

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 20, 1955

FIVE CENTS

Reports on Washington's Spanish Satellite:
Faction Fights in Franco-land

... page 6

Left Wings in the French Unions

... page 3

Democracy IS Good Politics

... page 5

The Bund, the Zionists and the 'Forward'

... page 7

STATESMANSHIP OR CLASS STRUGGLE?

as the Wall St. Journal said

'Feet to the Fire,' Both GM and Ford Yielded in Face of Militant Strike Threat

By BEN HALL

The UAW has won a victory in the first round of its decisive 1955 negotiations with auto's Big Three. A Ford strike was averted only at the last minute and by a hair's breadth. Even after the Ford settlement, General Motors balked; spreading local strikes in GM plants were followed by company threats of a three-day lock-out, thinly disguised as shutdowns due to part shortages. Peace was finally possible at Ford's only because the company surrendered its main positions and granted the union substantial concessions all along the line.

CASH VALUE

In a press release, the UAW officially gave the following estimate of the cash value of the Ford settlement:

"Guaranteed Wage Plan	5. cents
Pension Plan Improvements	4.5
Improvement Factor [Automatic	
Yearly Increase]	6.2
Wage Inequities	1.3
2½ Week Vacation Step	.2
Hospitalization-Insurance	1.2
Triple Pay for Worked	
Holidays	.8
	19.2

"The pyramiding effect of the improvement factor and other economic benefits on factors like shift premiums, holiday pay and the like, plus the adjustment of local union inequities, brings the total cost of the new package to over 20 cents an hour."

Taken as a whole, what the UAW won is a substantial economic package—equivalent to 20 cents an hour, according to computations of union economists.

But its chief rallying cry was "For a Guaranteed Annual Wage," a demand inscribed on the union's fighting banner after years of preparation. In dollars and cents, what the union won toward GAW was a modest, even skimpy, plan for limited supplementary unemployment benefits. The new contract offers only a thinly watered-down version of the UAW's Guaranteed Annual Wage demand, a demand which remains a continuous objective.

But the UAW's victory in principle is more far-reaching than is indicated by simple economic arithmetic. With the Ford contract, the fight for the GAW in mass production industry has not ended; it has just begun.

Ford carefully labels its concession a mere supplement to unemployment insurance. But that is a face-saving consolation.

The *Journal of Commerce* refers to "the Ford-UAW agreement on the principle of the guaranteed annual wage." The nation's daily press, as reported by the *New York Times*, is almost unanimous in recognizing the agreement as the first step toward a GAW, and is almost but not quite as unanimous in decrying its effects on "free enterprise."

Here, in basic industry, one of the country's powerful employers concedes responsibility for workers during layoffs. The UAW does not hesitate to say where it stands. In agreeing to discuss the company proposal on June 4 it wrote that it would consider it as "a possible basis upon which we could achieve the objectives for which the union had advanced its demands for a Guaranteed Annual Wage."

There is no doubt that the UAW, with the whole labor movement, will use this agreement as a vantage point to fight on for the long-range goal.

The stage is now set for a radical advance in the thinking of the American working-class. The Guaranteed Annual Wage demand has become a living re-

(Continued on page 2)

Despite Gains Made, Ranks' Reaction to Ford Pact Is Cool

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, June 11 — Unless all present signs and indications are misleading, the Ford package obtained by Walter P. Reuther, including a modified form of Guaranteed Annual Wage, has met with a cool and in some cases hostile reaction among the men and women in the auto plants.

The enthusiasm of the UAW leadership for its gains, and the paeans of praise heaped on it by the daily press here, and by many magazine, radio and TV commentators, somehow failed to permeate the ranks of the UAW. This does not mean that the ranks will turn it down, for the memory of long strikes has long since put one idea across in the shops—better to take a dime without a strike than strike for an extra nickel.

It goes without saying that the UAW leadership does not agree with this estimate or with the judgment of the secondary leaders about the reaction of the rank and file. But the secondary leaders have felt enough criticism in the shops and at the locals to dampen their own first enthusiasm for the package.

Even though the incidents at Ford Local 600 are an exaggerated form of hostility to the contract, they do serve to illustrate the failure of the package to make a hit with the rank and file.

When Carl Stellato, president of Ford Local 600, left the contract conference to announce the signing of the new pact to the mass meeting at the plant last Monday noon, he honestly expected to be greeted as a hero by the workers. The vigorous boos, heckling and considerable hostility shown to him shocked and dismayed him.

In his case, the "super-militancy" he had shown the previous week, in making a radical-phrasemongering speech boomeranged on him. His enthusiasm and the sight of the crowd had intoxicated him and also the crowd, so that almost any package he returned with would have caused some let-down.

AGGRAVATED

The bitterness among the skilled workers was aggravated, it must be said, by some of the Reutherites at Ford Local 600 who saw a chance to cut Stellato down to size, and they sure used the opportunity. While the UAW leaders are quite irritated at the skilled workers, this factional factor is conveniently overlooked. At 600, Stellato rather than Reuther is taking the heat for the disappointment over the package.

(Continued on page 2)

POLITICAL WARFARE OVER GERMANY: Adenauer and U.S. Fumble for Answers

By GORDON HASKELL

Hardly a week goes by but a new front is opened by the Stalinists in the current political war. Although the invitation to Chancellor Adenauer to visit Moscow, or its equivalent, was a foreseeable step in the present offensive, it followed with bewildering speed on the heels of the visit of Bulganin and Khrushchev to Belgrade.

The reaction of the American camp to the latest Russian move conformed to the exact pattern one has come to expect from Washington. Adenauer's policies tend to follow those of the State Department more closely than is the case with any other major political figure in Europe. In this situation, too, he acted like a real "American."

To the politically appealing offer of the Russians to open diplomatic, economic and cultural relations with West Germany, Adenauer replied with "cool reserve." The West German government announced that the Russian note would be studied carefully, and after some

doobtful sections of it had been satisfactorily clarified, it could be hoped that some kind of a meeting between Adenauer and the Russians would not appear to be counter-indicated.

For years the Stalinists have refused to recognize the Bonn government at all. Without raising any demands on it in advance, they now offer to give such recognition and to normalize relations with West Germany.

HE COULDN'T REFUSE

Of course, everyone knows that once discussions on these matters are entered into, the whole question of West Germany's integration into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will eventually appear on the agenda. Sooner or

later, with hot haste or at a deliberate pace, the Stalinists will unfold their proposals for the unification of Germany. But they are wily enough not to raise these questions in their present note to Adenauer as a precondition for diplomatic talks or recognition.

From all reports, the Stalinist overtures aroused high hopes in West Germany that the door may have been opened through which their country can move toward unification. To refuse point-blank to negotiate with them would have meant political suicide for Adenauer. But in his response he showed more concern for the reaction of his American allies, than for the interests of the German people.

Among things which his spokesmen said must be clarified before any meeting between Adenauer and the Russians are: whether Russia intends to continue to recognize the government of East Germany; whether the Stalinists are ready to recognize the Adenauer government as the only authorized spokesman for the whole German people; whether they propose to force the loosening of ties be-

(Turn to last page)

Both GM and Ford — —

(Continued from page 1)

ality. It is no longer a propagandist's dream, no longer just talk, no longer mere point in convention resolutions.

It can become—it has become—a fighting demand to be pressed at collective-bargaining sessions and to be fought for on the picket lines. Every important CIO union will now take up the GAW as a practical demand.

The CIO, the UAW and the militant vanguard of labor that they represent rise to prominence at the very moment of merger with the AFL. Far from going into eclipse, the CIO gives a new impetus to the labor movement as the prestige of the progressive wing in the united labor movement soars.

In recent years, the UAW pioneered in the fight for pensions and medical benefits. To win pensions, for example, it fought a long and bitter Chrysler strike. But important as these demands were, their social implications were limited. Medical benefits aid the ill. Pensions help the aged. But the demand for GAW is a new, deep-going demand upon capitalist society for security for the whole working class. Beginning in the auto industry it must draw in labor everywhere.

It has been pointed out that only a minority of labor has yet won pensions and it is argued that an even smaller minority will win the GAW. Be that as it may, the decisive sectors of the American working class, in the struggle for GAW, will become deeply convinced that it is their right. It will mark a further development toward labor class-consciousness.

FORD'S MOTIVES

Ford's final concessions were a sharp retreat from its first position, which had rejected any form of GAW. What lay behind this retreat?

- The auto industry enjoys a period of prosperity; profits and production are in fine shape. The immediate future holds promise of a continuing boom. In sum, the company can easily afford the settlement.

- The price is modest at a time of high profits. The special fund will cost the company only 5 cents per hour.

- Ford faces sharp competition to retain its relative standing in the market. Its struggle for position with Chrysler goes on. And it aims to definitely supplant GM's Chevrolet as the nation's most popular car.

- Ford gets an important concession: a three-year contract. During this period it is promised uninterrupted production and is free to make advances toward automation without paying the costs that would have been imposed by the UAW's original demand.

- Above all, it feared a strike. None of the other factors need have been considered if the company were not pressed by a union which would and could fight.

UNION'S STRATEGY

On the other hand, the UAW settled well below its asking price, especially on the GAW. Could more have been won by a strike? If so, would the risks and costs of the struggle have been justified by what was won? This was a decision that had to be made, and was made, by the union, its committees and its leadership.

Among their calculations were the following:

- If the Ford concessions were generally advantageous, a quick settlement had to be seized lest the possibility disappear. Negotiations were teetering on the edge of strike; once a strike began, new and unpredictable developments might alter the whole picture, e.g., a possible GM strike.

- The settlement brought powerful pressure against General Motors, most powerful of the UAW antagonists. The union avoided a two-front battle and could concentrate its resources against GM if a strike proved necessary.

- Above all, the settlement brought economic concessions, an advance in principle toward GAW, and an impetus to the GAW fight in every industry.

From the known facts one can hardly quarrel with the union's bargaining strategy in the difficult Big Three negotiations. The contract is important in cash value; the union undoubtedly won a victory here.

But, there are other aspects. What will prove to be of enormous political and social significance are the discussions of the meaning of this contract, discussions which are already cramming newspaper columns.

At a joint press conference with John S. Bugas of Ford, Walter Reuther analyzed the new contract; "We believe," he said, "that this effort we have made to-

gether gives the lie to the Communists in the world because it proves in a very practical way that free labor and free management can get together, can find the common denominator for working out their common problems."

And he added: "The Ford Motor Company is entitled to a great deal of credit for having shown the courage and wisdom for making it possible to pioneer in this important field; of finding a way to provide workers and their families a greater measure of security against the hardships and hazards of unemployment. . . . I believe that both the company and the union have made a great contribution to both the well-being of the company and the workers and together we have made a greater contribution to the American public. And I congratulate Mr. Bugas and the company representatives for their contribution. . . ."

PISTOL TO HEAD

From Reuther's remarks, one imagines that the contract was the cherished creation of statesmen burning with zeal for the good of the public. But it was nip-and-tuck whether the union would be forced into a long strike; Reuther's offhand comments are a rather ludicrous and labored effort to fit events into an improvised philosophy of class harmony.

On June 7, only one day after the pact was signed and sealed, two representatives of the Ford Motor Company replied in writing to questions posed by the *Detroit Free Press*. The two were: Richard L. Johnson, manager of the Special Financial Projects Department, and Karleton W. Pierce, manager of the Industrial Relations Analysis Department.

Their comments as reported in the *New York Times* include the following: ". . . the income of the laid-off workers must be low enough to provide him with an incentive to look for another job in the event of a long lay-off"—and "It is a great danger to a man's incentive to keep working or when he is laid off to find another job" if he were guaranteed his regular wage for 52 weeks a year.

It is clear that these representatives of "free management" intend to retain the whip of hunger to drive "free labor" to work. The extent of their "social responsibility" is revealed in these simple answers.

It is true that the contract was not won by an all-out strike. But neither was it granted by an employer conscious of responsibilities to the public. It was imposed upon Ford by the class struggle.

It was the organized class power of the UAW that put a pistol to the company's head. This union, with this membership and this leadership, compelled Ford to give in. The vanguard of American labor broke through the wall of boss resistance because it was ready to fight, and the company retreated before the threat.

On the even of settlement, the looming threat of a general Ford strike was clear. In Chicago, Cleveland, Buffalo, New Jersey and finally at the Rouge Plant in Michigan, Ford workers began to walk off their jobs. The strike was beginning without a strike call.

'FEET TO THE FIRE'

The *Wall Street Journal*, in an editorial on June 7, records the grim facts of life:

"Strikes affecting nearly half of Ford's UAW membership actually started while negotiations were still going on. Feet to the fire, the company could bargain only about the form of the union's misnamed GAW demand, not the substance. That is exactly the way the union planned it. . . . By contrast with the Ford offer [original stock purchase scheme] the settlement the union demanded and got is a throwback to a darker age of labor relations. . . . The union leaders arbitrarily insisted on this one preconceived plan and had the power to impose it both on the company and their own membership. . . ."

From its own distorted pro-employer standpoint, the *Wall Street Journal* recognizes what happened to Ford.

In contrast, we remember what happened to the United Steelworkers union and the International Union of Electrical Workers in their quest for a GAW. The steel monopolies rejected out of hand the union's polite request to investigate the problem. The IUE's demand was simply ignored. Nothing happened; it was all forgotten; no statesmanship; no concession to the union.

But the UAW had prepared its membership to fight for this demand and its militant traditions live on. Its leadership is committed to broad social objectives like the GAW. Convention delegates had

authorized a strike fund of \$25,000,000. This was a union, unlike the others, that was capable of blazing the trail for the whole working class.

The Ford contract teaches not the harmonious coexistence of union and boss; it demonstrates that a union which is ready and willing to pursue the class struggle can win decisive concessions from the monopolies, sometimes without a strike.

If Ford workers had been unwilling to fight, the company would have offered nothing. The power of the union lies in the fighting union-consciousness of its active membership. This consciousness is the first stage of American working-class consciousness and it is this that the companies strive to undermine.

Both Ford and GM proposed to allow their workers to buy stock. Their aim was nothing less than the dissolution of the intense union loyalty of workers and the creation of an illusory mood of worker-employer collaboration. They failed. Before negotiations had begun, Ford circularized its employees boasting of all the benefits graciously provided by management. The union replied: these were not granted by a selfless company; they were wrested from it after bitter struggles.

Now that it has been compelled to submit, Ford is eager to appear as a public benefactor. The company would, if it could, hijack the union loyalty of the workers. It cannot; but fairy tales of em-

Ranks' Reaction — —

(Continued from page 1)

In the case of the skilled workers, since they have been working six and seven days a week for the past five or six years, any so-called modified Guaranteed Annual Wage just doesn't make an impression. Job security has not been their problem, so that the idea of a flat 30-cent raise is much more attractive. And when the contract gains are called a 20 cent increase—and there is great doubt about the figure—the skilled trades are simply agitated all the more.

That is why moves to leave the UAW, telegrams of protest, special meetings, etc. are going on among the skilled workers. Since this sector of the UAW was once Reuther's stronghold, a rather new relationship is now developing within the UAW. Of course, it was not much work to arouse at least part of the production workers against the skilled workers, as was done to stop the wildcat at Ford, for blasting the "money-hungry" skilled workers is part and parcel of most production-line politicians' oratorical bag.

CRACKDOWN

As the Ford workers kept dragging their feet to return to work after the settlement, General Motors workers began to jump the gun, and a series of wildcats took place. In the previous week, the UAW leadership had tolerated the Ford wildcats as good pressure moves. But since the cool reception to the Ford package, any growing rank-and-file movement may well have gotten out of hand; so the UAW quickly cracked down on GM strikers, with a very strong denunciation of this technique as "sabotage of negotiations"—something that didn't sit well with the men and women in the shops, especially since GM had demanded that the UAW crack down on the rank-and-file strikers.

Any long-range forecast of the impact of the Ford settlement would be premature at the present time, but some of the incidents that occurred this past week point toward the kind of reaction the ranks will have in the future.

It is customary, of course, for both top UAW and company officials to pose and shake hands after a major agreement is reached, and even to say a kind word for each other. In the Ford case, John Bugas called Reuther "Walter," and Reuther called Bugas "John," and said "We both won." This just didn't go over in the shops. Nor did Bugas' announcement that he had changed his mind on his promise to the Ford workers that "any further gains that GM may give the UAW will be incorporated in our contract." Now the Ford package stands on its own.

So General Motors and Chrysler workers do not expect any bigger gains, for that would serve to aggravate the resentment and passivity among the Ford workers, and both management and the union know it. Thus neither GM nor Chrysler can be easily pressured into a really bigger package of gains.

Among the many glowing articles written about the new Ford contract,

ployer-union harmony deny union members a true picture of events and to that extent play into the hands of the company.

The UAW won because it had confidence in itself and none in the auto bosses. It will have to rely on its own power in the future as it has in the past.

For the new contract leaves many things unsolved.

During the next three years, while the unemployment fund accumulates, workers enjoy only minor protection against lay-offs. For the first year, no benefits of any kind are permitted. Even by the middle of the second year, men with less than 5 years seniority will be able to get a maximum of 10 weeks protection; and with 5-10 years seniority, less than 12 weeks.

According to the plan, nothing is paid during the first week of a lay-off; workers have no protection against nagging short lay-offs and short work-weeks.

The GAW, as proposed by the UAW, is designed to soften the impact of automation upon labor and to compel the companies to pay part of the social costs of readjustment. But under the new contract, automation may proceed for three years while the company has only minor obligations to its workers.

If employment becomes critical during the life of this contract, it is clear that the union will have to take up the fight again. We can be confident that the UAW and its membership will not remain passive victims of mass lay-offs.

The lesson of Ford is a guide for tomorrow: the victory came not from benevolent employers and statesmanlike management but from the organized power of the UAW in the class struggle.

one in particular caused some reaction in the shops, and it didn't help the UAW leaders. Sylvia Porter of the *New York Post* had a rave piece in the *Detroit Free Press*—all excited about the new aristocracy of labor, the auto workers. To the men and women on the fast assembly lines, in the hot metal shop, the dirty foundries, and the other not-so-pleasant places to work in the auto shops, that term "aristocrat of labor" seemed just like an insult.

EXPECTED TOO MUCH

Her article happened to come out the same day that further details of the contract were printed, and this didn't help, nor did the editorials of praise of the new contract, published here, assist in selling it. For two weeks, Guy Nunn of the UAW radio department had been blasting the papers on almost everything they did and said. Now these same anti-labor papers were praising the new contract. How come? This was a standard argument in the shops all day and all week.

On a large and more important scale, what has happened is that Reuther's brilliant speeches and promises had aroused the dreams, hopes and aspirations of the auto workers. He did in a fine way what Stollato did in a crude way at Ford. He agitated the workers to expect more than they would possibly receive. And this is the source of the discontent in the shops now.

It seems that the people in the shops saw only the negative features of the new contract.—"The plan doesn't even start for a year." "I've got enough seniority—it doesn't mean a thing to me." "Why didn't they lower the pension date?" "How come a three-year contract?" "Do we get our five dollars back?" [strike assessments]. It was questions like this that plagued the shop leaders all week.

Take an important gain like the six-cent hourly-improvement factor. The viewpoint of the ranks on this is simply, "That's nothing. We get that every year." This and other features are just expected as a matter of course.

In checking throughout the Detroit area plants for reactions, one can only conclude that nowhere did the excitement and the enthusiasm on the top levels of the union permeate into the shops and the ranks. As of this writing, it must also be said that the UAW leadership not only does not recognize this, but is quite aggravated by any mention of this "possibility." And in the face of Walter Reuther's obvious belief that he accomplished a truly historic gain, it is not likely that anyone will tell him otherwise, at least for a long time.

**Read the
NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's leading Marxist review**

FRANCE

Left-Wing Unionists Organize in CFTC

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, June 4—The Catholic trade-union federation CFTC (Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens) held its 28th congress on May 29-30, six months after the congress of Force Ouvrière and two weeks before the congress of the CGT. In size and importance, the CFTC is equal to the FO—about 800,000 members.

At its last congress, in May 1953, an active left wing, the "Reconstruction" group, made its first real appearance. This socialist-oriented minority originated in the immediate post-war period, and has little resemblance to the consciously class-collaborationist Christian trade-unionism before 1939.

It's age-composition is young, and it is based on the building trades, the electrical, metal, chemical workers' and teachers' unions, whereas the conservative element draws its support from the white-collar workers and civil-servants, who made up the bulk of the pre-war Christian trade-union movement.

At this congress, the "Reconstruction" delegates attacked the leadership on two main issues: the conduct of the strikes in August 1953 and the general orientation of the federation, nationally and internationally.

"Reconstruction" accused the leadership of having purposely stopped the August strikes by negotiating prematurely with the government, in order to keep the greatest mass movement France had seen since 1936 within limits they could control. This, it will be remembered, is the same accusation the left wing in FO leveled against its leadership at its congress last November.

AGAINST SPLIT POLICY

Both left-wing minorities rightly feel that the August strikes could have been turned into a major political victory, if parliament had been called in before negotiations with the government started. While neither minority was able to make its point of view prevail in its organization, the important fact is that both assimilated the experience in the same fashion.

Another major conflict arose over the question of Christian trade-unionism in Germany. The CFTC's conservative wing believes in maintaining separate Christian trade unions as a matter of principle, and supports the policy of the Christian trade-union international which aims to establish such unions wherever possible. Thus it supports Adenauer's effort to split the German DGB.

When the spokesman for the majority, honorary president Gaston Tessier, took the floor to announce that the splitting efforts in Germany were more advanced than ever, and that the CFTC majority was supporting them, the opposition protested vehemently. In the view of "Reconstruction," "trade-union pluralism" can only be justified in a practical situation where the labor movement is split up in incompatible political tendencies anyway, and that to apply it to a country where such splits don't exist is contrary to every interest of the worker, Catholic or otherwise.

SHARP CONFLICT

On general orientation, the "Reconstruction" group opposed the majority line of trying to "humanize" the capitalist regime by means of a few reforms and controls. The opposition holds that capitalism cannot be reformed but must be replaced by a planned economy under workers' control.

The minority spokesman Mathevet said: "The choice is not between Stalinism and the bourgeois capitalist world, however humanized; it is between the totalitarian and technocratic form of socialism of the Stalinists and a socialism contained in economic policies rather than parties, a socialism which respects and strengthens the liberties to which the labor movement has always been attached, consequently, a democratic socialism."

"Reconstruction" also presented a motion calling for the end of the state of emergency in Algeria and for negotiations with genuine representatives of the Algerian people, which the majority voted down in passing.

The conflict between the two factions became particularly sharp during the elections to the Bureau. Faced with the

militant opposition of the left wing, the leadership applied every bureaucratic measure in the book to keep it from being represented.

In the vote on resolutions, the motions of "Reconstruction" were regularly supported by about 40 per cent of the delegates. In the Federal Council, where the members are partly elected by the congress, partly appointed by the industrial and departmental federations, "Reconstruction" won only 10 seats out of 44 (6 appointed, 4 elected).

The Bureau is elected by the Federal Council and includes 12 members. In 1953 two minority representatives were elected to the Bureau. In order to reflect the real strength of the opposition, 5 representatives of "Reconstruction" should have been elected this year. Instead, the leadership used its majority in the Federal Council to completely eliminate the opposition from the Bureau, whereupon the minority representatives walked out of the council meeting in protest.

UNITY POSSIBLE

The announcement of the election result was met by loud protest demonstrations from the floor, with delegates yelling "Forty per cent!" and "We want workers in the leadership!"

It goes without saying that the elimination of the opposition from the Bureau cannot weaken the opposition in the ranks. By suppressing the voice of "Reconstruction," the leadership has only weakened the authority of the Bureau, and has created a situation in which its instructions may not be followed on the local level in the future.

In any event, "Reconstruction" and its allies are now within reach of becoming a majority in the CFTC, especially since their unions are more likely to recruit members than the older, conservative federations. This situation also puts unity between FO and CFTC in the realm of the possible, since "Reconstruction" has no principled objection to it.

Indeed, if "Reconstruction" won a majority in the CFTC, it is more likely that the major obstacle to the unity of the two organizations would be the FO leadership, which would have every reason to fear the merger of the FO and CFTC left wings.

CGT ALSO GROWS A LEFT WING

In a week, the Stalinist-dominated CGT will hold its congress, which was introduced, for the first time in years, by a principled discussion. Two positions have arisen: the official Stalinist one, which calls for opposition to a policy of economic reforms carried out by a bourgeois government; and a position which, for lack of a better term, may be called reformist-Stalinist, which would support and participate in any progressive effort that may be undertaken within the framework of the present system.

The latter position is defended especially by two members of the CGT Bureau, Rouzaud and Le Brun (the latter of Union Progressiste), and is supported by those elements in the New Left that would like to cooperate with the CP if only it were "less sectarian."

The most significant fact about this opposition, however, is that it exists at all—an unprecedented phenomenon in the CGT since 1947. It also may reflect pressure from certain federations and locals to break out of the isolation the CP has imposed on the CGT, and to find points of contact with workers of other organizations.

The rise of vocal oppositions in the three main labor organizations, along with the increasing militancy in the locals (the number of local strikes has been continuously increasing since January), indicates a growing independence of the trade-union rank and file which, if allowed to develop, could have important political consequences.

LONDON LETTER

Labor Stand Makes Tories Open Talks on Rail Strike

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, June 8—Strikes continue to be the main topic of conversation in Britain at the present time and all the energies of the elected Tory government are concentrated upon the two major stoppages which are locking up wide sections of industry.

The 11-day-old strike of railway locomotive men, called by the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, continues to play havoc with the transport system in Britain. It has also had widespread repercussions in other spheres.

Even the usual leisurely business of swearing in the new members of Parliament and electing a Speaker of the House of Commons has been compressed into two days instead of the usual four, and the official opening of Parliament originally scheduled for June 14 has been advanced to June 9. This date is also celebrated as the official birthday of the queen and is usually marked by a ceremonial parade of trooping the color in London. Because of the transport difficulties this annual pageant has been called off.

Negotiations on the strike — which originated from a demand by the ASLEF for increased pay for the locomotive crews in order to maintain the differential above what it considers the lesser skilled railwaymen — have continued unabated throughout the past week. On Sunday the prime minister, Sir Anthony Eden, made a broadcast in which he reviewed the position over the past week; he also made the point that negotiations on a settlement could not take place until the strike was called off. A similar demand that the strike be ended before negotiations could begin was made by Sir Brian Robertson, chairman of the British Transport Commission and boss of the nationalized railways.

TUC PLAN

This demand found no favor with the trade-union movement. The ASLEF issued a statement in which they made it clear that they would not consider calling off the strike merely in order to get around the table with Sir Brian Robertson. Their insistence on this point was later backed up by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress after it had held a special meeting, lasting more than six hours, to discuss the situation.

After the meeting the TUC issued a five-point plan for progress toward a settlement. The points were: Joint talks between the three railway unions, the ASLEF, the National Union of Railwaymen and the Transport Salaried Staffs Association, should take place on the subject of differentials in the wages system. The NUR should agree that the Transport Commission can start discussion with the ASLEF on the locomotive men's pay on the understanding that the NUR are consulted prior to any settlement. (This clause is necessary because the NUR maintains that if the locomotive receive an increase it will itself apply for an increase for the other grades—thus the position will be restored to where it was before the strike began.) The ASLEF should agree to meet the Transport Commission with a view to establishing absolute minimum increases. If all the previous points are covered the TUC would press the prime minister that talks commence prior to the strike being ended. The final point was that the TUC would keep the matter under constant review in order to secure a speedy settlement.

VICTORY IN SIGHT

It can be seen that the TUC's plan hinged around the fact that negotiations should take place before the strike was ended. Thus it backed up the ASLEF against the Transport Commission and the prime minister. This attitude has produced results, for today Sir Brian Robertson met Jim Baty, leader of the ASLEF, for the first time in 39 days.

After a five-hour meeting a joint statement was issued which stated that "certain misunderstandings" had arisen which had been cleared up and that the time is now opportune for the two parties in dispute to deal in "a spirit of mutual confidence." This looks very much as if victory is in sight for the railway men—at least in the first obstacle concerning discussions prior to the resumption of work.

This belief is reinforced by the fact

that Sir Brian Robertson sent a letter to the minister of labor today in which he said that the Transport Commission appreciated that "before the strike is lifted there must be discussions." This is indeed a major about-face from the previous position.

Meanwhile the strike of 20,000 dockers, which began when the National Amalgamated Stevedores and Dockers called its members out on May 23, continues to hold up many ships in Britain's ports. This strike concerns the right of NASD representatives to take part in the port machinery of negotiation.

Settlement of this dispute seems no nearer and is bedeviled by the fact that the TUC is insisting that, before anything can be done, the NASD must return the 10,000 members which it recruited from the Transport and General Workers' Union some months ago. The TUC maintains that this was a breach of the Bridlington Agreement—the British equivalent of the "no raiding" pacts in the U. S. The NASD have offered to stop collecting subscriptions from these members until their future can be settled and hope that this move will strike a satisfactory compromise which will enable the TUC to take up the cudgels on its behalf.

At the moment it seems that the TUC is so occupied with the rail strike that it has pigeonholed the dockers' dispute until some later date. This is rather frustrating for NASD, because exactly the same thing has happened as far as the press is concerned—they have been pushed out of the picture by the bigger issues of the railwaymen.

'OLD BOYS' GOING

On the parliamentary field things are beginning to move. The Parliamentary Labor Party held its first meeting this week and made arrangements to elect its leadership.

The campaign against the "old boys" of the Labor Party—mentioned in last week's article—which some sections of the press are carrying on has begun to have some effect. Hugh Dalton, aged 67; Emmanuel Shinwell, aged 70; and Chuter Ede, aged 72, have all let it be known that they will not be standing for election. It is also believed that William Whitley, aged 72, who is the chief whip of the party, will not stand for re-election; this is the result of considerable pressure which has been placed upon him by back-bench Laborites.

Of Clem Attlee himself there is no news—only rumors. These all whisper that he will either give up the leadership now or else will resign at the party conference in October—but both of these whispers must be treated with due caution until more positive evidence is available.

Aneurin Bevan, it is believed, will this time stand for election to the Labor "Shadow Cabinet" from which he resigned after disagreement with the party line on Asian affairs.

With all of this chopping and changing there is no telling what sort of leadership may appear on Labor's Front Bench in Parliament. But, whatever it is, there is no doubt that it will be subjected to considerable pressure from both the back-bench MP's and the party rank and file to press the attack on the Tory government.

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's Views on Khrushchev-Tito Talks

To the Editor:

The régime of Bulganin-Khrushchev is preparing a new diplomatic offensive in Europe, based on a complete change in the Kremlin's foreign policy, which can lead to a sensational turn. The first symptom of that turn was the agreement with Austria, according to which the Russian troops will be withdrawn on the condition that Austria stays neutral and does not participate in the Western-bloc. If the Warsaw conference [of the Stalinist states—Ed.] were only the legalization of the Russian occupation troops, as the State Department thinks, then it would not represent anything new, just an old maneuver, a political answer to the Paris agreements. But I think that Warsaw is the beginning of the new Russian policy; it is the start of the new diplomatic offensive whose object is to cross out the Paris agreements and win the neutralization of Germany.

For, with the incorporation of West Germany in the Atlantic Pact, there has practically been a cancellation of Yalta, which was based on the defeat and partition of Germany. After the economic restoration of West Germany, with the assistance of American capital, the accession of the Bonn republic to the Western bloc signifies a change in international relations and the establishment of a new international equilibrium. In spite of the Russian occupation of a part of Germany, the latter is no longer a defeated country but a powerful factor in international policy, as a member of the Western bloc. German industry is the strongest and most powerful, next to the American, and together with the latter it is changing war-industry and war-power relationships in favor of the U. S. and against Russia. Therefore the Paris Agreement had so great a repercussion in Moscow, as a basis for a change in internal as well as foreign policy. It is unquestionable that the success of U. S. policy was facilitated by the conservative "immovability" and "firmness" of the Molotov tactic, formulated in old Stalin's school. The Kremlin trusted in the strength of its army and did not perceive the growth of the West German economy, the decisive factor in national restoration of Germany, that is, in the change on the international level. The "professional revolutionaries" of the Kremlin turned out to be conservative sleepyheads and let themselves be taken over by the "ordinary American businessmen." A piteous sight.

Now they understand that in practice Yalta does not exist, that Germany is not humbled to the ground but is an ally of the U. S. and disposed to revenge itself against Russia and seek the reconquest of its lost territories. The Russians have a traditional fear of the Germans and great respect for German superiority, inherited from tsardom and from 150 years of political collaboration against the European revolution and democracy. The Kremlin knows very well that the entrance of Germany into the Western bloc means the decisive superiority of the West, whose pressure in Europe will be impossible to stop without war. Given the present situation of its internal crisis, the growing mass opposition and the decomposition of the régime's machine, the Russian bureaucracy

is absolutely unprepared for war. Therefore it is forced into the sensational change in its foreign policy. For if the trip planned by Khrushchev and Bulganin to Belgrade is not sensational, then there is nothing sensational in this world. If the *Pravda* article saying that Yugoslavia is a socialist country, ruled by the working class and peasantry, is not sensational, then there is nothing more worthy of attention in our twilight world. The Kremlin is giving a new demonstration, not only of its political elasticity, but of the change which is going on in Russia, of the break with the old Stalinist rigidity in international policy. Of course, the "new look" of Stalin's epigones is the result as much of the internal crisis of the régime as of the changed international situation. Conquest of Yugoslavia for "neutrality" could be a big success for Russian policy and a second point of support in the planned diplomatic offensive against the West. But when the Russians talk about Belgrade, Vienna or Warsaw, they are really talking about Bonn, because the objective of the new Russian diplomatic offensive is the conquest of the German people for neutrality, which means the annihilation of the Paris Agreements.

The Russians know very well that the price which they must now pay for the neutrality of Germany will be very high, much higher than it would have been before the Paris Agreements. But it seems that the Russians are willing to pay any price, because the internal situation of the régime is very serious. What can the Kremlin offer the Germans for their eventual neutrality? Many things that the Germans desire: in the first place the reunification of Germany, which can be realized only with Russian permission, because the West cannot achieve it except by war against Russia.

In the second place, the Russians can offer the German nationalists the territories of the Oder-Neisse and a new partition of a hated Poland—the traditional policy of Russian-German collaboration at the expense of Poland. What good German could resist that offer, including the Social-Democrats, not to speak of the nationalists and the rightist Christian-Democrats?

In the third place, the Kremlin could offer the Germans, and especially the German bourgeoisie, their conquest of enormous markets in East Europe, Russia, China and Asia, "Lebensraum" in the East and the delusion of a "German mission in the East." What German could resist that offer?

In the fourth place, the Kremlin could offer the Germans the withdrawal of Russian troops from East Germany, the liquidation of the puppet regime, new democratic elections, in exchange for a neutrality pact and the tearing up of the Paris Agreements.

Maybe it could also offer a "neutralization" of Poland and Czechoslovakia and their incorporation in a "neutral zone," under the leadership of Germany.

In brief, the Kremlin could offer the Germans all these things which they could obtain only from a victorious war under American hegemony against Russia. What German could resist that offer?

Of course, *der alte Fuchs* Adenauer rejects the Russian offers and will refuse them. The incorporation of West Germany in the Western bloc is the result of his own policy, but his party is surrounded by nationalists of different hue and by the strong and active Social-Democratic opposition. The new-Russian policy, and new Russian offers of German unification, could influence the German voters very strongly. If the nationalists could be seduced by regaining East Germany and Silesia and Pomerania, reincorporated in a unified Germany, then the Social-Democrats cannot resist the illusions of a second Weimar Republic, neutral as between the two blocs, and prosperous thanks to Russian benevolence and to open economic expansion into the enormous territories of the Russian empire. A spontaneous coalition of Social-Democratic and nationalist voters could defeat the Adenauer party and liquidate the Adenauer government; and then there would be a new international situation in which the Kremlin policy would have an open door. Not only in Germany, but also in France, Italy and Great Britain, the Russian policy of a neutrality zone in Europe will meet with a great number of supporters.

Of course, one could say that the ultimate aim of the new Kremlin tactic is to disable Europe and prepare it for Rus-

sian conquest. But the Kremlin could combat such skepticism by the fact of greater and greater concessions to Germany, winning also greater and greater support from supporters of the peace and neutrality policy. For at Yalta the Kremlin obtained so many countries and so much territory that it now has a great deal with which to make "Greek gifts."

It would seem that the turn in Russian international policy, perhaps begun as a maneuver to defeat the Paris Agreements and to recover from the political defeat in Europe, corresponds without doubt to the internal change in the Russian situation; and thus is also proof of the crisis and decomposition of the régime of Stalin's epigones.

Therefore, the new course of the Russian diplomatic offensive and Kremlin concessions in exchange for German neutrality will depend on the degree of the internal decomposition, in the first place of the growing pressure of the Russian masses. The more acute the internal crisis, the greater the concessions for creating neutral zones in Europe.

From every standpoint, active or passive backing to the Russian policy on the part of supporters, German Social-Democrats or British Laborites, will only weaken the fight of the Russian masses against the Kremlin and help the Russian reaction to delay historical development and the final liquidation of Stalinism.

A. RUDZIENSKI

Australian Labor Party And 'Catholic' Issue

To the Editor:

Your March 28 issue containing the article on the internal situation within the Australian Labor Party has just reached me and I would like to protest at the number of misleading statements contained in the article. My reply is the following:

(1) The Australian Labor Party governed for four years after the war and was responsible for the full employment and living standards we have here today. Your article suggests that the ALP was only the government during the war.

(2) We are not to the right of the British Labor Party. Although I personally oppose SEATO it must be remembered that the attitude of the ALP to SEATO is the very same as that of the BLP.

(3) Your correspondent has apparently not studied the 1951 campaign to ban the Communist Party; otherwise he would know that every section of the ALP officially opposed the banning of the CP, and the Leader of the Party, Dr. H. V. Evatt, went around Australia twice addressing "No" campaign meetings. To say that the party did not take a serious stand on the question is misleading and insulting to the ALP, which has always believed in free speech, and to our outstanding leader who, as president of the UN General Assembly, assisted in the drawing up of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(4) The reason why the ALP enjoys the support of the Catholic community is that earlier in the century it was the ALP who supported the Irish in their campaign for a united Ireland and most Australian Catholics were from Ireland. It is interesting to note that the party has failed to secure the support of Italian Catholics.

(5) Never at any time has Dr. Evatt employed Rupert Lockwood on his staff as your article suggests. Lockwood has been a CP member for many years and is known as such. I think your correspondent is confused with O'Sullivan (Dr. Evatt's press secretary) who admitted at the Royal Commission on Espionage (which met in Canberra and Sydney, not Adelaide) that he had supplied information free to the Russian embassy on his journalist colleagues; however, it must be remembered that O'Sullivan supplied this information whilst working for a capitalist newspaper and before he joined the staff of Dr. Evatt.

(6) Dr. Evatt was correct in saying that a certain section of one document was faked. However, it is not true to say, as your article incorrectly suggests, that when Dr. Evatt was asked to substantiate the statement he could not. The Royal Commissioners refused him permission to have a handwriting expert look at the document. For a long time they refused him permission to look at the document itself! When Dr. Evatt persisted in his attacks on the security service and the document, the Royal

Commissioners ordered him to leave the court. This was one of the gravest and most serious attacks ever made by judges in a British court. Dr. Evatt, who was a High Court judge before entering the federal Parliament, certainly has a greater knowledge of law than the three judges who are members of the Supreme Court.

(7) Dr. Evatt was not supporting the Stalinists. He was appearing on behalf of two members of his secretariat who had been falsely accused. It is true that his action did cause comment within the party but only within a small section anxious to capture the leadership of the ALP for personal gain and glory.

(8) The Communist Party still remains a powerful influence with the unions mentioned in the article. I am at a loss to understand how your correspondent came to the conclusion that the CP had been destroyed within these unions.

(9) It is true that there are some Catholic members within the ALP who are more anxious to follow their religious beliefs than their ALP views. But your correspondent has forgotten one very important thing and it is this—we Socialists are not attacking the Catholic Church nor is the church attacking the party. The members referred to have fraudulently used their religion. The most bitter opponents of these people are Catholics, including the deputy leader, Mr. A. A. Calwell. The article suggests that this is a war between the ALP and the Catholic Church. Nothing is further from the truth. The reason why the delegates boycotted the federal conference was that they tried to blackmail the conference into following a certain line. Even the extreme right-wing New South Wales Executive has endorsed the decisions of the federal conference together with every other State Executive and the ACTU.

(10) The old members of the Victorian State Executive were not expelled because they were members of the "Roman Catholic secret society." The Federal Executive was requested to investigate the situation in Victoria, where there had been conflict between the industrial and political wings of the ALP. The Federal Executive decided to hold a special conference and a new Executive was elected by the special conference. Not until after the "old" members had demonstrated at the federal conference were they expelled and then only for their conduct. I suggest that LABOR ACTION next time it publishes an article should first see that it is correct in every detail.

LEONARD A. LAMBOURNE

Sydney, Australia.

Thanks to Comrade Lambourne for writing in his corrections. Our London correspondent Alexander, who wrote the March 28 article, is on leave because of press of personal work, but perhaps he may be able to comment later, particularly on the five points which constitute factual corrections on events in Australia.

Checking the others ourselves (in line with Lambourne's suggestion, *ex post facto*), we report:

(1) and (7) do not accurately refer to Alexander's statements, which perhaps were unclear at these points. (2) This is very definitely a moot opinion, which Lambourne might be hard-pressed to defend. (4) Not a correction, but an interesting additional fact. (9) Comrade Lambourne seems to be minimizing the "Catholic" angle as the source of the party dispute, substituting the formal organizational and disciplinary questions which no doubt were indeed the immediate points of conflict. If he is right the latter remain unexplained. In any case Alexander's article (like most others we have seen) ascribed the source of the conflict to a Catholic group in the party which had support from the church hierarchy. As always, there is no question here of all Catholics in the ALP, or of "attacking the Catholic Church" as such, etc. So Comrade Lambourne's discussion in point 9 (and in part, 10) adds welcome data but does not quite bear on the over-all picture, as far as we can make out from here.—Ed.



LABOR ACTION

June 20, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 25

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

The standard biography

KARL MARX

by

Franz Mehring

\$3.50

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

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

June 20, 1955

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

DEMOCRACY IS GOOD POLITICS: SDA Can Help to Reinvigorate Liberalism

By ELI FISHMAN

The liberal student movement in the United States is faced with a crisis today. How this situation will be met in the year ahead will be determined to a large extent by the decisions of the coming convention of Students for Democratic Action, ADA youth affiliate and the major liberal student organization in the country.

This crisis has two general aspects.

First, it derives from an intellectual void in liberalism as a national phenomena, an inability to formulate a principled, liberal response to the problems of civil liberties and foreign policy.

And secondly, as a result of this theoretical vagueness (and, sometimes, retrogression) the liberal student movement is confronted with a very real crisis of leadership. It has failed to develop younger people to take over its organization, and it will continue to fail to do so as long as it cannot present a clear, straightforward and principled program to the new politically conscious students.

The convention in Baltimore this week can determine to formulate a consistent, democratic liberal program. Only by doing this can it hope to continue SDA's role as the leader of the liberal campus youth in America. The world scene is changing, and the campus scene with it. Liberalism must rethink itself—or else be rejected by those to whom it appeals.

After the liberal-Stalinist split in 1947, American liberalism increasingly identified itself with the Democratic Party. In doing so, liberal leaders were often in the forefront of repressive, anti-libertarian measures. This trend culminated in the Humphrey Act of 1954 (but one should not gloss over liberal sponsorship of the attorney general's list, caution in criticizing the loyalty program, etc.).

And although student liberalism did so reluctantly, unwillingly, and in a spirit of sharp criticism, it went along with the whole process.

LIBERAL FIGHT NEEDED

Since the last ADA convention in March, there have been signs that the contradictions of the liberal position are forcing some kind of re-evaluation in the adult organization. The control of the Senate by Southern Democratic reactionaries and Adlai Stevenson's move to the right, i.e., toward the Southern leadership, has forced ADA to become increasingly critical of the Democratic Party. This does not, of course, mean that ADA has moved toward socialism, or anything like it. It does mean that ADA has been

THE AIM OF THE YSL

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

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

—From the Constitution of the YSL

forced into modified opposition in order to defend liberalism.

An analogous situation is shaping up on the campus. The student milieu is no longer that of the Stalinist-liberal split in 1947. A new generation of youth has arrived in the American high schools and colleges and is demanding a sharp, principled opposition to the general drift in both civil liberties and foreign policy.

If SDA fails to appeal to this sentiment, it could be channeled by the Stalinists or dissipate itself in an aimless and apolitical kind of radicalism. In a sense, the forces which are propelling ADA toward a position of modified opposition are even stronger on the campus.

This is the general situation. The SDA convention must formulate a response to it.

DEAD PRINCIPLE?

In civil liberties, the issue within SDA has centered on the question of academic freedom. Some have argued that concentration on the defense of the rights of Stalinists in the academic community amounts to beating a dead horse—after all, most of the Stalinists have been tossed out by now anyway; why not save strength to fight on a more immediate issue? That academic freedom is not a dead horse can be determined by three of the cases which have directly involved SDA in the past year: the suspension of a member at Brooklyn College; and the demand, on the part of the administration, for membership lists at CCNY and at Antioch.

But more important is the symbolic significance of the academic-freedom question. Many fear that there is a dead principle beneath the dead horse, and that if the principle is allowed to die here, it will continue to die in loyalty and security cases, immigration, army discharges, and on and on.

In a sense, what is demanded is an act which clearly indicates an over-all attitude: a reaffirmation of the traditional liberal principle that the criterion for academic employment should be competence and competence alone.

Given such an open stand on the rights of Stalinists in the academic community, the entire civil-liberties question should be put in focus. For in every other area of American freedom—the rights of the accused to know his accuser, the right to a hearing, the right to freedom from "quasi-judicial" inquisition and harassment—the issue is the same reaffirmation of traditional liberal values.

It is perhaps one of the most tragic facts about contemporary liberalism that some of its leaders—in particular, Hubert Humphrey, a vice-chairman of ADA—have led in the reactionary revision of these values. A stand on academic freedom is the clearest announcement that SDA can make of its dissent from the anti-libertarianism which produced this tragedy.

This tragedy in the area of civil liberties makes a bridge to foreign policy.

For at the ADA convention, one of the most reactionary resolutions was a definition of American Stalinism as primarily conspiratorial. On the domestic front, such a definition allows for the use of

police methods against Stalinists even when they are exercising their democratic rights. But more than this, the emphasis on conspiracy as the essential quality of Stalinism suggests an analysis of why American liberalism has failed to produce a position on foreign policy which is markedly different from that of Eisenhower.

Stalinism has certainly used conspiratorial methods. It has had its spies. But China did not fall because of spies or the evil advice of the Institute of Pacific Relations. Ho Chi Minh did not raise a mass army of volunteers because of Alger Hiss. In China, in Indochina, and throughout the world, Stalinism has built its greatest victories upon its political appeal.

ACTS TOO!

To millions in the colonial world, to European workers, Stalinism's anti-capitalist position is clear and concrete while its reactionary and totalitarian internal structure is an academic question.

It is certainly a tragedy that so many millions have been duped by Stalinism. Yet this tragedy cannot be met by bemoaning the fact; it can only be countered by a political appeal. In broadest terms, such an appeal must be on the basis of democracy, it must offer the hope that a decent standard of living can be attained without totalitarianism (and, indeed, point out that totalitarianism denies that standard of living in many cases).

And whatever the rhetoric of American foreign policy in recent years, its reality, a reality of support to imperialism in Asia and Africa and reaction in Europe, makes such a democratic appeal impossible. In order to counter totalitarianism with democracy there must be acts as well as words.

American liberalism has not proposed such acts. In many cases, it seems fearful of the very vocabulary of democracy.

Because of this, the Stalinist "peace" offensive has produced a state of shock not only in John Foster Dulles' State Department but among liberals as well. For once given the conspiratorial analysis of Stalinism, and support to a foreign policy which is built upon a system of reactionary and pro-imperialist alliances, it is almost inevitable that the political offensive of the Stalinists is met with amazement and confusion.

ISSUES

Concretely, student liberals should ponder well:

—the political nature of Stalinism and the necessity of a political offensive based on democracy in word and deed to counter it; the fallibility of the conspiratorial definition as a technique of political analysis and basis for political action;

—the vast anti-war sentiment of the peoples of the world, amorphous, often neutralist, which will almost inevitably go to the Stalinists unless a positive and clear alternative is formulated by democratic anti-Stalinists;

—the H-Bomb and the change in the nature of war which it tokens; the necessity for a categorical stand of opposition to its use, an immediate call for the end of H-Bomb tests;

—German rearmament and the fetishism of American policy which is bent on maintaining its military alliance without any regard to the political consequences; the entire question of NATO, for that matter;

—colonialism, in particular the defense of Chiang by the State Department and the vacillation in that direction on the part of so many liberals.

These are only some of the issues. In this analysis we have raised major

questions, but not proposed answers here. As socialists, our answers differ from those of liberals, and it would be fantastic to suggest that a liberal organization adopt a socialist program. What we are concerned with is what we have in common, and this is no small matter.

For both liberals and socialists are, or at least should be, in agreement that the main task today is to defend and extend democracy. And this is our basic theme with regard to the SDA convention: that it should carefully and conscientiously rethink the issues in terms of democratic values.

REAFFIRMATION

And this leads to a final point: that, in a very real sense, liberals today seem to be afraid of liberalism. Perhaps this is the core of the issue—the defensive, frightened, confused attitude of liberals in America today.

For example, there seems to be a liberal assumption that liberalism is bad politics, that if the people were really told about the beliefs of liberalism they would reject them. Therefore, do not attack the witchhunt head-on and offer a clear alternative—rather, contrive to arrange it better. Therefore, support, even if hesitantly and unwillingly, the defense of Formosa in order to attack the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, but never raise the central issue, that of support to the reactionary and discredited regime of Chiang.

In this context, the SDA convention could perform a service to liberalism by restating a militant faith in its traditional values and by organizing for the coming year on the basis of a conviction that liberal values do have relevance and cogency today: to say that democracy is good politics.

There is a particular opportunity for just such a reaffirmation in this summer of 1955. McCarthy the man is in defeat but McCarthyism remains. The fact that the man could be defeated opens up the chance to attack the institution. If this is not done, if the formal structure of the witchhunt passes into law after the hysteria dies down, liberalism will not only have missed an opportunity; it will have done a great disservice to the cause of freedom.

For this is a time for re-evaluation. The necessities and contradictions of liberalism's recent past are forcing ADA into new positions.

At its convention, SDA has an opportunity to join in this general liberal movement, indeed to play a creative role within it. If it does not, the failure will not merely be one of principle—it will amount to a forfeiture of SDA's claim to the leadership of the liberal student movement.

FRIDAY from 9 p.m. on

JUNE 24

New York YSL's

BIG BOOK BAZAAR

Bizarre bargains on books of every breed—political, fiction, non-fiction, semi-fiction, etc.

114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

REPORTS ON WASHINGTON'S SPANISH SATELLITE

Franco Regime Rocked by Faction Fights

The latest issue received (April 5) of the Spanish POUM's *La Batalla* headlines the existence of two critical problems for the Franco regime. One is the friction between the Spanish dictator's regime and Washington, as Franco presses for more money from Uncle to pay for his sale of Spain over the American bargain-counter.

The other, a very interesting development which has had less publicity in this country, has to do with the furious (and even underground!) polemics being waged between the monarchists, who are encouraged by Franco's apparent intentions to go toward a monarchical restoration, and the fascist Falangists, who are being disoriented by their Caudillo's turn.

The lead editorial in *Batalla* sums up: "The Franco regime has entered on one of the most critical periods in its existence. The permanent factors of crisis—economic paralysis, disintegration of the so-called 'National Movement,' inability to solve Spain's fundamental problems, popular opposition—are irremediably getting worse. And the latest developments—struggles among the different social and political fractions of the dictatorship, difficulties with the rulers in Washington—are becoming dramatic.

"... This is not a merely conjunctural phenomenon nor an episodic and passing crisis. What we are seeing are the clear symptoms of the whole system's fever, the system which on April 1, 1939, opened up one of the most ignominious periods in the history of Spain.

"... Under the pressure of big landed property, of the big bourgeoisie of the army and the church, Franco has initiated a turn toward a Bourbon restoration. The process has been slow and painful. . . . The plebians of the Falange have finished their mission; the traditional forces of reaction no longer need them. . . .

"The first result leaps to the eye: the disintegration of the 'National Movement.' The latest statements and acts of Franco alone have served to finish it off. The press organs of the different sectors of the Movement polemize against each

other under the watchful and intransigent control of the censorship. And now indeed, the Falangists and the monarchists of the different tendencies have had to resort to clandestine propaganda in order to defend their positions clearly. The fact is unique in the annals of totalitarian regimes. . . .

"Falangists and monarchists polemize and quarrel these days in the midst of indifference on the part of the popular masses. Franco himself has had to recognize, in his statements made to *Arriba*, that 'revolutionary subjects' persist; that the monarchy does not arouse the enthusiasm of the younger generation. Let us not forget, however, that the Caudillo said more. He made clear that he was not heading toward restoration out of "spontaneous sentiments, but because of a thought-out movement in the interest of the fatherland, for a repudiation of republicanism, and out of fidelity to tradition and our best history. Which can be translated into straight Spanish as follows: to the Spanish ruling classes, the monarchy which is being prepared for appears as the sole instrument which can save the essence of Francoism and hold the front against the continual pressure of the popular masses."

La Batalla also publishes a number of quotations from the underground leaflets being put out by Falangists who protest the restoration move of Franco. The leaflets say:

"We do not want a king! Our rejection of the monarchist restoration is not due to personal resentment but to the teachings of history. We declare that on July 6, 1947 [referendum on the Law of Succession], the Spanish people said: 'Franco, yes! But nobody else!'"

"We want the government of a Caudillo who has raised himself out of the people through his proved merits, but we will never accept the government of a king who ascends the throne thanks to family inheritance."

"We repudiate every aristocracy which is not one based on work."

In reply, equally illegal leaflets by the monarchists laud "the person and the family of Don Xavier de Borbon y Bra-

ganza, the legitimate king of the traditional Spanish monarchy," i.e., the pretender to the throne. Monarchist clandestine literature was traced by Franco police to the Condesa de Ibarra and Cardinal Segura.

Another group of Falangist students distributed leaflets in which a different tack was taken. The clandestine leaflets said:

"Whatever may be the color of their shirts, the government functionaries must get to know the ideas of the Falangist youth, which include, among other things, a firm opposition to any intention of restoring the monarchy in Spain. . . . As

Falangists, we cannot agree with what has been done and with what is proposed. What has been done has satisfied only the personal ambitions of some few, and the rest are those who suffer. In a word, we want the doctrine of the Falange applied in its totality: King, no! Franco, no! We want the syndical state!"

Here these fascist students are demanding a theoretical corporative state as an "extremist" program, but as can be seen, from this they deduce opposition to both Franco and the pretender whom he proposes to put back on a throne. The forces behind Franco are clearly being rocked by internal explosions.

FROM "IBERICA"

Madrid Vignettes, 1955

Following are passages from an article in the monthly *Iberica* (for May 15) entitled "Spain in 1955: Madrid." The magazine is published by a board headed by Norman Thomas and Salvador de Madariaga.

BY GEORGE DENNIS

... [To judge the wider political effects of the U. S.-Spanish treaties] I would like to quote one Spanish judgment, both because of the person who made it and the circumstances under which it was made. The man is José L. Aranguren, one of Spain's leading Catholic intellectuals. He wrote one article in *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos* which advocated the establishment of a "dialogue" between the Spanish intellectuals inside Spain and their colleagues in exile. Then in reply to comments by men like Guillermo de Torre and José Ferrater Mora, he wrote a second article which appeared in *La Torre*, a magazine published by the University of Puerto Rico. To my mind, the key passage in this second article is:

"We are beginning to realize that the underlying political structure of the Spanish regime has been in no way affected by our small intellectual skirmishes, because in the field of international politics it has entered the worldwide Russian-American struggle. As intellectuals, we could bewail the autonomous character of this new and gigantic 'reason of state' which limits our freedom of speech in the field of politics; but we are grateful that, in compensation, it broadens the scope of our specifically intellectual liberty."

One need not agree with Aranguren's optimistic conclusion about the better conditions thus created for the "dialogue"; the important point is his unequivocal statement that America is now the main force behind the Franco regime. He repeats, in less picturesque and more veiled language, the view I quoted of the lounge in the Plaza del Rey in Barcelona: that the moment the first church is burned, the U. S. Marines will land.

... One cannot say that the newspapers give the real opinion of the public. To get a closer impression, one must look into two other Madrid publications: the students' monthly, *Alcalá*, and the humorous weekly, *La Codorniz*.

Alcalá is published by the Falangist student syndicate and this fact is very much reflected in its pages. But it does voice unorthodox opinions. In the issue of February 25th, for example, there is a signed editorial stating that, by limiting severely the number of admissions to technical courses, the number of technicians in Spain is artificially maintained at the level existing thirty years ago. The measure was inspired by the technicians themselves, who wish to keep their remuneration high by limiting competition. The same issue contains an article by another student, expressing thoughts on atomic war, coexistence and world government, which are anything but officially inspired. A sample: "No four governments can condemn the world to a brutal genocide."

There is in Spain today, just as there was in the Spain of Lazarillo de Tormes, an all-pervading atmosphere of nihilism. Time and again, and from various peo-

ple, I have been offered the phrase, "Nobody believes in anything," as the best description of contemporary Spain. And it is not an empty phrase. It has been confirmed by no less a man than the present archbishop of Toledo who told a circle of friends: "It is among my duties to examine the consciences of the rich and the powerful. And to do this is to plunge into an abyss of falsehood, duplicity and misery." Ideals of any kind are merely objects of ridicule. Nobody believes in anything.

Against this omnipresent nihilism, the façade of official belief is being desperately kept up. The regime yields not an inch from its position that it and it alone represents Spain. Before I came to Spain, I thought that the best description of the situation was Larra's epitaph, "Aquí yace media España. Murió de la otra media." ("Here lies half of Spain. It was killed by the other half.") Now I know better. The other half was not killed, it merely lies prostrate. It is Unamuno's "venceréis, no convenceréis" ("conquered, not convinced") that is the real key to the situation.

FROM "LE POPULAIRE"

Youth Problem

Le Populaire (Paris), organ of the SP, has published a report from its Barcelona correspondent which includes the following interesting observation on Spanish youth:

"The monarchist Calvo Serer made a violent speech in which he stated that 'Spain is the only country which is occupied by its army,' which was followed by a brutal reply from Jordana Fuentes, and doubts and vacillations between the generals and the bourgeoisie.

"The Franco regime is desperately searching for a way out. It realizes that it has formed a vacuum.

"After 16 years of dictatorship, the regime finds itself confronted by a serious problem which it does not know how to solve: the future of the youth, upon whom depends the future of the country. The failure of the regime is recognized by its most representative men. Senior Sanchez Mazas, former Secretary General of the Falange, accuses the Falange organizations of 'keeping the youth of Spain in a state of infantilism and paralysis.' This attack, considered in connection with a report published a few days ago in the magazine of the Central University of Madrid, enables one to better understand the present situation. This magazine published the findings of an investigation made concerning the opinions of young Spanish students. Their replies to the questions are to some extent in contradiction to Senior Sanchez Mazas' statement, but they also are in contradiction to statements made by the regime.

"Seventy-four per cent of the students asked stated that official Catholicism spreads hypocrisy; 79 per cent believe that Catholicism should be compatible with religious freedom, 47 per cent believe that the Spanish Church is an obstacle to scientific progress, and 71 per cent maintain that religious orders should not dedicate themselves to teaching."

FROM THE CNT

Renew Terror in Barcelona

The Spanish CNT (syndicalist confederation of labor) in exile has issued a statement protesting new terroristic measures taken by Franco's police. An excerpt indicates the tension in Spain:

"Unfortunately, on May 7th, the Bank of Vizcaya in Barcelona was robbed. According to the press four bandits escaped with half a million pesetas. There was no bloodshed. In spite of accusations, the CNT of Spain declares that it has no connection with this robbery or with any other similar acts.

"Following the bank hold-up, Franco's armed forces and the police made a tremendous and furious show of strength and struck against the underground labor movement. Large scale raids were organized, whole city blocks were surrounded and many homes were searched. There were numerous arrests, especially of persons already on the police lists or on parole. Most of the persons detained were released within a few hours after many of them had been beaten up and some seriously injured.

"During the course of these raids and searches of private homes, the police discovered the print shop where *Solidaridad*

Obrera and *CNT* were printed. Everything on the premises was seized and the following persons were arrested: Manuel Llatje Tomas, Antonio Mirael Guitart, Juan Vicente Castells, Primitivo Llan-sola Renau, Vicente Llan-sola, his wife Dolores Cabañas Montañes and Maria Mas Casas, the sister of Valerio Mas, the well known militant and veteran of the Confederation.

"All of these comrades were beaten and barbarously tortured at the Police Headquarters, especially Manuel Llatje Tomas whose condition is critical.

"Men and women are imprisoned and tortured in Spain for defending freedom of expression and the right to print and circulate their ideas in print. In this case—and the police themselves know this—neither Primitivo Llan-sola Renau, Dolores Cabañas Montañes nor Maria Mas Casas have any knowledge of or connection with our underground press or with any of our other activities. Such arrests as these can only be based on a sadistic spirit of political vengeance which is characteristic of a regime based on injustice.

"There are evil winds hereabouts. A general wave of police terror has been unleashed. Public places where our people are thought likely to congregate are invaded by the police armed with revolvers and submachine guns. Everyone present is required to show his papers and anyone from whom it is thought some information may be extracted either by simple interrogation or inhuman torture, is taken into custody.

"The local police have been reinforced by elements from other provinces and men armed with tommy-guns are everywhere. This is not limited to Barcelona. The surrounding countryside and all the highways leading into the city are controlled by the Civil Guard. . . ."

**Three New Pamphlets
by Leon Trotsky
on the 1905 Revolution**
"1905: Before and After" .25c
"In Defense of
Insurrection"10c
"1905: Results and
Perspectives"25c
All three for 50c.
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

HIT HARD BY HITLERITE GENOCIDE IN EUROPE, THE BUND NOW FACES ATTACKS BY PRO-ZIONISTS

THE JEWISH BUND RE-FORMS ITS RANKS

By AL FINDLEY

The third world conference of the Jewish Bund, held in Montreal in the middle of April, represented a post-war consolidation of the remnants of this once-powerful organization, which has suffered extensively from the decimation of the Jewish peoples in Europe.

The Bund has a long and honorable tradition of service to, and struggle for, both socialism and the Jewish working class; this is a fact that is widely recognized regardless of differences with their point of view. Visible at the Montreal conference was the terrific impact of the destruction wrought by Hitler on the Jewish people. The Bund's base — the Yiddish-speaking masses of Eastern Europe, with their revolutionary struggle against capitalist poverty and discrimination—had been cut to pieces by the Nazi terror. The émigré branches of the Bund, which once were far-flung, have now become the Bund.

Divorced from its main base, the Bund became more pliable to pressures to conform to the reformist ideas of some of its "friends" who hold high places in the labor movement.

In addition, the Bund, which has traditionally been anti-Zionist, ran into another serious problem in the post-war period with the outburst of pro-Zionist sentiment among the Jews in connection with the struggle in Palestine and the establishment of the state of Israel. Insofar as this development was also due (at least in part) to reaction to the terrible fate of European Jewry, it represented another blow at the Bund resulting from Hitlerism—the other side of the coin of the decimation of the Bund's Jewish base.

Organizationally the third world conference marked a step forward for the Bund in this period. On a world scale, it now has one daily and 6 periodicals, some cultural institutions, and some newly organized units. Some of these play a role in Jewish life in their countries.

MAJORITY PRO-WEST

At the Montreal conference the organization took its stand on the main political questions of the world today.

The resolutions (now published in the Bund organ *Unser Tsait*) show that the majority right wing of the movement has unfortunately lined the Bund up quite clearly with social-democratic reformism and the U. S. war camp. But a left wing, which obtained the support of about 10 delegates, presented an alternative set of resolutions which put forward a more militant Marxist position of independent class action.

The right-wing majority resolution, ascribes the war threat in the world exclusively to Stalinist aggression and imperialism, and paints the organization of the Western military camp as solely a justified reaction to this threat. It states solidarity with the "demand that the Western powers should oppose the threatened Communist attack on Formosa" but "at the same time the democratic world [meaning the capitalist world] must do all that it can to save mankind from a third world war."

Otherwise it takes a slap at "those reactionary-capitalist and nationalist circles of the Western world that want or speculate about a preventive war," at the "remnants of capitalist imperialism," at "the Chiang Kai-sheks, the Syngman Rhee's, the Francos, and other such allies" who are a "hindrance in the fight of the democratic world against communism"; but at no point in this right-wing statement is even lip-service given to the idea that there is a connection between war and the drives of capitalism (as distinct from the "hindrance" of "bad" capitalists and bad allies). Instead, the resolution winds up with the pious avowal that "a lasting, permanent peace can, however, only be achieved in a world that has vanquished the various forms of totalitarianism and also capitalism" and has built socialism.

Even the right-wing resolution, how-

ever, inserts advocacy of an "understanding between the two blocs" to relieve tension, though "not at the price of appeasement."

'BEVANITE' WING

The left-wing minority, which can perhaps best be described as "Bevanite" in its political orientation, divided its political documents into three resolutions. In its general resolution on "The Problems of Socialism," it emphasized adherence to the basic ideas of class-struggle socialism: "... affirm that the Bund remains loyal to the fundamentals of socialism which have made the international working class into the decisive factor in changing the world, in the struggle against capitalism, national oppression, against imperialism and war. The basic ideas remain unbroken and have been strengthened by the reality of events that we have lived through and are living in at present."

The resolution stresses the independence of the socialist movement, the fight against imperialism and for proletarian democracy. It advocates that "an International of action should become a reality in our era of direct struggle for socialism."

In another point, the resolution advocates that the Bund "support and work together with all the forces of the proletarian movement that are opposed to both extremes—against reformism and against communism."

The left-wing position taken up by the group shares not only the virtues of Bevanism but also many of its weaknesses, most particularly in foreign policy and with respect to Stalinism. With regard to the "extremes" just quoted, for example, the resolution proposes to "slowly bridge the gap that divides the working-class movement itself into rival camps." This equivocal attitude toward Stalinism strongly affects also the left wing's resolution on the war question.

Where the right wing had pushed the Bund into support of the capitalist war camp, the left wing reacts with a counter-position of neutralist "coexistence," associated with no analysis of Stalinism or of Stalinist imperialism and no clear differentiation from the latter. It limits its programmatic proposals mainly to the neutralist platform of negotiated deal, opposition to atomic weapons, anti-capitalist-colonialism, etc.

Both wings came out strongly against German rearmament, mainly on ground of the danger of renewed German militarism and Nazism, but neither recognized in any way the right of the German people to achieve their own sovereignty including an army.

The positive features of the left wing's "Bevanism" in foreign policy show in its refusal to support the capitalist military alliance, and in its opposition to capitalism as a cause of war, while its illusions show in its failure to take as clear a stand in opposition to Stalinist imperialism.

JEWISH QUESTION

On the Jewish question, the conference was unanimous. The Bund declared that the Jews were a world people "united by a common history and cultural heritage, by the conscious feeling of belonging to one people, by tradition and language, by the dangers of reaction, anti-Semitism and similar problems." This, of course, is the basis of the Bund's traditional position as a separate Jewish-socialist movement, though other socialists have long questioned this separateness.

The Bund conference called for:

strengthening Jewish national life all over the world; concern for Yiddish; Jewish secular culture and education; struggle against assimilation.

It denounced Zionism, among other things, for its pessimistic approach to the possibilities of Jewish national culture outside of Israel and for the fact that "Zionism wants to transform all Jewish settlements [outside Israel] into colonies, into a hinterland for the state of Israel."

PLATFORM ON ISRAEL

The conference stated the importance of the creation of the state of Israel. The fact itself is neither hailed nor decried. The resolution says Israel "could play a positive role in Jewish life, but first it must do the following: (1) stop considering Israel as the state of all Jews; (2) the interests of the Jews in Israel to be subordinated to the interests of the Jews the world over; (3) Israel should apply the principle of democracy—the self-same one we demand where we are a minority—in Israel both to Jews and non-Jews; (4) remove all Israeli obstacles to peace with the Arabs; (5) Yiddish should be taught in all educational institutions and have full rights and freedom in public life."

Israel has not solved the Jewish problem (the Bund went on to say) and in some respects has made it worse and, of course, more complicated. The greatest danger for Israel is a renewed Arab-Israeli war. Zionist nationalism on the one side and Arab nationalism and reaction on the other side are obstacles, each in its own way, to a peace. In the interests of peace Israel should recognize the rights of the Arab refugees to repatriation and compensation. The resolution also calls for an eventual Jewish-Arab federation of the Near East.

The statement sums up its proposals for Jewish workers in three points: (1) "Here-ness," meaning concentration on the problems of the workers wherever the Jews are, as against making Israel the center of all Jewish activity; (2) socialism; (3) national will to live.

Only a combination of these three, the Bund declares, can assure the continued existence of the Jewish people.

OUT OF THE MUDPOT

Of course, the Bund's position on the Jewish question is highly controversial from every standpoint, and one would certainly expect the Zionists to criticize it, as is their right. For the most part, the Bund and its resolution were duly attacked, but to only a small extent were their ideas discussed. Some sneered that the Bund had left only its anti-Zionism. Few discussed its particular concept of the Jews as a world people. Few Zionists took up its challenging statement that Israel did not solve the Jewish problem.

The low point of the attack on the Bund came from the Jewish *Daily Forward*. The *Forward* was once a socialist organ, having been founded by people associated with the Bund.

The *Forward's* editor, Hillel Rogoff, violently attacked the Bund as "traitors" who are "echoing Arab propaganda," etc. The vicious slander was due to the fact that the Bund had dared to criticize Israel. (In the writing habits of many pro-Zionists, any criticism of Israel whatsoever is "Arab propaganda," just as in the Stalinist system, any criticism of the Russian holy of holies is "fascist propaganda," or whatever the current focus of abuse may be.)

Since we have already reported all the Bund's references to the Arabs, the reader can judge for himself how depraved the *Forward's* calumny is.

But the editor of the *Forward* set no bounds to his indignation. This very democratic person declared in print that if he had but known that the Bund would adopt such a resolution, he would not have reported their conference in his paper nor given them publicity. True to this declaration, in the following week's round-up of activities of Jewish organi-

zations, there was no report on Bund activities.

The especially interesting fact to be noted at this point (in case we have given a false impression) is that the *Forward* does not consider itself Zionist, unlike so much of the Jewish press, and Rogoff personally has never called himself a Zionist. His furious reaction to the Bund criticism is not a reaction to criticism of Zionism but to criticism of Israel. In such circles there have been similar frenetic reactions to any criticism of Israel even by pro-Zionists; here the state (Israel) has been separated off in its inviolable sanctity even from the Zionism which gave it birth.

HONEY-AND-MOLASSES

A real Zionist, Dr. Margoshes of the Jewish *Day*, took an entirely different tack in discussing the Bund conference. Far from denouncing the Bundists he practically offered them a membership card in the Zionist organization. There are really no differences left between us Zionists and the Bundist anti-Zionists, declared the good doctor. We both agree that the Jews are a nation, that Israel is an important fact, we both recognize the importance of Jewish settlements outside Israel; and as for other matters, they are secondary.

In understanding this honey-and-molasses approach of Margoshes, it must be remembered that the main American leaders of Zionism (represented by Margoshes) are at loggerheads on the tenets of their creed with Ben-Gurion and his supporters. Ben-Gurion, the Israelis and a majority of the world Zionist movement insist that real Zionists must emigrate to Israel or have this perspective; they demand emigration from the U. S. and especially demand that Zionist leaders show the way.

The American Zionists, while giving lip-service to the idea of emigration and the "Ingathering of the Exiles" from the diaspora, have steadily refused to emigrate or to put emigration in first place, arguing that a Zionist can remain in his present country (namely, America) and play a role as a Zionist—the role of "philanthropic Zionism" or cultural-community activity.

Thus the American Zionists have been fighting a rearguard battle in the Zionist movement for some recognition of settlements outside Israel. Despite the fact that they too place Israel in the center and are in favor of focusing most of the Jewish activities around Israel, they need some justification for not embarking on a policy of speeding up emigration—an emigration which they know will not take place from the U. S. no matter how much they urge it.

STRANGE SPECTACLE

So the kernel of seriousness in Margoshes' reaction to the Bund is the same kernel as that which causes Ben-Gurion to denounce the Americans as having abandoned Zionism. The hard-shell Zionists accuse the people like Margoshes of having given up Zionism, and Margoshes soft-soaps the Bundists with talk about "no difference." What this reflects is mainly the ambiguous position of the American brand of Zionist leaders.

Hence we have the otherwise strange spectacle of the Zionist spokesman Margoshes greeting the anti-Zionist Bundists with soft invitations, while the "non-Zionist" Rogoff abuses them with reprehensible obloquy. As we have pointed out, to Rogoff and his friends the real crime of the Bundists was that a Jewish organization should dare to criticize Israel. Rogoff therefore had no need to discuss the Bund's ideas in any loyal or semi-decent fashion.

Rogoff and the rest of his renegades from socialism who run the *Forward* are, naturally, continually talking about "democracy" and usually make it the main test for everything. They support Washington and its Syngman Rhee's in the name of the same democracy. But where is their democracy, i.e., freedom of discussion, with relation to Israel?

Among such people criticism of Israel is permitted, but only in private. So the great democrats put a news blackout on the Bund.

The Bund met this censorship with a protest meeting and tried to muster its friends and former supporters in the Workmen's Circle and Forward Association to reverse Rogoff's diktat.

A victory for the Bund will be a good thing, not only for the sake of freedom of discussion in Jewish circles on Israeli problems, but also because it can be helpful to the Israelis themselves. After all, like all human beings, they are not immune to mistakes, even from within the standpoint of Zionism itself, being so close to their problem that vision may be narrowed. As always, freedom of criticism is a necessity even from the point of view of those who are criticized.

Political Warfare over Germany — —

(Continued from page 1)

tween Bonn and NATO; whether by recognizing the Bonn government the Russian government intends to formalize the partition of Germany.

These "demands" are intended for propaganda purposes, but their effect can only play into the hands of the Stalinists. Any refusal by Adenauer simply to meet with the Russians on the ground that they plan to continue to recognize the government of their East German satellite would doubtless be repudiated by the vast majority of the people of West Germany. The same is true of an attempt to have the Russians commit themselves in advance on any of the other issues as a condition for negotiations.

Since this is so patently clear, the only purpose in raising these questions is to delay negotiations until after the projected Big Four conference in July.

'SMART OPERATORS'

The Eisenhower administration has had even less to say to the German people than has Adenauer (and after all, the German people are the objects of these maneuvers). All that the American government could bring itself to say is that Eisenhower has complete confidence in Adenauer's utter loyalty to his friends and allies.

That may be reassuring to the Bonn cabinet, but it can hardly counteract what is implied in the Stalinist invitation: the opening of serious negotiations for the unification of Germany.

As the date for the Big Four conference draws nearer, all kinds of suggestions are being made on how to strengthen the hands of the American delegation at such a gathering. James Reston of the New York Times deplors the failure of Eisenhower to utilize the "best brains" of the country in preparing for the con-

ference. The people he has in mind are George F. Kennan, Paul Hoffman, General Walter Bedell Smith, and others who have had experience in dealing with Russia or Germany.

The same note is struck by Doris Fleeson, Washington columnist of the New York Post. The idea seems to be that Smart Operators can make up for the absence of a policy, or that if the "best brains" are gathered together perhaps some policy which no one has thought of yet can be worked out.

In casting about for some kind of an answer to the Russian campaign, the same Doris Fleeson, who is one of the more intelligent commentators on the Washington scene and who has excellent connections, reports approvingly a suggestion made by Thomas E. Murray, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. That is that the Big Four leaders be taken to see an explosion of the hydrogen bomb!

Imagine the political effect of this throughout Europe and Asia:

The Russians come forth with all kinds of talk about peaceful coexistence. They hint at the formation of a neutral belt of nations across Europe. They bring peace offerings to Tito, and tour Nehru all over their country, with smiling children giving him flowers and doves circling overhead. They offer grandiose disarmament plans and generally present themselves to the people of the world as men who want nothing but peace, and are willing to strike reasonable bargains to get it.

And the Americans are to propose, as THEIR contribution to the atmosphere of peace, that the Russians come and see an American H-bomb explosion!

Thomas E. Murray and Doris Fleeson have the best of intentions. Their idea is that the men who may one day have to make the crucial decision for war or peace (may have to press the button

which will start an H-bomb war, so to speak) have never personally witnessed the awful destructiveness of this weapon, and that a personal view of it might have a deterring effect on them. To the world such a proposal would simply mean: The Russians talk peace, the Americans wave the H-bomb. That is their answer if things are not settled to their liking!

INKLING

Let us give credit where credit is due. John Foster Dulles is not altogether without some answer to the Russian campaign. He continues to suggest that one of the things to be negotiated at any four power conference is the withdrawal of Russian troops from the Satellite countries of Eastern Europe.

That he has touched the Russians on a sore spot is demonstrated by their indignant claim that there is nothing to negotiate with regard to Eastern Europe, that Dulles is seeking to interfere in the internal affairs of the countries of that area, and so forth.

Dulles' line contains an inkling of what a genuinely Democratic policy of political warfare could be like. It would seek to embarrass, expose and defeat the Stalinists in the eyes of the peoples of the world. It would seek to do so not simply by a propaganda campaign exposing the crimes of Stalinism, but by proposing concrete policies, as part of a consistent democratic foreign policy, which are capable of rallying mass popular support behind them.

The strength of the Stalinist political offensive on Germany lies precisely in the fact that they have offered to withdraw their troops from East Germany in return for a withdrawal of the United States. They urge the unification and neutralization of the country as a concrete policy, not just a propaganda campaign. Thus they hold the initiative and appear before the masses, especially in Germany, as the side which is willing to offer a practical proposal for peace and national unification.

It is quite likely that the Russian proposal is a bluff predicated on the idea that the United States will resist to the bitter end withdrawal of their troops from Germany and of Germany from NATO. But the only way in which an American government could effectively call that bluff and turn the Russian offensive into a rout is to counter it by proposals at least as bold as those offered by the Russians.

For the United States, however, such a policy would involve willingness to withdraw its troops from Europe and abandon its A-bomb bases. This would be a concrete demonstration that America was no longer relying on sheer military force as its chief, if not only, weapon in the cold war, and would open the possibility of a political offensive.

NOT SO BIG IN GERMANY

From such a posture, an American government capable of political warfare could call on the Russians to withdraw their troops from East Europe and disgorge the territories annexed by them after World War II, and could do so with enormous political effect. The sympathy of the peoples of Germany and much of the rest of Europe, which are now being won by the Russians in their guise as reasonable peacemakers, would turn against them. The popular pressure would then be directed at Stalinist imperialism rather than at a United States whose only answer to Stalinism in Europe is to build up armies and stockpile nuclear weapons.

But American capitalism is showing itself incapable of meeting the Russians with a democratic foreign policy that can win in the political struggle for the world.

At the close of Chancellor Adenauer's visit to Washington, he joined President Eisenhower in a statement which declares that the concept of neutrality is inapplicable to Germany. Adenauer went on to add that a neutral Germany would create a power-vacuum in Central Europe which would represent a "constant danger to everyone."

This attempt to close the door on Russian proposals before they are made may go over big in Washington and in the American press. The German people, however, are hardly likely to greet it with enthusiasm, as it offers them no hope whatever for the unification of their country. It thus prepares the road for the political strengthening of Stalinism in Germany and throughout Europe.

That is the price of relying on H-bombs instead of politics in a period when political warfare is decisive.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

Ferment in Africa

By PRISCILLA CADY

South Africa recently made overtures up inconclusively last year, among African governments on the question of national or internal. England rejected the proposal, possibly because of the rather joint defense against aggression, delicate relations now existing between the British Commonwealth and its member nation, South Africa, which wants to be entirely free to pursue its own policies and would presumably try to dominate any such confederation. It is of interest to note here that an American general recently visited the Strydom government to discuss military needs.

NIGERIA: 'INDIVIDUALISM'

The people of West Africa, writes the New York Times, are much too individualistic to fall for the Communist line. The evidence for this is seen in the markets and bazaars of Nigeria where everyone conducts his own little bit of trading. Politics is all very well to them, says the article, but trading is art, poetry and music.

The fact that national independence is a burning question today in highly political Nigeria is not mentioned. Presumably we are supposed to believe that these people don't mind who runs the country as long as they can keep on trading inadequate goods for insufficient money. . . .

KENYA: CONCESSIONS

The Royal Commission Report on East Africa has been published at a time when, according to reports, the back of the Mau Mau has been broken, although isolated guerrilla warfare may continue for some time. It is all the more interesting, therefore, that along with other suggestions for improving conditions, the commission advocated opening up the fertile highlands—generally known, for good reason, as the "white" highlands—to African farmers.

This measure, so totally in opposition to the wishes of the settlers, indicates the serious view that Britain is taking of the strength shown by the colonial peoples and the drastic (for her) measures she is willing to take to prevent another Mau Mau, in Kenya or elsewhere.

The tune everyone is piping is that

the Mau Mau, being totally vicious and wrong, must be granted no concessions but that the Kenyans undoubtedly have legitimate grievances which enlightened colonialists must remedy. Apparently this feeling exists even among some of the settler population, where a reaction to the brutal measures of the government has produced a more liberal turn of thought regarding the Africans.

The Royal Commission pointed out that Africans in general suffer from malnutrition, disease and the lack of a stable place in society. They advocated a breakdown of all customs, from the color bar to the tribal system of accumulating rather useless cattle as wealth, which tend to retard the full economic development of the country.

Although the land question is indeed a vital one, the current impression that its solution, or partial solution, will end unrest is false. Undoubtedly some of the more acute problems of underereating and overcrowding would disappear, and also some of the sense of grievance. But the discussions about whether or not the Kikuyu people actually owned the land which the British settlers took over is a purely academic one, as the white farmers came along with a new government, new laws, and new weapons. Even if the Kikuyu were to get all the land to till and were still to suffer under colonial rule, striving for national independence would still go on.

A New Collection!

MARX AND ENGELS ON BRITAIN

Contains the whole of Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England* in addition to dozens of their articles and letters. 538 pages—fully indexed—hard-cover—fine binding—but only 2.50! All orders must be accompanied by payment.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Get Acquainted!

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

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2. New
- 6 months at \$1. Renewal
- Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE