

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

THE GOVERNMENT INFORMER SYSTEM

- I—What It Takes to Be a Stoolpigeon
- II—Witness for Hire: Bundenz to Matusow
- III—The Case of Cox and Bakcsy

... page 6

FEBRUARY 14, 1955

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

As Ally of Chiang, U.S. Supports A Regime Which Lives for War

Justice

The conviction of Claude Lightfoot, a CP leader in Illinois, for violation of the infamous Smith Act is the latest use of this police-state measure. It marks another step in that for the first time the law was used against a single individual. There is, however, some justice in the coincidence that it made the news in the same week that the fantastic Harvey Matusow blew another hole in the government phalanx of informers.

For a survey of the latter phenomenon, see pages 6-7 of this issue, where the point is made that the number of government informers exposed as liars has virtually reached the stage of being a "mass" political phenomenon.

But it must be added that the Smith Act, as conceived and used by the government, would be all but inoperative without such a string of stoolpigeons on hand for the government. The informer system is not simply an adjunct of the Smith Act but a necessity for it.

So, too, Lightfoot was convicted on stoolpigeons' testimony, and convicted not of the real political crimes of Stalinism (which are not a matter for the courts) but convicted of violation of a police-state law.

Band-Aid, Anyone?

Like most other New Yorkers, we travel the subways (especially mornings) in a semi-comatose condition. For weeks now a certain subway-card advertisement has been staring us in the face with a Message without breaking through into consciousness. This week it happened. We woke up between stations to stare at a truly fantastic sight.

The card ad is a Civilian Defense poster. Half of it consists of an imaginative photograph, depicting the explosion of an atom bomb over a big city. The picture leaves nothing to the imagination about the result. The fireball is blanketing the whole metropolis. In modern technical jargon, this city has been "killed." According to the picture, a good part of the area would be vaporized out-

(Continued on page 4)

Dissenters

Attacking the treaty with Chiang Kai-shek in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which passed it, Senator Morse (Ind.) denounced it as likely "greatly to increase the risk of war in Asia." He was supported in the committee only by the right-wing Republican Langer, and by no Democrat, in his motion to amend the treaty by specifying only the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores and no other islands.

Morse also declared that the treaty would "involve the United States in the Chinese civil war on the side of Chiang Kai-shek." Yet, in spite of this bold language, Morse himself proposes that the U.S. get so involved by defending the very seat of the Chiang regime in Formosa. He boggles only at the idea of defending the off-shore islands.

Such is the type of opposition offered to the administration's pro-Chiang policy even by the small minority of dissenters in Congress.

By GORDON HASKELL

The whole world is holding its breath as the American Seventh Fleet begins massed operations off China's mainland. The evacuation of the Tachen islands, in itself a retreating operation, brings the military forces of the United States and China closer than they have been since the end of the war in Korea, and under circumstances where the smallest slip, the slightest misinterpretation of orders by a commander on the spot, could produce a military "incident" of major proportions. Hence, even if no one believes that the Americans or the Chinese Stalinists actually want war or are planning on war, few believe that war under these circumstances is impossible.

Why is there any possibility that the Stalinists will interfere with this evacuation, when they will be able to take the Tachens without a blow the minute the last of Chiang Kai-shek's troops have left?

If the Stalinists were of a mind to intervene, they would not have to make the case to the world that Chiang's troops are being withdrawn from the Tachens so that they can fight the Stalinists under better circumstances at another time. Chiang has made the case for them.

On the day the Tachen withdrawal began, he announced to the world that this action is part of the "positive preparations for the counter-attack [against the mainland] and not a negative stand." "The most important task which this government faces," he declared, "is to counterattack the Communists and recover the mainland."

That is an open challenge, if not an invitation, to the Stalinist government of China to try to stop this redeployment of troops. And it is quite in character for the Chiang regime.

WAR-PROVOKERS

For his is probably the only government in the world whose existence, in the most obvious, direct, and short-run sense, depends on an early war; which has everything to lose through peace; and yet which is completely incapable of waging or winning the war it needs unless it can involve the United States directly in it.

Thus, one of the reasons for the world-wide apprehension over the Tachens evacuation is obvious. America's partner in the operation is an open, avowed, incurable war-provoker. No matter how firmly the reins are held, there is always the chance that he will break loose in some desperate attempt to get America and China into the war.

And the world knows quite well that Chiang does not stand alone in his desire to settle accounts with the Stalinists with American arms. There is also the Knowland wing of the Republican Party; the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Radford; and a big batch of generals who agree with him.

SUN-BATHERS WARN

It appears that to this group we can now add the executive council of the American Federation of

MURDER IN PUERTO RICO Shows the Political Climate

By BERNARD CRAMER

A murder has thrown a spotlight on the administration of justice in Puerto Rico under the regime of Munoz Marin, who is presented to American liberals as a paladin of democracy.

A dispatch to the New York paper *La Prensa* reports from San Juan: "The matter most discussed this week has been the exoneration of Rafael Flores Montanez by Judge Julio Suarez Garriga. As

is public knowledge, Rafael Flores Montanez clubbed to death Victor Carrasquillo. Montanez alleged that he had killed in self-defense and the public officer did not question the word of the killer and considered that he had acted with justification."

But this is not a routine barbarous slaying. Two public facts about it expose the atmosphere of political persecution of opponents which prevails in the so-called "free state" under the Munoz regime.

In the first place, the victim Carrasquillo was a well-known Nationalist Party supporter. Last March, when scores were arrested in Puerto Rico on the mere ground that they belonged to the same political party as the four who fired shots at the floor of Congress in Washington, he was among those taken in. He was among those acquitted by the jury—as *La Prensa* says, "a jury composed of 12 citizens completely free of any suspicion of sympathy for the Puerto Rican Nationalist movement."

Before this, Carrasquillo had served as a principled political objector against the American army

(Continued on page 4)

THREE DOWN

Beria—

Mikoyan—Malenkov . . .

Next week's LABOR ACTION will analyze the events surrounding the downfall of Malenkov and the changing of the guard in the Kremlin.



(Turn to last page)

AFL-CIO Unity Has Reuther Boxed In

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Feb. 6—While the prospect of labor unity between the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations is viewed as a major blessing as well as a foregone conclusion in most labor circles, it seems more like a shotgun wedding to the UAW.

Walter Reuther, CIO and UAW president, seems to be boxed in, and in no position to demand the kind of terms from the AFL which would eliminate some obvious evils in the American labor movement.

Spearheaded by Dave Macdonald of the Steelworkers, most CIO officials are rushing to sign any kind of unity agreement which would put them in a position comparable to their colleagues in the AFL, both power-wise and financially speaking.

The kind of unionism foreseen by these bureaucrats was symbolized this week by the embarrassing story—embarrassing to Walter Reuther—that came from Miami Beach. It was published that Reuther's headquarters for the negotiations were at the \$120-a-day rate at the Roney Plaza Hotel, much to Reuther's personal dislike and to the amusement of the AFL and CIO officials who love to bask in the reflected glory of the wealthy vacationers in Florida.

While Reuther finds it difficult to hide his dislike for this kind of ostentatious living, he finds his dislike for the company of many AFL officials (especially Dave Beck) almost impossible to conceal.

Nor can he hold out for the kind of no-raiding agreement that is vital to decent unity, to prevent many smaller unions from being swallowed up by ambitious people like Beck. Nor can he get any serious action on the grave problem of racketeering in AFL unions.

In the UAW, one regional director is slated for the skids simply because he seems to own too much property and too many saloons. This is hardly a recommendation for re-election in a union like the UAW, while this same individual would be a piker or almost a paragon of virtue in the Teamsters Union, for example.

But the insistence of MacDonald on unity at any cost—especially at the prospect of cutting Reuther down to size—and his obvious determination to split the CIO if Reuther continues to press for any better terms than those now offered by the AFL, has taken away Reuther's power.

Nor is this simply a matter of Reuther being reduced in stature to just another AFL vice-president. There are many tendencies within the UAW itself to ape AFL business-unionism and this development will get a spurt and support in an AFL organization.

Against this unwelcome trend, the UAW and Walter Reuther have one main weapon: the determination to put on a campaign for a 1955 negotiations victory which will cause sufficient discontent in more complacent unions to bring some revitalization of the American labor movement. This may well turn out to be Reuther's last stand against the pressures of status-quo unionism.

LABOR SCOPE

Weddings and Tails . . . AFL Puzzle . . . The Cold Finger

By BEN HALL

When George Meany met reporters after the Miami winter meeting of Labor's League for Political Education, he complained bitterly about the choice by the Democrats of Representative Graham A. Barden of North Carolina to head the House Labor Committee. Barden, he said, was hostile to labor on all issues—a simple truth.

Of course, he hastened to add, the Republican labor policy was hopelessly anti-labor. However, he emphasized, the AFL was "not wedded to the Democratic Party."

This last phrase is becoming a commonplace in the labor movement. Reuther has just reminded us that the CIO is not "the tail to the Democratic kite."

What remains puzzling is this: if labor rejects the Republican Party and if it is not a wedded Democratic tail, where will it go if the Democratic Party is not satisfactory?

A wedded woman can always go home to mother. An unwedded labor movement can hardly go home to a Republican. Just our way of saying that a labor movement which wants to assert its independence must hold the door open to a new party.

AFL Puzzle

The AFL Executive Council, also meeting in Miami, voted for full support to Eisenhower's Formosa policy. In fact, it warned, somewhat like right-winger Knowland, against any concessions to the Mao regime. Recognize Communist China? Never, at least not until the people of China had a chance to vote in free elections. Until that time, the U. S. should recognize only the Chiang regime.

A very novel position! As long as a dictatorship rules the mainland of China, we are to defend a dictatorship on For-

mosa. But the AFL, which is anxious for free elections in China, has, regrettably little or no influence with Mao. But it has some influence in the United States, which supports a military dictatorship on Formosa. Why not demand free elections and full democracy for the Formosans?

The Cold Finger

In his radio broadcast of January 24, CIO commentator John W. Vandercook was dubious over Eisenhower's policy. He is in a hopeless muddle over the problem; he sees nothing wrong with supporting dictator Chiang, and he yearns for a return to Truman's policy.

As, for example: "One can't help but wonder if Mr. Eisenhower may now regret that he abandoned the Truman policy of keeping the Chiang Kai-shek regime in exile from taking potshots at the Communists. While that policy was in effect, the Formosa strait area was quiet."

Vandercook comments not at all about quiet and noise in other parts of Asia under the Truman regime, say in Korea.

But what we want to highlight about his radio broadcast is his recognition of the mood of our times as reflected in the Formosa discussion: "In the House an invisible, cold finger of warning lay on every shoulder—the warning that is one of the peculiar afflictions of our time and one of its great dangers—the warning that a politician, of any party, who dares even to discuss an official policy in relation to a Communist power, will invite by his daring the deadly charge that he is an appeaser, or is even sympathetic to the Reds."

Spirit of the Times

While on the spirit of our times, we are reminded of the formation of a Leather Workers Organizing Committee of the CIO whose task it will be to unify several locals which have seceded from the Stalinist-dominated Fur and Leather Workers Union and to begin a drive to win the majority of leather workers back into the CIO.

The committee is chaired by a well-known labor official, R. J. Thomas, who was last headlined in a desperate struggle to hold on to the presidency of the UAW, a struggle in which he held on to a last-ditch alliance with the Stalinists. LWOC rules exclude from membership anyone who is a member of the Communist Party or who follows its line.

Many unions have inserted such clauses in their constitutions. But the action of the LWOC is nonetheless significant. This is the first important CIO organizing committee to be set up under the administration of Walter Reuther. The UAW constitution does not exclude CPers from membership.

The following possibilities are suggested: (1) That this portends an attempt to change the UAW constitution in a direction calculated to satisfy right-wing elements in the labor movement; or (2) that Reuther, in the search for respectability, permitted the LWOC to adopt its rule without criticism from him but does not intend to force such a rule into the UAW; or (3) that Reuther mildly and gingerly questioned the clause but quickly withdrew under pressure from CIO Vice-president Riffe, representative of the Steel Workers Union.

Give us a hand to keep our fine press going for the coming year! Contribute to the ISL Fund Drive!

QUOTAS

National Office	\$1500
New York	3800
Chicago	1800
Los Angeles	600
Bay Area	500
Newark	400
Philadelphia	250
Buffalo	250
Detroit	200
Pittsburg	175
Seattle	150
Cleveland	150
Indiana	75
Akron	50
Reading	50
Oregon	50
St. Louis	25
Streator	25

ISL FUND DRIVE

On the Mark — the Goal Is 10G

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

On February 15 the Independent Socialist League will open its 15th Annual Fund Drive. The 1955 campaign has a goal of raising \$10,000 to sustain the ISL and the press, the *New International* and *LABOR ACTION*.

There never was a more important time than now not merely for the maintenance but the extension of our press. As the world moves from crisis to crisis, the message of socialism, independent and international socialism, is more urgent than ever. There are not many such voices in our land, or in the rest of the world.

The crisis in the world is now reflected in the danger of war; it is also reflected in the decline of democracy. It doesn't take a keen eye to see that the voices raised against the danger of another world imperialist war, and against the attacks on democracy in the form of attacks on civil liberties, are not many.

Judicial pricesses by "committee hearings," or the establishment of a national index by an attorney general's "subversive list," followed up by state proscription lists, have become part of everyday

life. These have produced private "watch and ward" political censor groups, which act like vigilantes in almost all sectors of American life. The black list is becoming a norm in the country.

The worst feature of this government-inspired development is the difficulty in obtaining due process against administrative acts without legal precedent. Thus, the attorney general's list, drawn up in secret, without charges made against organizations, and without any hearings whatsoever, has become the national index, even though it has no legal standing in a court of law.

Yet the voices raised against this unhappy development have been few indeed. Even those who have been fighting against this, like the ISL and its press, have received small support.

Right now, the ISL has one case in the District Court of Appeals in Washington, the Shachtman case. Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL, was denied a passport on the sole ground that the ISL was on the attorney general's list. That case is, in effect, a challenge to the legal standing of the list. Through the aid of the Workers De-

fense League and the interest shown in the case by Norman Thomas, we were able to obtain the services of Joseph Rauh as counsel. But the case has not yet received the wide support it deserves from those organizations who should be in the thick of the fight.

We have had to go it almost alone. All of this is in preparation for our long-standing demands on the attorney general to grant a hearing to the ISL. After we had complied with all the regulations in Executive Order 10450, the very busy and very political attorney general has yet to set the promised date for a hearing, one year and a half after the ISL replied to the interrogatories of the Department of Justice.

More recently, the New York State Civil Service Commission, employing the attorney general's list, put the ISL, without notification or a hearing, on a list of its own. That action will be challenged by the ISL. It has already enlisted the aid of the New York Civil Liberties Union and its counsel, Osmond K. Fraenkel.

The ISL is fighting not only in its own name; it is carrying on a fight that belongs to the whole labor and liberal movement. But the labor movement is sadly and shamefacedly silent about the whole business; it says little about these things and does even less. The liberal movement is sharply divided on these questions. A large part of the liberal movement, because it is compromised on the question of war and imperialism, rationalizes the blows against civil liberties on the ground that most of it is directed against the Stalinists. But these liberals remain silent even when anti-Stalinists are victimized.

These are some of the reasons why the ISL 1955 Fund Drive is more important than ever. Our quota is not as great as in former years, but our needs are certainly greater.

We call upon all our readers and friends to help us in this fight we are making.

Below we print a list of local quotas for the ISL. The ISL will do its part; but it needs help, more help than it has received in other years.

Give us a hand to fight our cases!

Mark Twain on Loyalty

You see my kind of loyalty was loyalty to one's country, not to its institutions or its office-holders. The country is the real thing, the substantial thing, the eternal thing: it is the thing to watch over, and care for, and be loyal to; institutions are extraneous, they are its mere clothing, and clothing can wear out, become ragged, cease to be comfortable, cease to protect the body from winter, disease and death. To be loyal to rags, to shout for rags, to worship rags, to die for rags—that is a loyalty of unreason, it is pure animal; it belongs to monarchy, it was invented by monarchy; let monarchy keep it. I was from Connecticut whose constitution declares "that all political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their benefit; and that they have at all times an indeniable and indefeasible right to alter their form of government in such a manner as they may think expedient."

Under that gospel, the citizen who thinks he sees that the commonwealth's political clothes are worn out, and yet holds his peace and does not agitate for a new suit, is disloyal; he is a traitor. That he may be the only one who thinks he sees this decay, does not excuse him; it is his duty to agitate any way, and it is the duty of the others to vote him down if they do not see the matter as he does.

MARK TWAIN, "A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court."

BRITAIN

Who'll Step into Key Labor Post?

By BERNARD DIX

LONDON, Feb. 2—This week there began the process of choosing a man for one of the most important positions in the British labor movement. The position is that of general secretary to the Transport and General Workers' Union which, with over 1¼ million members, is the largest trade union in the world and one which has a decisive voice in many matters concerning British labor.

The election is necessary because Arthur Deakin, the present general secretary, reaches the age of 65 in November and must therefore, according to the union rules, retire from office. His successor will be chosen by a ballot vote of the whole membership—or those prepared to cast their votes—and the nomination papers for the election have this week been dispatched to the 4,000-odd branches maintained all over Britain.

Arthur Deakin was elected secretary in 1945 as successor to Ernest Bevin; but he had in fact been doing the job since 1940 when Bevin resigned active participation in the union on becoming minister of labor in Churchill's wartime coalition government. Six candidates offered themselves for election in 1945 and Deakin scored an easy victory by topping the poll with 203,314 votes; this was more than the total number of votes received by the other five candidates.

Deakin's period of office as the secretary of this giant union is not likely to go unremembered by the British labor movement. In particular it is not likely to be forgotten by labor's left wing, which has found itself in constant conflict with Deakin and the 835 votes which he controlled at the Labor Party Annual Conferences. On every major issue Deakin has lined up with the right wing in no uncertain manner; time after time he has been the spearhead of the right wing attack with his hard-hitting speeches at the BLP annual conferences.

At the 1952 conference, for example, he was billed to deliver to the Labor Party fraternal greetings on behalf of the Trade Union Congress. His actual speech could hardly be called fraternal! He lunged aggressively at the Bevanites, whom he accused of "creating a mistrust which will destroy the confidence of the people of this country in the Labor Party as an effective instrument of parliamentary government."

RIGHT-WING HATCHETMAN

He claimed that the Bevanites had organized a caucus within the party and warned them that an organization would be set up to counter it. He further demanded that the Bevanite weekly *Tribune* cease what he called its "vituperation" and "carping criticism." This speech, it must be recalled, was made the day after the elections had taken place for the National Executive Committee when the Bevanites had captured six out of the available seven places and had unseated Herbert Morrison in the process—a factor which greatly annoyed the right wing.

This speech of 1952 is not an isolated example of Deakin's attitude towards the left wing—it is a characterization of his normal behavior. He has constantly used every weapon at his disposal in order to frustrate left opinions and to silence critics of the official party line.

Last October when the dockers were engaged in one of Britain's most important post-war strikes Deakin used every endeavor to stifle the left wing, even to the extent of prompting the Labor Party executive to use the threat of expulsion against Michael Foot, Jennie Lee and J. P. W. Mallalieu—the three Bevanite MPs who comprise the editorial board of *Tribune*.

The row blew up when Deakin, in a speech at Birmingham, was reported to

have said that the strike on the docks was a Communist-inspired plot. *Tribune* immediately hit back by stating that Deakin, in making such allegations, proved that he did not know what the strike was about and that he had little interest in finding out. It also delivered a further well-aimed blow at Deakin by pointing out that he had made this allegation at Birmingham—an inland city—and that he had not even bothered to attend dockers' meetings held in London.

Following this article the General Council of the TUC, of which Deakin is a very prominent member, complained to the NEC of the Labor Party, which in turn complained to the editorial board of *Tribune*. In its letter of complaint the NEC stated that the article was an "unwarranted, irresponsible and scurrilous attack upon the leadership of the Transport and General Workers' Union," in other words upon Arthur Deakin. The letter further asked the editorial board of *Tribune* how such an attack was reconciled with membership of the Labor Party. Thus the Bevanites were plainly told that their opposition to Deakin could lead to expulsion from the party.

The outcome of this conflict was a lengthy article in *Tribune* in which the three Bevanite MPs justified their position and pressed home their attack against Deakin and the right wing in general. Then—just for good measure—they reprinted in full the article which had originally given offense to Deakin. Faced with this gesture of defiance, and the support which it received amongst the party rank-and-file, the NEC were forced to play on the soft pedal, and the storm gradually blew out leaving *Tribune* the undoubted victor and Arthur Deakin still not "compensated" for the attacks made upon him.

CANDIDATES

So much for Deakin. What of likely successors?

The favorite is considered to be the present assistant general secretary, Jock Tiffin. A man in many ways similar to Deakin, he has also made an impression as an outspoken antagonist of the left wing, thus following the footsteps of both Deakin and Bevin. Tiffin was for some time chairman of the London Labor Party and many of the conferences over which he presided were the scene of stormy debates in which he always played a prominent part in resisting the pressure of the left.

A further likely successor is the present chairman of the London Labor Party, Charles Brandon. A quiet and placid man he is entirely a different character from either Deakin or Tiffin. Although he is known to be a firm friend of Herbert Morrison and generally sympathetic to the right wing, he displays none of the aggressiveness of the other two; his chairmanship of the London Party has been marked by the fair manner in which he has conducted himself. His present position in the unions that of the London area secretary—which means he is responsible for nearly 1,500 branches containing 358,000 members, a foree to be reckoned with if it swings to his support in this election.

CP'S ROLE

Besides these two contestants there are likely to be several others who stand much less chance of being elected. In the absence of a cohesive left force in the union it is impossible to foresee whether a candidate is likely to appear who will present a challenge to both Tiffin and Brandon on issues of policy rather than administration and personality. As is common in such affairs rumors are rife but few of them seem to have sufficient foundation to rely upon.

One of the points of interest likely to develop during the election is the attitude of the Communist Party. For some years now the union has prohibited members of the Communist Party from holding

(Turn to last page)

LONDON LETTER

Britain Is Fumbling with Colored Immigrant Issue

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Feb. 2—Britain is facing a rising problem of discrimination against colored immigrants, especially workers from the West Indies.

One of the important quotas of the McCarran Act limited the number of West Indians entering the United States to 100 per year, which virtually prevented them going there to seek work.

It is estimated that of the working population of the West Indies one third is unemployed or underemployed; furthermore only about half the marriages are of a permanent nature, while families are large.

The ease with which manufactured goods can be sent to the West Indies, the clemency of their climate, and the happy disposition of their people have all tended to discourage capital investment in industry to the advantage of a flourishing tourist industry for wealthy Americans and Britons.

This chronic underemployment forces West Indians to emigrate. Nowadays since the McCarran Act, they have come to Britain to seek work in a country of full employment.

CROWDED IN SLUMS

Many of them have had to sell valuable possessions to enable them and their families to make the journey. It costs each adult at least 40 weeks' full wages, and many have been saving for years.

On arriving in Britain most have settled in London, Liverpool and Birmingham. Because of their poverty they have settled in the slums, and many are living at a very high density per house because they cannot afford rents. As in other parts of the world, economic factors like these have forced them to live in circumscribed districts.

Their lack of technical training has meant that they have had to concentrate in particular jobs. In Birmingham, for instance, many work as casual laborers in the light steel plants. In London they are employed as bus conductors, railway porters, etc. The majority are employed in nationalized industries or in the Civil Service, because of prejudice among private employers.

Unfortunately, the trade unions have not always taken the most progressive line. Their official policy is against discrimination at every level, and they have obtained guarantees that they will not be employed at lesser rates than are paid to other union members.

Yet in Birmingham and in London there have been occasional stoppages of bus crews. Some conductresses are said to have objected to the employment of Negroes "because they were frightened." However, last month the Birmingham Trades Council passed a resolution against any discrimination. This was given wide publicity.

Birmingham and Brixton—a district of London—have recently been concerned about the position of West Indians. Some welfare organizations are genuinely concerned about their overcrowding; some political organizations want an excuse to exclude them. The Home Secretary recently appointed an adviser to the West Indians in Birmingham. He has been inundated with requests for lodgings, for work and for legal aid. Brixton is organizing a committee to help them.

Different ideas, however, motivated Osborne, a Conservative MP, who introduced a bill to limit the number of immigrants into England.

Though he denied it, it was obviously directed against West Indians. In defense

of his bill, many Tories pointed out that Englishmen could not travel freely to the West Indies, to Canada, or most of the dominions in the empire. Osborne wanted to see that all immigrants were in good health, had some guaranteed support in this country, and had work to go to when they arrived.

The Tories pointed out that many West Indians were living on National Assistance because they could not find suitable work. They did not point out that it was only a very small per cent of the total who had not found work so far, nor that the reason for Commonwealth restriction on immigrants was precisely to keep out colored people and "undesirable" Middle Europeans.

In this connection, when Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia, was asked in a television interview why colored people were not allowed to emigrate there, he replied that it was not that Australians did not like colored people, but that they felt they had a right to decide what types of people entered their country. Everyone knows that it is to preserve Australia from "the Yellow Peril" of Chinese, Malays and Japanese.

It is said that there are 20,000 colored people in Birmingham; it is said that this number of West Indians intends to come over annually. So far, however, few statistical studies have been made, and most statements are loaded with prejudice. It is, however, true that—as Bustamente said recently—many more men than women are coming to Britain. If emigration is to be any sort of solution to the economic problems of the West Indies, more women will have to leave.

AID THEM ABROAD

Fears have been expressed that Britain will be "overrun" by colored people. This idea is not only childish but unworthy. It has been pointed out that when slavery was abolished in England in the early 19th century, the proportion of colored people was much higher than it could possibly be were the whole population of Jamaica to come over here.

As socialists we don't bother to incline our ears to such nonsense, but I quote it to demonstrate the shallowness of the rationalization some people use.

The West Indians' case is foolproof. They don't like the climate here; some people don't like them here. If the British government does not want them here, why not invest more money there to provide more work? Furthermore, why did the British government make agreements to take large quantities of sugar and bananas from Cuba, when the labor situation was far worse in Jamaica—and it is responsible.

Meanwhile, the recent elections in Jamaica have brought in Mr. Manley and his Labor Party. Manley is considered to be a man of integrity, though not such a demagogue as Bustamente—the Minister of Transport and leader of the last government. It remains to be seen whether Manley—a respectable lawyer—will be able to take serious measures in the face of the British governor-general to alleviate the severe economic depression which forces so many unhappy West Indians to leave their beautiful islands in search of work.

Note: The date has been changed to

FRIDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 25—8:15 p.m.

MAX SHACHTMAN

on

Peace Through Coexistence?

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

DEFECTORS

'LOOK' LAMENTS THE FATE OF THOSE WHO 'CHOOSE FREEDOM'

By BOB BENDIX.

The current issue of *Look* magazine has a little piece on a less well-known sidelight in cold war, the fate of those "who choose freedom."

There are, after all, only a few Kravchenkos who make the transition from the relative comfort afforded to a minor Stalinist bureaucrat to the even greater comfort of a best-seller in the West. What happens to the rest of the refugees from Stalinism?

It is well known that a number of official and semi-official propaganda agencies of the U. S. lay a great emphasis on Stalinist defectors, particularly if the defector happens to be a former MVD man, that is to say, ex-butcher. Special provisions in the McCarran Act exist for the purpose of smoothing the way to the land of milk and honey of the fortunate ones who choose freedom if . . . if there is some immediate propaganda benefit to be gained from his defection from the Kremlin.

But thousands escape; thousands of faceless—and politically unimportant—citizens of the USSR make their way to Western Germany every year. Their fate is an indictment of U. S. propaganda even in the eyes of people who accept the American camp with few if any qualifications.

Today we know—and many liberals are still silent about—the fate of hundreds of thousands of DPs immediately after the Second World War. It is perhaps one of the worst betrayals that can be laid at the door of the Western Allies during the period of amity that followed Yalta and Teheran. Thousands were deported forcibly into the hands of the Stalinists; the MVD had a free run of a number of DP camps and was actively aided by the police of a number of Western countries in hunting out those who refused to go back.

UNRRA, administered by New Deal liberals and probably unusually heavily influenced by the Stalinists, cooperated

fully in the efforts of the Stalinist regimes to force the return of its reluctant citizens. LaGuardia and Lehman (who headed that agency) might or might not have known about its role, but its role is documentable. It refused food to "trouble-makers" and put every conceivable pressure on the DPs to return.

The fate of most of the Russian citizens who had been exposed to the temptations of the West was years of forced labor. And in all probability the fact that they had been turned over to the Russians by U. S. or British army authorities helped them get a better perspective on the realities of power politics today.

DISHEARTENED

However today, presumably, we have "learned." After all turning the DPs over to the tender mercies of their oppressors was something that came as a part of the alliance with the Soviet Union, and can be blamed on Roosevelt and his liberals (so the line goes); today we know that Stalinism must be fought and that we must appeal to the peoples of Eastern Europe. . . . Endless books are written to prove that our best allies are the Russian people; Radio Free Europe spends huge sums on its propaganda work. Movies are made about the mass of staunch democrats who long for a chance to cross the Iron curtain to fight for freedom; etc.

The article in *Look*, slickly illustrated, shows a rather unattractive detention camp. It features articles about a number of the inmates. For example: a family of three living on relief (\$35 a month). For example: a number of former privates and officers in the Russian forces who "are snarled up by red tape" and have no place to go—who certainly cannot come to the United States.

In interviewing one of the deserters the article pauses to consider the fact that after three years in the detention camp he is almost ready to go back to whatever fate awaits a deserter in Russia.

The fate of such men can help to explain why there are fewer deserters now than there were a few years before. It must have taken years before the would be deserters came to believe that their fate in the West would be almost exactly what the Stalinist propaganda said it would be.

Currently a major appeal for further funds for Radio Free Europe is under way. Many labor and liberal leaders are associated with this organization. It is to be wondered how much they know about a campaign which asks men to risk their lives to escape to Western Europe, knowing full well that they will be left to rot in various detention camps for years to come.

YOU'RE INVITED

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

Labor Action FORUM New York

Thursday, Feb. 17
8:45 p.m.

Stan Gray

reviews

"The Vinson Court"

A Study of the Course
of the Supreme Court

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

Note that there will be no Forum on Thursday, Feb. 24, since the Shachtman meeting on "Peace Through Coexistence?" is taking place the next day (see ad on page three).

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

right, all of it reduced to rubble, and the suburbs 25 miles out would be lucky to escape with mere masses of dead.

Taking off from this vivid reminder, the card ad bears a message. What can it be?

Instructions on evacuation, perhaps? Exhortation to join the CD corps? A plea to prevent war?

None of these. The big type on the card reminds us to have enough first-aid supplies on hand.

Expert

We see that Senator Bricker of Ohio has criticized "some present-day scientists" who talk publicly about political matters that are outside their fields of "special competence." He was, of course, hinting that politicians like himself would be happier if scientists stopped exercising their political consciences (in public) about the uses of the atom bomb, or, in other words, foreign policy, as well as about such questions as witch-hunts against scientists.

Bricker raises an interesting question—not, however, about scientists but about politicians.

As far as the scientists themselves are concerned, the case is simple. They have a right and duty to speak out on political questions like every other citizen, and on matters like the above-mentioned, a greater-than-average moral duty to speak up.

To be sure, there are people who foster the delusion that a man who has attained eminence in one field is equally an authority on entirely unrelated matters—like the newspapermen who ask for opinions on the international situation from socialites returning from Cannes. But this is a prejudice held less frequently by scientists than by the press and the politicians.

If, however, people are to be restricted to matters within their areas of special

competence, what would have to be done with types like Bricker and politicians in general? The prospect for democracy which this raises is enough to make one view with alarm.

Politicians commonly claim special competence on only one question: how to get elected, or how to get somebody else elected. Once elected (to the Senate, for example) these specialists unfortunately have to vote on a wide variety of issues, like what to do with the atom bomb, about which they know nothing and about which they can only bone up in a hurry at the best.

It is precisely the ideology of authoritarianism to talk in terms of excluding non-specialists from this field.

In fact, the whole field of politics has this in common with (a) parenthood and (b) the Olympic Games, namely, that amateur status itself has a "special competence" here. Indeed a longer-term aim of socialism is to abolish professional politicians entirely. Unfortunately this is not an immediate possibility, though a look at Bricker makes us want to hurry it along.

"Our Man"

The U.S.-installed dictatorship in Guatemala has taken another big step back to the past with a series of measures, proclaimed by Castillo Armas, destroying the rights of labor. As a result in part of energetic attacks and demands by the CIO and AFL, the regime retreated in its first efforts to destroy free labor unions entirely, but it has now struck directly at workers' demands. In addition, a week ago, peasants' unions were banned.

The new anti-labor measures free employers from obligations to: make job changes on the basis of seniority and ability; check off union dues; avoid any type of discrimination; allow time off to union officials for union business; reinstate dismissed workers who win in the labor courts; etc.

Puerto Rico Murder — —

(Continued from page 1)

draft. He had refused to register, in spite of the fact that, because of physical defects, he could never have been accepted anyway.

OBVIOUS BRUTALITY

The second fact is that this man who was killed by Flores "in self-defense" was an invalid and cripple who could barely walk, as a result of an early spinal injury complicated by arthritis which prevented the normal use of his arms.

The plea of "self-defense" was entered by the killer Flores, then, against a man four feet high who had great difficulty moving his very legs and arms. Yet this plea was unhesitatingly accepted by the police and courts.

A memorial article by Ruth Reynolds, who knew Carrasquillo, points out: "Flores was released immediately on his own recognizances. After investigating the matter, Judge Suarez Garriga announced that Carrasquillo had been teaching Nationalist doctrines to his sons, and that he saw no reason to charge Flores with any crime. The murderer has returned to live and work on the farm belonging to the man he killed, while Carrasquillo's 9-year-old son, Victor Jr., has found a haven in an orphanage operated by Spanish priests."

The *La Prensa* dispatch reports: "Among the allegations accepted unconditionally by the Public Ministry in exonerating him, Flores Montanez alleged that Carrasquillo had been coming around bothering him and threatening him. . . . The killer of Victor Carrasquillo al-

leges also that his victim threatened him, brandishing a machete. All this was also accepted firmly by the officers of public justice who exonerated the killer."

This then is what has scandalized Puerto Rico—the speedy exonerated of a killer simply on the ground that he claims he had to defend himself against attack by a crippled dwarf by beating the latter to death!

MANEUVERS AHEAD

A subsequent dispatch to *La Prensa* from San Juan hints that some legal machinations are in process by District Attorney Angel Viera Martinez, an experienced hatchetman of the Munoz machine against the Nationalists. The official "will file a charge of assassination" against Flores in spite of the decision of the judge "and in spite of the necessity of taking the matter to the Supreme Court so that it may review the decision of the judge."

The *La Prensa* story adds:

"District Attorney Viera Martinez said that he proposes to file the indictment as soon as possible, but that he could not set a specific date."

It may well be that the murder occurred for personal motives, but what is significant about the case is the political motives of the regime in shielding the brutal murderer. So the people of Puerto Rico suspect, as they read the headlines.

It is a question whether orders from Washington will get the Munoz regime to put a better face on an otherwise blatant offense to justice.

Joe Knight

In sorrow we report the death of a comrade of long standing in Cleveland, Joe Knight. From early youth, when he was an itinerant worker and active member of the IWW, Joe Knight had dedicated himself to the freeing of the working class from political, economic and social injustice.

He was at one time a national leader of the Proletarian Party, devoting full time to organization work. His political development led him independently to the positions of the Workers Party and the ISL. After many years of organizing and teaching, Comrade Knight was forced to refrain from active participation in the socialist struggle, but he carried his convictions firmly to the end, and never gave up his hope for the emancipation of the working class.

The ISL, and its Cleveland branch in particular, marks the passing of Comrade Knight with renewed determination to accomplish the goals for which he had given so much of his life.



**LABOR
ACTION**

February 14, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 7

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

Youth Organizations and the Young Socialist Movement in Britain

By ALEX NEWBOLD

LONDON, Jan. 14—Interest in politics among young people in Britain today is not very great, and this is noticed by all the political youth organizations in the country. This is a situation common to all the countries in Europe which escaped the complete economic chaos during and following the Second World War and have experienced comparatively stable social-democratic regimes.

The political apathy among young people has particularly been noticed in such countries as Denmark and Sweden where before the war practically the whole of the organized youth movement was centered around the adult political parties. The earnings of young people in these countries have been comparatively high over the whole period, and sports, dancing and even hooliganism at times have proved far more attractive than "playing at politics." Entertainment in the political youth movements is largely self-made, and why, so the argument goes, should we bother about making our own entertainment when there are plenty of cinemas, dance-halls and amusement arcades to provide the entertainment for us and we have the money with which to pay for this?

We therefore have the anomalous position where the actions of the two rival imperialisms are demanding more and more attention and protests from people before it is too late, while the group of people who should and would otherwise have provided a vigorous opposition to the status quo—the youth—are remaining silent. The lack of interest applies equally to socialist and conservative youth groups, but it is obviously to the latter's advantage, for apathy always plays into the hands of reaction.

REACHED A PEAK

In Britain, there has never been a very strong political youth movement of a socialist character, for there has always existed a virile non-political youth movement, and the atmosphere in the Labor movement has always been against the enthusiastic banner-waving and crusading spirit of the continental socialist youth movements; a large potential membership particularly during the thirties was needlessly lost.

There was a Labor League of Youth in existence during a part of the thirties, but a long struggle between Stalinist popular-frontists and generally left-wing militants led to a complete victory of the former, and the Labor Party consequently dissolved it sometime before the outbreak of the war. The vital opportunity on the part of the Labor Party to reform the League immediately after the 1945 victory was lost, and it was not until some local

branches of the League, formed under the auspices of the local Labor Parties in 1948-49, pressed for a national coordination of League branches, that the B.L.P. gave any serious attention to the youth movement on a national basis. Although the popularity of the B.L.P. was at that time past its peak, there followed a rapid expansion of the LLOY all over the country.

The total number of branches reached 662 in November, 1949 and an all-time peak of 820 in November of the following year, representing well over one branch for each parliamentary constituency.

LITTLE HELP FROM BLP

The foundation of the League was only a prelude to a long and bitter struggle between it and the adult party. Afraid lest the experience of pre-war days, when the Stalinists had gained control of the organization, was to repeat itself, the B.L.P. conceded only very limited powers to the League from the start.

The National Committee was only a consultative committee, with no real powers of decision; the national conference (held every year since the foundation of the League) was only to be a national and not an annual conference, to impress on the delegates that it was only held regularly by the grace of Transport House; and worst of all, no political resolutions were allowed to be discussed at this conference.

These rules were justified by the N.E.C. of the BLP by pointing out that the Leagues were "integral parts" of the local LPs (as indeed they technically were) and that consequently as all members of the League were ipso facto members of their local LPs, they had full rights of political discussion in their wards and on their general management committees. But this never belied the fact that their political enthusiasm became somewhat diluted by the endless discussions on the number of cups of tea for the next social being organized by the party, or of how many poll-tellers were needed for the coming municipal elections—two topics which habitually take up some 80 per cent of the time taken at local LP meetings.

Needless to say, the choice of person to make the tea or act as pollster usually falls on young Harry, who would be far better employed doing this than talking his head off about politics, which after all, he really doesn't know very much about yet.

And it is not surprising if many young and enthusiastic comrades soon dropped out after a short period of this treatment. By no means do I want to imply that the adult sections of the party were deliberately hostile always, but there is no doubt that some were, and others considered the League as more of a nuisance to put up with than as a positive help in the struggle for Socialism.

WON CONCESSIONS

During the initial period of its existence, organization was set up at all levels to coordinate the activities of the Leagues—local, regional and national. It was decided that the National Committee should consist of two delegates from each regional committee. This resulted in the composition of the League's national body being rather unrepresentative of the feelings of the League as a whole, since in many regions where proper organization never existed, the delegates were then nominees of the local paid party official, and this is becoming even more the rule today when the organization is getting still weaker.

At the same time a bitter struggle was being waged by most active Leaguers for

what was called "national status" and the National Status Movement dominated the early development of the League. Broadly, it aimed at achieving for the League a status of independence from the national party as it existed in nearly all continental socialist youth movements.

In this movement militant left-wingers soon took a dominant lead. Organization, they said, would not offer an attraction to youth, yet that was all the League was allowed to discuss at the National Conference. If it could discuss politics at a national level and consequently form its own policy, it knew it had the constructive alternative to present to youth in Britain.

The following years up to the present day saw the gradual granting of most of these demands, thus in many ways stealing the thunder from the opposition inside the League, but at the same time coming too late to save the League from a wholesale decline; so that at the count in January 1954 there were only 384 branches left in the country, and now, a year later, probably fewer still.

The first of these concessions was in the form of study reports, first of all presented to the conference in 1952, and based on reports sent in by League discussion groups and collated by the NCC. The first two of these were on "Youth and Education" and "Youth and Recreation" and although they didn't give great scope for discussion, the delegates to the conference showed great ingenuity in bringing all the world's problems within the range of these two topics.

LEAN TO LEFT

The documents presented to the 1953 Conference on "Control and Management of Industry in a Democratic Socialist State" and "Youth's Contribution to World Peace and Recovery," and to the 1954 Conference on "European Unity" and "Local Government," provided good opportunities for lively political discussions, and it became quite obvious that the majority of delegates to both conferences rejected the official policy of the BLP in favor of a more militant and progressive alternative. Thus the document on World Peace stated: "Once a country becomes a satellite of either the Communist or American capitalist systems, then its whole economy is gradually geared up to assist in the struggle [for world domination]. Undoubtedly this means that the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. can be classified as imperialist." European Unity was rejected completely except on the basis of a Socialist United States of Europe, as it was felt that the present attempts at unity were only made to provide a front line of defense (or attack) in a struggle between the two world blocs.

A further concession has now been made for this year's conference, where amendments and resolutions will be allowed on the study group reports. But there is likely to be still fewer delegates to discuss these reports, for the League shows no signs of reviving, and an optimistic assessment of the numbers in the League

put the membership at somewhere around five thousand, and by no means all these are really politically active.

YOUNG TORIES

It may be worth taking a short glance at the other political youth organizations. Numerically, the Young Conservatives are by far the largest; at one time they numbered 100,000, but even they are experiencing a decline at the moment.

To call it a political youth movement is really a euphemism, since their politics only go as far as snob appeal, and the rest of the time is almost entirely spent in organized dances and whist drives. In a sense the Tories have been more clever than the BLP for they have at least managed to get a few more active helpers during election times—but apart from this activity, politics are considered rather dangerous, because when several of these young Tories have taken part in youth parliaments in various parts of the country, they have started thinking and often left to join the BLP. Debates are therefore always discouraged by the local Tory agents.

The Young Communists do not have a very great influence at all, apart from being the only one of the three to publish a weekly paper. (The League publishes a monthly 12-page tabloid, the Young Tories nothing at all.) They have been making strenuous attempts to infiltrate and influence the League, with hardly any success, for it has generally held true with the League, as with other adult bodies, that where a radical alternative to the status quo is offered, the maneuverings of the Stalinists are readily exposed for the sham that they are. For example, it is interesting to note that at the last two annual conferences of the LLY there was not a single delegate who took even a fellow-traveling line in the discussions.

The YSL's Aim

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means; or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

You can still attend the New York YSL seminar-class on
Toward an Understanding of Marxism

Meets in two sections, Tues. or Wed. at 7:30 p.m. at 114 West 14 St., N.Y.C.

The third session, Feb. 15-16, will be on "The Economics of Marxism."

Other sessions as follows:

- (4) The Economics of Marxism (continued).
- (5) The Class Struggle and Society.
- (6) State and Revolution.
- (7) Approaches to Marxism.
- (8) Concepts of Democratic Socialism.
- (9) Marxism as Method.

Come to our

YSL's 1st Anniversary Party

SATURDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 12

Dancing, refreshments, socializing, conversation—folk-dancing too.

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

THE GOVERNMENT INFORMER SYSTEM — I

What It Takes to Become a Stoolpigeon

By HAL DRAPER

The blow-up of the government's stable of informers and stoolpigeons has been an amazing phenomenon of the witchhunt, when you start to put all the facts together.

In one case after another, government informers have been publicly exposed as professional liars and falsifiers, in spite of the fact that in this climate it hasn't been quite "patriotic" even to question their word.

On the opposite page, some of the facts are put together—some in the excellent article from the *Progressive* there quoted, some by the ACLU brief in the Peters case. And of course, latest of all has been the fantastic break of Harvey Matusow, the "reformed" character who is now getting a book published on how he was a liar for the FBI. Matusow got circumstantial about cooking up false testimony with Roy Cohn, about lying against Lattimore, the CP defendants in the Smith Act trial, etc. It doesn't even matter whether one thinks he is telling the truth now or then!

We would add to the list also the name of Bella Dodd; though with a difference. We are thinking of what happened in the affair of Senatorial candidate Case of New Jersey, when he was smeared in the middle of the campaign with the charge that his sister had had shady Stalinist associations. The informer in this case was Mrs. Dodd. After Case's counterattack, she claimed that she had mistaken another woman of the same name for Case's sister.

Well, maybe she did. In fact, just to make the point completely clear, let's assume that she had made a mistake in identity (what some people might call an "honest" mistake, to distinguish her from Matusow). However, she had taken no pains to determine whether the Case woman she had fingered WAS the senator's sister or not UNTIL the senator's TV speech made it a national issue. There is surely a difference between such an attitude of under-concern with truth and justice and (say) Matusow's purely venal and conscious falsification, but it is a difference which may not strike all of us as constituting an unbridgeable moral chasm between a Matusow and a Dodd.

IS IT "WRONG"?

However, let us not pursue this exploration of the field in which careful lying shades off into careless half-truths. Back, then, to the liars—

The list of exposures and self-exposures is, as we said, amazing. So soon! Surely there is no basic reason why the government could not have gathered a herd of docile stoolies and informers and fingermen who could at least be trusted to do their job truthfully?

A piquant explanation might be that the CP managed to infiltrate the ranks of the stoolpigeons too! But we do not have to go to fantasy for suggestive answers.

As such a suggestion, we should like to point to the characteristic of these informers which also and simultaneously provides an answer to a second question.

This second question is one which bedevils liberals who do not quite see their way clear to condemning the whole informer system which the government has set up.

For is it really wrong in principle to use informers and men who are derogatorily called stoolpigeons? Is it wrong to "squeal" on a wrongdoer and thereby protect all we hold dear? Is it wrong for the police to cultivate informers who will lead them to detect murderers, rapists, kidnapers and other criminals?

Take for example (we might be told, to continue a statement of the other side) the dilemma of Terry in "On the Waterfront": Is he a stoolpigeon or a despicable character because he testifies the truth about the murderous racketeer who has terrorized the workers? This is the moral feeling which the racketeers themselves have worked to instill among the men. The man who breaks these mores is really a hero . . .

So if informing, or cultivating informers, is not in itself, always and everywhere, a bad thing, one can criticize the government's activities for "excesses,"

for "blunders," perhaps, but not as a systematic violation of political morality or as an installment of police-state practices.

There is many a liberal who is compelled to rationalize along these lines. It is a necessity, for example, for the whole school of yellow liberals who have followed Sidney Hook in abandoning the right of Stalinists to teach. As we once showed in LABOR ACTION in a different article, the Hookites (who insist that CP membership, but not CP ideas, is the bar to the job) must and do rely on for their evidence of CP membership on the stoolpigeons and fingermen and not on any criteria with a less shady character in the eyes of academicians.

BASIC DIFFERENCE

Do these rationalizers have a case? Only by dint of completely ignoring the basic difference between the kind of examples they cite and what the government is actually doing.

What they point to, for justification, are informers who expose real crimes—acts which everybody, including the perpetrators, recognize and accept as real crimes, without any controversy. Let us, for the sake of argument, agree that informers are useful in such cases, or honorable or what you will.

But the stable of government informers who are the crux of the present controversy are not men who are informing on criminal acts. They are kept by the

government to expose the *political opinions and political affiliations* of selected victims, and most commonly the past political affiliations.

They are stoolpigeons for thought-police.

A man who "squeals" on a murderer is not violating the sensibilities of any decent person in society. He is violating the gang's code. He may be violating his own code. Indeed, regular police stoolpigeons often are despicable characters because their actions do violate their own codes, which are the same as those of the gang on whom they squeal.

WHAT TO EXPECT

But when Budenz (to take the energetic informer who is the most venerable of the lot and who has not yet been exposed as a liar) points the finger at a man merely because he once knew him as a Stalinist sympathizer (that is, a man with certain political ideas) and thereby helps to ruin that man's career without the slightest reason to believe that the victim is a present danger even in the light of the witchhunt laws—why then, we submit that this informer cannot justify his conduct TO HIMSELF on the fair-seeming grounds with which our liberals rationalize.

It takes men of a certain cut to engage professionally and on a large-scale in a career of character assassination. What is involved here is precisely the difference between a Terry of "On the Waterfront" and a Matusow-Budenz-Crouch.

Thus we get to our answer to the first question, too. We have a right to expect that this occupation will attract degenerates—political degenerates, moral degenerates.

Remember that we are here discussing the professional informers. There are also, of course, the one-shot informers

who have been forced to stool on former friends and associates by government threats and pressure. These are bad enough, but different.

THE PROFESSIONAL "EX"

There is another distinction to be made, too. The article from the *Progressive* (on the next page), for example, refers to these rats as "professional ex-Communists." Well, that may serve to obscure a point.

In a real sense, Arthur Koestler (for instance) is also a "professional ex-Communist"—in the sense that his career has pretty much been founded on his writing and thinking as a reformed Stalinist who has been through it and can now tell us all, etc. If Koestler had never joined the CP, it is doubtful whether his talents, such as they are, would have been so apparent to the anti-Stalinist world.

We make this point precisely in order to separate him from the polluted ranks of the paid political pigeons; lest things be confused by the over-all term—"professional ex-Communist." Our grievances against the Koestlers are political, and our opinions of them in that field are very low. But—

A Koestler merely says in effect: "See what an idiot I once was, as I tell you about my experiences as a Stalinist; and therefore I am wondrously qualified to be your political guide and mentor now."

But (to take the holiest of the pack) a Budenz says in effect: "See what a scoundrel I was, what a treacherous, lying, perfidious, falsifying rascal—as everybody knows the managing editor of the *Daily Worker* had to be—and therefore take heed from my words now and listen to my moral exhortations and preachments."

Oil Workers Prepare Fight Against Bosses' Witchhunt in Private Industry

By BEN HALL

The CIO Oil Workers Union is determined to fight the witchhunt in industry. It has announced its position in a full-page article in the January 10 issue of its paper, the *International Oil Worker*, under the headline, "Witchhunt Firings May Extend to Oil, Chemical Jobs."

The article is outstanding because (1) it focuses sharp attention on the danger of ideological intimidation in factories; (2) it points a finger of accusation against the Truman Democratic administration, a rare act of honesty in a labor movement which oozes apologies for its Democratic friends; (3) it unambiguously declares that it will fight the witchhunt in the oil industry right through its regular grievance procedure. But—

(4) At the same time, its position is undermined by a failure (common to almost all liberals today), to take a consistently democratic stand.

The Oil Workers Union is one of the largest in the CIO. And it will soon become even larger and more powerful through merger with the CIO Chemical Union into a united Oil and Chemical Workers Union.

This unity will hardly tend to water down the militant line of the oil union. The Chemical Workers Union is headed by Elwood Swisher who recently commented in a sympathetic vein on AFL Paper Makers President Phillips' speech for a labor party. Swisher's administration has authorized and led repeated strikes in atomic energy plants and carries on a continuing campaign to expose the second-class-citizen status of atom workers.

"Those totalitarian forces in the U. S. which have been hounding government employees for the past seven or eight years may soon be in a position to get a man discharged if he works for private industry in an oil refinery, chemical plant or on a pipe line." The article goes on to explain that the Chamber of Commerce is pushing hard for a new law to legalize the ousting of so-called "subversives" and "security risks" from private industries working on "defense" contracts.

Note the time element: "the past seven or eight years." This is not a slip or an accidental revelation; the *Oil Worker* is deliberately pointing out that Democrats share the blame.

For example: "under both Democratic and Republican administrations—it has not been necessary to prove anything on a man to call him a 'subversive.' Typically, government employees have been fired after only kangaroo court hearings in which the accused employees had no chance to face their accusers."

NAMES DEMOCRATS

The *Oil Worker* denies even the cloak and consolation of anonymity to offending Democrats. It names Truman mildly but insistently. "In fairness, it must be pointed out that a good many hundreds and perhaps thousands of government employees were discharged under the Truman administration—although Truman didn't boast about it so much." (Note: Truman and his party have, however, been doing a lot of boasting lately) Their standard reply to accusations of "treason" has been to point to their record of initiating the witchhunt.

A strong protest is made against the star-chamber character of security hearings; against the fact that charges of "subversion" are vague and never defined; that the accused is considered guilty in advance; that he is never allowed to confront his accusers.

But on a key question of principle, the article is silent and consequently evasive: Should consistent democrats defend the civil liberties of admitted Communists? And should unions defend their right to work?

The nearest thing to a comment on this question is: "In government 'loyalty' cases a typical charge is that an individual has been 'sympathetic toward' the

Communists. This is quite hard to define. An individual may heartily oppose the Communists on the whole and therefore be violently anti-Communist, but at the same time he may sympathize with their viewpoints on one or two isolated matters. Should such an individual be considered 'sympathetic' to Communism? Common sense says no, but in practice some people have gotten in trouble under just these circumstances."

DODGING ISSUE

But suppose an individual is really and truly sympathetic to the Communist Party, or even a member of it? A real-libertarian, however he might detest the opinions of such a man, would fight for his right to work and to speak.

The *Oil Worker* dodges this duty by pointing to a different one: the job of defending the rights of those falsely accused of CP sympathies. Yet the official policy of the UAW, up to now, calls for the protection of the jobs of CPers—a policy which should be maintained by the union and defended everywhere by union militants.

The witchhunters had a free hand in hounding government workers; but, says the *Oil Worker*, they will run up against opposition in industry. "That opposition is the union grievance procedure. . . . In government employment, such grievance procedure was never available."

And the article concludes on this note: "Fortunately, the labor unions have the machinery to resist this endless march toward government by smear. That machinery is union grievance procedure through which the unions can fight each and every discharge, unless in fair trial, definite and subversive offenses are proven against the accused worker."

But what is a "subversive" offense? Is it a CP membership card? "Communist" opinions? A speech? A bomb?

Regrettably, the *Oil Worker* is as vague as those it criticizes.

Undoubtedly it will do its best to hold the line against wholesale victimization of militants and dissenters in industry. But, can it succeed without facing up to the full obligations of consistent democracy? That's another matter.

Don't miss a single week of

LABOR ACTION

A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

THE GOVERNMENT INFORMER SYSTEM — II

Witnesses for Hire: Budenz to Matusow

Following is a condensation of an excellent article in the current Progressive (February) by Wilbur H. Baldinger, entitled "Witness for Hire."

The witness-bearing careers of professional former Communists, who have become something of an elite American class, can be arduous. . . .

Take, for example, the well-known Louis Francis Budenz, long-time managing editor of the *Daily Worker*. A subservient Communist Party hack for ten years before he suddenly reformed to emerge in 1945 as a patriot, Grade 1-A has been the most tireless name-dropper of them all. Lately, however, his direct-knowledge denunciation of the disloyalties of others have been lagging somewhat. . . . So Budenz is now often reduced to swearing he recalls that someone in the Party once told him that somebody else was "a member," or "under discipline," or "a loyal adherent."

This type of evidence may leave something to be desired by a lawyer by way of corroboration, but it does have the virtue of being virtually irrefutable. . . .

But such testimony does fine, say, for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which recently reported with pride that over the past six years it has obtained "positive identifications" of 4,151 U. S. Communists. The ex-editor of the *Daily Worker* has been vastly helpful in making that claim possible.

Budenz, who has parlayed his self-proclaimed Communist perfidy into piety, respectability, a chair of economics at Fordham University, 22 lines in *Who's Who in America*, and a card in the American Management Association, never had it so good. He has testified that his post-*Daily Worker* income from such sources as witness fees, lectures, and book royalties ran at a rate of more than \$10,000 a year. . . .

IN THE STABLE

But there are lesser witnesses who deserve more public attention than they've been getting. The government, in its ceaseless search for Communists and one-time Communists who don't exploit their lamentable affiliation, has many additional helpers. Some are nearly as interesting as the better-known Budenz, Bentley and Chambers.

Among the informers are 35 ex-Reds sustained in a stable which the Immigration and Naturalization Service maintains on its regular payroll as "contractors." The Service also keeps a callbook listing a half-hundred refugees from the Communist Party who work part-time on a \$25-per-diem basis. They all are on tap to testify for the prosecution in deportation and denaturalization cases, and repeatedly are on loan to Senate and House committees and varied federal agencies as qualified expert witnesses.

Then there are numerous paid agents who infiltrate the Communist Party to take down the names and seduce others into it so they can be exposed to the FBI (which at times appears to accept the competence of almost anyone for this

assignment) and the committees. While so engaged their living is derived in part from an FBI budget item of \$70,000 for "unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character." Hitherto unheard-from I-was-a-Communist-for-the-FBI characters pop out of the Communist Party with growing frequency to set themselves up in what by now is a pretty competitive business. . . .

POOR MEMORY

All government agencies don't match the performance staged in a run between last Sept. 15 and Nov. 19 by the Federal Communications Commission, on which two new Republican members—John C. Doerfer and Robert E. Lee—are McCarthy devotees. In this chilling show the FCC tried to demonstrate that Edward O. Lamb, millionaire Democratic publisher of the Erie (Pa.) *Dispatch* is a Communist who should be denied renewal of a license for his television station, WICU.

The main testimony against Lamb (who offered \$10,000 to anybody who could prove the FCC's charge) came at bewildering length from Marie Natvig, a divorcee of 50 who said she only recently had bestowed herself on the FBI. She attested that she was a Toledo Communist between 1935 and 1937 and that Lamb was a comrade, too—even to the intimate point of once paying for her hotel room. But, try hard as she did, Mrs. Natvig couldn't recall just where she lived as late as 1943, or where she married the second of three husbands, or the location of a family fur shop enterprise in Akron, or

the names of any professors she said gave her learning at Radcliffe, Harvard, and Columbia. . . .

But many of the professionals, experienced, informed and steadfast as they may be, are novices compared with Paul Crouch, who at 51 is recognized generally as the dean of the corps. . . .

THE CROUCH FLOP

Crouch has been top man in the Immigration Service's per-diem division of former Communists, averaging \$5,000 a year from the taxpayers, who are getting more than their money's worth if versatility of performance is what they want. He has been featured by the government in at least 60 proceedings of one sort or another, winning critical attention for such triumphs as these:

- In February, 1953, Crouch swore at a deportation hearing involving Jacob Burck, Chicago *Sun-Times* cartoonist who as a young immigrant once did drawings for the *Daily Worker*, that he knew the suspect well over the years as a Communist and had seen him at many Party meetings. Asked to point out Burck, Crouch unerringly fingered a Chicago *Tribune* photographer who was in the room to record the humiliation of the competition. Burck's counsel later filed 19 sworn affidavits, challenging Crouch's credibility in other incidents.

- In 1949, in the perjury trial of Harry Bridges, Crouch said that he "had no knowledge of David Davis," otherwise identified as a Philadelphia Communist leader, and repeated the denial three times. In 1954, testifying at the Smith Act trial of Davis and eight Party colleagues, Crouch swore that he had worked closely with Davis in the '30s on infiltration of the Army.

- In the Spring of 1949, in Un-American Activities Committee hearings on possible wartime espionage at the University of California's radiation laboratory at Berkeley, Crouch swore he "was active in trying to infiltrate all scientific research" there, but that he "was not permitted [by Party superiors] to know the names" of any Communists within the project. But in its annual report for 1949, recording development of its "Scientist X" case against Dr. Joseph W. Weinberg, the Committee was able to say: "Supplementary evidence regarding Weinberg's Communist associations was supplied by Mr. and Mrs. Paul Crouch, who stated they had attended Communist meetings with this scientist." Weinberg swore that he was no Communist. At his resultant perjury trial in March, 1953, when Crouch was the key witness, Weinberg was acquitted.

When the conflict in Crouch's testimony in the Bridges and Smith Act trials was called to Atty. Gen Herbert Brownell's attention at a press conference in May, 1954, he said that he would give "the matter" some "study." No positive results of Brownell's reflections have been manifested since.

Nor is there any known disposition by the Justice Department, which always is quick to catch criminal discrepancies in testimony by Communist suspects, to police the hearing or trial, conduct of any other witnesses in the field. . . .

EXTRAORDINARY THEY ARE

This comfortable state of affairs for ex-Communist informers was disturbed once—in the State of Washington. There, in 1948, George Hewitt, told the Canwell Committee that Prof. Melvin Rader of the University of Washington had attended a Red educational caucus in New York in 1938 or 1939. By painstaking research Rader finally succeeded in collecting ten-year-old grocery bills and similar memorabilia which proved he was nowhere near New York in the periods mentioned by Hewitt, who was indicted for perjury. The authorities, however, never pursued their quarry to the point of extraditing him for trial.

The officially accepted doctrine in Congress and the Justice Department seems to be that all a Communist needs to do to win the plaudits of the citizenry is to leave the Party and start talking, no matter what the state of mind or morals which took him into the subversion in the first place. And anybody who raises a question or any eyebrow over the revelations of ex-Reds may himself become the object of suspicion or at least a frown.

The official attitude has been succinctly stated by Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney III, who is in charge of the Justice Department's Criminal Division: "It is because of the extraordinary qualifications of these witnesses that their testimony is so devastating to the Communists and, I dare venture to suggest, it is because of their very effectiveness that they have become a target of abuse by certain elements of the press."

"Extraordinary" seems peculiarly apt as a blanket characterization of many of these witnesses.

Oaths for Sale

"Mr. Hank Shippey and Mr. Jerry Riseley . . . sat over coffee one day not long ago, dreaming things up. And they conceived the idea of selling loyalty oaths for \$1 each by mail. . . . They put an ad in an institutional veterans' paper of about 10,000 circulation. 'Help Fight Communism With a Loyalty Oath,' the ad read, urging the reader to buy one from the Loyalty League, a post office address. In less than two weeks they had 700 orders and they're still coming in fast. Mr. Shippey and Mr. Riseley hurriedly had a printer set up a loyalty oath form in color with 'Loyalty Oath' in red script over the top. The form states that the undersigned 'is not, nor has been, etc., etc.' There is a place for the purchaser to sign and another place for the whole thing to be notarized. After which it is suitable for framing like a marriage license."

—From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 28, 1954.

THE GOVERNMENT INFORMER SYSTEM — III

The Case of Cox and Bakcsy

In its "friend of the court" brief filed in the case of Prof. Peters, the American Civil Liberties Union also criticized the use of confidential information in the government security program which is not disclosed to the employee under fire. (The Peters case is that of Dr. John P. Peters, senior professor of medicine at Yale; the Supreme Court has agreed to review his dismissal from his post as special consultant to the surgeon-general of the U.S. because of "reasonable doubts" of his loyalty.)

One of the cases cited in the ACLU brief as showing the abuses of civil liberties dealt with a United Nations employee whose loyalty had been questioned, in part, on the basis of an allegation that he had been employed by the now defunct San Francisco School of Social Studies from 1934 to 1940. The school was charged with disseminating Communist propaganda and seeking pupils "inclined" to Marxist philosophy.

"A request for the source of this accusation was refused," the brief states, "but after an exhaustive independent investigation by the [employee's] attorney," the

charge was found to be based on a verified complaint in a law suit brought in 1938 in California by Ivan Cox. Cox, a local union official expelled from his post for embezzling funds, sued 5,000 persons including a local Communist party branch, the Regents of the University of California and Stanford University, and several prominent members of the movie colony for damages, charging they had conspired to have him dismissed.

SMEAR, HE SAYS

The brief relates that when Cox dropped the suit several months later he stated under oath that the suit "was instituted in order to 'smear' every prominent person in the state of California, including the Regents. . . ; that he had been 'duped' by a private detective then 'wanted' for assault, and the detective's attorney, (thereafter censured by the California Bar Association); that he knew nothing about the San Francisco School of Social Studies and was induced to commit perjury by the detective and his lawyer." The suit was dismissed by the California courts.

"The source of the information upon

which the interrogatory . . . was heard," the ACLU brief continues, "was not disclosed [to the employee] and was not known to the members of the International Employees Loyalty Board, even though it could in no way be considered 'secret.' Fortunately, it was shown to be a complete fraud and hoax; but what would the result have been, if the source of the charge had not been discovered by [the employee's] attorney? What weight would have the Loyalty Board have given to [the] charge, which was part 'of all the evidence' upon which the Board was authorized to make a determination."

Illustrating the danger of anonymous informants, the ACLU brief asserts that Captain Charles C. Bakcsy, the source of another charge against the UN official, that he had attended Communist Party meetings, had been repudiated by government officials in other cases as "incredible and unworthy of belief." The brief argues that if Capt. Bakcsy had been one of Dr. Peters' accusers, the absence of confrontation and cross-examination would have denied Dr. Peters the opportunity to disprove the accusations or test the credibility of his accuser.

Pamphlets by LEON TROTSKY

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

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

Package price for all
10 pamphlets—\$1.50

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

Have you read . . .

"NEXT— A LABOR PARTY!"

by
Jack Ranger

A discussion for trade-unionists of American labor's greatest lack and greatest need.

25 cents

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

As Ally of Chiang — —

(Continued from page 1)

Labor. These labor statesmen, foregathered at their annual winter session in Miami Beach, Florida, took time off from their sun-bathing and golf to issue a pronouncement on the present Formosa crisis.

"We strongly warn," their resolution states, "against any attempt, under cover of pursuing the armistice pattern set in Korea and Indochina, to grant the Russian-imposed Mao Tse-tung terror regime American recognition and to smuggle it into the United Nations. The issue in this theater of strife and combat involves far more than the possession of any particular island. The fate of all Asia, and consequently the fate of the entire world, is at stake here."

According to the New York *Times* report, the executive council is unequivocally opposed to any admission of the Chinese Stalinists to the UN until after a plebiscite has been held throughout China, under UN supervision, to determine whether the Chinese people want the Stalinist government. The United States should also continue to recognize only the regime of Chiang Kai-shek until such a plebiscite has been held. (We wish to emphasize that the above is based on the New York *Times* report on the AFL's action. If the official text, when available, reveals any significant difference from the press version, we will be happy to pass it on to our readers.)

Why Not Beck?

It appears from this that the AFL executive council, which claims to speak in the name of over ten million organized workers in this country, is lined up on this question with Senator Knowland and Admiral Radford rather than with Stevenson or even Eisenhower. The demand for a UN-sponsored election in China can have no real political meaning in the present situation. It is either an expression of a utopian dream (from these hard-headed business-unionists), or a veiled demand for a war on China. For only in a conquered China could a UN-supervised plebiscite possibly take place.

Further, it is not too clear why the AFL "statesmen" picked on Chiang's government as the one to be recognized until such an election has been held. They might as well have selected the Brotherhood of Teamsters as the rightful government of China. The Chinese people have had as much chance to vote freely for or against Dave Beck as Chiang Kai-shek, and we would be willing to bet that in a free election in which only two of them were candidates Beck would come out on top. His chances would be excellent mainly because the people of China have never heard of him, while they know Chiang and his satraps all too well.

Confession by Eden

The CIO has also pronounced itself against letting the Chinese Stalinists "shoot their way into the UN." But the same *Times* report (Feb. 5) which announced to the Chinese people the glad tidings from Miami Beach of free elections and liberation also stated that the CIO "action was taken only after a wrangle inside the resolutions committee," at their recent convention in Los Angeles.

"Walter Reuther, the CIO president," continues the *Times*, "originally lined up with his brother Victore in proposing that the Mao government be recognized, but later switched his position to non-recognition."

In the CIO, it appears, there were at least glimmerings of political light as compared to the sun-drenched darkness which enveloped Miami.

Such actions by the American labor movement tend to isolate it from the labor movements of the rest of the world just as the government is isolated by its policies. In Britain, for instance, the whole labor movement is in an uproar over the Formosa crisis.

British labor has been pushing the Tories, headed by Foreign Minister Eden, to the wall. He is in the unhappy position of seeking to steer a course which will not separate him too far from his American allies, but at the same time which will also not separate the Tories too far from the votes of the British people in the elections which will probably come this fall.

Glimmerings in the CIO

Eden has taken the position that the Tachens, Quemoy and Matsu are clearly territory belonging to the government of China (Stalinists), but that this government should not seek to seize them in circumstances which may hurl the world into war.

This has aspects of a reasonable position, but it is one which can hardly entirely please Washington.

For it strongly implies that the Chinese Stalinists should refrain from taking what is rightfully theirs only because America may fight to keep it from them. But Eden's government is the chief ally of the government which threatens to plunge the world into war if the Chinese government seeks to take what rightfully belongs to it. . . .

Eden is forced to such expressions because of the relentless pressure of the British Labor Party, which on this question no doubt represents a popular will which extends far beyond the ranks of its usual partisans. Even the cautious Attlee has come out for the policy of recognizing the Stalinists as the rulers of China, and giving the Formosans a chance to vote freely on whether or not they want to go under the Stalinist yoke, remain under that of Chiang, or establish some other kind of status.

Peiping Heats It Up

The evacuation of the Tachens brings the Formosa crisis to a peak. If it passes without general war in the Orient, that will not mean that the crisis has been resolved.

The Chinese Stalinists have refused to come to the UN to discuss the status of the offshore islands, or a cease-fire in that area. They firmly and even arrogantly told the UN that they would only come to discuss getting the American fleet out of Chinese waters, and after the "Chiang Kai-shek clique has been driven out from the Security Council."

Their arrogance has been deplored by many spokesmen for America's allies who see in it an obstacle to some kind of normalization of relations in the Far East toward which, they believe, Eisenhower and his closest advisers have been leaning in recent weeks. Some have even gone so far as to see in this action a monumental blunder of Chinese diplomacy.

Actually, there is no reason to think that the hard-headed Stalinists have stumbled. From their own point of view, why should they let the American government off the hook on which it has so firmly impaled itself? The best they could have got by being "reasonable" would have been a seat in the UN and the islands closest to their coast, in exchange for some kind of an agreement not to attack Formosa, while Chiang's regime remains.

They will get the islands off the coast, sooner or later. In the meantime they can afford to wait for their seat in the UN, while the American fleet parades up and down Asian waters, within sight of the mainland, and while American planes fly within two minutes of Chinese cities. The propaganda value to them is incalculable.

The Pressure Is Telling

But how about Formosa? No one has yet offered them that as part of the deal. They can afford to wait for that, too. Every day Chiang's troops get older. Every month it becomes more evident that if he is ever to regain the mainland, or even to sustain himself on Formosa, he can only do so by the pledge of a shield of American boys from here to eternity.

All the Chinese Stalinists have to do is to keep the pressure on, avoid all-out war, and wait. The American government is incapable of coming up with a formula which could put political pressure on them. If it decides to fight the Stalinists on the mainland for Chiang, it will thereby brand itself as the aggressor in the eyes of the world and isolate itself completely. But short of that it can only threaten and strike aggressive postures, and stumble from one crisis to another.

The recent wavering in Eisenhower circles on the truce question shows that the pressure is beginning to tell, and that a glimmering of the impossible position into which the government's policy has got this country has begun to filter through. The Stalinists may well have confidence that if Eisenhower has begun to feel uneasy about the situation, even the executive council of the AFL may awake to the realities of the world in which it lives some day.

The real tragedy in the situation is that while it is virtually impossible for the Eisenhower government to abandon Chiang without demoralizing all the other reactionary regimes on the support of which its world policy is based, the AFL council and the labor movement as a whole do not need to hang on to their fantastically reactionary policy. The workers of this country would have nothing to lose and everything to gain if they demanded an end to American support of the capitalist oppressors of the workers in all other countries. That would be the way to start putting the pressure on the Stalinists.

Key Labor Post — —

(Continued from page 3)

any office whatsoever; as a consequence it is impossible that a Stalinist fellow-traveler may be prompted into placing his name upon the voting list, but there is not the slightest chance of such a candidate ever being elected. This is due to the constant campaign which the officers of the union have carried on against Stalinists and their sycophants inside the union; but this campaign has not been carried out by the adoption of militant policies which expose and isolate the Stalinists; it has been conducted simply by the use of the union machinery in the hands of the bureaucrats and in face of the apathy shown by wide sections of the union membership.

It is this lack of a positive left within the Transport and General Workers' Union which presents a formidable obstacle to the left forces in Britain as a whole. In the sections of the union catering for the dock workers, the public transport workers and the road haulage workers, there is a considerable element of militant thought; but in most of the other sections this element hardly seems to exist in any vocal fashion.

Even in those sections where it does exist it takes on rather a negative character and confines its activities almost exclusively to the industrial field. An exception to this general rule is in certain areas where the Stalinists direct the feelings of frustration into the formation of various types of unofficial organizations unrecognized by the union proper. They do this, of course, because it is the only manner—due the bar on their holding office—in which they can exercise any element of control.

STALINISTS LOST

Such a situation often leads to the Stalinists taking up rather peculiar positions; such as in the recent dock strike when they fought against large sections of the Transport and General Workers' Union who were leaving the union in a body and joining the Stevedores Union which was conducting the strike and which generally displays a militant industrial policy. It must be mentioned that the Stevedores Union does not bar members of the CP from holding office, but, due to its militant line, the Stalinists have not been able to gain any degree of control in it.

At the time of the dock strike there were but two members of the CP on the Executive of the Stevedores Union. One of them became so disgusted with the CP's line in supporting the right wing leadership of the Transport and General Workers' Union that he promptly tore his party card up! It will take the CP a long time to live down that incident amongst the dock workers.

At the moment, therefore, there seems little possibility of any strong left forces emerging from the TGWU, certainly not of the strength to influence the forthcoming elections of the new general secretary. The best that can be hoped for at this moment is that the elections will provide a sufficient degree of interest whereby the left wing in the union can activate the large section of passive membership. If this can be done, and at the same time the growing Left forces in other unions and in the Labor Party maintain their pressure, it will be an event which will have great importance for the advancement of socialist ideas within the British labor movement.

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