

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

OCTOBER 8, 1951

FIVE CENTS

## BLP Ranks Back Bevan in Vote!

As we go to press, newspaper dispatches indicate that delegates' sentiment at the convention of the British Labor Party is dominated not by the right-wing leadership but by supporters of Aneurin Bevan.

It is clear, dolefully reports the N. Y. Times' London correspondent, that the party conference "had swung far to the left of its present moderate leadership," both "by its deed and its words." He explicitly ascribes this leftward swing to the "rank and file" of the party, while consoling himself with the thought that the big trade-union bloc votes at the convention still hold the majority for the Attlee right wing.

No programmatic fight has taken place at the convention because of Attlee's tactic of calling for a new election this month—a step explained by many observers as motivated precisely by the desire to avoid a showdown at this convention. The test vote took place on elections to the seven (out of 27) places on the party Executive which are determined by the local branches.

In this vote, all Bevan supporters were re-elected with a bigger vote than ever before, Bevan himself topping the list as usual. At the same time, "the conference turned thumbs down on most of those connected with the government's rearmament program, especially those who have had the temerity to stand up in meeting and support it." These included Defense Minister Shinwell, John Strachey and two other ministers.

The rank and file of the Labor Party are with Bevan and against the Attlee-right-wing rearmament policy. This is now a recorded fact.

Leading Socialist Parties of Asia Point the Road—

## Socialists of India and Japan Declare Unity In Fight for Third Camp vs. Both War Blocs

By MAX SHACHTMAN

A Third Camp—Independent of the two big imperialist camps represented by Washington and Moscow?

A Third Camp—firmly pledged to oppose the coming world war, refusing to support capitalism as a lesser evil to Stalinism or Stalinism as a lesser evil to capitalism?

A Third Camp—committed to struggle against both capitalism and Stalinism in the interests of the working class and the colonial peoples, in the name of true internationalism, democracy and socialism?

Yes, that would be a fine thing, say the skeptics, the tired and retired people, the timid and the highly respectable people in the labor movement. It would be fine indeed—*if* there were such a thing. Give these people such a movement, big and powerful already, and there is no doubt that many of them would finally join in with it. But, ask them to help in organizing this movement, in building it up and strengthening it, in helping overcome all the difficulties and weaknesses it has in its early days, and they shrug their hopeless and helpless shoulders.

### TOILERS NOT DOOMED

Not we! We do not for a moment believe that the toiling peoples of the world are doomed to choose only between decaying capitalism and Stalinist barbarism in order to perish futilely in the blood and devastation of the war they are preparing, the war they are already conducting in ruined Korea.

Not we—and not growing numbers of socialists in Asia, that newly-awakened continent in which something like half the population of the world lives and longs for that freedom, prosperity and peace which neither capitalism nor Stalinism can give them. They are not skeptics

or tired. They are not waiting for the Third Camp to drop before them from the skies, full grown. They set about the work of organizing the forces that already exist among the millions and the tens of millions.

From the Asian continent now comes more good news. It is in the form of a joint statement signed in Tokyo on September 14, 1951, by Rammanohar Lohia, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Socialist Party of India (many of us

had the opportunity to hear Lohia at his meetings in the United States from which he went to Japan on his way back to India) and by Hiroo Wada, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Japan. We are pleased to print the full text of the statement on our front page and commend it to the close attention of our readers.

### THE THIRD CAMP

Where we speak of the Third Camp, the statement

speaks of the Third World of socialism. The difference in terminology is of no consequence; in meaning, they are the same thing. They are not at all the same thing as that "Third Force" which is, for example, the watchword of the French Social Democrats. There it is nothing but an excuse for giving up the fight for socialism in order to effect a working agreement with the "progressive" capitalists at home and with American imperialism abroad. The Indian and Jap-

anese socialists reject the "world of communism"—a term which they apply quite erroneously, if understandably, to Stalinism. Stalinism has no more in common with communism than it has with socialism; less, if anything.

But their rejection of Stalinism does not bring the authors of the joint statement into the camp of capitalism, today dominated by the United States. They do not, out of hysterical, panicky and uncomprehending fear of Stalinist imperialism pledge their arms to American imperialism as their protector.

That's the course of the European Social-Democrats and their American counterpart, but not of the socialists in Japan and India. In the fight for democracy, for national independence, for socialism, they depend not on the two world reactions, but as is only proper for genuine socialists, on their own program and the independent organization and action of masses of the people themselves:

"We socialists are aiming to achieve this third world of socialism, and our primary objective in Asia is therefore to obtain the coordination of all Asian forces of socialism and democracy, which will combat and defeat equally the other two Asias of status quo and vested interests on the one hand and communism on the other."

### TRUE FRATERNITY

Likewise gratifying is the cooperation to which the representatives of the two parties pledge themselves and the mutual respect they show for one another. This elementary attitude for socialists is in stark contrast to the disgraceful and disgusting attitude adopted by most of the leaders of the big Social Democratic parties of the "modern" and "civilized" countries of Europe. They

(Turn to last page)

## JOINT ANTI-WAR DECLARATION For the Indian and Japanese Socialist Parties

Tokyo, Sept. 14, 1951

We had intimate conversations and as a result reached the happy conclusion that the Socialist Party of India and the Social Democratic Party of Japan entertain certain common views.

(1) The world we live in today is divided into three worlds opposed to one another. One of these is the world of status quo wanting to preserve vested interests and the feudal and capitalist systems. Another is the world of communism necessarily accompanied by chaos and other evils. The third world is the world of democratic socialism which promises development of human society. We socialists are aiming to achieve this third world of socialism, and our primary objective in Asia is therefore to obtain the coordination of all Asian forces of socialism and democracy, which will combat and defeat equally the other two Asias of status quo and vested interests on the one hand and communism on the other.

(2) We are agreed that home policy to be pursued by the Socialist Parties of Asia should adhere to the principle of equality, and effect social reforms, redistribution of land, socialization of industry, and, through planned economy, raise the low level of production and improve the poor standard of living imposed on Asian peoples. We also believe that political and economic power and technology should be so arranged as to be made available to the common man in the small communities of village and town.

(3) The Socialist Parties of India and Japan are convinced that world peace can be indefinitely secured only when the retarded two-thirds of the world, parts of which, like Africa, are still under political subjection, is raised to a decent level of well-being and strength. Such an equality among all parts of the world can alone realize a healthy balance of power and thus eliminate war.

(4) We sincerely desire that Japan be accepted by all the sister nations of Asia, in the belief that the peace and prosperity of Japan depend on the peace and prosperity of other Asian peoples and that Socialist Japan will never allow a reversion to the dark days of militarism and imperialism. We pledge that progressive Japan will do its utmost toward achievement of economic prosperity through supply of techniques, machinery and machine tools to all the sister nations of Asia, in particular, Burma and Indonesia.

(5) In carrying out these common aims, the Socialist Party of India and the Social Democratic Party of Japan will work in close cooperation. Meanwhile, the Social Democratic Party of Japan will shortly send a delegation to India. We hope that a conference of all Asian Socialist Parties will soon be held.

For the Socialist Party of India:  
Rammanohar LOHIA,  
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee.  
For the Social-Dem. Party of Japan:  
Hiroo WADA  
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee.





# The Lamentations of Sidney Hook

## The Professor Deplores 'Cultural Vigilantism' but Absolves the Government's Role

By EMMA STOKES

Sidney Hook, head of the philosophy and psychology department of the graduate school at New York University, pontificates periodically as a kind of self-appointed conscience of American liberalism, after having embraced and left most of the political movements of socialism.

Hook is exercised about what he terms "cultural vigilantism" in American life in the September 30 issue of the New York Times Magazine. His article begins:

"Letters, periodicals and visitors from foreign countries provide convergent evidence that a strange picture of American life and culture is being etched in acid abroad. Even in non-Communist circles in Europe and Asia, the view is sedulously being cultivated that the United States, posing as the chief defender of Western values of freedom, tolerance and respect for individual differences, is actually in the grip of an epidemic hysteria of witchhunting, Communist baiting and character lynching. It is sometimes alleged that a reign of terror—political as well as cultural—is rampant in this country, differing in degree but not in moral kind from the ruthless suppressions of the Iron Curtain countries."

Hook does not specify who is depicting this "strange picture," this "cultural reign of terror" that is being spread abroad. It is obviously not the Stalinists, to whose exaggerations most persons, and especially Professor Hook, are accustomed. They are apparently people of more seriousness and probity for Hook to become so concerned.

### "Deplorable Incident"

The article continues:

"On the basis of one or another deplorable incident [sic] loud outcries have been raised in the press and on the platform that we are on the verge of fascism. Orators with greater eloquence than discriminating judgment announce that we are already living in a police or garrison state and that our traditional Bill of Rights functions only as a deceptive ritual to conceal the ugly facts of repression. Predictions have been freely made that before long we will be burning books in the street..."

Worst of all, these anonymously-made assertions have been "growing in volume even on this side of the Atlantic." They are picked up abroad by the peoples of Asia and Europe, "even in non-Communist circles" and "are cited as evidence that Europe and Asia must protect themselves from the two colossi of cultural intolerance—the USSR and the U.S.A."

Who these "orators" are and who is making the "predictions" of "book-burning" is left unsaid throughout the article. But Hook considers the "exaggerations" dangerous because "They weaken the moral case of Western democracy against Communist totalitarianism." They tend "to anaesthetize people to a point where, if ever a genuine threat of a police state were to arise in this country, Cassandra cries of 'fascism' would leave them apathetic. This actually happened in Germany." (We thought, as once did Hook, that the failure of the working-class organizations to unite in struggle against Hitler was the main reason for the victory of Nazism.)

### Synonym for Witchhunt

Hook asseverates that the most important harm done by these "exaggerations" is to divert our attention from the "real danger" which is—the not inept phrase is Hook's, the emphasis ours—"the cultural vigilantism of certain pressure groups in education, economics, art, science, entertainment, religion and other social fields." Not "epidemic hysteria," or political and cultural "reign of terror," if you please. Those phrases will distract from the real malady, cultural vigilantism.

Hook's argumentation is bizarre. For the only real "exaggerators" who level the charges of fascism and bookburning are Stalinists. The genuine, consistent liberals (a category which must exclude Hook), the thinking labor leaders, the Marxists and socialists have made the correct allegations, those that can be classified under the

charge of vigilantism, both cultural and political. Is it the latter against whom he inveighs? Hook is aware that these are genuinely concerned with what is happening to the tradition of the Bill of Rights, and not because of the march of fascists on the right but because of the blows against democracy which began at the top, in the government itself, and have permeated all layers and areas of society.

### It's Those Communists Again

Hook significantly and deliberately excludes politics and government from consideration in his article, with a mention that the "political threats... are already being so freely debated these days from both the White House and Capitol Hill." By this omission, and elsewhere specifically, he removes from the government any onus for the phenomenon of "cultural vigilantism."

But Hook does illustrate the phenomenon with copious and pedestrian notes. He states that opponents of progressive education, apparently organized on a national scale, link progressive education with communism, and is at some pains to prove that the connection is absurd. Reputable economists, he states, are labeled subversive for advocacy of a proposal such as a withholding tax on dividends—as have been the advocates of price and wage controls, rollbacks, public housing.

Needless loyalty oaths in education and other professional fields; the dictation of what textbooks should be used in classes by private persons and groups; condemnation of performers in radio and other fields of entertainment for their political backgrounds; condemnation of the contents of plays, movies and radio; the identification of the philosophy of John Dewey with that of Hitler and Stalin—Hook's article is replete with examples. He adds:

"Almost every day some incident reveals the growing pattern of cultural vigilantism which invokes the slogans of Americanism while betraying its best traditions."

In answering the question, "What are the causes of the development of cultural vigilantism?" Hook specifically exculpates the state power: "Nor is it true to say that the cause of cultural vigilantism is to be found in the activities of the government."

What are the causes? "The obvious main cause is fear of communism, and to the extent that fear is based on knowledge it is a healthy and legitimate fear." And: "That mood [the anti-Communist mood] is principally the cumulative result of a long series of actions by the Communists themselves—from the post-war usurpation of power in the satellite countries to the espionage cases and the invasion of Korea."

It is astonishing, but these are the shabby ideas that Hook is reduced to in evaluating the emergence of the problem he christens "cultural vigilantism." Of course, his arguments are designed to protect his own behavior in the post-war assault on civil liberties and his position of support to the U. S. in the war. He took the stand that Communist teachers should not be allowed to teach.

### Hits Subversive List

We cannot but suspect that Hook is a little more aware of the role of the government than he vows, for among his proposals for reducing the incidence of cultural vigilantism are some that relate directly to the role of government. He proposes that "the attorney general's list of subversive organizations should be published only after hearings have been conducted and the relevant evidence published, including the demurrers, if any, of the responsible officers of the organizations. The loyalty program should be rethought and more selectively applied."

Thus, for the first time since President Truman decreed Executive Order 9835 and caused the attorney general to draw up a list of "subversive organizations" to be used as an index for government employment, has

**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**

can help you build your own labor and socialist library. . . . Write for free book list. And remember: we also supply books of ALL publishers. Get ALL your books from

**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
- 114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

**Read about INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM**  
Send for the two special issues of LABOR ACTION devoted to explaining the ideas of the Independent Socialist League —

**May Day 1950—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism**  
**May Day 1951—Independent Socialism and the War**  
10 cents each

Sidney Hook publicly questioned, to our knowledge, the procedure employed. As LABOR ACTION has repeatedly shown, this order was a most powerful catalyst in producing the current hysteria, or "cultural vigilantism," if you like.

The list has been published for four years now. No organization listed has ever received a hearing, a notification of the intentions of the attorney general or a notification of listing except after the event and in the public press. The attorney general's list was not and could not be confined to government employment. Its by now universal application in industry, commerce, entertainment—and in those fields Hook is especially worried about art, education and philosophy—was indicated.

### Getting Alarmed

Another governmental measure, the Smith Act, is praised by Hook for permitting open hearings and appeal, even if its "wisdom" is questionable. Hook must recall that it was sanctioned by a sharply divided Supreme Court and passed because of the support of Truman's appointees, and that it made possible the prosecution and persecution of the Stalinists.

In dismissing the government's role in the generation of the current atmosphere, Hook ignores the disgraceful conduct of congressional committees, the habits of the Senate and the House which permit McCarthy, McCarran, Nixon, Mundt, et al. to run their sideshows. In consideration of the behavior of these legislators alone, how can Hook seriously believe his own argument that mere fear of Stalinism and the actions of the Stalinists caused the moods in American life which he fears today? Did he think they were not serious manifestations of anti-democratic feeling solely because they occurred on a governmental level?

Unfortunately, to have spoken about these things forthrightly would have seriously undermined Hook's position as a supporter of one of the imperialist blocs in the current cold war. Now that "anti-communism" has become a stock-in-trade and political plank for the Republicans, Truman himself—and Hook as well—were moved to issue a word of caution.

Politics and the government, and Hook's relation to them, which Hook wants to leave out of the discussion are of its essence and account for the shallowness of Hook's reasoning. He is driven to lament the fact that "instead of whipping up sentiment against the domestic agents of the Kremlin [we find it hard to believe that Hook seriously considers this a problem], the government has been accused by some of its critics of lagging behind the mood of the people. Although it is true that in some respects governmental measures have fallen short of proper standards of justice [mind you, alien short of proper standards of justice], government agencies, if anything, find their work hampered by the private fevers of cultural vigilantism which have arisen like a rash from the anti-Communist mood."

But the "anti-communist mood" was not something that sprang out of the feelings of an enraged people. It is worked up deliberately through the activities of the administration, the Senate and House, by the press and the tens and hundreds of official and unofficial bodies that dot the country, the self-appointed censors and patriots.

To further emphasize his concern lest the American temper be exaggerated, Hook recalls one of the worst periods in modern American history, the Gogan-Brown-Scully Bomb Squad of 1920 and the Palmer raids and mass deportations. Today's mood is not as dark in many ways; in some it is darker. But Hook plucks that period from American history because it is in many ways comparable to the present, if with many differences.

### The Fingers Point to U. S.

Hook is hard pressed to defend his thesis that a wrong impression is created abroad about American democracy by those who exaggerate the truth. The colored nations of the world do not point to a Cicero, Illinois, because they are Stalinists. The Europeans and Asians who criticize the state of civil liberties in the U. S. have ample right to do so. The U. S. is posing as the champion of freedom and democracy in the struggle against totalitarianism. Is it to be wondered that accusing fingers point at incident after incident in U. S. life which indicate a narrowing of freedom and democracy?

We suspect that the suspicious mood of these peoples begins not with incidents in American life, but rather on native shores and starts with certain American dealings with the Chiang Kai-sheks, Bao Dais, Syngman Rhee's, General Francos and their similars. Are they far from right in looking upon the current anti-democratic hysteria as an integral part of the American social scene rather than Hook's aberrant phenomena?

The fact is that democracy has received repeated blows in the United States and these blows have originated in the administration and Congress. The cold war, the threatening conflict with Russia, has forced the government to begin that struggle with a preparation of the home front in the only way it knows how: by industrial, political, military and psychological mobilization. To defeat and destroy Stalin's agents in this country, it has embarked on the road which threatens the bourgeois-democratic heritage of the country. The resultant stalinophobia supplants an understanding of the nature of Stalinism. The anti-democratic measure used against Stalinism are inevitably directed against genuine socialists, the only effective anti-Stalinists, against all radicals, liberals and non-conformists. And, in essence, even against Sidney Hook.

# German Socialists Seize Initiative on Issue Of National Unity, against Pressure by U.S.

By GORDON HASKELL

Germany is once again becoming the central political battleground in the global cold-war struggle. But in the closing months of the year 1951, the German people themselves are playing a much more important part in deciding their own destiny than has been the case at any time since the total defeat of the Nazi armies in 1945.

This is true not only of that portion of the German nation which enjoys the relative democracy of Western Germany, though it is they who are taking the political initiative. It is also true of the Germans, in the first place the German workers, living under Stalinist totalitarianism, but in a much different sense.

The latter have no way of expressing themselves politically except through their stubborn and mainly silent resistance to their Stalinist rulers' attempts to enlist their enthusiasm for their Russian puppet government. But even from behind the Iron Curtain they have been able to give enough evidence of their true political feelings to convince the political leaders of Western Germany, and above all the Social-Democratic leaders of the West German working class, that they can be relied upon to strike a powerful blow for freedom and democracy if they are given half a chance.

This is the outstanding, the all important fact which has emerged from the present stage of the political struggle for Germany. Six years after the collapse of Nazism the German working class, organized politically in the Social-Democratic Party, is forging rapidly to the head of the German nation. All the political calculations of the occupying powers in both parts of the country, and certainly every move by the Adenauer government, has to be made with one question uppermost in mind: What effect will any action have on the power and prestige of the Social-Democrats?

U. S. CHAUVINIST VIEW  
The present phase of the struggle has been initiated by the Americans and their allies. They are determined to "integrate" Western Germany into their military and economic bloc. As is usual for those who determine American foreign policy, the dominant considerations are military. Everything must be done to create a German military force which can supplement the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

All other considerations must yield to this one. For the Germans at this time, anything which contributes to this is a sign of "political maturity," "democracy," a "broad understanding" of European problems. Anything which obstructs it or even delays it is a sign of "resurgent nationalism," and all the other evils to which the Germans are supposed to be peculiarly addicted.

The State Department has not favored us with a White Paper setting forth its views on the integration of Western Germany into the Atlantic Treaty system. However, the views of the Allied high commissioners, and particularly of their American contingent, have been consistently "leaked" through their "chosen instrument," Drew Middleton of the New York Times.

A study of his dispatches over the past two weeks gives as clear a picture as could possibly be obtained of the completely "American," that is, the utterly chauvinistic attitude of the American government toward the German people.

The foreign ministers of the United States, Britain and France met in Washington just before the NATO conference at Ottawa. They decided that Germany was to be offered a wide extension of sovereignty in exchange for iron-clad guarantees for the creation of a German military force completely integrated into the structure of the NATO armies. These ends were to be accomplished through signing a series of "contractual agreements" which are to replace the occupation statute.

Although no text of these proposed agreements has been published, it appears that in addition to the military guarantees, they are to contain assurances of the continued "decartelization" of German industry, to provide for the presence in Germany of Allied troops as long as the Allies deem necessary, and for reparations. The Allies will maintain the right to intervene in German political life only if there should arise a threat to democracy there; they will continue to control Berlin, and will retain in their hands the power of decision on the reunification of Germany, i.e., on German foreign policy insofar as it relates to Russia.

For it is quite clear that should the Stalinists accept this challenge, and succeed in winning a majority or even a large plurality under the conditions set forth it would be a tremendous political victory for Stalinism in Germany and in the world, even if the Western Allies were to step in and prevent unification from taking place. But by the same token, should the Social-Democrats or even the bourgeois parties win in a democratic political contest, Stalinism would suffer a major political disaster even though it is quite certain that the Russians would not permit the unification of Germany under such circumstances.

The world-wide propaganda machine of the American government speaks in the name of democracy. It is for democracy, for freedom, that America purports to spend its wealth and the lives of its sons all over the world. It is democracy which the American government seeks to inculcate in all the benighted peoples subject to American control or influence. What then was the reaction of the American government to this proposal of the German Social-Democratic Party, which was not only completely democratic in form but which showed the greatest possible confidence in the democratic will of the German people?

### WASHINGTON'S LINE

The world-wide propaganda machine of the American government speaks in the name of democracy. It is for democracy, for freedom, that America purports to spend its wealth and the lives of its sons all over the world. It is democracy which the American government seeks to inculcate in all the benighted peoples subject to American control or influence. What then was the reaction of the American government to this proposal of the German Social-Democratic Party, which was not only completely democratic in form but which showed the greatest possible confidence in the democratic will of the German people?

As soon as the decisions of the Big Three foreign ministers were known, the Russians initiated a political counter-offensive. On September 15, Otto Grotewohl, East German premier, made a speech offering unity to Western Germany. This was followed by speeches by other Stalinist dignitaries, and was shortly endorsed by General Vassily I. Choukov, Russian commander in chief in East Germany.

As the Times pipeline put it: "The Bonn government's statement tomorrow [on its demand for free elections throughout all Germany] is not expected to please the Allied High Commission for it will mean that for the time being the attention of the West German Parliament has

## Conditions for Unification

- (1) The electoral area shall form a single constituency and each party shall submit a list of candidates for the entire electoral area.
- (2) Freedom of political activity in preparing and carrying out the election shall be guaranteed.
- (3) All restrictions in passenger traffic between East and West Germany and between East and West Germany and Berlin will be repealed three months before the elections.
- (4) Candidates for the national assembly will receive a guarantee of "absolute personal freedom."
- (5) Before, during and after the elections no one may be arrested, detained, subjected to disciplinary action or dismissed from his employment because of his political attitude.
- (6) Party meetings in public shall be permitted without restriction and shall be protected.
- (7) The distribution of newspapers, periodicals and the reception of radio broadcasts are not to be restricted.
- (8) Secrecy of the election shall be restricted.
- (9) Ballots must be uniform and voting must be in secret.
- (10) Renunciation of any of these provisions will invalidate the entire election in any polling district concerned.
- (11) Votes shall be counted in public by a committee consisting of representatives of all parties.
- (12) The preparation and carrying out of the election shall be under international protection and supervision.
- (13) Protection of the election everywhere is to be entrusted to international supervisory bodies and German authorities must comply with the directions of these bodies.
- (14) The supervisory bodies shall safeguard the rights and liberties of the populace and every German will have the right to appeal to these bodies.

of the American officials toward any discussion of German unification.

After some hesitation, Adenauer finally presented the Bundestag with fourteen conditions under which his government would agree to elections for a national assembly that would discuss the organization of a reunited Germany. These express the Social-Democratic position in full, and were approved by the Bundestag with only the Stalinist deputies voting against. Their motion that the East German offer of unity talks be accepted and a date set for such intergovernmental discussions was overwhelmingly defeated.

### THEY'RE AFRAID

The conditions under which the West German government will agree to all-German elections are important and we print them on this page. They set forth all the necessary guarantees for a democratic election. Adenauer stated at the same time that his government will apply at once for an international investigation of electoral freedom in West Germany under the supervision of the United Nations and challenged the East German government to do the same.

The American officials feel that since the Stalinist bluff has now been called, it is quite likely that the Russians will themselves have to step openly into the picture. They are fearful that the Stalinists might actually accept the formula for German unity drawn up by the Western powers at the Paris conference of foreign ministers in May and June of 1949, which was rejected by Vishinsky at the time.

Even they realize that to reject such an offer now out of hand, after the Germans of all parties have expressed themselves so strongly for immediate unification, would be disastrous. But from all reports, they are at a loss what to do if the offer is made.

What is the American government afraid of? Actually, it is not too easy to answer this question. It appears that the chief element in American thinking, if it can be called that, is the fact that they have determined to swing a re-armed Western Germany into their camp immediately, and until this is accomplished they are simply blind to everything else involved.

### SOCIALISTS WILL GAIN

Of course, there is an additional element which keeps cropping up in the dispatches. That is their realization that the German Social-Democracy has made a large step forward in winning the support of the German people by taking the initiative on German unification, and that if the struggle for unity is permitted to dominate German political life for any length of time, they stand to win most from it.

In a dispatch dated September 28 Drew Middleton puts it this way: "Instead of seeking to bring half of Germany, by far the richer half, into the Western community, the United States would have to raise its sights to the winning of all of Germany for the West."

"This would not be easy. In the first place the Communists have made great progress with the young people of East Germany. Then, too, the first government of a united Germany might well be a socialist regime headed by Dr. Kurt Schumacher, a less malleable subject for United States pressure than Dr. Adenauer."

That is well said, indeed! And it is said despite the fact that everyone who is not a political idiot knows that Schumacher and his party are hated far more deeply and considered a much

(Turn to last page)

# Socialists of India, Japan — —

(Continued from page 1)

treat not only the people, but even the Social Democrats of the countries which were on opposite sides from theirs in the last war—Germany, for example—with a poisonously chauvinistic superiority.

And their attitude and policies toward the people and socialists of the small countries, most particularly of the still backward, the colonial and semi-colonial countries, is, if that were possible, still more despicable. In this respect, they can learn a lot from the socialists of Asia, if they are still capable of learning anything.

**We too can learn from Asia. Yes, we "superior Americans" can learn from the "inferior and backward Asians." That is not because they know all the answers to all the questions. Not even because we can always**

**agree with the answers they do give, or with the way they give them. What is lacking in that precision and clarity of position which are required for precision and clarity of action—that will come, we are convinced. But the entire American labor movement and working class can learn from the socialists of India and Japan the great and overwhelming importance of establishing and maintaining their own independence from the ruling classes of the entire world, and first and foremost, from the ruling class of their own country.**

## HAS NO PROGRAM

The "advanced" labor leadership of the United States, which presumes to give lessons (and even instructions!) to the labor movement of the rest of the world, has not even worked out a rounded political and social

program of its own for the nation, let alone a program of its own for a foreign policy of the United States. We are not even speaking of a socialist foreign policy, but of a democratic foreign policy. In this respect, the statement of the Indian and Japanese socialists shows how many thousands of miles they are advanced ahead of the American labor movement.

But not only in this respect. They are imbued with the great and all-promising idea of organizing the Third Camp of socialism, democracy and peace as a force independent of the two imperialist war camps and as a challenge to their world dominion. The joint statement, which is signed in the name of organizations which have real and growing strength among the people, is a splendid step toward the expansion of that Camp, now in Asia, tomorrow throughout the world. Capitalist expansion,



Stalinist expansion—those are the wrack and ruin of the people. But the expansion of the power, the self-reliance, the independent movement of the people themselves—there lies the grand future for mankind.

# German Unity —

(Continued from page 7)

greater menace by the Stalinists than is Adenauer and his conservative clique; that he and his party are intransigent opponents of Stalinism and that hence any political victory which would bring him to the head of a government of all Germany would mean an utter rout for the Stalinists throughout the country.

But Kurt Schumacher is "a less malleable subject for United States pressure than Dr. Adenauer." That is, he is more independent; he is convinced that as long as Germany has not won its full sovereignty and is not in a position to treat with the other powers as an equal, Germany and hence the German working class will remain a subject of the manipulations of America and the Western Allies in their own interests.

And in order to unite Germany, to create the economic and political basis for full sovereignty and equality, he is willing to rely on the democratic will of the whole German working class, including the "youth with whom the Stalinists have made great progress in Eastern Germany!"

## SCHUMACHER "LOOMS"

"The figure of Dr. Kurt Schumacher, leader of the socialist party," writes Middleton on September 29, "looms large both in the coming debate on integration with the West and in the present debate on the unity issue. He has been discounted by the United States and the French High Commissions as untrustworthy and a demagogue; but it has been apparent in the last two weeks that his power is greater than either the Americans or the French have realized. [Note: the British, it appears, were not prey to the same illusions, for he does not mention them.—G. N.] It was Schumacher's socialist party that took and held the initiative in answering the Soviet offers by proposing a city-wide election in Berlin. That has provided the Bundestag with a positive preliminary approach to the issue of nation-wide unification."

Later in the same dispatch Middleton states that Adenauer has been helped in his efforts to restore greater independence to Germany "by the almost pathological fear on the part of some of the occupation powers that if his requests were not met Germany would either fall to Dr. Schumacher or drift along into a fatuous neutrality more helpful to the Soviet Union than to the Western Powers."

Needless to say, LABOR ACTION holds no brief for all of the policies of the German Social-Democratic Party. Our criticisms have been stated, and we will no doubt find other occasions on which to elaborate them further. Yet it is precisely that which instills an "almost pathological fear" in "some of the occupation powers" which we find most admirable in his approach. That is what is called his "nationalism," i.e., his determination to struggle for the full national sovereignty of his occupied country.

## NATIONALISM

In recent weeks there has been an alarming growth of militarist and chauvinist organizations in Germany. The German generals are forming "veterans" organizations with an openly reactionary and militarist program. They feel that as long as the Americans are seeking to "integrate German manpower into the defense of Europe" as their prime policy, the day of the return of the military to a key position in German political life is not far off. Their politics are, of course, utterly reactionary; their ideology is completely chauvinist.

The nationalism of the Social-Democratic Party is of an entirely different character from the nationalism of the generals and their industrialist supporters. In fact, it is the policy best calculated to keeping these gentry from achieving their goals. For it recognizes and enlists the legitimate aspiration of the German people for national independence and self-determination in the fullest sense, while at the same time giving expression to their desire for both political and economic democracy.

And the American government's reaction to the new feeling of self-confidence of the German people as it expresses itself in their growing support of the Social-Democracy's demand for uniting Germany, for greater independence from American control, is quite typical. In the first place it is so "American" that it can see in this only an obstacle to the pet plan for immediate "integration" into the West. And to the extent that it can even think beyond its simple formula for defeating Stalinism by increasing the military power arrayed against it, the American government has only a near pathological fear of the most consistently democratic and the most effectively anti-fascist and anti-Stalinist force in Germany.

## FROM THE ICFTU INDICTMENT—

# CAMPS OF THE LIVING DEAD

Last week we carried one excerpt from the pamphlet "Stalin's Slave Camps," published by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, dealing with the "uranium slaves" in East Germany.

The following report is that of a medical doctor who was a prisoner in one of the camps in the uranium area in Jachymov, Czechoslovakia, which was quoted in the pamphlet:

General malnutrition causes blood diseases and lack of resistance to infection. Every second prisoner is suffering from either a rash, boils (furunculosis), carbuncles, lichen, scabies or diseases of the eyes. The heavy work to which very few of the inmates are accustomed—as they are mainly former lawyers, teachers, journalists, priests, politicians, officers, business people, industrialists or white collar workers—causes ruptures which cannot be treated and trusses are not available. Cases of inguinal hernia (in Czech *soukove kyly*) among those over fifty are not infrequent and I have examined some where the ruptures reach the knees. Not even in these circumstances is the prisoner allowed relief from work.

## DISEASE RAVAGES

Health conditions in general are deplorable. It is obvious that the exhausted human organism suffers especially during underground work. There are mass appearances of chronic inflammations of the respiratory tract, developing to asthmatic trouble and other complications. Cases of consumption are numerous. In the camp adjoining the "Slavkov" uranium pit, about 30 per cent of the inmates are suffering from tuberculosis, as far as I could ascertain. This situation is worsened by numerous accidents, and injuries caused by shooting—a regular feature during the nights.

After the evening signal by gongs made of old gun ammunition, no one is allowed to leave the barracks for any reason whatever, even during epidemics of enteric fever, and on such occasions the atmosphere of despair in the barracks is unbearable. The guards are brutal and sometimes beat the prisoners who live in constant fear and some on the verge of mental derangement.

The seven-day work week and the so-called off duty time which is filled with voluntary brigades for such tasks as peeling potatoes, shifting coal, building camp roads, etc., result in pitiful hide and seek between the inmates and the guards but there is usually no escape.

## IMAGE OF HELL

Further deterioration of health conditions is caused by the complete lack of hygienic and sanitary arrangements. Barracks are overcrowded beyond description. At the sounding of reveille, half the occupants leave the barracks because there is no space for them to dress. Washing is limited to those who can grab a little water, of which there is almost none. They must wash in the same tins which they use for their food. Breakfast is usually ersatz coffee and sometimes bread. At 6 a.m. there is roll call lasting about an hour in all kinds of weather. Guards and staff run about madly, because usually they count the wrong number. They swear, slap and kick the prisoners and the peak is reached when the lories arrive to take the prisoners to their jobs. With the assistance of the police, the lories are filled and they resemble loads of wooden blocks more than a human transport. Each lorry is accompanied by several guards with machine guns (an exact replica of a transport to place of execution). In January last, one lorry traveling at full speed lost its side-wall. Twelve people fell out and suffered extensive injuries.

There is no instruction on

avoiding injuries while at work underground and fractures of the skull are frequent.

## "BROTHERHOOD!"

The latest reorganization of the camp system has allocated a new task to the central Vyckmanov camp. It has become a labor depot for work carried out on the surface, while the camp "Bratrstvi" (Brotherhood!) is the pool for underground labor. Prisoners who are too old or who have been worked to exhaustion are now concentrated in Vyckmanov, as they are unable to fulfill the norms demanded in the pits. Formerly, they were sent to forced labor camps in other parts of the country. But now no illness can bring relief. The camp is the center of the unwanted, who find liberation only in death.

Many of the dreadful conditions could be corrected or improved without difficulty, if the camp authorities were interested. But it is obvious that these camps are in fact extermination camps and every fatality is replaced by five others sentenced by the Peoples Courts. The camps, formerly described as being used for the re-education of political opponents, have become a tool of the class warfare, with the aim of liquidating class-enemies.

## Get ALL your books

from  
Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

We can supply you!

## 1948 BOUND VOLUMES of LABOR ACTION and The NEW INTERNATIONAL

Labor Action: bound in heavy cardboard covers. \$3.00  
New International: attractively bound in red cloth, with index ..... \$4.00

• Combination offer: both for \$6.00

Cash orders only. Make out checks to:

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS  
114 West 14 Street, New York City