one. Therefore, short of a drastic change in political conditions, there is no possible basis upon which German youth should cease to oppose rearmament.

Are the makers of American policy then wrong in excluding from their calculations the refusal of German youth to serve as atomic-cannon fodder? Two facts stand out in stark contradiction to each other. It is assuredly impossible to form an army against the firm refusal by half the population of military age to be inducted. But never in modern times

has militarism been even noticeably hampered by the opposition of the youth, as the fate of the "Oxford Pledge" movement demonstrates.

The answer is this: German rearmament can be defeated if the half of German youth who now resolutely proclaim their intention to refuse induction unite in a cohesive movement behind a bold and appealing internationalist socialist program; and if the young people of other lands speak up in support of German youth and follow their example by opposing the war preparations of their own governments. As to the task of German youth—that is clearly in strong and capable hands. The rest is our burden.

The responsibility of American democratic and socialist youth is clear; when the London and Paris agreements are submitted to Congress for ratification this spring, loud and vigorous opposition to them will show that America is not a solid mass of reaction; it will be a promise to German youth of a future powerful ally and will give important political and moral support to their present struggle which is, in a vastly important sense, the struggle of us all.

## 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 .....

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, publication date Jan. 21:

Anne Fremantle, ed.: *The Age of Belief*, Mentor, 50¢. Fred Hoyle: *The Nature of the Universe*, Mentor, 35¢. Ritchie Calder: *Science in Our Lives*, Signet Key, 35¢. Stefan Lorant: *Life of Lincoln*, Signet Key, 50¢. J. H. Plenn: *Texas Hellion*, Signet, 25¢. David Loughlin: *A Private Stair*, Signet, 25¢. Rosamond Marshall: *The General's Wench*, Signet, 25¢. W. B. Huie: *Mud on the Stars*, Signet Giant, 35¢. Norman Hales: *The Spider in the Cup*, Signet, 25¢. James Aswell: *The Young and Hungry-Hearted*, Signet, 25¢.