

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

THE ANTI-ZIONIST  
SOCIALISTS OF ISRAEL

... page 6

THE SCALISE STORY:  
A New Chapter Is Coming Up

... page 2

MARCH 7, 1955

FIVE CENTS

## NATIONAL TOUR

The national speaking tour by ISL chairman Max Shachtman starts this week. In effect, it was kicked off by the New York forum on Friday, Feb. 25 at which Comrade Shachtman discussed "Peace Through Coexistence?" Labor Action Hall was packed, as the speaker took up various aspects of the international cold-war crisis. (In lieu of a report on the speech, readers are referred to the coming issue of the *New Internationalist*, which will feature an article by Shachtman on the same subject.)

Following are the dates on which he will be in each area:

|              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Newark       | Mar. 2          |
| Philadelphia | Mar. 4          |
| Reading      | Mar. 5          |
| Pittsburgh   | Mar. 6-7        |
| Cleveland    | Mar. 8-9        |
| Oberlin      | Mar. 10         |
| Detroit      | Mar. 11-13      |
| Chicago      | Mar. 14-16      |
| St. Louis    | Mar. 17         |
| Los Angeles  | Mar. 23-26      |
| Bay Area     | Mar. 27-30      |
| Seattle      | Mar. 31-April 2 |

Readers of LABOR ACTION are urged to watch the columns of the paper for notices of the Shachtman meetings.

Comrade Shachtman's general subject at his meetings will be "Europe and Coexistence."

## German Workers' Rallies Tell the World: 'We Don't Want To Die for Dollars or Rubles!'

By GORDON HASKELL

The West German parliament has ratified the Paris agreements on a straight party-line vote. After a relatively brief but stormy debate, the Adenauer coalition was able to muster 315 votes against 150 for the Social-Democratic (SPD) opposition. The coalition then split over the ratification of the agreement on the Saarland, but still succeeded in getting it passed by a substantial margin.

Vigorous as the debate was in the Bundestag (the session was broadcast and televised to the whole nation) it was but a pale reflection of the campaign waged throughout the country over the issue. During the weeks preceding the vote, mass meetings and demonstrations were held over the country.

A one-day strike of 800,000 steel and coal workers, though ostensibly over the issue of co-determination in industry, was actually a trial mobilization against the government's position on rearmament. On the eve of the Bundestag vote, from 15,000 to 25,000 people demonstrated against the Paris agreements in Mu-

nich. In Bonn some 2,000 persons tried to march on the Bundestag building, and were dispersed by fire hoses and police clubs. Other demonstrations occurred in Opladen and Cologne.

At the vast Munich demonstration, organized by the unions, banners proclaimed: "WE DON'T WANT TO DIE FOR DOLLARS OR RUBLES!"

The struggle against ratification was organized by the trade unions and the Social-Democratic Party. And these workers' organizations succeeded in gaining the support of wide sections of the middle class.

For instance, on January 29 a mass meeting held at the historic old church

of St. Paul in Frankfurt was co-sponsored by a group of well-known non-party professors and clergymen, the vice-chairman of the Federation of German Trade Unions, and the chairman of the SPD. (Besides Georg Reuter and Erich Ollenhauer, the other co-sponsors were Prof. Alfred Weber, theologian Dr. Helmut Gollwitzer, pastor Ernst Lange, a Catholic professor of theology, Johannes Hessen and Gustav Heinemann, leading lay member of the Lutheran church.)

The socialist youth and student movements were particularly active in the campaign.

### FIGHT WILL CONTINUE

The vote has been taken in the Bundestag, but a struggle has begun which has reached a breadth and depth unprecedented in Germany since the end of the war. The Social-Democrats, and particularly the militant wing of the trade unions, have announced that for them ratification of the Paris agreements is not the end of the battle.

(Turn to last page)

## A Report from the Court of Appeals in Washington: Court Hears Lively Debate on Shachtman Passport Case

By HAL DRAPER

The clerk of the court called the case of MAX SHACHTMAN, APPELLANT, v. JOHN FOSTER DULLES, ET AL., APPELLEES. The U. S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D. C. was ready to hear the appeal on the Shachtman passport case, February 23.

Only the interested parties on both sides (i.e., their attorneys and staff) were in the courtroom; for although this reporter was technically a visitor, that hardly made me a disinterested bystander. I came more or less expecting to listen to what would inevitably be a legal-technical contest; I was quite wrong. The significance of this appeal for civil liberties in the United States bristled from the proceedings; and I would wish that all LABOR ACTION readers could have so vividly been impressed with the issues at stake.

This case is of basic national importance for civil liberties, and don't underestimate it. I emphasize that because it was only a little while ago that it was borne in on me for the first time—and we have still never even mentioned it in LABOR ACTION—that this is just about the first political passport case in the courts. It is the first case on passport rights where the government openly gives political reasons for denying the passport. (In other cases, like the Robeson

case, the real motive of the government was indeed political, but Robeson was denied a passport on a technicality, so there could be no political test.)

### MAKING LEGAL HISTORY

It's for this reason that the hearing I listened to had a triple-barreled significance which showed up in the lively courtroom debate—a debate which, as I shall report, was joined in at many points by the presiding judge on the bench.

The first aspect of this threefold significance is, of course, the question of passport rights which was most directly before the court. Here the case of *Shachtman v. Dulles* is going to make legal history, for this is still largely an unresolved question, and either way the decision will be setting precedent for a whole spate of cases which are getting into court or heading for court.

The second aspect of the case directly involves the attorney general's notorious "Subversive List." It is the State Department's Passport Office which made the link when it decided to give, as official reason for denying Shachtman's passport, the "listing" of the Independent Socialist League as "subversive." Thus, through this passport case, the courts

will also be called to pass on the expanded usage which the government has been making of the List.

These two issues concern all civil-libertarians. The third aspect of the case concerns socialists more narrowly; for entwined in the issues of the case is the question whether Independent Socialism is to be smeared as "subversive" by this capitalist government. Especially at two points during the hearing, the government attorney came out with whoppers about the character of the ISL that alone should serve to get them thrown out of any court of reason (figuratively speaking).

### JUDGE SCORES BULLSEYE

A decision by the three-man court (Judges Edgerton, Washington and Fahy) is to be expected perhaps within a couple of months; but insofar as a layman can get an impression from the participation of the judges in this hearing, the prospect is encouraging. Attorney Joseph L. Rauh Jr., speaking for the Shachtman appeal, made a powerful opening presentation; at a couple of points, judges interrupted to ask questions to which they got cogent replies. But when the government attorney, Assistant U. S. Attorney Harold Greene, stepped up to face the bench, the climate changed.

In fact, Greene had gotten exactly one sentence out when Judge Edgerton interrupted to say "The Elg case says you're wrong . . ." and an argument ensued. Greene was given a rough time by at

least two of the judges, Edgerton and Washington.

At more than one point, Greene was visibly so disconcerted or confused by the posers he got from the bench that he either stumbled and bumbled before getting his bearings or (once) simply remained speechless for a long minute before changing the subject.

In mid-course, after several exchanges, Judge Edgerton addressed Greene:

"Your position is that it is not a violation of due process of law to take away by the mere whim of the secretary's office, one of the liberties of an American, that of traveling abroad?"

Taken aback, Greene muttered that there is no "right" to travel.

"The question I raised," rejoined Judge Edgerton, "is not merely the right to travel but the right to leave the United States." He paused, and then added solemnly:

"I don't see how, with a straight face, we can speak of a free world and yet have a situation like that!"

That scores a bull's-eye, but, of course, we must remember (before optimism runs away) that it is only an *obiter dictum* by one judge. In spite of the rather sorry figure which the government attorney cut in the courtroom, under heavy fire from the bench, it is yet entirely possible that the government can get a majority decision on some point of law.

In next week's issue of LABOR ACTION we will go more systematically into the issues of the case as such, as these are

(Turn to last page)

## ISL FUND DRIVE

## Get That First Installment In Real Quick!

By ALBERT GATES

## Fund Drive Director

The Fund Drive took a nice spurt upward in the past week. We did not make the \$1000 average necessary to complete our national quota on the date scheduled, but we did manage to beat the showing of the first two weeks.

We received over \$900 in the past week, which pushed us over the \$2500 mark to give us a percentage of almost 25 for the first three weeks.

The top cities were New York and Chicago. Chicago is the real surprise of the campaign. Not only did the Windy City branch up its quota voluntarily to \$2000, but it has proceeded to show it was in earnest by sending in \$1017 to date, keeping it ahead of New York in the standings.

New York too is doing well. Although in percentages it is still far behind its Chicago rival, New York is ahead in actual contributions with \$1188.50. Ben Hall says New York has only just begun and by next week they expect to give Chicago dust in passing it. Well, we will see.

Our friends in Streater are coming up. They are right behind St. Louis, which is still in first place. Only Philadelphia and Pittsburgh really improved their positions. Pittsburgh was helped by a cut in its quota. Even so, its contributions are coming in at a faster pace than a year ago.

## WEAK SPOTS ON COAST

The other branches which made a showing last week seem to be resting. Although Seattle found a place in the standings, our branch did not contribute to it directly. The Seattle standings result from contributions of two friends. If they do not hear from us personally this week, this is an acknowledgment of our appreciation and thanks to their generosity. What about the Seattle branch? We're waiting.

That's the way it is now. The branches which have made a tolerable showing in the first weeks are carrying those places which still haven't made a single contribution since the campaign started—and it started before the official opening date.

The National Office picked up a few points with the aid of a contribution from our old friend in Boston. But there is a rumor that the N.O. is going to bust the drive wide open before long.

The weak spots are Los Angeles and the Bay Area on the West Coast. Closer home, you can read the list yourself. Let us see if, by the next two weeks at the latest, every quota will be represented with at least one payment. We should then be able to push the drive over by the date of its end.

Our friends and readers can help us substantially by joining in the drive to help maintain LABOR ACTION for another year, and to keep the *New International* too.

Address your payments to me—but above all, send them in.

## Give to the Fund Drive!

The Independent Socialist press and the work of the ISL needs your help. We urge readers to send their contribution in at once—even a small one! Make all checks payable to Albert Gates.

# THE SCALISE STORY: A New Chapter Is Coming Up

By BEN HALL

Little Augie Pisano and George Scalise, up to a few weeks ago, were prospering nicely, a fact revealed on February 15 when they were indicted for racketeering in union welfare funds.

After recovering from the original surprise of discovering that they are still actually alive, one can reflect upon the mysterious tides in the backwaters of unionism that permit notorious crooks and racketeers to prey upon organized labor.

This incident, by itself, highlights the agreement between responsible AFL and CIO leaders to outlaw rackets in the new united labor federation and to take action to drive crooks out of organized labor. Meany and Reuther want to cleanse the union movement of gangsters; and the job will have to be done if the labor movement is to fulfill its role as the political and social leader of the country.

But the very mention of the name Scalise reminds us of how long and how deeply the infection of corruption has been allowed to fester in the AFL. The fight against it will not be easy. Meany, Reuther and the others will meet up against strongly entrenched opponents with powerful allies, inside and outside the labor movement. Scalise was associated with an infamous and classical case of racketeering in the AFL.

According to the recent indictment, Scalise and Pisano linked up with Sol Ciento, the secretary-treasurer of an AFL union, the Distillery, Rectifying, and Wine Workers International. A gangster friend got them a lawyer, Louis B. Saferstein. Through Saferstein they wrote up insurance policies for Ciento's union and split the profits. In two years, they are accused of taking 1,500,000. So successful was the venture, that Ciento, Scalise and Pisano began to rustle up trade in other unions, setting up a whole network of graft in welfare funds.

## RAGS TO RICHES

Scalise and Little Augie Pisano are old friends, and their joint business ventures inside unions goes back a long way. Augie was a member of the Capone gang and later rose to fame with Joe Adonis, one of the top men in the rackets syndicate.

Scalise is a former president of the Building Service Employees International (AFL). He was installed in that post by the Capone gang. A condensed and connected account of his career can be read in *Crime on the Labor Front*, by Malcolm Johnson. It is significant not simply as history but as an example of what was tolerated in the old AFL and what must be eradicated root and branch.

According to Johnson: In the thirties, the Capone gang moved in on locals of the Building Service Union in Chicago, taking them over by bribery and terror. The gang machine controlled the International president, Jerry Horan. When Horan died in 1937, a gangster conference picked Scalise as the lucky successor and the International Executive Board obediently consented.

Three years before, Horan had made a quick trip to Brooklyn where he had summoned the local leaders of his union to a meeting. He introduced a man whom they had never seen before. "This is your new Eastern vice-president," he said. That was it and no questions were asked. That man was George Scalise.

Up to then, Scalise had been a mere Brooklyn-raised thug who started his career in 1913 with a conviction for compulsory prostitution, and for the next 20 years was closely associated with the top

gangsters. His chief backer in Brooklyn, and the man who pushed him for the job of representing the mob in the Building Service Union, was none other than Little Augie. Their touching friendship was endured through all these years.

Scalise had already accumulated some experience in the field of unions, but only on a local scale. He had organized small locals among auto washers, grocery employees, beauty shop workers, laundry workers, dyehouse workers.

At the same time he maintained another independent but related enterprise. He operated the "Sentinel Service Company," which was, sad to say, a strike-breaking agency.

As a union official, he sold "strike insurance" to employers. If they wanted to avoid strikes, they simply paid the fee he demanded. But if an employer refused, union-man Scalise would engineer a strike while "Sentinel Service" Scalise (the same) would hire out strikebreakers to the embattled boss.

These ingenious methods he transferred to the Building Service Employees Union on a grander scale.

By 1935 the union was tightly in the hands of gangsters. Its 1935 convention was held in Chicago and all the leading gangsters were present, including Little Augie and Joe Adonis.

Another participant was a man named Louis (Two-Gun) Alterie who was a voting delegate and who had been a delegate in 1934 to the AFL convention. He openly boasted of fighting gang gun battles in the streets of Chicago and might have risen high in the union except for one mistake: he was blown to pieces later that year by shotgun blasts.

## TALE OF BAMBRICK

Scalise's labor career seemed to come to an end (we now see that it was only temporary) in 1940 when he was indicted in New York by District Attorney Tom Dewey for grand larceny. He was accused of stealing \$60,000 from the union treasury. In Chicago he was indicted for taking \$118,000. At his New York trial, evidence showed that he had received over \$300,000 in salaries and expenses from 1937 to 1940. But all this was chicken-feed compared to what he drew from extortion in its varied forms. Half of what he got, including his own salaries, went to the gangster mob.

But there is more to the story, including the mysterious role of an assistant district attorney. For that you must follow the tale of James Bambrick. Bambrick was president of Local 32B in Manhattan. He was a man who was not controlled by the mob and had to be broken.

In 1934 Bambrick's local planned a strike against building employers in the garment center in Manhattan. He was told by "Gurrah," a gangster associate of Louis Lepke, to lay off. This was Lepke territory and he planned to sell the bosses "strike insurance" at the rate of \$1000 per building.

## ENTER DEWEY

Bambrick refused to play ball. Scalise promised him a 25 per cent cut of the take; but still Bambrick refused. In the strike that followed, the local was successful. The support of workers in the highly union-conscious garment center permitted them to win out over the gangsters. But Bambrick was through.

In the two years that followed, he learned that Scalise, Lepke and the gangs were protected by politicians. During one strike, a state senator delivered a message to him that Little Augie had vetoed a wage increase that the union was demanding. By 1936 Bambrick had to decide: Scalise told him that he would have to begin paying off the mob or he would be killed. It was that simple.

Bambrick began to tap the union treasury to meet the demands of the gang. And so when Scalise was convicted and went to jail, Bambrick went with him.

And this brings us right up to the mystery. In 1948, when Thomas E. Dewey

was a candidate for president (the same man who had convicted Scalise of the Building Service Employees Union), one of the first unions to endorse him was this very same Building Service Employees Union. Three men came as a delegation to deliver the union's support personally and Dewey received them with honor. These men were: William L. McFetridge, Tom Burke, and David Sullivan.

Of the three, McFetridge was the man who replaced Scalise as president of the Building Service Union. He is now an AFL vice-president and a member of its Executive Council.

Burke, who went along, was first vice-president of the Building Service Union. In the years before, at Scalise's trial, he had been identified by testimony as one of Scalise's strong-arm men, as a partner in extortion and sharer in the loot.

## "NO COMMENT"

But the story of the third man, David Sullivan, cannot be told so quickly. At the time when he was delivering blessings to Dewey, he was the president of Local 32B, the man who replaced Bambrick. What makes his career so fascinating is his peculiar manner of rising. And here we find the links with the district attorney's office.

Victor J. Herwitz was an assistant to Thomas E. Dewey and had been the man charged with getting indictments against Scalise and Bambrick. In February 1942, just after Sullivan was elected president of Local 32B, Herwitz resigned his job as assistant district attorney and became counsel for Local 32B with a reported salary of \$33,000-40,000 a year.

One of the officers forced out by Sullivan charged in a court suit that Sullivan was promised immunity from prosecution by Herwitz in return for the promised local job. When this case was thrown out of court on a pure technicality, an attorney representing a rank-and-file union group leveled the same charges before the Bar Association, asking that Herwitz be disbarred. He charged, too, that Herwitz had forced Sullivan's leading opponent for the top local post, a man named George Planson, to withdraw from the race under threat of prosecution.

Just then Herwitz went into the army, and by the time he got out a few years later the case was cold. Demands were made upon Dewey that he investigate. To all demands, he replied: No comment.

All this is not just history. It is a typical example of how the scandal of racketeering was overlooked and tolerated in the old AFL. And under this policy, corrupt leaders could grow powerful and remain respectable right up to today.

As the labor movement unites into a single union center, the opposition to this policy is being enormously strengthened. The struggle which must ensue will not be an easy one. In some sizable sections of the AFL the traditions and practices of corruption have persisted in one continuous line for decades.

## V. Reuther on CIO in Europe

By JACK WILSON

It was just five years ago that the thinking echelons of the UAW leadership, along with other segments of the CIO and AFL, were debating problems of policy for American labor's role in Europe. The main idea was to work out a program to break the grip of Stalinism over decisive sections of the European labor movement.

A major case in point was France, of course. And there was little patience either with the anti-Stalinist French labor leaders or with American socialist critics of CIO policy who didn't see any possibility of success for the CIO because of the obvious trend of CIO and UAW thinking.

In brief, the American labor leaders either ignored the impact of political ideas and programs or else reduced the whole program of French labor to a "practical one." Junket after junket of CIO leaders, experts, and assorted travelers visited Europe, bringing back in tow some carefully chosen (by the State De-

(Continued on page 4)

## CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's  
Fund Drive.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

**BRITAIN**

# Bevanites Busy In Key Miners' Area

By BERNARD DIX

LONDON, Feb. 24—The British trade-union movement, because it controls 80 per cent of the voting power at the annual conference of the Labor Party and directly elects the majority of the National Executive Committee, is an extremely important factor in British politics. It is possible that one large union by changing its attitude on a particular aspect of policy could alter the line-up of forces within the party and bring about a change of policy of the party as a whole.

At the Scarborough conference of the BLP last year, a resolution calling for opposition to German rearmament was defeated by only 371,000 votes out of a total of some 6,000,000 votes cast. If one or the other of the large trade unions had cast its vote for the resolution it would have resulted in a defeat for the right wing and the BLP would have been committed to a policy of opposing German rearmament.

The National Union of Mineworkers, with a voting strength of 684,645, supported German rearmament; yet the division within the union itself on this subject is so great that if the Yorkshire Area miners could have been persuaded to oppose German rearmament, then the whole of the union's voting strength would have been cast in that direction. In effect the 140,000 mine workers in Yorkshire held the balance of power not only within the union itself but in the entire Labor movement.

**BEVAN HITS NUM**

Because of its almost unique position this area of the NUM is now the scene of discreet—but quite determined—conflict. The left wing is using every endeavor to widen its influence in Yorkshire, while the right wing is as equally determined to maintain and extend its present dominant position there.

This clash of opinions and forces has, in the main, been carried out in the lodges (as the locals of the NUM are called) and as a consequence has not attracted a great deal of press publicity or comment outside of the NUM and the BLP. But recently an incident occurred which, though only small in itself, indicates the depth of feeling which exists.

On February 5 Aneurin Bevan addressed a meeting of Yorkshire miners at Moorends and it is reported that during his speech he dealt with many issues which are points of conflict within the party—such as German rearmament, the war program and foreign policy in general. It is also reported that he attacked the NUM for supporting Hugh Gaitskell as Labor Party treasurer last year after the death of Arthur Greenwood and registered his objection to the NUM being "in favor of reactionary policy."

Attending this meeting was the Yorkshire Area organizer of the National Council of Labor Colleges with a new tape recording machine which had recently been acquired by the NCLC for training Labor and trade-union members in the art of public speaking. Feeling that Bevan was one who could teach much in this art, the organizer recorded the whole of his speech on the tape and subsequently made it available to any of the organizations affiliated to the NCLC—which includes the NUM.

**RIGHT WING COMPLAINS**

A fortnight after this occurrence the Hoyland Labor Party held its annual dinner at which the principal guest was Hugh Gaitskell, the right-winger who defeated Bevan in the election for party treasurer. During the course of speeches at the dinner the secretary of the Yorkshire miners, Fred Collindridge, expressed his views on the "proxy speeches" which Bevan was giving to the NUM lodges in Yorkshire by saying: "If individuals come into the coalfield and set

out in an insidious way to size up miners' branches and even go to the extent of using tape-recording machines, then we can't take it lightly."

He afterwards told reporters that the Yorkshire Area Executive of the NUM would be considering the matter at its next meeting on the grounds that it was an attempt to "affect or destroy party unity."

This, however, was not necessary—for as soon as news of this conflict was made public in the columns of the press, the general secretary of the NCLC instructed that the offending tape be withdrawn. He explained this action by pointing out that the NCLC was an educational body which had no particular line on items of current controversy; he added that it was a pity that instruction in public speaking had been linked with such controversial issues. "It wasn't very tactful," he said.

It is at this point the matter now rests and it is doubtful whether it will be pursued any further now the objective of securing the withdrawal of this effective propaganda device has been achieved.

Activity of a different character has been taking place in the 344,000-strong Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers which has recently been holding its presidential and executive council elections. The USDAW is one of the larger British unions and, like the NUM, is a key factor within the Labor movement. For some years it has pursued a policy which can be broadly termed as Bevanite and two of the six MPs who were expelled from the Parliamentary Labor Party for voting against German rearmament are members of the USDAW Parliamentary Panel—which means they receive financial support from the union for their election campaigns.

**"NO NEED FOR CP"**

As can be expected the Stalinists have for long cast covetous eyes on USDAW and have tried extremely hard to secure control of the union and its policies. The recent elections have shown how far removed they are from achieving this objective.

Walter Padley, Labor MP for Ogmere, received 215,487 votes in the elections for union president, while the Stalinist candidate received but 29,239 votes. The Stalinist candidates for the executive council suffered similar fates, for not only did they fail to gain any further seats but actually lost some that they already held. In the elections for the twelve divisional councils, only 3 known Stalinists were returned out of a total of 96 elected members.

There is little doubt that rebuffs such as that administered by USDAW are causing acute anxiety to the British Communist Party. The latest issue of the CP weekly *World News* contains an article by John Gollan, the national organizer of the CP, which complains: "among Labor workers generally we have certainly not yet succeeded in getting the correct understanding of the importance and role of the party. As everyone knows, there is a tendency among militant Labor workers to argue that the left in the Labor Party is enough, and there is no need for the Communist Party."

This lament is followed later by the reiteration of the old theme that "there can be no final defeat of the right wing and the triumph of militant policies, without the unity of the Communist Party and the left." This slogan is repeated by the CP with less confidence now than it was five years ago. The activities of the Labor left wing during that period have, quite conclusively, demonstrated the fallacy of the Stalinists' arguments; and the defeats they are suffering come as a result of the realization of this by the Labor left which, with very few exceptions, has little love for the Stalinist party.

# Swiatlo Revelations Describe Groups in Polish Party Regime

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The statements which have been made by Colonel Swiatlo, the Polish secret police (UB) agent who defected to the West, fully confirm our reports about the political past of Bierut and other puppet leaders of the "Popular Democracy" in Poland, as well as about the internal relations in the Polish Stalinist party (United Workers Party, PZPR).

According to these reports there are three groups in the party Central Committee. Their origin lies not in ideological differences but in degree of loyalty to the Kremlin and subservience to the Russian GPU.

The most important faction was that made up of militants of the old Communist Party of Poland who remained loyal to their own past and to Russian Stalinism as representative of a "socialist" country. As we have recounted in past articles, the leaders of the old CP were divided into a majority and a minority faction by ideological and programmatic differences. They were all liquidated and murdered by Stalin on the basis of the monstrous charge that they were spies of the Polish government; and the CP was dissolved by Stalin's decree in order to clear the way in Poland for the Stalin-Hitler pact.

Bierut, then an unknown and obscure CP militant, started his career at this time in the service of the Russian MVD, as a denouncer of the CP leaders and their murderer in complicity with Stalin. No CP existed in Poland for a whole period, until Gomulka reorganized the old militants and got permission from the Kremlin to recommence activity. This is the origin of the most important group in the present party today.

**PREVENTIVE PURGE**

But, at the same time, within Russia there were groups of old Polish Communist émigrés who had survived through the Great Purge because of their servility to the GPU or because of their insignificance. This group, controlled by Bierut and the MVD, founded the "Union of Polish Patriots," under the official leadership of Wanda Wasilewska and other innocent fellow travelers, as the decline of Hitler's Germany gave Stalin prospects for a new occupation of Poland. This "Russian group" was swelled by new émigrés from Poland who converted to Stalinism, like Berling, Osobka and certain other members of the "Lublin Committee."

The third group consists of former militants of the Polish Socialist Party (PPS) who entered the "United Workers Party" after the PPS was forcibly merged with the Stalinist party; e.g., Grossfeld, Lange, Kluszynska, and others.

During the first period of the "Popular Democracy," the group which enjoyed the greatest importance in the party and

in the government regime was Gomulka's "native group," under the watchful eye of the Bierut group. But gradually there took place the process of liquidation of both the PPS group and the native-CPP group, in favor of the GPU-Russian group of Bierut, Radkiewicz, Berman, Zambrowski, and others.

The liquidation of Gomulka represented precisely a preventive purge of the PPS and CPP groups, ensuring that they would not become in the future the social and political bases for a Polish variety of Titoism. No evidence for any factional activity on the part of Gomulka existed, for he was absolutely loyal to Moscow. It was the aspirations of the working masses and of the old Polish Communist militants for a certain independence from the Kremlin which was the real ground for the liquidation of the most important group in the party, a group which furthermore possessed a certain degree of grass-roots popularity in the old pro-Communist workers' centers.

**BIERUT'S SYSTEM**

The purging of the PPS-CPP groups still further weakened the Stalinist regime in Poland and undermined its stability, isolated it from the masses, and reduced it to more complete dependence on the Russian military occupation. Through this changeover, the aspirations of the Polish Communists which were expressed in Gomulka's slogans about the "Polish road to socialism," and the whole ideological life of the party, were replaced by the personal policy and police control of Bierut. Imitating the big boss in the Kremlin, Bierut built up card-index dossiers on all the prominent members of the party, including the Politburo members. He knows, for example, the past of Radkiewicz, as we recounted in last week's article, and was able to blackmail him into cooperating in Gomulka's liquidation.

During the period of the Kremlin's intensive anti-Semitic campaign, the position of Berman was greatly weakened; and Bierut also wanted to smear him with the case of Gruenberg, who was accused of selling Health Ministry supplies on the black market. Berman's position became so weak that he had to hand over to Bierut the security section of the Politburo, on the pretext that the liquidation of Gomulka was going on too slowly.

But with the new course in Moscow, Berman's position was reinforced; the Gruenberg affair was hushed up and filed; and Berman privately ordered an investigation of the antecedents of Bierut's mistress, Wanda Gorska, whose brother had been a policeman in pre-war Poland.

In the personal fight between Radkiewicz and Zambrowski, two members of the CC and Politburo, Radkiewicz

(Continued on page 7)

**LONDON LETTER**

# Eden's Trip to Woo Middle East

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Feb. 24—No doubt you have read enough about SEATO and Dulles' meeting with Sir Anthony Eden in Bangkok. A much more interesting sideline has been the visits Eden has made to Egypt and Iraq.

Britain has recently gained a great deal of prestige in Egypt for the evident good will with which she is carrying out the acrimoniously arrived-at agreement on the Suez Canal withdrawal. Even General Aly Amer—never an Anglophile—published an article in *Al Misri* discussing the smoothness of the evacuation.

At the same time Egypt has been the leading opponent in the tenuous association known as the Arab League of the proposed treaty between Iraq and Turkey (which is in NATO). After considerable persuasion, Nuri Es Said of Iraq had come to Cairo to tell the Arab League that he was not going to change his mind. Iraq was making the treaty with Turkey whether they liked it or not.

It is believed that Eden had unofficial talks with Colonel Nasser about the possibility of Egypt joining such an alliance, but with the present climate of Arab opinion the communiqués contented themselves with mentioning Canal Zone talks. Sir Anthony Eden's next visit is to see

Nuri himself. In Baghdad he is attempting to persuade Iraq to stand firm on its proposed treaty with Turkey, like that with Pakistan. Sooner or later, the whole Middle East will be drawn into the East-West struggle if this goes on.

Pakistan is already allied to the West both by being in the Commonwealth, and by its general policy in the Far East. Jordan is united by treaty and 28,000,000 annually to Britain. Iraq and Persia, as well as these other countries, already receive American aid. There are British bases in Jordan, Iraq and Cyprus, and Turkey is clearly with the West, while the recent visit of the Shah of Persia to Britain and the U. S. has strengthened this diplomatic link.

At present, then, the two crucial countries are Iraq and Egypt, and it is no coincidence that Sir Anthony Eden has stirred up considerable pro-Western diplomatic activity in these two countries. The West is still working on the weak assumption that diplomatic treaties and powerful armies can keep social unrest out of underdeveloped countries.

But recent information suggests that Stalinist parties in Persia, Iraq, India and Indonesia—as a few examples—are growing despite strong police forces and despite American aid and British diplomacy. Or because of it?

**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 West 14 Street, New York City  
specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.  
Send for our free book list.

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

## Rudzienski Writes In Views on Malenkov's Fall

To the Editor:

Malenkov's act in resigning the premiership of the government from the platform of the Soviet Congress seems to me like the attendance of a living corpse at his own funeral. The macabre scene, possible only in Russia, reminds us of the devils of Dostoevsky. But apart from its macabre theatricalness, it has great political importance.

It is a big defeat for all of those who (like Isaac Deutscher) have been awaiting a new socialist course in Russia from Malenkov. It is also a surprise for all partisans of peaceful collaboration and coexistence between West and East, like the British Laborites and the German Social-Democrats.

Now, in Russia the pure-blooded Stalinists have won out, the heavy-industry program was proclaimed by the congress, and Molotov, the old stupid Molotov, has declared that "the socialist world is stronger than capitalism," etc., etc. Where is Russia really going? Does the capitulation of Malenkov and the victory of Khrushchev mean a return of Stalinism (understanding by this a return to Stalin's own policies), that is, a new period of deep reaction, a new era of feverish armament, a "hard" policy against the West, international expansion; or are these events symptoms of a mortal disease of the Stalinist regime in Russia and everywhere else?

I am inclined to the latter view, for the following reasons.

Thirty years of Thermidorean and then totalitarian reaction in Russia, the permanent civil war against the working class and the peasants, the armament and war policy, together with absolute disdain for the needs of the masses, have not only drained the material and moral energy of the Russian people but also exhausted all the moral prestige of the old Bolshevism and, with it, the historical and political possibilities of Stalinism. The revolution is gone; it destroyed the old feudalism and also the old backward private capitalism, but it did not build "socialism in one country" as Stalin had promised the people. The historical experience of thirty years speaks against Stalin's doctrine, in the name of which Stalin murdered the whole Old Guard of the revolution. The masses are not only tired; they are drained, entirely exhausted, disillusioned, and they are offering powerful pressure against the regime; they are fighting with the only means they have at their disposal in the totalitarian state, passive resistance against the labor norms in industry and against the new and bigger delivery quotas in the kolkhozes.

Stalinism has arrived at an insuperable historical barrier; it does not have the confidence of the masses, their faith; it has exhausted all its energy and all the material and moral possibilities of these masses; and so it has reached its historical limits. Totalitarian reaction has hit rock-bottom; it can no longer live on credit from the revolution; it must be replaced by another political form, or it goes on to catastrophe.

Malenkov's "merit" lay in his new appraisal of the situation, because he belonged to the new generation and understood that the masses are exhausted and that the whole policy of the regime must be changed, if the system was to be

saved. He promised the masses to take their needs more into account and to develop the production of consumers' goods; he also wished to mitigate international tension, because he knows that in case of a new war the masses will not fight for the regime and that therefore the regime cannot survive a new war. But this "new look" of Russian policy required concessions to the masses, the abolition of GPU control over the party and also restraints on the party, that is, clique control in the state. This "new style" in Malenkov's policy alarmed the old conservative circles of the leading Stalinist school, which considers this policy very dangerous to the Stalinist regime, because it would end up with the collapse of party domination as well as revision in economic and international policy, the "taboos" of Stalinism up to now.

The old Stalinist fraction of Khrushchev-Molotov is trying to prevent this catastrophe with a return to the classic Stalinist policy, to totalitarian reaction: more cannon, more MVD control, more work, more heavy industry, less food, less clothes. Under this "glorious banner" victory has been won by the Stalinist faction in the Soviet Congress.

But they will find out that the success of the Stalinist policy was not due to Stalin's personality, but to the objective historical situation in Russia and in the world, after the defeat of the socialist revolution and the abolition of the Bolshevik dictatorship in Russia. Now the situation is completely different, and it will be very difficult to solve the new problems with the old methods of Stalin. It will be very difficult, if not impossible, to drive the Russian masses to new efforts in industry and agriculture, because the masses have lost hope in the possibility of realizing a socialist economy under the Stalinist whip.

So the time for Stalinism in Russia is over, and neither Khrushchev nor Molotov can remedy that fact. The internal fight of the factions inside the Stalinist party is merely the result of this new situation. It will not lead to a new triumph for Stalinism but to the gradual annihilation of the Stalinist party, which is absolutely obsolete and overpassed by the new objective situation. Therefore the appointment of Bulganin as the new premier in the government, it seems to me, does not set him up as arbiter, or as the instrument of the Khrushchev faction, but is the beginning of a new political period, in which the role of the party will be replaced by the army.

Whether the new policy of "neo-Stalinism" will lead to internal collapse, or to an international catastrophe, or will inaugurate a period of gradual liquidation of the GPU and the party regime and end with army rule, is very difficult to foresee, because of lack of knowledge about aspects of the Russian situation. The victory of the army does not necessarily signify a stage of Bonapartism and war, in spite of historical analogies such as the restoration of capitalism in Russia. It could also be a new evidence of peaceful liquidation of Stalinist totalitarianism, that is, a new experiment with Malenkov's policy on a larger scale. The victory of the Khrushchev faction will only accelerate this inevitable process and not stop it.

For Stalinist totalitarian reaction has hit bottom, and its time is over. New times are coming.

Andrzej RUDZIENSKI

## Democracy in Unions: A Case from Seattle

To the Editor:

Several articles in your issue of February 14 touch, obliquely, on the fundamental problem of civil liberties within labor unions. If recent labor-union activity here in Seattle is typical, I must conclude that the greatest threat to the political and ideological freedom of union members in the country is the labor union itself.

Consider the following incidents: E. D., an officer in the local Steelworkers, was removed from his union office for "imposing his political views in the mind of one R. G." (sic). The specific crime of E. D.: asking R. G. to read a certain passage from a work by Lenin.

R. G. appealed to the Steelworkers International union. A hearing was held and E. D. was expelled from membership on the finding by an International board that he "had aligned himself in his thinking with the policies enunciated by the Socialist Workers Party."

The union witchhunt, exceeding any-

thing the government or the employers have produced, began in earnest last summer after the appearance here of the Velde Committee. Labor-union support for the work of the committee was almost unanimous. Two weeks after the hearings by the committee, the state CIO Council amended its constitution to bar union membership to anyone who "belongs to a subversive organization or supports it actively." At least ten union members who had invoked the Fifth Amendment before the committee were expelled from union membership as a result.

And I suspect this is a national pattern. Hence my skepticism at the resolve of the CIO Oil Workers Union to fight the "bosses' witchhunt." (Ben Hall, "Oil Workers Prepare Fight Against Bosses' Witchhunt.")

In "Labor Scope" of the same issue, Ben Hall expresses some amazement that the LWOC-CIO excludes Communists or party-liners from membership. In fact, many unions have gone far beyond that degree of proscription. The Seattle local of the Building Service Employees provides in its constitution that: "No member of the Communist Party or any subversive organization nor any person who subscribes to their doctrines shall be allowed to hold membership or office. . . ."

Let the labor unions stop hollering about governmental and employer repression. The unions may have taken their cues from Congress, but they stand far to far outdistance their progenitors in the matter of repression of political dissent. What happens to the dissenter, the Stalinist, the socialist, the pacifist, the "Fifth Amendment witness" under the master constitution of the AFL-CIO combine? Will the labor unions let him work?

Best of luck to your fine paper. . . .

J. G. S.

## Taking Up the Cudgels For Prof. G. D. H. Cole

To the Editor:

I wish to express my amazement at the article on G. D. H. Cole which appeared in the January 31, 1955 issue and was written by Mr. Bernard Dix. Seldom have I read anything in the socialist press quite as off-base and unfair as this article is.

Mr. Dix attributes a knowledge about what socialism really is and how it must be built to the British working class that does not now exist, and fails at the same time to recognize that Mr. Cole is one of the very few articulate spokesmen for genuine socialism, i.e., a classless society.

I wonder if Mr. Dix has read Mr. Cole's recent remarkable pamphlet, *Is This Socialism?* In this pamphlet Mr. Cole points out that a removal of the class structure did not take place in Great Britain under the Labor government, but only a shifting of the class base. And he also states that many Laborites, especially the trade-union bureaucracy, do not want the class structure abolished. Mr. Dix evidently believes the hope for socialism rests with these leaders and the rank and file of the workers who elect and support them. It does, but it rests even more with intelligent men like G. D. H. Cole who understand socialism and will have to educate both the trade-union leaders and the rank and file of the workers, but especially the union bureaucracy.

This is a very difficult task and I think Mr. Cole should be forgiven for an occasional utterance of despair and loneliness. LABOR ACTION should assist Mr. Cole in this great and glorious task.

Very sincerely yours,  
Lionel Ford HOLMES

Pending any reply that Comrade Dix might wish to make from London, a couple of comments at this end:

We are of course anxious that our writers remain fair and on-base, but surely a second reading of Comrade Dix's offending article will convince our correspondent that he has not done justice to it. He will find that Dix was favorable enough to Cole's lucid, often trenchant and scholarly criticisms of Laborite and right-wing socialist policy; and that his criticism of Cole was the professor's lack of any "clear and positive statement of principles" of his own; "having revealed the negative side of the problem he [did not] do likewise for the positive side." (Moreover, as a previous article in LA, not by Dix, had pointed out, Cole's lack of a positive point of view of his own has pushed him in the direction of all kinds of illusions about Stalinism.)

Whatever our correspondent may think

## Laborscope —

(Continued from page 2)

partment) specimens of European labor leaders, and reporting solemnly that the French workers didn't know how to organize, unions didn't collect dues, they lacked administrative skill ("You know the French"), they didn't believe in productivity, and they had no sense of efficiency.

Not being blatantly chauvinistic, the American labor leaders didn't say it openly, but everyone knew the pitch: French labor leaders lacked American "know-how." Less was said about English labor leaders, except for Bevan who was denounced frequently; and hope in German labor leaders also dimmed when they displayed typical hard-headedness and insisted on running their own affairs, refusing to support Adenauer which American labor leaders thought was the only policy that made sense.

In the context of that and other experiences, and the quiet but very evident retreat of the CIO from this kind of crude thinking and organizational interference in the European labor movement, a rather remarkable appraisal of CIO policy in Europe came out this week in the current issue of the *New Republic*.

It takes the form of some comments by Victor Reuther, who directed CIO work in Europe, on Vaf Lorwin's new book on the French labor movement.

Reuther now refers to the "impossibility of any successful effort to remold the French labor movement into a union shop, check-off, no-contract-no-work American trade union." He outlines a whole series of historical-background reasons and political-climate differences to explain this viewpoint: something which was simply sneered at a few years ago when mentioned by socialists.

### "BUSYBODYISM"

As for policy, Victor Reuther suggests three generalizations as guideposts for aiding the French and European labor movement: They should be helped to achieve a healthy independence, to develop a grass-roots organization, and to have democratic expression of rank-and-file views.

As for the role and value of CIO work in Europe, Reuther politely calls it—and we presume his own role—at best a form of busybodyism. More often, of course, many AFL and CIO leaders in Europe sounded like flunkies of the State Department, and provided the Stalinists with a field day for criticism:

Lest anyone think American labor leaders were alone in this miserable flop, it should be recalled that American intellectuals made no more of a contribution. One great novelist, for example, opined in Paris for the press that what Europe needed was another American infantry division.

The failure of American labor in Europe speaks for itself. Reuther simply acknowledges the obvious. What becomes more pertinent now is what American labor can and must do to play a role with some idea of success in terms of Europe.

Here it seems that the first step indicated would be precisely to apply Reuther's guideposts for European labor to the American labor scene. The now united labor movement could aid itself, and be an inspiration for European labor if it would (1) become healthily independent, (2) develop grass-roots organization, and (3) reverse the trend toward further bureaucratization, and become a genuine expression of democratic trends within society and in its own structure.

of this particular criticism of Cole, which he does not discuss, he has no disagreement with Dix when he points to the value of some of Cole's writings. But we would agree with Dix that this value lies in its criticism of official Labor policy, not in its ability to suggest any consistent alternative.

We should also like to suggest to our correspondent that Cole's "despair and loneliness," which happened to be the immediate subject that Dix discussed, are not unrelated to Cole's pro-Stalinist illusions, which play no small role in his inability to offer a positive lead where it is so sorely needed. It is virtually a "law" of politics today that pro-Stalinist leanings arise in proportion to loss of hope and faith in the revolutionary mission of the working class to emancipate itself through its own class struggle.

Precisely because Cole is one of the most outspoken and vigorous critics of right-wing Labor policy, it is useful to keep these things in mind about his own politics.—Ed.



**LABOR ACTION**

March 7, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 10

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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## Oberlin Debs Club Debates Formosa and Foreign Policy

OBERLIN, O., Feb. 15—The Eugene V. Debs Club, a student socialist group here at Oberlin College, has initiated a campaign in opposition to United States policy on Formosa. The club adopted a resolution expressing its views on the Formosan situation and circulated petitions among the student body protesting the action taken by Congress at the request of the Eisenhower administration.

Their activities produced a lively interest on this matter among students here; a group of students who support U. S. foreign policy issued and circulated a counter-statement upholding the policies and actions of the government.

The Debs Club challenged these students to a debate on this question. As a result, a debate in which Gerald Lehmann and Tim Wohlforth (of the Debs Club) argued against American intervention, and Dave Williams (a member of the ROTC) and Yuan Chang supported the action of the American government, was arranged. None of the speakers officially represented any campus organization in the debate.

Excerpts from the Debs Club's "Resolution on the Formosan Situation," which was read in its entirety by Wohlforth during the debate, follow:

"We of the Eugene V. Debs Club strongly condemn the action taken on the Formosa situation by the United States Congress under the urging of the president of the United States."

"We say this out of no sympathy for the Chinese Communist cause. The Chinese Stalinists are as vicious exploiters of the working class as can be found in any part of the world. We as socialists feel ourselves diametrically opposed to this anti-socialist and anti-democratic regime."

"Furthermore we have no illusions about Nationalist China. Chiang Kai-shek runs one of the most ruthless mili-

tary dictatorships in modern history. To refer to Formosa as a 'free nation,' as our president is fond of doing, is to engage in Orwellian slogans. Only if 'slavery is freedom' and 'war is peace' does our present foreign policy make sense."

"This resolution illustrates the bankruptcy of our whole foreign policy. Have we nothing better to defend in Asia than Chiang Kai-shek? Have we no other solution to the Far Eastern situation than to threaten total war, a war from which civilization may never recover? It seems that we are able to offer no progressive alternative to the peoples of the world who are being taken in by the Stalinists."

"We reject the currently popular flag-waving variety of super-patriotism as represented by the so-called 'Students for Sensible Action' [the student group supporting U. S. policy—Ed.]. We are motivated to take this stand because of our sincere love of our country and our democratic heritage. We feel that provoking war in Asia to defend a dictator is not in keeping with this heritage."

"We offer as an alternative to the present preventive-war foreign policy of our government, a policy based on the self-determination of all people. Such a foreign policy would unite us with the peoples of the world and not with their exploiters, be they Chiang Kai-shek or Chou En-lai."

"Is military might or containment the only means we have to defeat Stalinism? We believe that many of the people of the world are in a state of revolution. There is still time to turn these revolutions into democratic channels. Our nation has the power to guide men in their quest for dignity. For our own defense it is an absolute necessity. We must either lead these revolutions or be crushed by them."

(Continued on page 7)

## YSL Revives Sather Gate Tradition at Berkeley with Rally on Kremlin Overturn

By JACK WALKER

BERKELEY, Feb. 21—"As the Campanile bells marked noon Friday, a group of students stopped before a semi-trailer parked near the Administration building. On it was a banner reading 'The meaning of Malenkov's demotion—Berkeley Unit, Young Socialist League.'—From the front page of the *Daily Californian*, Feb. 21, 'Socialists talk at Sather Gate.'"

At this meeting, which the *Daily Cal* looked at as a "revival of a dying tradition," Berkeley YSL organizer Charles Shain gave a socialist interpretation of Malenkov's ouster from the premiership in Russia. Some of the causes for Malenkov's dismissal which he discussed were: the English and French ratification of the rearmament of Western Germany; the internal Russian crisis in agriculture and light industry; and the unresolved struggle for power at the apex of the Russian bureaucracy as it gravitates back to one-man rule. The immediate effects of Khrushchev's victory, he said, are to step up the arms and heavy industry economy in Russia and the satellites at the expense of consumers' goods (contrary to the easy optimism of Deutscher), increase world tension, and bring closer world war III, although not in the very near future.

There is a way, Shain mentioned, that a different U. S. government, one not exclusively committed to a policy of military mobilization only, might be able to take advantage of the Russian situation today. Russia has hinted through its puppets that it might withdraw occupation troops from Poland as well as East Germany if the Western powers would leave Western Germany. Since the immediate effect of the retreat of Russian troops could well mean a revolution in these areas, why couldn't a more far-sighted U. S. government (i.e., a labor govern-

ment) call this bluff by withdrawing its troops? Russia would have to back down and would be on the defensive for a change, in the propaganda "cold war." It couldn't invade Germany because this would lead to World War III, in which case German industry would be H-bombed anyway.

"Standing inside the makeshift 'platform' . . . an old standby for political groups wishing to speak 'on campus' without actually being on campus," as the *Daily Californian* article said, the YSL organizer emphasized the importance of such meetings as this where viewpoints other than the American or Russian Party Lines were presented. He spoke "before a generally attentive crowd, though one which constantly changed its composition as new listeners came and 'old' ones left."

The audience of about 80 people were told that when the two political camps had managed to line up practically all the nations on one side or the other "the world will be dangerously near World War III." Therefore, it was to the interests of the American people, that independent parties such as the Indian Socialist Party or the much less independent German Social Democracy should take power.

Several copies of the Berkeley YSL's pamphlet *James Burnham and the Managerial Revolution* by George Orwell, and the latest *Anvil*, were sold to members of the audience. Announcements were made for a joint YSL-ISL forum that night called "The Russian Developments and the Formosan Situation," and for a YSL class series based on "The Organizational Weapon" that would begin in about 10 days. The forum that night was attended by several people who had been at the noon meeting. The YSL intends to hold additional street meetings as important political events happen.

## The British Student Movement Marks Time

By ALEX NEWBOLD

LONDON, Feb. 16—Superficially, the position of the student labor movement may look slightly more encouraging than that of the other sections of the political youth movement, which I covered in a previous article in *Challenge*, but it is only a question of a slight degree. Most students in Britain are interested in politics to a certain extent, and a good few take part in the political life on campus, usually centered round the "Union" debating societies. But then it is true that political awareness is always high among students in general.

Even so there is a noticeable decline from the earnestness experienced in the thirties and particularly from the immediate post-war period, when the Labor government stimulated a tremendous interest in socialism. Political debates are now more characterized by attempts at good form rather than good content.

Many of these debates are now given over to obscurantist religious subjects inspired by such conservative thinkers as T. S. Eliot and C. S. Lewis. And where there is a sincere interest in serious political thought the attitude of (say) the Labor Clubs is lamentable for its lack of inventiveness and healthy irreverence towards the status quo.

The Conservative clubs on campus are, again, more in the nature of social clubs, to which it is "the thing" to belong, and in most universities they form by far the largest political clubs. The Liberals find in the universities their last stronghold in the country outside the "Celtic fringe" which still elects its six Liberal MPs to Parliament. Having experienced no participation in any government for many decades, the Liberals have collected a good deal of misplaced idealism particularly at the universities, where the thought of being idealistic without doing anything about it has a peculiar charm of its own.

The student labor movement is fairly clearly divided into three distinct organizations: the 40-year-old Student Labor Federation; the more recently formed Communist Clubs, which are usually party cells as well; and the individual Labor Clubs, affiliated to the National Association of Labor Student Organizations, which has close though often strained relations with the BLP.

### LEFT LABORITES

The Student Labor Federation with its affiliated Socialist Clubs was captured by fellow travelers and outright Stalinists during the Popular Front period and the war, and since then it has acted as nothing more than a typical Stalinist "front" organization for seducing the unwary. At its recent annual conference in January, at which approximately sixty delegates from thirty affiliated clubs attended, it passed resolutions supporting the aims of the Warsaw Youth Festival this summer and called for "left-wing student unity" following the current CP line. This comes particularly strange from a body which has little *raison d'être* outside complete unification with the Communist clubs.

NALSO was founded immediately after the war by a group of democratic socialist students, prominent among them being Donald Chesworth, who was for a long time the student secretary of IUSY. They were quick enough to realize that once an organization has been captured by the Stalinists there is not much chance of ousting them. They formed NALSO as a rival to SLF but were careful enough to make the new body completely independent of the BLP in spite of the close ideological identity between the two, thus avoiding the mistakes which followed such a procedure in the Labor League of Youth.

However, they are to a large extent financially dependent on the BLP and in

this way it has been possible for the latter to exert some pressure on the leadership, particularly in regards to its attitude to IUSY. Nevertheless, NALSO has maintained a position which is to the left of the BLP, particular with regards to colonial policy. In this respect it is particularly well placed, as the number of students from colonial territories has assumed vast quantities since 1945, and it can make a direct appeal to these. One of its former secretaries, John Stonehouse, spent two years in Uganda developing the cooperative movement there.

### NO WITCHHUNT

There have been very few issues on which the student labor movement could effectively stimulate action on general matters. There is a very widespread system of national and local government grants and the great majority of students are in receipt of one of these. On the whole these have been fairly generous, although lately they have declined in real value with the rise in the cost of living. The grants are paid on the basis of a fairly stiffly graded means test based on parental income, and it is significant that the agitation for the abolition of this means test has come from the higher income groups who claim that they have great difficulty in keeping a son or a daughter at college.

The main snag as far as the grants are concerned lies in the great divergence between the counties in the allocation of funds to higher education. This manifests itself in number of school-leavers who actually obtain a grant, rather than in different scales. Consequently, a person born in London has, for example, four or five times the chances of reaching a university on a grant, than one in Derbyshire. But of course, the students already at college, while granting the necessity for changing this position, are not likely to get worked up about it.

Most important, perhaps, in a direct comparison with higher education in the U. S. today, is the fact that there is nothing remotely resembling a witchhunt on campus. The more well-known Stalinist university professors, such as J. D. Bernal, H. Levy, M. Dobb and V. Gordon Childe, have on no occasion been openly intimidated or threatened with loss of jobs for political beliefs, nor is there any special military obligation for students in college apart from the general national service.

Only in one instance has there been a direct case of political persecution, and then it was at the instance of the American authorities. This was at the University of Birmingham, in the (by now) well-known Dr. Cort case.

NEW YORK YSL  
Sat. eve., March 12  
**Spring  
Social**  
Refreshments—Dancing  
FOLK-DANCING  
Labor Action Hall  
114 West 141 Street, N. Y. C.

# THE ANTI-ZIONIST SOCIALISTS OF ISRAEL

By J. ARTUSKY

The second conference of the Bund organization in Israel, which took place in Tel-Aviv on October 23 and November 6, 1954, brought forth differences of opinion in our ranks. The differences revolved not around the ideology of the Bund but only around a few questions involving the state of Israel.

As to Zionism in general and its harmful role for the Jewish people all over the world, there have been no disagreements in the past and there are none now. On this question the dividing line has been and remains clear. Complications do appear on the problem of the role of Zionism in Israel and the Bundist struggle in the state of Israel.

No one can deny that the state of Israel owes a great deal to Zionism. The state is the dream-child of Zionism. Though a series of international events and the catastrophic destruction that befell European Jews helped in creating the state, the ground for it was prepared by decades of Zionist political and "pioneering" work. That fact cannot be negated.

It is this fact that gave birth to the popular misconception that Israel and Zionism are identical concepts that cannot be divided.

## Zionism a Danger to Jews

When the Bundist organization came into being in Israel over three years ago, it took a position of *differentiating* or separating the two concepts—Israel and Zionism. It took a positive attitude to the state but retained its negative position on Zionism.

**The Bund in Israel took the position that: Zionism, despite its achievements for the state, was in its essence—as a movement of Jewish nationalism—inimical to the state of Israel; that the idea of the "Ingathering of the Exiles," of territorial concentration of the Jewish people in Israel, is a dangerous concept not only for the continued existence of the Jews in the world but also for the very existence of Israel itself and of its inhabitants.**

Resolutions expressing these ideas were adopted unanimously at the first meetings of the Bund. They established a clear dividing line between the Bund and the Zionists not only in relation to the general Jewish question but also as to the role and requirements of Israel.

The first meeting and conference of the Bund took place at a time when the politics of "Ingathering of the Exiles" was "triumphant." There was still in process a mass immigration which, however, had fatal effects on the economic crisis. There was a shortage of the most elementary products; the Israeli pound was devalued; over 200,000 people were homeless in the Maabrot and other camps for the newcomers; and the majority of the Israeli population lived on charity and food parcels received from abroad.

The harmful effects of the Zionist politics of "Ingathering" was obvious. While the Zionists saw this condition as the "birth pangs" of the Zionist millennium, the Bundists analyzed it as a result of trying to achieve a false utopia. The Bundist organization was the first and, at that time, the only organization that warned against continuing the false policy of "Ingathering of the exiles."

On the question of relations with the Arabs, there also existed a clear dividing line between the Bund and the Zionists.

## The Zionist leaders and masses at that time

still were living under the psychology of victory over the Arab countries. Their Jewish nationalism was optimistic; they rattled their small swords, and lived in the belief that "time is on our side." The policy and practice of discrimination against the Arab minority within the country was in full swing. The Bund, which insisted on peace with the Arab world, was clearly aware of the dangers that stemmed from such a nationalism.

The position was also clear on the question of Yiddish. There was open and flagrant discrimination against Yiddish in Israel. It was obvious that in Israel there was no other organization except the Bund that was interested in defending the rights of Yiddish and fighting for its equality.

## Insecurity Grows

In the course of the two years since our first meeting, great changes have taken place in conditions in the state of Israel.

The mass immigration has stopped. The illusion of "Ingathering of the Exiles" has begun to evaporate. It has been getting clearer even to Zionists that the state of Israel cannot solve the Jewish question and that the "exiles" will remain in existence, that Israel will remain a small state inhabited by a small portion of the Jewish people.

The international position of Israel also took a turn for the worse. The great powers began to cultivate the friendship of the Arab states and to strengthen them both politically and militarily. In Israel the optimism began to diminish and the feeling of insecurity began to grow. There no longer existed the belief that "time is on our side."

True, the policy of "activism" against the Arabs was the reigning policy and it had its sharpest manifestation in attacks on Kibya, etc. These, however, were acts of despair rather than of optimism. They sprang from the feeling that tomorrow the situation of Israel would be worse and it behooved people to use the immediate opportunity to the utmost.

One result of the changed feeling was that the government began to liberalize its treatment of the Arab minority inside Israel and talked more often of peace with the Arab countries.

There took place important changes in the internal policies of Israel. A radical change occurred in the economic program of the government. The unsuccessful policy of rationing and austerity was abandoned. A free market was established which, while it legalized black-market prices, brought a plentiful supply of products. The bourgeois classes received many privileges and opportunities to make huge profits. At the same time the government froze the wages of workers and set itself the goal of reducing the standard of living of the workers.

## Deepen Zionist Crisis

The government did succeed in continuing the development of the country with its new policies. Both industry and agriculture have advanced and the currency has more or less been stabilized. This success was at the expense of greatly deepening the social division in the country, sharpening the class antagonisms. It thereby helped the growth of dissatisfaction and the disillusionment of the people with the Zionist parties.

All these things contributed to deepen the crisis in the Zionist ranks. The tendency to flee from the country grew. It did not, however, bring about a strengthening of the Bundist organization in Israel. Rather it was apathy to the political struggle that grew amid the people generally; among the youth there sprouted "Canaanism" and estrangement from the Jews; as regards left elements, the "Communist" tendency grew in strength. The Zionist parties, basing themselves on the state apparatus and economic institutions, succeeded in retaining their hold on the majority of the population in an organizational sense—though losing on the ideological field.

The difficulties which the Bundists met in spreading its ideas and political influence gave rise to a tendency

With the following article, translated by Al Findley from the February issue of Unser Tsait, we are glad to acquaint our readers with the comparatively recent establishment in Israel of a militant anti-Zionist socialist movement, the Israeli section of the Jewish Labor Bund (which publishes Unser Tsait in this country).

Judging by the content of the accompanying article, which reports on the Second National Conference of the Israeli Bund, the political and ideological stand of the Israeli Bundists on the issues of Zionism, Israel and the Jewish question is very close, if not indeed identical, with our own, up to and including even our proposal for federal unity with the Arab people. We greet this correspondence in socialist thinking with great pleasure, and hope to follow more closely the activities and ideas of the Israeli Bund as spokesman for a genuine socialist approach in Israel.—Ed.

among a group of comrades to think along the lines of de-emphasizing our principled struggle against Zionism, which is slowly dissolving of its own accord, and to concentrate only on such slogans and demands as are more adapted to the feelings of the masses and do not antagonize their Zionist beliefs. These comrades also believed that we should not accuse the Israeli government of not wanting peace with the Arabs. At any rate, these comrades argued, we cannot change the Zionist character of the state—it may take generations—it is therefore correct to concentrate on slogans and demands that are concrete and on problems or sore points of the workers in general and the Yiddish-speaking masses in particular.

## No Programmatic Retreat

The recently concluded Second National Conference of the Israeli Bund rejected these proposals. It took the position:

(1) By putting aside our principled opposition to Zionism we erase the separation between us and the Zionist parties now in opposition to the government, and that will weaken our organization; and

(2) Without the political-ideological struggle against Zionism, our organization would lose its right to exist as a separate tendency.

**In opposition to the proposed program, the conference decided that our main function is to maintain the ideological independence and propagate our truths despite the fact that they are not popular at the moment.**

The course of Israeli's development in the past few years has strengthened our position *ideologically*. The failure of mass immigration, symptoms of the bankruptcy of the Zionist ideas about the "millennium," the crisis in the Zionist ranks, the rise of dissatisfaction with the Zionist parties—all these factors demand not a weakening but an intensification of our struggle against Zionism. The conference pointed out that the distorted forms taken by the disillusionment with Zionism—growth of apathy, Canaanism, and the Communist tendencies—are only the beginnings of the awakening process in the Jewish population.

It is therefore the duty of Bundists to unite with these masses to direct them toward democratic and non-Zionist socialism, i.e., in the direction of the Bund. This obligation will not be fulfilled by hiding, but rather by expressing openly and clearly, the Bundist opposition to Zionist ideology and politics.

The conference underlined the necessity of demands and slogans that defend the political and social rights of the masses and strengthen the struggle for the equality of Yiddish. It emphasized that the reactionary and anti-democratic politics of the government is the inevitable consequence of the Zionist character of the governmental policy.

## Toward Unity with Arabs

So too, in relation to the question of peace with the Arab states, the conference deemed it correct to state its position clearly and unambiguously: "while the respective nationalisms of both the Arabs and Jews are responsible for the current situation and are an obstacle to a stable peace," that "on the Jewish side, the main obstacle to such a peace is the Zionist ideology of the 'Ingathering of the Exiles' which bears a tendency to territorial expansion."

The conference condemned the so-called "activist" policy in relation to the Arabs as exemplified in Kibya, etc., and emphasized that the only road to peace lies through mutual compromises from both sides.

The conference thereby formulated the unique position of the Bund on the basic problems of the state of Israel. Its positive attitude toward Israel is not bound up with the Zionist ideas of redemption but with uniting the state of Israel with the general national groups of the Jewish people, as a national community that is at peace with all the nations among which it dwells. The task of Bundists in Israel—no matter how difficult that task may be—to find a way to the masses through a fight for a socialist Israel, freed from Zionist politics, that, on the one hand, will be capable of making peace with the Arabs and even unite with them in a federated community, and, on the other hand, maintain its cultural unity with the widespread Jewish people.

The debate that took place at our conference helped to crystallize the ideological face of the Bundist organization in Israel; and the freedom for differing opinions is not in contradiction but is in line with the basic traditions of the Bundist fraternity. This spirit manifested itself in the celebration of the 70th birthday of the Bundist veteran in Israel, Bentzaz Tsalewicz, that took place at the same time as the conference. At the celebration all political differences disappeared. As a united family the Bundist organization celebrated this well-earned anniversary of its presiding officer.

This Second Conference, which carried on the banner of fidelity of the Bundist ideas, is an important step in the coming difficult but responsible road of the Bundist organization in Israel.

PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION

# German Rearmament and the Jews

To the Editor:

Following is the reply which the *Newark Jewish News* printed in answer to the article of the *Jewish Newsletter* that you reprinted with obvious relish [LA, Jan. 31]:

"In an editorial, 'German Rearmament and the Jews,' the commentator seeks to make the point that the State of Israel has virtually sold its soul to the Bonn Government in exchange for 820 million dollars in reparations, and allegedly for this reason remains silent on the issue of rearming West Germany. More, the editorial charges that American Jewry under Israel's influence, similarly refrain from comment on this question.

"The writer concludes: 'Nothing illustrates more graphically than this incident the intellectual and ideological domination of American Jews by Israel and its interests. American Jews do not voice any protest independently of Israel, just as Poland or Czechoslovakia and other satellites never voice any opinion of protest independently of Moscow. Conformity with the ideological headquarters is the surest sign of all satellitism, be it political, ideological or spiritual.'

"To put one thing immediately straight, we would like to say for the record that none of the numerous pro-Israel editorials which have appeared in this newspaper was ever requested, much less ordered, by any Zionist organization or agency affiliated with the State of Israel. This newspaper has never received, and, we are certain, no other newspaper has received, requests, instructions or orders to conform to a line deemed favorable to Israel.

"Where West German rearmament is concerned, this newspaper is not aware of any official line. The fact of the matter is that this has been an extremely thorny problem. The steps taken by our government in cooperation with the other democracies are based on the intention to use the strength of a free and democratic West Germany in concert with other European nations in order to ensure that the Soviet Union will not be able to swallow up all of the continent. As a matter of fact, the question for years hasn't been whether or not to rearm Germany. It has been one of determining under whose auspices Germany would be rebuilt: under the control and guidance of the western democracies or under the aegis of the Moloch in the East."

The question, of course, is not whether any orders are issued or whether the domination is indirect, but, as you seem to have sensed in your editorial comment on the article, the question is entirely political.

Even those Jewish groups that opposed acceptance of reparations from the Bonn government did not mount a protest against rearmament. That includes the Revisionists and ex-members of the Irgun who in Israel demonstrate against shipments of goods and some who even threaten to show their hostility in person to German sailors. They too are caught in the political contradiction of support of the Western imperialists and opposition to German rearmament. The same is true of Jewish non-Zionist Social Democrats who thundered against any rapprochement with the "German murderers." Silence and even embarrassment when the *German Social-Democracy* opposes rearmament.

On a different question: B. Z. Goldberg, Jewish Stalinoid columnist, in a commentary on the Egyptian execution of the two Jews as spies, makes a charge that protests in the U. S. were restrained because Tel-Aviv had some kind of deal that the men would not die. He draws two conclusions: (1) that keeping quiet and respectable protesting will not save persecuted people, and (2) that the Zionists "betrayed" their co-thinkers in Egypt on orders from the Israeli embassy. B. Z. Goldberg in discussing this question does not mention the fact that while the Western powers protested the death sentence, the Stalinist powers that Goldberg supports kept quiet, and so he and they too share the responsibility for the death of these two innocent men.

B. Z. Goldberg has his own political reasons for trying to discredit the Zionist leaders as does the *Jewish Newsletter*. As for LABOR ACTION, just because something is anti-Zionist, it should not be applauded. Let's stick to the real and not

the imagined crimes of the Zionists.

Al FINDLEY

## Comment

Comrade Findley's letter insists that there is only one motive for the amazing phenomenon that the one people who have been outstanding in the world for silence on German rearmament is "the one which has admittedly suffered most tragically and pitifully from German militarism" (as the *Jewish Newsletter* put it)—namely, organized Jewry in Israel and also outside Israel, including America.

He argues that the one and only motive is the cold-war foreign-policy motive, which our own editorial comment pointed out ("sensed," as Findley says). He argues that Germany's 820 million in allotted reparations to Israel has nothing whatsoever to do with the motivation.

Perhaps his certainty on this point will be somewhat shaken by the fact that the reparations motive has been frankly and clearly stated in print by the well-known editor of the official Zionist organ in Britain, Jon Kimchi, writing in his column in the *London Jewish Observer and Middle East Review* last month. The magazine is the official organ of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain. Kimchi wrote:

"The Jewish agitation against the restoration of a sovereign Germany complete with armed forces has largely faded out. The reasons for this decline in the specifically Jewish opposition to German rearmament are obvious: there was the German agreement to pay substantial reparations to Israel and the Jewish Claims Conference, and the meticulous execution by Dr. Adenauer's government despite extremist opposition and Arab threats. This made the position of the Israeli government increasingly delicate. The earlier sustained opposition to every attempt to bring the Germans back into the international community was abandoned."

Surely what is "obvious" to this British Zionist leader should be credible to Comrade Findley as at least one motive for the otherwise amazing phenomenon

of Jewish silence on German rearmament.

At the risk of making my good friend Findley feel that I'm twisting the knife, I'd like to insist that even without the enlightenment afforded by a public statement by a Zionist leader, it should have been "obvious" to him that the cold-war motive alone could never account for what has happened, especially as far as the Israeli Jews are concerned.

For he completely ignored what our reprinted article highlighted: All over Europe, all over the world, opposition to German rearmament has swirled up like a storm from elements just as pro-Western as the Israelis—in fact, from thousands and thousands who are a good deal more firmly pro-Western than the Israelis. Obviously it is not true by a million miles that mere pro-Westernism can account for the thorough silence in Israel; or else it would be impossible to account for the widespread and bitter opposition to German rearmament which lards even right-wing politics in France, in England, in Belgium, in Germany itself, in Asia, . . .

All this would be true even if Israel were just another country, with no special traumatic relationship with the German militarism which is now being rebuilt!

A factual correction of Findley's reference to "Jewish non-Zionist Social-Democrats": Bundists and other non-Zionist Jewish Socialists have attacked German rearmament. In fact, the very reprint-article which Findley is criticizing was based on the attack published by the *Jewish Bulletin*, edited by I. N. Steinberg, Kazdan and Nelson. This in spite of their cold-war position.

All this being so, we urge Comrade Findley to examine his conscience on some of the gratuitous remarks in his letter which are based on his failure to appreciate the "obvious." We refer particularly to the irrelevant, but not irreproachable, amalgam in his last paragraphs between the Stalinoid B. Z. Goldberg, the *Jewish Newsletter* and LABOR ACTION. Let's not do this sort of thing, huh?—H. D.

# Oberlin — —

(Continued from page 5)

The club had also been conducting a campaign this semester in opposition to the administration's program for Universal Military Training. The group has been distributing anti-UMT literature and urging students to write their senators demanding that they vote against this measure.

In addition, the club has been carrying on a program of forums and other activities. It recently showed the film "Potemkin," a saga of the mutiny of the sailors of the battleship Potemkin during the Russian Revolution of 1905, at the college. Max Shachtman, national chairman of the Independent Socialist League, will speak on "Coexistence" at a meeting to be sponsored by the club on March 10.

# Swiatlo — —

(Continued from page 3)

wheeled up loaded "evidence" against Zambrowski's wife, who had been the mistress of Cesanis, chief of pre-war Poland's information bureau. But because Radkiewicz's own past could not pass purity inspection, he had to wind up by giving Mme. Zambrowski a clean bill of health.

We are dealing here with third-rate personalities, shady characters, susceptible with ease to blackmail by each other and all together by the Russian GPU—compromised men with pre-war pasts including capitulation to the police and relations with the old information bureau. Of such human material are puppets made.

Some of the leaders of the Politburo or UB are believed by public opinion to be involved in the black-market business, e.g., Gruenberg of the Health Ministry, Vice-Minister Romkowski of the UB, Antosiewicz of the UB, and many others. Bierut and the others know about this, but they are waiting for the right time to use this ammunition in an "ideological" fight.

Corruption seems to be as prevalent in Warsaw as in Moscow, and a large quantity of "national goods" are for sale on the black market, with the complicity of dignitaries of the government and party leadership.

## FILMS and Ideas

### George Orwell's 'Animal Farm'

# A 'Socialist Classic' on the Screen

By MEL BECKER

When a socialist's classic is adapted to the screen one takes special notice. And as long as distortion does not destroy the work's essence, one applauds loudly. Such is the case with George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, that biting satire on Stalinist Russia, now on the screen as an animated-cartoon film.

Only one reservation before the applause begins. The ending of the allegory is changed, not merely in the sense of changing Orwell's conclusions, but in such a way as to leave open diametrically opposed interpretations. As we know, Orwell's deeply ingrained pessimism led him to doubt the outcome of the socialist struggle, led him to envision the world of 1984. Thus, he has, at the conclusion of *Animal Farm*, the animals peering through a window into the room where the pigs are holding a celebration, and, lo, they cannot tell the difference between these new exploiters and the humans who had preceded them.

But in the film the story does not end here. After this scene the swallows fly to the human-ruled farms and tell all the oppressed animals what disastrous events are occurring on *Animal Farm*. Hearing of the plight of their brothers, enraged, the oppressed animals march to the farm and easily overturn the pig ruling class. The film ends with an inspiring sight: all the animals, from all the farms, stand over the bonfire of Farmer Jones' house, singing the old revolutionary song. After all the toilers are victorious. . . .

To be sure, the circumstances under which the animals leave the human-ruled farms are quite vague. One is not sure whether, allegorically, this is supposed to be a representation of capitalist intervention in war against Russia, "liberating" the animals so that they can be exploited by the humans again (although this interpretation is perhaps gainsaid when the film concludes with the old revolutionary song); whether the animals have simply slipped out of their own

farms unbeknown to their own masters; or whether they have first overthrown their own "farm" rulers and then come to help out in eliminating the new pig-type ruling class.

Naturally one may well suppose that this point was deliberately left in a blur. It would be really surprising to see more clarity on the part of the *March of Time's* former editor in dealing with this aspect.

In any case, the applause can now begin—not as loudly as it might have been, but loud nevertheless. For with this one reservation, the film keeps to the original fairly closely. It even produces greater effects many times than the novel could. For instance, when Napoleon changes the slogan "No animal may kill another animal"—it was originally painted white, which has become dull—the added words "without good cause" are painted with the bright, red, dripping blood of the "counter-revolutionary" chickens.

There are other minor political questions that could be raised, but these also apply more or less to the novel as well as the film, and so need not be argued here. There is no need to dwell upon our admiration of the novel or film taken as a

whole. Where else do we find such a brilliant socialist satire on Stalinism? Where else do we find such wholehearted support and identification with the exploited, toiling masses?

What with the stinging quips (All animals are equal—but some are more equal than others. No animal may sleep in a bed—without sheets. The revolution is complete, comrades, no more singing of revolutionary songs under penalty of death; etc.); the superb speeches of old Major and Snowball, the portrayal of the treacherous, bureaucratic, simplistic mind of Napoleon (e.g., his famous polemic against Snowball's careful analysis for the necessity to build a windmill, "Bosh"), and a whole host of other unforgettable particulars, one is overwhelmed by the power and impressionistic truth of the satire.

## 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

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, out Feb. 18:

Lao Tzu: *The Way of Life*, a new translation of the Chinese classic by R. B. Blakney, Mentor, 35¢. R. H. Bainton: *Here I Stand; a Life of Martin Luther*, Mentor, 50¢. Horace Coon: *Hobbies for Pleasure and Profit*, Signet Key, 35¢. George Sklar: *The Housewarming*, Signet Giant, 35¢. Marris Murray: *The Color of the Blood*, Signet, 25¢. Alexander Eliot: *Proud Youth*, Signet, 25¢. Peggy Goodin: *The Lie*, Signet, 25¢. John D. MacDonald: *Cancel All Our Vows*, Signet Giant, 35¢.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION—  
\$2 a year does it!

# Not for Dollars or Rubles — —

(Continued from page 1)

The Munich demonstration organized by the unions was told by Max Woerner, chairman of the Bavarian trade unions, that ratification would not end "our fight against rearmament." The SPD has pledged itself to fight every enabling law under the agreements tooth and nail, both in the country and in the parliament.

Adenauer and his henchmen sought, throughout the nationwide campaign which preceded the parliamentary vote, to tar the socialist opposition with the charge of pro-Stalinist leanings. In one speech, Felix von Eckardt, federal press chief and one of the chief government spokesmen, said that remarks by agitators at small meetings approached high treason. Herbert Wehner, one of the most able Social-Democratic leaders, responded to this by accusing the government of collecting information against his party for the purpose of being able to try it for treason at some future date.

## THEY LIKE SCHMID

The SPD's opposition to the Paris agreement has aroused the American press to a virtual hate campaign against the German labor movement. Herbert Wehner was picked by Time magazine (Feb. 28) as the "evil grey eminence" of the SPD.

Typical of Time's "objective" report-

ing on the German events was this: "... the SPD is still doctrinally Marxist, making much ado about dialectics, red flags and the greeting 'comrade.' The Socialists say they are pro-Western, but they oppose German membership in the West European Union; they are stoutly anti-Communist, yet they line up on Moscow's side in its fight against the Paris accords. At a time when West Germany, and most, though not all, of its workers are enjoying unprecedented prosperity, the SPD still tends to couch its cries for social justice in obsolete Marxist phrases which catch no fire."

Time's candidate for "progressive reformer" of the SPD: Carlo Schmid, whom it describes engagingly as an "able . . . potbellied bon vivant."

Though avoiding the hopped-up language of Luce's organ, the sober New York Times says about the same thing. A lead editorial on February 25 ends: "Having suffered complete ideological, economic and political bankruptcy in the face of the startling German recovery under a free-enterprise system, the Socialists now take their last refuge in a false 'patriotism' exceeding that of the most outspoken nationalists. The result is a flurry of mass rallies and street riots in what begins to look like a relapse into revolutionary tactics. Such tactics clearly

play into the hands of Soviet Russia."

The true explanation for the passion with which these organs of the "American Century" lash out at the SPD is that, far from displaying its bankruptcy, the German labor movement has shown a vigor and militancy which has astonished many of its friends and struck consternation into the hearts of its enemies. Hardly a year after a demoralizing setback at the polls, which strengthened the anti-Marxist wing of the party led by Schmid, the movement has been revived by a series of bold trade-union and political struggles.

## ANTI-LABOR TRICKS

As the campaign against the Paris accords develops, it becomes increasingly clear that the left wing of the movement is strongest in the trade unions and the youth organizations. It is the unions and the youth, in the first place, which took the campaign to the people in dramatic fashion. Yet these are the same unions which, till not too long ago, took a stand against pressing for higher wages on the ground that this might impair the competitive position of German industry in the world market!

Adenauer has not failed to draw a lesson from the new militancy of the unions. Right after the last elections he moved to split the trade-union federation by en-

couraging a campaign for a separation of the Catholic unions from the united body.

\* The campaign was too crude, lacked preparation, and fell flat. But Adenauer knows that as long as the union movement remains united, it forms a powerful means of uniting the whole working class against the policies of his government.

Now a new tactic is being tried. The religious workers' associations (konfessionellen Arbeiterverbänden) have decided to contest the factory council elections in the Rhein-Ruhr area on separate tickets AGAINST those put up by the trade-union federation. This decision, in which Catholic and Protestant workers' associations seem to have formed a united front, could obviously be a move to sharpen antagonisms within the labor movement on a religious basis, with the eventual perspective of splitting up the labor movement.

(These religious workers' associations appear to be somewhat similar to the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists in the United States. Despite their claim to be purely confessional and non-political, a Catholic worker was recently expelled from the Catholic Workers' Movement for membership in the SPD.)

## WEAK ON ALTERNATIVE

The vigor, imagination and breadth with which the German labor movement has conducted its campaign against the Paris agreements is a heartening sign for the future. Nevertheless, the politics of the campaign lack the soundness of its execution.

The West German labor movement has shown a healthy resistance to the incorporation of its country into the American military bloc in the cold war. For that is the real meaning of the Paris agreements and the rearmament of West Germany under them. "We don't want to die for dollars and rubles" is a cogent summary of the alternatives which are being offered the German people by the two war blocs.

But where the German labor movement has shown itself weak is in offering a really durable and tenable alternative to the policy of Adenauer. To his spurious argument that West Germany will be able to negotiate more successfully for the unification of the country with the Russians "from strength" after it is rearmed and part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, they have answered only that West Germany should demand "sincere" negotiations among the four occupying powers before casting its lot with the capitalist bloc.

Such a program, however actively and vigorously it may be propagandized, still leaves the German workers and the nation as a whole in the position of a passive object of the cold-war struggle. At best it is a temporary slogan designed to mobilize the maximum resistance to the most pressing danger: incorporation into NATO. At worst it expresses a dangerous illusion that Germany can be united and removed from the world struggle as a result of a deal between the Stalinist and capitalist blocs which will lay the foundation for an era of peaceful co-existence.

## SOCIALIST BULWARK

If the German labor movement were to carry out its intention of continuing its struggle against the NATO-rearmament plan, it would be under strong pressure to adopt a program which offers a more serious alternative than has yet been developed to the illusion of a united, neutral Germany dangled before them by the Russians or the obvious disaster of the incorporation of a rearmed West Germany into NATO.

They would have to demand the unconditional evacuation of the country by the armed forces of both sides, so that the German people can decide their own policies freely, in exactly the same way that every free nation has the right to make its own decisions.

A campaign for unconditional evacuation would have to be directed primarily at the foreign occupiers of the country rather than at Adenauer's government. Its object would be to make continued occupation of the country no longer feasible for the United States, Britain and France, and to seek to stimulate and aid a similar campaign against Russian occupation in East Germany.

Its development and execution would be extremely difficult. But it would make the German working class and the German people active participants in the decision on the fate of their country; and orient them toward the struggle for a socialist Germany which could offer a victorious political and military bulwark against the Stalinist threat on the east.

# Shachtman Passport Case — —

(Continued from page 1)

brought out in the briefs on both sides and as they were argued in the hearing. It is enough to indicate here that the government, for the purposes of this hearing, decided to make its main pitch on the claim of "unreviewability."

## BUREAUCRATIC CLAIM

While this is, of course, a legal position in the first place, it has a symptomatic social significance. The government is taking the stand that the action of the Executive on this aspect of citizens' rights (passports) cannot be reviewed by the courts. It is claiming unchecked and uncontrollable power for itself, on this field! It is telling the judiciary in so many words: No one has any power over us on this issue.

In the eventuality that this position is upheld by the courts, it will be one more step in the bureaucratization of social life in the United States, one more step in the rise of administrative-decree-law to dominance. A favorable decision in the Shachtman case would, on the other hand, be a blow against the trend.

In the second place, the government tried to counter Attorney Rauh's argument that the Passport Office had denied a passport to Shachtman solely on the ground of the "listing" of the ISL. Here too we will report on some important aspects in next week's LA, but it was in this connection that Assistant U. S. Attorney Greene came up with his howlers on the ISL. We cannot claim, perhaps, that the strictly legal significance of these passages d'armes is great—I don't know—but in their own way they give a deep insight into the political mentality of the witchhunters, a mentality which is seen made up of equal parts of abysmal ignorance, brassbound cynicism, and deep reaction.

## BLASPHEMY

(1) Is the ISL "anti-Communist," as appellant claims? In the background was the fact that the attorney general's list classifies the ISL not only as "subversive" but also "Communist." To support this, Greene dipped down into the vast resources of his mighty intellect, 'way way down. . . .

"We admit," he said, "that Mr. Shachtman is anti-Communist as far as the world Communist movement is concerned. But communism means also—Webster's dictionary defines it as simply 'a system of social organization where goods are held in common' . . . Certainly Mr. Shachtman will admit that he is Communist in the sense that Webster defines it!"

No thunder toppled the marble columns, no lightning ripped through the roof; and this was very strange, because—behold!—St. Peter had just been put on the attorney general's Subversive List.

This deponent hereby deposes and says that he is violently opposed to any system of holding all goods in common, a system not contemplated by a socialist reorganization of society. But whereas we are definitely not "communist" in the sense defined by Assistant Attorney Greene, it

happens that the subversives who are cleanly hit by his lexicographical rejoinder are those of whom we are told in the Acts of the Apostles:

"And fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles. And all that believed were together, and had all things common. . . ." (Acts, 2:44-5.)

(Now finally, after all these centuries, we can understand why "fear came upon every soul" in connection with this subversive practices.)

Again: "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common. . . . Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." (Acts, 4:32f.)

It does not matter of course, that the communist group here in described was dissolved some time ago, since, as is well known, the attorney general's list makes no distinction between the living and dead in subversive organizations. Perhaps a majority on the list at present are, as a matter of fact, as non-existent as Peter's communist-action organization, composed of stiff-necked characters who used to say:

"Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you." (13:41.)

## TOO ANTI-STALINIST

(2) In his very last word at the hearing, Attorney Greene harked back to a point which had already appeared in cold print in the government brief, semi-credible though it was.

At this point the government brief is trying to show, for reasons which will appear in our analysis next week, that the Passport Office did not rely solely on the attorney general's list in denying Shachtman's passport. What then? It proceeds to refer to the informal hearing which Shachtman was given by the Passport Office [see LA, Nov. 16, 1953]. At this hearing the Passport officer had questioned Shachtman about his last trip to Europe, particularly his visit with the comrades of the Spanish POUM and the Ukrainian comrades around Vpered, supporters of the then Ukrainian People's Army, the anti-Moscow underground.

So in this connection, the government brief charged: ". . . appellant has been in contact with a Spanish group and a Ukrainian group, both of which have a purpose to overthrow foreign governments by force and violence; he discussed revolutionary plans with members of the groups; he would visit them and similar persons again were a passport granted to him."

A footnote right here quotes a statement by a 1907 second assistant secretary of state. The authority does not ap-

pear crushing, but the statement is interesting: ". . . no one is entitled to our protection when he is engaged in machinations against a friendly government. . . ."

The whole picture rushes up to confront us, for the brief now adds: "If the record contained nothing but Mr. Shachtman's admitted purpose to associate abroad with various revolutionaries and to discuss with them plans for the overthrow of foreign governments, that would constitute sufficient grounds for rejection of his request."

Needless to say, the record of the hearing, cited by the brief, clearly shows that Shachtman said no such silly things about plotting with the POUM or the Ukrainian comrades for the overthrow of Franco or Stalin. Needless to say, also, this whole point in the brief is disgusting hypocrisy, in view of its distance from the real reasons for the Passport Office's action, and in view of the public fact that the government not only gives passports to people who openly advocate the overthrow of the Russian government but even employs them. Indeed, the brief is technically on behalf of the same "John Foster Dulles, et al." who came into office breathing fire about "liberation."

## SHADES OF VISHINSKY!

Be that as it may, the government is on record in black and white as pretending that it must withhold a passport from this "subversive" Shachtman because he is so dangerously interested in plotting the overthrow of that well-known "friendly" government in Moscow. . . . Did anything more fantastic ever come out of the Moscow Trials themselves, where Bolsheviks were shot in the back of the head, charged with crimes which were in fact the daily practices of their judges and prosecutors?

It is vital that we win the Shachtman passport case, against this chicanery and against this rationalization for administrative-bureaucratic abuses. Beyond it, also, lies the broader attack on the attorney general's infamous "Subversive List" itself.

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

- No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism.
- No. 2—Independent Socialism and War.
- No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis.
- No. 4—Socialism and Democracy.
- No. 5—What Is Stalinism?

10 cents each