

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 14, 1952

FIVE CENTS

Stalinist Anti-Semitism in Czechia ... page 6

God, Man, and Buckley at Yale ... page 5

A 'Liberal' Rationale for Franco ... page 4

Jim Crow Repeats—Truman Doesn't ... page 6

Lynn to Tour Country on Reynolds Case

Conrad J. Lynn, counsel for the Ruth Reynolds Defense Committee, will tour the Midwest this month and hold meetings telling Americans about this case and calling for assistance in the appeal of her conviction.

Ruth Reynolds, a well-known American pacifist, was arrested and convicted of conspiracy to overthrow the government in Puerto Rico during the aftermath of the Nationalist Party's struggle. It coincided with the drive against that party. Conviction was based on the terms of the island's "Little Smith Act."

Since Miss Reynolds was not a member of the Nationalist Party but merely friendly to it and many of its members, a separate defense committee has been organized for her. Headed by A. J. Muste of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Defense Committee includes among others Dr. Rachel D. DuBois, Thelma Mielke, chairman, and Julius Eichel, treasurer.

TOUR SCHEDULE

Lynn's tour schedule follows. Branches of the ISL and SYL are asked to attend the Lynn meetings and to assist in making successful this activity in support of the democratic rights of Miss Reynolds.

| | |
|----------------------|--------------|
| Toledo, Ohio | Jan. 2, 3 |
| Chicago, Ill. | Jan. 4, 5, 6 |
| Twin Cities, Minn. | Jan. 7, 8, 9 |
| Madison, Wis. | Jan. 10 |
| Yellow Springs, Ohio | Jan. 11, 12 |
| Wilberforce, Ohio | Jan. 13, 14 |
| Dayton, Ohio | Jan. 15 |
| New Haven, Conn. | Jan. 18 |
| Cleveland, Ohio | Jan. 20, 21 |
| Oberlin, Ohio | Jan. 22 |
| Washington, D. C. | Jan. 23, 24 |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | Jan. 25, 27 |

Ho Chi Minh's Terror Regime

Next week's **LABOR ACTION** features a first-hand account of what is really going on behind the lines in the Stalinist sections of Indo-China. It is by N. Van, an Indo-Chinese socialist, presently residing in Europe, who participated in the revolutionary struggle in his own country. Don't miss it.

Truman Message: War and Taxes—'Fair Deal' on Shelf for the Duration

By PHILIP COBEN

The biggest compliment that could have been paid to President Truman's State of the Union message would have been: a spirited and indignant attack upon it by his opposition from the right, the Taft Republicans and the Dixiecrats. It would at least have meant that he had said something.

The truest commentary on it is, in fact, the absence of any such reaction, as we go to press the day after.

When Senator Taft yawned just as Truman reached one of his would-be oratorical crescendos, we sympathize with him, if not with his politics.

Of course, Republican congressmen gave reporters their formally hostile quotes, and the attack will come—this is an election

year—but the only audible comment from Mr. Republican himself, immediately afterward, was a snidely approving one, which will deserve mention.

Whatever factitious denunciations the GOP leaders manage to work up in the next few days, they have real cause to be grateful.

While their own comments clearly show they know the reason why, a reading of Truman's message will equally enlighten anyone who was not at a radio. It is the docu-

ment of a man who has nothing to say, or who wishes to say nothing. Truman did not get his votes that way in 1948, and the Republicans know that Golden Rule exhortations will not beat them in 1952.

It may be that the State of the Union message which is annually required of the president is degenerating into a meaningless formality. If so, it is a sad reflection of what is happening to democracy. For the people have a right to expect that their elected leader should use this occasion to tell them what he proposes to do, what his ideas are, what his policies will be, what his program is. Instead the mouthpiece of the more intelligent Republicans, the *New York Herald Tribune*, is surely right when it seizes the opportunity to dismiss the mes-

(Turn to last page)

SPEECHIFIED



Eisenhower's Brass Hat in the Ring

By MARY BELL

From the *New York Times* and the *Herald Tribune*, cheers; from the *Daily News*, chronically opposed to all "global weepers," wait-and-see; from the *Daily Mirror*, welcome with reservations; from the Truman-inclined Post, a discreet query, "Who Is Ike?"; from the Luce publications, a blank check already made out; from Senator Taft, purely

formal welcome; from Warren and Stassen, welcome with foreknowledge of the heavy possibility that their delegations will be pooled with that of Senator Lodge; from the Taftite Chicago Tribune, the epithet of "Pig in a Poke." These were the first reactions to the final confirmation by General Dwight Eisenhower that he is a willing candidate for the Republican nomination. The leadership of the labor movement, which has had varying positions on Eisenhower, has not committed itself.

accept the Democratic nomination? The labor leaders can scarcely forget that a few years ago in the dog days of the Democratic campaign before their 1948 convention, they proposed Eisenhower as the Democratic candidate.

For the Republican backers of Eisenhower—the "internationalist" wing of the party—this ambiguity is one of the virtues of Eisenhower's candidacy. They hope it will enable them to capture the sizable free-floating independent voters if Eisenhower emerges as the nominee for the presidency. For many Republicans, it is a question of having a crack at the White House and the spoils of office, a chance they have not had since 1933.

But for the leaders of the Eisenhower campaign, chiefly on the East and West Coasts, it is a question of stopping Taft. Their agreement is mainly on "internationalist" foreign policy as opposed to the "nationalist," ultra-

conservative, Midwest isolationism which animates the Taft supporters. The cohesiveness of this desperate group, except at election time and except on support of Eisenhower, is weakness. Taft has an important grip on the party machine and has stated that if the pledges of support he now holds remain firm, he is assured of the Republican nomination.

There is a deep schism in the Republican Party based upon different special interests and convictions. Yet Taft's "isolationism" is capable of opportunistic distortion as shown in some of his

(Turn to last page)

The UAW Unemployment Crisis: Will It Shake Reuther's Control?

By WALTER JASON

As the grave unemployment crisis sharpens in the auto industry, its reflection in the structure, functioning and political relationships within the United Auto Workers (CIO) provides material for worthwhile analysis.

Contrary to many first-hand but superficial judgments, the sum-total result of the failures, inadequacies and groping of the Reuther leadership in this crisis does

not weaken its grip on the union but rather strengthens its hold on the vast union structure and organization.

(Historically, the triumph of a bureaucracy through its very failure of leadership is nothing new to students of world politics. Stalin's betrayal of the Chinese and German revolutions destroyed the revolutionary movement but also did furnish a basis for the triumph of Stalinism.)

In baldest form, the unemployment crisis in the Michigan area of the auto industry weakens precisely those centers of opposition to the Reuther regime. Take the once-powerful Ford Local 600: Its

voting strength once numbered 70,000. It may be less than half of that by the next convention.

In the place of old, large, powerful and experienced local union leadership, in major politicalized auto union centers, the shifting of work to other new plants also partly shifts the organizational basis of the UAW. The UAW may lose 200,000 members in Michigan but will pick them up, sooner or later in new plants. In this fresh milieu, the hold of the international union over the local is very much stronger.

In the Detroit-Flint area, the international representatives do not play a decisive role in the lo-

(Continued on page 2)

'Me First—To Hell with the Other Guy!'— Reuther Tags Along with GM's 'Solution'

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Jan. 1 — If it were not for the tragic plight of the 200,000 unemployed auto workers involved, the top-level conferences and resulting statements by Washington officials, auto industry spokesmen, and the leadership of the United Auto Workers (CIO) would provide the greatest three-ring circus of comedy for the years 1951-52.

Surely, the joke of the year is the spectacle of the greatest profit-making corporation in the world, with the fattest war contracts, amounting to billions of dollars, and with a guaranteed profit for the next five years, screaming that it is being discriminated against by the government that gave it the contracts. The corporation is General Motors, of course. Its public blast against the railroads, the oil companies, and the power companies for building new plants when the steel could have been used to build more automobiles—at a greater profit—simply shows that a profiteering pig is never satisfied.

CRAZY ECONOMICS

With an oil crisis in the Middle East that jeopardizes the supply of oil, General Motors is sore because the government is urging and aiding oil companies to find more supplies of oil! The railroad companies, a basic industry in wartime, are blasted for rushing to make themselves equal to any task ahead. The power companies also are preparing for grave emergencies ahead. What's General Motors' contribution to the defense of its system, capitalism? It wants to build more cars, make more profit. Its 4 billion dollar war contracts, and 2-million car market for 1952 isn't enough; it is being discriminated against!

Besides the other auto corporations, General Motors has a staunch ally in its fight for more steel. Like any good AFL business agent who wants to see that "his company" gets all the business, Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, vigorously joins in the demand of the auto companies for more steel.

Senator Blair Moody of Michigan adds his bit to the crazy economics involved in this dispute by suggesting that Ford shut down its Chicago and other outstate plants and return the work to Michigan. A proposal that must excite the Chicago UAW workers to a frenzy of enthusiasm!

LOST IN THE JUNGLE

Other CIO union leaders, not to mention AFL leaders, cannot be very anxious to help Walter Reuther see that steel is kept from the industries in which they have contracts and reassigned to Michigan, so that Reuther doesn't have the unemployed on his neck for the next year. . . .

What the unemployment crisis in Michigan has done is laid bare the jungle character of capitalist economics, and the utter futility of any activities of a pro-capitalist-minded union leadership to contribute any ideas of merit to an-

swer the problems—except the stock capitalist idea: "Me first, the hell with the other guy!" Is it a wonder that John L. Lewis, who practices this philosophy without any hypocritical flourishes, scorns the "intellectual pygmies" of certain other unions?

Basically, the whole fight now centering around war work in Michigan and the growing unemployment is a case of trying to lock the barn after the horse has been stolen.

Under the original and tenable military plan of dispersal of war industries insofar as possible, and the creation of new, effective, and efficient low-cost new plants, the auto companies built new plants outside of Michigan, with the juicy incentive of tax reductions which give them the plants in five years, free of any real cost. This is a standard practice of capitalism. The Detroit auto workers are seeing how it works.

GUNS AND BUTTER?

Not only was this sound from a military point of view—one has only to think what an atom bomb would do to Detroit, concentrated into a great war work center as in 1942-45—but it signified a great saving to the government in building war products. The military do not want to build tanks in Detroit Chrysler plants, for example, when they can get labor 50 to 75 cents an hour cheaper at the New Orleans plant. That's the way they think.

Surely such a social outlook and such "patriotism" must be called into question. But how can Reuther and the UAW leadership answer this argument? They print a full-page advertisement in Detroit's paper last week to inform the world that the "UAW-CIO Leads the Fight Against Layoffs!" The essence of the argument is that they repeatedly proposed a set of ideas that they hoped would mean "Guns and Butter."

They ignore the fact that 40 million autos on the road now, plus an estimated production of 4 million for 1952, is all of that kind of "butter" that American economy needs, as it prepares for war.

The UAW leaders cannot argue, as Aneurin Bevan did in England, that butter should come before guns. They are committed to the war program, even if they don't say so in the Detroit advertisements.

NO QUARTERBACK

It's interesting to note the difference between their line in the Detroit papers, addressed to the auto workers, and Reuther's letter in the December 31 issue of Newsweek magazine.

There Reuther says: "When and if we get to the point where the flow of materials and manpower into civilian production is interfering with defense production, it is our position that the defense program must be given first consideration and civilian production must be curtailed."

Reuther's escape clause from that commitment is: "But we are not yet at that point. In fact we are a long way from it."

In his noble but futile efforts to make capitalism work, Reuther runs into the hard fact that he is indeed not a quarterback—as his advertisement puts it, "We are not Monday morning quarterbacks"—but simply a waterboy in the ball game.

That he has begun to recognize his limitations is shown in the significant statement in the Detroit papers where the UAW urges a harmony of defense and civilian production as the key to the answer to unemployment during dislocations and transfer to war work. "Such a dovetailing of defense and civilian production work is not an easy matter and it will involve certain technical and operational difficulties."

"We in the UAW-CIO are confident, however, that if management will apply its much publicized technical know-how and ingenuity the job can be done." Did any AFL business agent ever make a more flattering comment on the abilities of his bosses than that? Even the auto barons must have done a quick double-check when they saw that statement in print.

Suppose the auto corporations reply, as they have in the past: "Sorry, Walter, you flatter us too much. It just isn't economical to dovetail production the way you'd like." How can he reply?

IT'S THE LINE

Suppose the military say that the UAW insistence on slowdown of war production reduces the "margin of safety" necessary for potential war with Russia; that "we are not a long way from it, but close"—what reply can he give?

Reuther is not less talented, smart, shrewd, or anything else than he used to be. His "line" is what puts him and the UAW leadership in trouble. For he is committed lock, stock and barrel to the build-up of American capitalism for war with Russia. His difficulty is that the ranks of his union,

above all, the unemployed auto workers, aren't sold on that line by a long shot. Especially since industry is running hog wild on a profit spree from both civilian and war production!

The UAW leadership doesn't dare tell the ranks in the Michigan area about the wage-differential pattern set up by the Wage Stabilization Board, which guarantees lower wages in war production work elsewhere; and that the trend away from Detroit will continue while this economic factor operates.

The UAW leadership demands that Congress increase unemployment compensation allotments to boost payments to Michigan's unemployed. Since unemployment benefits for married men with families are as high as weekly wages in many Southern plants, it is very unlikely that Congress will ever do any such thing.

Here, the failure of the CIO drive to organize the South, the failure of the UAW to have nationwide contracts, with equal pay for equal work on a national basis, create other economic endowments for industry to do as much work elsewhere as possible. Another whole aspect of the unemployment problem hasn't even been touched by the UAW officials.

Even with 100,000 unemployed auto workers for six months in 1951, the industry had its second greatest production year in history. It totaled about 6 million vehicles. What about that kind of unemployment, which is inherent under capitalism?

WORSE BEFORE BETTER

How many of the unemployed are permanently displaced not by lack of steel but by technological improvements? One major manufacturer reduced his motor and machine division manpower by 25 per cent this last year, through new automatic machinery which helps build a far better motor, at far less cost and manpower.

It is a fact that the auto industry could produce even 5 million vehicles in 1952 with 200,000 fewer workers than they employed in 1951. Part of the whole circus on civilian-war production arguments here is an evasion of the problem of unemployment in the auto industry.

There is nothing to suggest that in the coming months, the UAW is going to work out any program that in reality will begin to solve the crisis here. Rather, it appears likely that things will get much worse before they get better in Michigan.

Unemployment Crisis — —

(Continued from page 1)

cal unions openly. In the outstate industries, they are often more important than local union leadership in negotiations. They serve as the "buffer" between the local union and the company. This trend increases especially in this period where local unions find themselves impotent in the face of major problems, dealing with local managements of huge companies, and with a rank and file worried about jobs above everything else.

The first effects of the "depression psychosis" in the auto shops now is not militant anger but rather fear based on insecurity. The mad scramble over exercise of "seniority rights" during layoffs serves to point up this phenomenon. In the period of relative prosperity, subsidiary agreements on seniority rights, building of "fences" in divisions and departments, was permitted to go unchallenged because the whole problem of seniority had a sort of abstract character.

COMPANY TAUNT

Now, many workers with far greater seniority than others find themselves unemployed, because of all the qualifying clauses in many contracts which permitted seniority to be exercised either by departments, divisions or plant-wide. Women workers, of course, are the first victims of this kind of agreements. In Detroit some plants have laid off women with 9 years' seniority, while men with one year remain on the job.

Perhaps the cruelest and most pointed example of the snafu on this question is the one occurring in the plants of a corporation which does get some defense work or work from another section of the corporation. Local union officials, pressed by their own rank and file, resist any attempt to apply the principle of corporation-wide seniority. The workers themselves resist any union efforts to get employees with more seniority into their plant. The question is put this way: "Why let a man with ten years come into our plant when this means I'll be laid off before him?"

In the workers' less than ten years' seniority. It is a fact that corporation

officials taunt union representatives on this point in negotiations. This important product of mass unemployment never reaches the public press but it is a heavy factor within the shops and the plant bargaining structures.

The floundering of the union on this vital issue—and this is a basic principle of unionism—shows how far the UAW has retrogressed in the crisis.

OPPOSITION'S PROBLEMS

Among the secondary leaders in the UAW, as many of them become demoralized under these pressures as become angry to the point of wanting to do something about it. The realization that the Reuther leadership has been unable to do anything really effective in this crisis certainly lessens its popularity, arouses skepticism and cynicism, but the mood of bitterness and opposition does not necessarily go any further.

Certainly, critics receive closer attention and better hearing. But the relative impotence of the entire union in this crisis—given the basic program of the union—weighs more heavily on the secondary leaders than the attraction of new ideas.

As a matter of fact—when the sound and fury of the Stellato opposition is grasped for what it is—Ford Local 600 is not able to do anything about its acute problems. The Ford plants in Chicago, Buffalo and Cleveland may expand and expand, the UAW may regain its lost membership elsewhere, but that doesn't offer much consolation to the UAW oppositions whose base grows smaller under their feet.

Secondary leaders also have two other problems besides the shifting moods of the ranks to contend with. The international union is now a vast, powerful, financially strong organization, greater than ever in UAW history. It has become a monolithic structure under the shrewd leadership of Reuther. "Taking on" the international is something different now than in the old days.

Even such a powerful movement as the "Rank and File Caucus" during World War II lived under an unstable regime, in which two major factions were still contending for power, and one of them—the Reuther faction

served in its own way as a protective covering for the militants. This kind of relationship is no longer possible.

The other ever-increasing factor is the role of the companies themselves. Can anyone imagine Ford firing 32 active union leaders for ten years, as they have at the Windsor plant, knowing in advance that all the union would do about it is force the local union to accept arbitration of this issue?

BUT 1952 IS AHEAD

And in other companies, the gradual "knocking off" of aggressive chief stewards and committeemen for "contract violations" has continued with the obvious effect that being careful grows into a necessary tactic for the once militant shop leaderships. There isn't a shop committee in the Chrysler setup, for example, that isn't reminded weekly that the chairman of the shop committee of the biggest local union, Dodge, still remains fired. Is it a wonder that the struggle against speedup has petered out in many plants?

These are some of the factors operating to give the Reuther leadership its confidence that it can ride safely through the stormy days ahead.

Where the rank and file will "get even" with the leadership is not so much in the inevitable but not too significant local union election contests next May, but in the coming national and state elections in the fall of 1952.

Here, the Reuther leadership seems to realize that its political influence is at a very low ebb. There isn't much, if any, confidence that it can help "save" its political allies like Governor Williams or Senator Blair Moody. The pessimistic mood of the UAW politicians in the Democratic Party is too obvious for anyone to deny or hide.

The trend of the UAW, or more exactly its retrogression, toward becoming "just another union" continues apace in this over-all atmosphere. The star of Walter Reuther may become even dimmer. This is not important. What is very regrettable is that the UAW, as the vanguard union of America, is in danger of also losing its luster.

Churchill Visit: Symbol of Britain's Decline

By GORDON HASKELL

Winston Churchill is now 77 years old. His long years of life, and the extraordinary speed with which historic events develop in our day have made it possible for him to incorporate in his own person the two roles described in Marx's aphorism:

"Hegel says somewhere that all great historic facts and personalities recur twice. He forgot to add: 'Once as tragedy, and again as farce.'" (Karl Marx, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.)

The announced purpose of Churchill's visit to Washington was to re-establish the relations between the British and American governments which prevailed during the Second World War; or in Churchill's own words, to "establish that close and intimate understanding" through which President Roosevelt and he were able to make the major decisions affecting the fate of the world.

Churchill is more or less the same man he was then, he holds the same office, and he set out to visit the same city. But the results were not and could not have been the same, for everything but the pantomime had changed. What had changed fundamentally was the relationship of the power represented by Britain and the British Empire to that of the United States and the rest of the world.

JUNIOR PARTNER

The change was becoming apparent during the Second World War, but it had not been completed. Although Britain needed a vast outpouring of American materials and arms in order to fight effectively, she was able to make an over-all contribution to the joint war effort which was indispensable to allied victory. Her soldiers, and those of the commonwealth and empire, fought on the battlefields from Burma to Europe. Her sea and air fleets kept Hitler across the channel and retained control, even though precarious, of the Mediterranean. Her political and economic ties were indispensable in maintaining the alliance or at least benevolent neutrality of much of the world toward the Allied camp.

Today most, if not all, of that has changed. Britain is still America's closest and most certain ally. But the moral blow delivered the empire in the last war has reduced her from a position of relative equality in the alliance to one of a very definite

junior partner, if the relationship can be called a partnership at all.

For the United States, much of the old British Empire and area of influence is a political liability, even if it remains an economic and strategic necessity. In Malaya, Britain is hardly able to hang on by the skin of her teeth under circumstances which are amassing an enormous political capital for Stalinism in Asia. In the Middle East, Britain's attempts to retain her old position in the old way are leading to one political disaster after another. In Africa, Britain's continued rule is leading inevitably to its day of reckoning, hastened measurably by the brutal behavior of the South African government toward its native and colored majority. And even in Europe, the British government's determination to stand aloof from the efforts of the Continental governments to bring some degree of unity into their economic and military affairs stands as a hindrance to the American government's designs for the area.

NO HEIR

To all this must be added Britain's own domestic economic plight. Despite the inroads of the former Labor government on the citadels of private enterprise in Britain, the country still is a bastion of world capitalism. As banker for the sterling area, as one of the great importers and exporters of goods on the world capitalist market, Britain is essential part of the capitalist system which America is seeking to perpetuate. But her economy has been dealt such terrible blows by the war that it is now evident

that it cannot continue as a viable capitalist organism without constant support from across the sea.

The United States cannot simply fall heir to Britain's former position in the world. That position was based on a growing and thriving world capitalism, in which Britain was able to take the lion's share. Today the whole capitalist world is disintegrating. And although the United States now enjoys a relative strength which far surpasses anything achieved by Britain at the height of her imperialist power, that relative strength is based not on the health of world capitalism but on its universal decay.

Thus Churchill came to Washington as the poor relative who seeks aid from his wealthy kin for the salvation of a bankrupt enterprise. Although this enterprise is no longer solvent, its affairs are so intertwined with those of the rich relative that its complete ruin would have the gravest consequences for both of them. This knowledge assured Churchill that he would not be turned away from the door. But at the same time, it meant that the American government is in a position to dictate the terms on which the enterprise will be kept more or less afloat.

HEAT'S ON AT HOME

There is another factor which makes Churchill's visit this time a hollow show. During the war, both he and Roosevelt enjoyed solid domestic political positions. Churchill was the head of a national government in which Labor had virtually given up its oppositional role. Roosevelt had also been able to all but neutralize the

Republicans. But today Churchill heads a party which got a smaller popular vote than did Labor, and the latter remains in hostile opposition. And the Democrats face the most difficult political battle of their 20-year rule.

Although this factor is far less vital than the world conditions in which Churchill's visit takes place, it too will have a definite influence on the negotiations. Every step taken by the Truman government in foreign affairs must be made with one eye on its possible electoral consequences. And there is no doubt that the Republicans are able to make capital out of the reluctance of the American people to bear the economic burdens of propping up the British Empire and the rest of the capitalist world.

The real tragedy of which Churchill's visit is a symbol does not lie in the collapse of the British Empire, nor in the political instability of the governments which he and Truman head, but in the absence both here and in Britain of a political opposition armed with a program which is capable of challenging their leadership from a progressive standpoint, particularly in foreign affairs.

Both the British and American labor movements stand committed to the essentially reactionary foreign policies of their governments, though the former has at least created the political instrument with which it is capable of challenging its rulers. But unless this capacity is transformed into an actuality, both Britain and the United States will continue to revolve in the ever narrowing circle of the world-wide decline of capitalism.

London Letter

Little to Cheer At Turn of Year

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 1.—The difference between the standard of living of the American worker and British worker is, of course, well known. The former has his financial worries, but (in most cases, and as long as he is employed) he does not have to worry whether he will be able to pay the rent, buy the rations AND buy a suit of clothes. The latter's chief worry may be that he cannot buy a pair of socks.

We can sum up this difference in a cold economic way by saying that the American economy is the top dog in the capitalist world, whereas most West Europeans live in semi-bankrupt, overcrowded, decaying systems which have had to call in the trade unions to keep them together.

All that is, in a roundabout way, apropos of our Christmas celebrations. To put on a decent show for our families, our visitors and the 20,000 American soldiers meant a great deal of effort. National savings showed an annual slump far more severe than previous years. Forty thousand students took fortnight jobs with the post office; miners worked overtime, etc. As prices go higher, presents become even more rubbishy. Christmas cards are only one sheet now; in fact, some friends of mine spent a Sunday afternoon doctoring last year's Christmas cards for this year's use.

Still, when it did come, everyone had a very happy and peaceful Christmas. They may even have forgotten about the prospective cuts in the food rations and dissolved troubles in a drink with the next door neighbors. They listened tolerantly and goodhumoredly to the king's broadcast, delivered in a hoarse voice to a happily inebriated audience, and saying nothing. A few people were thinking of Korea, and the "Gloucesters" who have just returned from there were the national heroes.

Few may have noticed a forecast that the cost of living would go up one point a month next year. Few may have been thinking of war, of dollar balances, or even of Vishinsky; so that it was with unrealistically little apprehension that the British people prepared for the turning of the year.

THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY on the HOME FRONT

Attorney General Quietly Readies McCarran Concentration Camps

By MEL HACKER

Attorney General McGrath is quietly taking the first steps toward setting up detention camps for "subversives" in this country. Federal prisoners, under the direction of James V. Bennett, director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, are at work converting a military airport at Wickenburg, Arizona, and two World War II prisoner of war camps at Florence, Arizona, and El Reno, Oklahoma, into detention camps with a capacity of 3000 persons. The McCarran Act charges the attorney general with the responsibility for rounding up and holding all persons likely to commit sabotage or espionage in case of war. "Reasonable grounds" for detention include membership in the Communist Party.

Here is another impressive reason for repealing the notorious McCarran Act. These concentration camps are aimed at intimidating critics of America's cold-war policy. The use of non-unionized, low-paid prison labor to construct these camps is a fitting commentary on their nature.

organizations are subject to dismissal from the public school system.

Thus, the private lives of a state's teachers are subject to a political inquisition by the Board of Regents. The opinions of the members of this board on who is subversive are private, not subject to open hearings.

Thought-control requires a robot-like orthodoxy. New York's teachers are being terrorized into a blank, empty conformity to our most provincial and reactionary prejudices, to an utter, unquestioning subservience before the big sticks of the cold war. Supreme Court decisions can merely blunt the power of thought control. This menace can only be stopped by the powerful protests of parent-teacher organizations and the labor union movement.

CHILD LABOR

Eight states lowered or relaxed child-labor standards during 1951 while only five states raised them. Indiana and Ohio passed "emergency acts" relaxing night-work standards for girls 16 and over. Wisconsin lowered the minimum age for house-to-house street work from 13 to 12 during the life of the Selective Service Act. Utah lowered the minimum age from 16 to 14 for work outside of school hours. North Carolina legalized work by girls 17 until 10:30 p.m. as ticket takers in movie houses. Alaska suspended the 8-hour day and the 40-hour week for child labor during vacations and lowered from 18 to 16 the age at which a girl may be employed in a restaurant. Gains included age-certification requirements, minimum age provisions and employer liabilities in accidents of children illegally employed in several states.

The relaxation of child-labor laws certainly seems to be a gain for American capitalism. It allows for a greater labor supply,



BOUND VOLUMES
of
LABOR ACTION
1945 to 1949
\$3 a volume
Labor Action Book Service
114 W. 14 St., New York 11, N. Y.

**Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION**
A sub is only \$2 a year!

**Marxism
in the
United
States**
By LEON TROTSKY
35 Cents Order from
Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

**SYL
BOOK
BAZAAR**
Phenomenal
Bargains!
Friday evening
February 1
at LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 St., N. Y. C.

**The Handy Way
To Subscribe!**

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:
 NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME (please print)
ADDRESS
.....
.....
ZONE APT.
CITY
STATE

Bill me.
 Payment enclosed.

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 world-wide 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!

YOU and SCIENCE

AAAS Puts New Stress on Social Angle

By CARL DARTON

During the week between Christmas and New Year's, the representatives of about 50,000 American scientists participated, at Philadelphia, in the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Members of over 200 affiliated and associated societies contributed papers on the whole breadth of the physical sciences from astronomy to zoology, as well as the human sciences from anthropology to sociology.

Most of the estimated 1500 papers presented were of a highly technical and specialized nature, and of interest only to the small membership of each society. However, such has been the pressure of events upon even a predominantly academic group such as the AAAS that this year, more than ever previously, there were a goodly number of talks and discussions on subjects reflecting the precarious position of science in society today. In fact, it was not physically possible for one reporter to cover all those of social significance.

It is apparent that the war economy (bringing dependence of science on subsidization by government contracts and restrictions on its traditional freedoms) has irrevocably forced the scientists to come down from their ivory tower. Like it or not, the scientists can no longer close their eyes to such subjects as politics in science and the social responsibility of their actions.

The theme of the present convention was set several months ago by the re-evaluation of the general policy of the AAAS by its executive committee. The following statement from this policy clearly indicates the new direction:

"In view of the present size and complexity of science, in view of the seriousness and importance of the relation of science to society, and in view of the unique inclusiveness of the AAAS, it seems clear that this organization should devote less of its energies to the more detailed and more isolated technical aspects of science, and devote more of its energies to broad problems that involve the whole of science, the relations of science to government, and indeed the relations of science to our society as a whole."

Accordingly, at the meeting in Philadelphia, the executive committee did not waste any time in implementing its policy of greater social awareness. One of its most important resolutions was that condemning the McCarran Act, which has greatly restricted the travel of scientists to and from this country.

Worried about Anti-Scientific Trends

Likewise, Dr. Kirtley Mather, president of the AAAS, before a session on "Anti-Scientific Trends in America," charged that "there is an organized movement to impose thought control upon the United States," and he called upon scientists to make an organized effort to defeat it. As further evidence of their feelings they selected as their president-elect Dr. E. U. Condon, formerly director of the U. S. Bureau of Standards, one of the most "McCarthy-maligned" government scientists of the recent period. Dr. Condon has since left the government for private industry.

A mere listing of other subjects of social interest at the meeting would be quite lengthy. Russian science received the attention of at least ten speakers, and although none actually said (as erroneously headlined in a Philadelphia newspaper) that "Red Scientists are Slaves," the concern for the crass political manipulation of science in Russia was evident. Most of the speakers on this subject were undoubtedly influenced by the heady wine of patriotism and with one exception entirely overlooked the fact that many of the criticisms of Russian science applied also to this country.

Another interesting session was on "Anti-Scientific Trends in America," which discussed the harmful effects of nationalism on science as well as the acceptance of pseudo-science by the American public, as evidenced by the popularity of Velikovsky's *Worlds in Collision* and the spread of the dianetics fad. Other subjects were "The Individual Responsibility of the Scientist," "National Security and Freedom of Thought," and "Difficulties Experienced by Scientists in Obtaining Passports and Visas from the Department of State."

To this observer at least, it is of significance that the pattern of restrictions on scientists and their struggles against it tend to follow the same lines as the labor movement. We do not believe it too utopian to consider that both movements could gain something by linking part of their forces.

YOU ARE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of LABOR ACTION, "Readers Take the Floor." Our policy is to publish all letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words. Letters must be signed; names withheld on request.

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 2 January 14, 1952

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WALKINS 4-4222. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) 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.

Editor: HAL DRAPER
Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIX

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

WORD WAR III—OR NEXT WEEK'S MOVIE? by E. R. Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, November.

This lead editorial gives some pointed comments on the notorious *Collier's* article previewing World War III. It aptly refers to a cartoon in a recent issue of the *Bulletin* picturing "two broadcasters, wearing gas masks and asbestos clothing, amidst the ruins of a destroyed city. After announcing that 'the end of our civilization is at hand,' they wish everybody goodnight 'on behalf of the Pure Oil Company.'"

The editorial then proceeds to write that the *Collier's* issue, rather than preventing war, is more likely to provide the Russian leaders with "authentic material for propaganda against 'American warmongers.' What can be more welcome to Soviet propagandists than a whole-page picture of the atomic destruction of Moscow?"

The *Bulletin* also emphasizes that the Russian and European intellectuals are not likely to be impressed by the possibility of American culture imposed on them in the form of Russian editions of *Collier's*, the *Saturday Evening Post* and *Life*. To quote further: "Quite apart from the ingenuity or silliness of the forecasts—which

vary strongly from story to story—the whole idea of presenting a preview of World War III, squeezed between advertisements of new cars, women's lingerie, and alcoholic beverages, strikes one as the acme of bad taste. The display of gory pictures seems aimed at making the issue a splash hit with the host of lovers of gruesome fantasies, while sufficient sentimental love-interest is injected to appeal, in accordance with established rules of successful journalism, to female readers bored by political and strategic speculations.

It is further added that the issue will not accomplish its avowed purpose of helping to prevent a Third World War. "Rather, the impression (abroad) will be that Americans relish imagining the next war and do not feel the horror at the prospects which seizes people in Europe at the very mention of it. As to those behind the Iron Curtain, they will never see the magazine nor be told that its title is 'The War We Did Not Want'; but they are likely to be served a full dose of quotations and pictures from it, likely to stimulate fear and hatred of America."

WORLD POLITICS

A 'LIBERAL' RATIONALE FOR FRANCO'S DICTATORSHIP

By RICHARD TROY

Until last spring it was generally agreed among liberals here that any solution to Spain's increasingly desperate position which retained the Franco regime could be no solution at all: Franco must go. This attitude prevailed until last spring when the vast strikes in Spain raised the specter of a popular revolution, and when the Truman government announced its aid-to-Franco program, thereby coming to Franco's rescue. Since that time, some American liberals have been painfully attempting to incorporate the rapprochement with Franco into their global ideological schema.

There was Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., for example.

Here we shall speak of two more such cases in point. First, an item which recently appeared in the papers in connection with a projected \$150-million loan Washington is thinking of extending to Franco, whose economy, according to the economic survey just finished, "is being held together today with baling wire and hope." Paul Porter, acting administrator in Europe for the Mutual Security Agency (successor to ECA) suddenly appeared in Madrid (a few days before the loan announcement) and said that the United States should send a special MSA mission to Spain—in other words, incorporate Spain into the general American overseas aid program. This was interpreted in Spain as a great triumph for the Franco regime.

Paul Porter? The name sounds familiar. Yes, he's the man who once directed the Office of Price Administration (OPA), the choice target of Robert A. Taft. And isn't he today one of the vice-presidents of Americans for Democratic Action (ADA)? Why, yes. Could it be that so eminent a graduate of the New and Fair Deals is mixing in the dirty work of propping up the Franco regime? Apparently so. It is true, of course, that Porter said that any aid the U. S. grants Franco must benefit Spain's "common man," but he was not too explicit as to just how this particular hope would be guaranteed.

If one is surprised to note that Paul Porter is publicizing Franco's needs, then one may also be shocked to read an article which appeared in one of the organs of American liberalism, *Commentary*. The article, entitled "How Deal With Franco?" appeared in the magazine's December issue and provides a rationale for America's present policy.

The author of the article, Franz Borkenau, is known for his two studies of the pre-war poli-

cies of international Stalinism. He is, in fact, a student of world affairs with the type of background and slant which may surprise some when they find him writing such a slick justification for so cynical a policy. The article grants all the correct, conventional democratic criticisms of the Franco regime. No defense of his reactionary role in Spanish politics is made. Nor is Borkenau one of those liberals who says that "it's too bad we can't have a democratic government, but—well, we've got to work with what we have." Borkenau is keen enough to see that the weaknesses of the apologetics are many and profound. He takes another tack.

SLANDER OF A PEOPLE

The Spanish people, he says, due to the climate and certain age-old traits, are incapable of developing a democratic life. It simply is not in their character. Throughout their history they have always been ruled by despots and military cliques. The few years of semi-republican government which they have experienced were flukes, exceptions to a stern historical rule. The Spaniards are a special sort of people; and, likewise, Franco is a special sort of ruler who, in his own perverse way, reflects the Spanish temperament, which is innately and historically isolationist and backward, despising all efficiency and progress. Democratic forces have always failed and must continue to do so.

We shall not take space here to discuss this racist-type of interpretation of a people—which is not to say that it does not deserve discussion, if only because Borkenau is not the first to resort to such sweeping stereotypes of a whole people in order to develop a rationale for the existence of a tyranny. The most prominent examples heretofore have been, perhaps, those neo-Stalinists who excused Stalin's totalitarianism in Russia by references to the innate traits of the Russian people. It is not altogether surprising that the same dish is served up for the Franco totalitarianism. For an analysis of social and historical forces they substitute easy generalizations about "national character," an explanation which has the immense advantage of being able to explain anything at all.

In the case of Spain, behind the "national character" is indeed the following historical influence, among others. Spain has not experienced that type of commercial-industrial growth which, in the rest of Europe, produced a strong, independent bourgeoisie capable of ruling the nation single-handedly. The great weakness of the bourgeois republic before

the fascists in 1936 was no accident.

But Borkenau overlooks some crucial facts: he passes off the Anarchist-Socialist solution of 1936 by calling it naive and hopeless. He neglects completely to mention the great strikes of 1951. He fails to mention at all the great decline, even from the low standards of 1936, of the Spanish economy under Franco's regime.

He fails to realize that the Franco regime is not simply one among many Spanish military rulers. Franco has brought the Spanish economy, not only to a standstill, but to an actual regression! Tremendous energies are being wasted and misused, energies which revealed themselves last spring in Barcelona and a dozen other places, among parts of the bourgeoisie as well as the vast majority of workers.

His analysis, like the policy which it is designed to justify, is not only not completely aligned with all the facts, it not only underestimates the democratic potential in Spain, but it is profoundly cynical. Franco, he says, is about the best thing the Spaniards can possibly offer, and so we'll have to live with it. "And if Franco is replaced at all, in the present circumstances," he closes his article, "it will be by a royalist junta—which would not really make much of a difference for the ordinary Spaniard—or by a Communist regime, which would be a disaster for Spain and the West alike." A "Communist regime" anyone in the least familiar with contemporary Spain knows of the weakness of the Communist Party in Spain. Borkenau must know this too, for earlier in the article he does not raise the "communist" menace as the alternative to Franco but only "civil war," a prospect he really dreads most of all and here he expresses his complete abandonment of any hope. For, really, he is saying, Franco seems to mean, at least, a certain temporary stability. America needs bases on the Iberian peninsula. Let's not tamper with the situation for who knows what might turn up? What he fears, in short, more than anything else is change. Franco's relatively weak dictatorship, in a manner of speaking, really appeals to his romantic notion of what befits Spanishness.

So much for Borkenau. His article represents a portion of the sentiment of American liberalism turning on itself under the pressures of the cold war. The bureaucrat Paul Porter represents another segment. But both are up the same essentially anti-democratic alley.

Youth and Student Corner

God, Man, and William F. Buckley, Jr. at Yale

GOD AND MAN AT YALE, by William F. Buckley Jr. Reviewed by BOB BONE

The class of 1950, singly and in alphabetical order, were being inducted into the status of Yale alumni. President Seymour, officiating at his last graduation ceremony, could scarcely avoid special emphasis as he called out the next name: "WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY, JR."

The young man who walked briskly forward to receive his degree had done well, by Yale standards. He was a political force at Yale—a Big Man On Campus. He'd been top man on the debating team, leading spokesman for the Conservative Party of the Political Union, and chairman of the *Yale Daily News*. From the latter post he had tossed editorials, like hand grenades, into a staid Ivy League community.

His editorials were always militantly reactionary, always witty, always infuriating. They were read avidly by Yale undergraduates. The faculty thought he was "dangerous"; the white-shoe student set thought he was God.

Beneath the surface, however, all was not well. There were elements in Buckley's background conducive to rebellion.

He was one of an upstate Connecticut family, Roman Catholic in religion and Committee-for-Constitutional-Government in politics. He was hampered at Yale on both counts: it is highly desirable for a Yale man to be Episcopalian, though Congregationalism will do in a pinch. It is further expected that he will be decently conservative in politics, but it is not in good taste to be militantly so.

Whatever the reasons, Bill Buckley was at odds with his Yale environment from the start. The result was a certain pugnacious tone which dominated his undergraduate career. In spite of his very real success at Yale, Buckley was fundamentally a rebel—a radical rightist who was not satisfied with what he found there, and was not afraid to take up the cudgels to effect a change.

As the crowning glory of his undergraduate years, Buckley was chosen to deliver the Alumni Day address during graduation week. A few days in advance, he submitted his manuscript for President Seymour's approval. It was found that in one part of the address Buckley intended to attack Yale as a hotbed of "atheistic socialism," and to call upon the alumni to withhold contributions until the situation was set to rights.

President Seymour, who like all college presidents doubles in brass as a professional fund-raiser, could hardly be expected to welcome this poacher on the official preserves. He insisted that the offending paragraph be blue-penciled. Buckley refused and was not permitted to deliver the address.

Militant Reaction

A year and a half after graduation, Buckley had his revenge. *God and Man at Yale* appeared on the bookstands, timed to coincide with the beginning of the fall term. For a week the Yale community discussed nothing but Buckley's book. For a week the *Yale News* carried a series of articles by faculty and students, virtually all condemning the book. As far as Yale was concerned, the evil spirit was exorcised—and forgotten.

Not so with the outside world. The lunatic fringe of the political Right began beating the drums. It is not often, after all, that they find a spokesman with brains.

Favorable reviews appeared by George Sokolsky, in his syndicated column; by Max Eastman in *The American Mercury*; and by John Chamberlain in the pages of *The Freeman*. These gentlemen drummed us, therefore, to consider Buckley's thesis seriously.

Buckley's essential argument can be reduced to two premises and a series of conclusions:

(1) His concept of university government: "The responsibility to govern Yale falls ultimately on the shoulders of her alumni." The alumni, Buckley maintains, are merely buyers of a commodity called education, and in a free economy, the rights of the consumer are sovereign.

(2) His definition of orthodoxy: "We are right and they are wrong," he remarks in his preface. "We" includes (a) Christians, as opposed to members of other faiths, as well as to sceptics, agnostics, and atheists; and (b) economic individualists, as opposed to "collectivists" and "socialists."

(3) His conclusions and proposals: since most Yale alumni are "Christian individualists," Yale teachers should proselytize actively on behalf of this orthodoxy. To this end, teaching and scholarship should be rigidly separated: "license in the laboratory is right and proper . . . while license in the classroom is wrong and improper." Creeds other than the orthodox are not to be neglected but "analyzed, discussed, and deflated" by the watchful teacher. Academic freedom, according to Buckley, is "a great hoax," "a shibboleth masking academic irresponsibility." Heretical teachers who deviate from the established orthodoxy

should be summarily fired. Alumni should withdraw all financial support from their alma mater until "Christian individualism" is accepted as the prevailing ideology, under the conditions stipulated.

God and Man at Yale cannot be ignored. It speaks to the witch-hunting psychology of our times. It presents an authoritarian theory of university education which challenges our basic concept of the university in a free society. A Yale professor, reviewing the book, writes: "Buckley hits hard and he hits to kill. He deserves an equally forthright and hard-hitting answer."

Let us first consider the concept of university government which holds that the alumni should be sovereign.

Buckley's appeal to the alumni to exercise their "consumer rights" by determining policy is strictly demagogic. It is the students who actually "consume" educational values, and the faculty which "produces" them. As such, these groups should play a decisive role in policy-making.

Someone, to be sure, must make the educational institution possible in the first place. In the privately endowed university, this function is performed by wealthy parents and alumni, out of the surplus value which they have extracted from the working class. In the state university, the legislature assumes this initial responsibility. But whatever the nature of the "enabling" body, its task should be the same: to create a free arena for the exchange of ideas. So long as the university functions as a free arena, the "enabling" body should be content.

Let the Dollar Vote!

Buckley's position on university government has been widely criticized as a Catholic position. He has been accused of proposing a return to medieval scholasticism. This criticism is merely a scapegoat device for middle-class Protestants who are disturbed by Buckley's ideas. Buckley's proposal for university government is not Catholic but capitalist—as solidly bourgeois as preferred stock.

In endowing the alumni with decision-making power, Buckley is simply recognizing the sovereignty of the dollar: since the alumni pay the fiddler, they should call the tune. Needless to say, there is no room in the Catholic concept of education for an organized body of laymen who determine policy independently of the church. According to the Catholic view, the church hierarchy votes; according to Buckley's view, the dollar votes. In each case, the real producers and consumers are barred from the polls.

Buckley's use of the symbols of Christianity is, like his reference to "consumer rights," primarily demagogic. It is a time-worn tactic for political reactionaries to function through "Christian" fronts. They understand that their backward ideology can most readily achieve mass support among fundamentalist elements in the population. Buckley's "Christian individualism" is a fake. Nowhere in the book does he mention the fact that his own concept of Christianity is Roman Catholic.

He seeks a broader front. His real concern lies in espousing the atavistic doctrine of a laissez-faire political economy. His real antagonist is "creeping socialism," which he chooses to identify with anti-Christ, as reactionaries have done often enough in the past.

Buckley's demand for a return to the teaching of economic individualism is, of course, utterly utopian. While it may impress a few backward alumni, the university administration is more sensitive to the requirements of the times. Students are not being deferred from the draft to learn the laissez-faire principles of the Manchester school. They are regarded by the government as the future administrators of a garrison state and a permanent war economy. They will graduate from college into a political economy of government rationing and price subsidies; of wage ceilings and manpower controls. Economic individualism will be about as relevant in this world as Ptolemaic astronomy.

The liberal Yale professors who attack Buckley understand this perfectly well. They complain that Buckley's narrow orthodoxy would stifle their liberty. What liberty would it stifle? Why, the liberty to teach Keynesian economics; the liberty to teach rigid government control of the economy, in the interests of total war; the liberty to prepare college youth for the new situation in which they will find themselves, as members of the ruling elite of a garrison state. Disinterested love of liberty is as rare as uncombined oxygen. Behind the liberal professors' demands for liberty lies a new orthodoxy.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in the reviews of Buckley's book carried in the *Yale Daily News*. Here the liberal professors vigorously protest Buckley's narrow orthodoxy and his attempt to throttle dissenting opinion, but not a single voice is raised against Yale's policy of excluding Stalinists from the faculty! These liberals do not really differ from Buckley in principle, but merely in their definition of orthodoxy. While their concept of tolerable dissenting opinion is far broader than Buckley's, it is not broad enough to include Stalinist opinion.

Buckleyism, like McCarthyism, is merely the extreme manifestation of a trend already accepted by most members of the teaching profession. Once we accept any limitation on academic freedom whatsoever, once we adopt the Sidney Hook position, excluding Stalinists from the university, the bars are down, and the way is paved for a fascist demagogue like Buckley.

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

114 W. 14th 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 _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____

State _____ Tel. _____

NEW YORK SYL FRIDAY FORUM
January 18 at 8:30 p.m.
The Negro in American Literature
Speaker: MARGARET LEVI
LABOR ACTION HALL
114 West 14 St., N. Y. C.

N. Y. Socialist Youth League Class—Sunday Evenings at 8 p.m.

The Politics of Independent Socialism

Remaining Sessions: NOTE CHANGES IN SCHEDULE

| | | |
|------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| January 13 | THE WAR WE NEEDN'T HAVE | Julie Falk |
| January 20 | DEMOCRACY AND THE NEW SOCIETY | Hal Draper |
| January 27 | WHERE TO BEGIN | Jack Maxwell |

At LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

THE SLANSKY CASE: Stalinist Anti-Semitism in Czechoslovakia

By AL FINDLEY

The downfall and arrest of Rudolf Slansky, former general secretary of the CP of Czechoslovakia and former deputy prime minister, was something of a sensation abroad, but people have become accustomed to Stalinist purges. In general, the purge of Slansky followed the regular Stalinist pattern or system, standing out only in the tempo of his slide from power to prison.

But there was one new and sinister element in the Slansky affair, and that consisted in the open and public anti-Semitic statements made by the highest officials and organs of the Czech regime. These took off from the fact that Slansky is a Sudeten Jew (real name Saltzman).

Unlike other purged leaders of various satellite countries, he could not be accused of friendship to Tito or Titoism with any degree of effectiveness. In fact, he had the reputation of being, and he was, the most loyal adherent of Moscow in the Czechoslovak Stalinist machine. The discontent of the people, it is well known, was growing; the Stalinist masters needed a scapegoat; for reasons which can be only speculative, perhaps, Slansky was chosen for the role.

Whatever the real motivations, however, an official rationale has to be given: and in Slansky's case, part of it was found in his Jewish birth.

Before World War II there were 360,000 Jews in Czechoslovakia. Of 55,000 survivors in 1948, only 15-18,000 remained, with a good percentage of these integrated into the regime. All Jewish organizations, except for Stalinist-dominated religious communities (*kehila*), were liquidated. All Jewish welfare and cultural organizations were nationalized and liquidated. The Zionist political organization survived longer than in other Stalinist countries and was never officially suppressed; it dissolved, mostly as a result of the emigration of its leaders to Israel. Czechoslovakia served as the main underground railroad for arms to Israel during the war in Palestine.

With the exception of *Vestnik*, organ of the Prague *kehila*, there are no Jewish publications in the country. The Jewish weekly *Tribuna*, though 100 per cent Stalinist, was accused of pro-Israel "weakness" and suppressed in the spring of 1950. *Vestnik* itself carries no news or comments on Jewish life, whether in the country or outside. It does carry religious instructions and the usual Stalinist propaganda.

Echoing the Nazis

During the purges of "pro-Western deviationists" in 1949, a number of leading Jewish Stalinists were removed from office. Among them were Eugen Loebel, deputy minister of foreign trade; Oskar Kostko, an official of the Ministry of Information; and Eugen Klingner, head of the press section of the Foreign Ministry. Enough Jews remained, however, both to claim that anti-Semitism was not involved, and, at the same time, to give room for anti-Semites to blame the country's troubles on "Jewish Communists" in the government.

The first reports of anti-Semitism came with reports by travelers that the majority of those arrested were Jews. These reports were unsubstantiated and did not have enough authoritative information behind them to back them up—until President Gottwald's recent statement. It is reported that about 14,000 people have been purged since the arrest of Slansky. If true, this figure would indicate that over a third of the Jews were being purged, either arrested or dismissed from their jobs and facing starvation.

On December 20 last, *Rude Pravo* (the leading Stalinist organ) quoted President Gottwald as saying that "the overwhelming majority of Communists who had been discovered as traitors do not have their roots in our country and in our party, but are cosmopolitans." He thus gave confirmation to the reports that the Jews were being purged. The word "cosmopolitan" has long been used by all East European anti-Semites to stigmatize the Jews as "foreign" elements incapable of assimilation. Since 1949 it has been used in Russia as well for the same purpose, so

'Cosmopolitans' [squawk!] Jewish Capitalists'



that by now it is almost entirely reserved for Jews, and has acquired the same derogatory racist-type of connotation as did *Zhid* in the Slavic countries or similar derogatory terms in the U. S.

If anyone doubted that "cosmopolitans" referred to Jews, it was left to Prime Minister Zapotocky to remove any last vestige of doubt. Zapotocky accused Slansky of being a spy for "Jerusalem." It was further emphasized when Zapotocky talked of "Jewish capitalists" and accused Slansky of favoring the restoration of capitalism by falsely linking him with those exiled non-Stalinist political leaders who favored a measure of compensation to Jews who had lost their property to the Nazis.

The *Jewish Morning Journal* (December 20) reported that Slansky was being denounced as a "cosmopolitan" who, after betraying his country as a "spy for the Western countries . . . wanted to escape to Israel." It continued:

"The overwhelming majority of Jewish officials employed by the various governmental agencies have been removed from their jobs. This is especially true in the Foreign Ministry. Those dismissed are not charged with neglect of duty or improper performance but with the general suspicion that they are 'cosmopolitans.'"

The same paper further reports that all Jewish employees of *Rude Pravo* have been dismissed. There are also reports that two of these, Oskar Preis and Valentine Lugaec [My transliteration—A. F.] were arrested and sent to work as slave-laborers in the Jachmistal mines near Carlsbad.

The development of official Stalinist government-sponsored anti-Semitism in Czechoslovakia

—the first satellite country in which it has appeared to this degree—closely follows the pattern of Russian Stalinist anti-Semitism.

In Russia it first appeared as isolated incidents in Stalin's struggle against the Left Opposition led by Trotsky, and was followed by slow destruction of Jewish cultural rights as a minority, and by an easing-out of Jews from prominent jobs. After the war the exclusion and dismissal of Jews from good jobs assumed a "mass" character and some government agencies became *Judenrein* in the Nazi sense ("purified" of Jews). This was coupled with a huge propaganda campaign against the "cosmopolitans" as "homeless" and "rootless" "traders" and "merchants," the targets being Jews with one or two exceptions.

Jews to the Wolves

Allowing for time lag and special circumstances, it was certain that anything "attained" in Russia would sooner or later pass over into the satellites. In Czechoslovakia the Stalinists have not only caught up with but surpassed their Russian mentors. The crudity and openness of the expressions used in Prague are, if anything, greater than anything made publicly and officially in Moscow so far. If this has happened in Czechoslovakia, then it is to be expected that Rumania, Hungary and Poland will not be far behind.

One special circumstance that existed in the satellite states was that, at the beginning, Moscow may have preferred Jewish Stalinists for two reasons: (1) They seemed less subject to Titoist influence; and (2) they would make better scapegoats to throw to the wolves when the going got tougher for the Stalinists in the face of mass disillusionment and resentment.

The time indicated by the second point has arrived, it would seem; and "Jewish capitalists" and "cosmopolitans" are readily accepted as the cause of evils by many Slovaks who have heard the same doctrines preached by their own home-grown anti-Semites, by the purveyors of the notorious forged "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," and by the Nazis. Even in Bohemia and Moravia, inhabited by the Czechs who have been traditionally relatively free of anti-Semitism, the remnants of Nazi propaganda plus the identification of Jews with "Muscovite" Stalinism render it easier to offer up the Jews as scapegoats, to whom all troubles may be ascribed; or at least, so the Stalinist hope, in order to divert attention from the real enemy of the people, the Stalinist regime.

Jim Crow Repeats—Truman Doesn't

History has repeated itself, but Truman hasn't.

Last September the president reaped headlines and congratulatory slaps on the back when he fired off a telegram to Sioux City, Iowa, after reading in the papers that a private cemetery had refused to bury Sergeant John R. Rice, a Korea veteran, because he was an Indian. Truman proposed burial in Arlington National Cemetery.

LABOR ACTION commented at that time that the act did him honor, but we offered another thought:

"What cools our reaction is that he 'permitted' his indignation to boil over in the case of an Indian but keeps it carefully under restraint when it concerns that which is the flagrant and all-pervading disgrace of the nation—anti-Negro Jim Crow.

"To put it bluntly, it was no skin off Truman's back to appeal to the nation's sympathy for the Indian, Sergeant Rice. It was not the act of courage and principle that it would have been if a Negro had been involved. It was mainly a grandstand play."

Some of LABOR ACTION's friends at the time thought we were a bit too harsh.

Now the press reports:

"For five weeks, relatives of PFC Thomas Reed have been denied a plot in the veterans' section of Greenwood Memorial Park."

Greenwood Memorial Park is a cemetery in Phoenix, Arizona. Its board chairman rejects the veteran's body because he was a Negro. He has wrapped the case in red tape until his board "clarifies its policy" or until the local veterans' organization send specific requests for the burial, etc.

The mayor of the city has called the cemetery's ruling "unfortunate" and condemned "discrimination that prevents boys who have given their lives in defense of the nation" from being buried there.

PFC Thomas Reed's father has two other sons fighting in Korea.

Reed's cousin, Mrs. Mary Jackson, says: "Thomas was killed in action while fighting in Korea with the others, no matter what color they were. Now he's being treated like this, and he can't fight back."

Thus far, Truman has been able to control his indignation.

A DISCUSSION OF THE MIDDLE-EUROPEAN PROBLEM—

Beware Adenauer's Price for Rearmament!

Comrade Rudzienski, a frequent contributor to LABOR ACTION on Poland, here presents his opinions on the German-Polish territorial question and German rearmament from a socialist point of view, particularly from the point of view of the Polish struggle. There are, of course, other aspects to both questions which he does not touch on, but we present his views as a discussion article for its own merits in stimulating thinking on these complex questions.—Ed.

By A. RUDZIENSKI

The looming third world war, from the standpoint of the U. S. capitalist government, requires the rearmament of Western Europe "for the defense of democracy." What will be decisive in that war will be not only the military importance of European rearmament but also the economic mobilization of Europe's basic productive forces—in the first place, steel and coal.

A Russian occupation of Western Europe and its mobilization of European industry could counterbalance American industrial superiority in steel, coal and oil. If the Russian bloc's steel produc-

tion may be figured at 50 million tons, and that of Western Europe (including Britain) as 40-45 million tons, then these two together would equal U. S. production. The war to come will be decided not only by atom bombs but, in the first place, by industrial power.

For the U. S. as for the Kremlin, West European rearmament raises the question: to be or not to be. And West Europe's industrial and military mobilization is absolutely impossible without the rearmament of West Germany.

The German bourgeoisie want to begin this rearmament in their own class interests, but they will exact a high price in their bargaining with the U. S. monopolists. This price will be not only the restoration of German economic and political power but also the "reunification" of Germany and its economic and political preponderance in the future Europe, especially in *Mittleuropa* (Mid-Europe), the entire area between Germany and Russia.

WILL THEY PAY THE PRICE?

This would signify, firstly, a new partition of Poland and the economic and political subjugation of Czechs, Poles, Hungari-

ans, Yugoslavs, Rumanians, Balts, Ukrainians, etc., by a restored German imperialism. The price for the rearmament of Germany would be paid by the small nations of Middle and East Europe, and not by Russia.

What is the position of the Polish political emigration, and of the Polish opposition to the Kremlin, to this important question, on behalf of the Polish people?

All Polish political centers abroad are waiting for the new world war, which is to destroy Stalin's empire and re-establish a "free and independent Poland from the Oder and Neisse to the borders of the Riga 1921 treaty." The Polish émigrés abroad will fight for "freedom and democracy" and will help the U. S. in its war against Stalin.

But the American bourgeoisie delivered Poland and all of East Europe to Stalin in spite of the solemn guarantee of a "free, strong and independent Poland" by the U. S. government. And now it is a public secret that the State Department, as well as the U. S. high commissioner in Germany, has given a promise to that "old fox" Adenauer to pay for German rearmament with

Silesia, Pomerania and East Prussia, after the war.

SUICIDAL POLICY

The U. S. commissioner, McCloy, declared to a delegation of German youth that they can expect the reincorporation of the lost territories, now joined to Poland. The German nationalists make plans not only for Silesia, Pomerania and East Prussia but also for the pre-war Polish Corridor, Posnan, Lodz and other Polish cities.

And will the Polish Nationalist, Peasant and Social-Democratic Parties support the U. S. bourgeoisie in this war which will bring a new subjugation of Poland and a German imperialism? Any such policy, from the standpoint of the national interests of Poland, is reconstruction and independence, is suicide, and it is proof that the bourgeoisie's policy has lost all sense and reason.

The Polish political leaders of the opposition think that "it won't be so bad" and that the U. S. will have to reckon with the will of the 100 million people in the area between Germany and Russia. But that is a pure illusion, because a capitalist Europe

under American overlordship will be divided between British, French, German and Russian zones of influence, even if a capitalist Europe is at all possible after the next war and after Stalin's destruction.

NO ARMS TO ADENAUER

The restoration of German imperialism or sub-imperialism and the delivery of Middle and East Europe to the German bourgeoisie would mean a blow against socialism. The interests of the working class and world socialism demand not only the downfall of Stalin and his regime in Russia but also the downfall of American capitalism (not of the victory of world socialism). Socialism in Europe means a socialist United States of Europe, that is, the defeat of the national bourgeoisies, in the first place the defeat of German and Russian imperialism, enemies of a socialist Europe today.

Therefore revolutionary socialism can support neither the restoration of the German capitalist empire nor its rearmament under the Adenauer government, in spite of the fact that we are

(Turn to last page)

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

On the British Trotskyists

To the Editor:

It may be of interest to readers of LABOR ACTION to know the real truth about the development of the [British] Trotskyist movement since the dissolution of the Revolutionary Communist Party, in May 1949, into the Labor Party. The facts as presented here are based not on hearsay and the reading of various Trotskyist publications over the last two and a half years only—they are based also on personal experience. It is just possible that the SWP may benefit from this survey as well!

In Britain today, the official Trotskyist tendency is so pro-Stalinist that Collett's—the CP bookshop—sells its rag *The Socialist Outlook*. The official Trotskyists are without much significance except in one or two districts in London and one district in Manchester. The Bevan movement reduced its importance to next to zero—as it did the Stalinist tendencies, by the way. I have read that Joseph Hansen was with Trotsky during his last hours; how he can stomach the criminal Stalinism of his British supporters, without being bilious, is a mystery I cannot fathom.

The most influential tendency are the unofficial "workers' statist," who are led by two former leaders of the now defunct RCP. They denounce in unbridled terms what they consider the betrayal by the Fourth International of Trotsky's theories, particularly in relation to his uncompromising struggle against Stalinism. Unlike the official section, they bitterly opposed the Tito-mania which gripped the Fourth. In Lancashire this tendency, particularly in the League of Youth, is very powerful. They have a printed youth paper which has considerable influence in the Labor League of Youth nationally. Despite a tendency to sectarianism, these people are well on the road to becoming a serious force in Northwest England. They are producing a theoretical organ—printed and bi-monthly—in the very near future.

A very small "state-capitalist" tendency is not in evidence much, as far as active work is concerned. However, the most important development has come from that

group. We did not change the name because of the past tradition of the YPSL, on the contrary the best argument against the change was that we are proud of our tradition as the YPSL and want to do all we can to retain that tradition and not to get away from it.

Your most obvious misstatement of fact was in saying that we reversed the position of the YPSL on the Second World War. The record of the YPSL on the Second World War is clear—a position of opposition to the war. The YS has reaffirmed its long tradition of an anti-war socialist organization.

Now to answer your opinions with my opinions. You state that the YS convention opens the way for close and fruitful cooperation between the SYL and YS. I would like to state that as a member of the YPSL who has long held the opinions expressed by the recent convention, and one who comes from a circle which has long held these positions, I have not felt that I could work with the SYL, nor do I feel that I can now. It may be sectarian for me to point out that I consider any organization to be sectarian that insists on calling the Third Camp position "our Third Camp position" as the SYL does, but it is not sectarian for me to say that I cannot work with an organization which shows its integrity in the manner that the integrity of the ISL and SYL has been shown to me over a period of time in the pages of LABOR ACTION.

A. V. London, Dec. 27.

On the Convention of the YPSL

To the Editor:

As a delegate to the Young Socialist convention from the "new left wing . . . Los Angeles," I wish to correct the LABOR ACTION story which was guilty of editorializing in the guise of news reporting and in misstating facts.

The flagrant use of the Hearst technique of using opinions to appear as straight reporting appeared first when you state that the YPSL "felt so uncomfortable with their old traditional name that they decided to trade it in for a bright and shiny new name, 'Young Socialists.'" We of California offered the name change and it was accepted when a two-thirds majority of the delegates agreed with us that the name of Young People's Socialist League was dated in phraseology and sounded too much like a church

group. We did not change the name because of the past tradition of the YPSL, on the contrary the best argument against the change was that we are proud of our tradition as the YPSL and want to do all we can to retain that tradition and not to get away from it.

Your most obvious misstatement of fact was in saying that we reversed the position of the YPSL on the Second World War. The record of the YPSL on the Second World War is clear—a position of opposition to the war. The YS has reaffirmed its long tradition of an anti-war socialist organization.

Now to answer your opinions with my opinions. You state that the YS convention opens the way for close and fruitful cooperation between the SYL and YS. I would like to state that as a member of the YPSL who has long held the opinions expressed by the recent convention, and one who comes from a circle which has long held these positions, I have not felt that I could work with the SYL, nor do I feel that I can now. It may be sectarian for me to point out that I consider any organization to be sectarian that insists on calling the Third Camp position "our Third Camp position" as the SYL does, but it is not sectarian for me to say that I cannot work with an organization which shows its integrity in the manner that the integrity of the ISL and SYL has been shown to me over a period of time in the pages of LABOR ACTION.

A. V. Los Angeles Young Socialists

On the Convention of the YPSL

To the Editor:

Check shows that correspondent Davidson is right in his factual correction of two sentences in last week's report on the YPSL (now Young Socialists) convention.

(1) On motivation for the change in name: our writer Henry Gale informs us that, by his words "felt so uncomfortable with their old traditional name that they decided to trade it in . . ." he did not intend to imply that the change was made in order to repudiate the "past tradition of the YPSL." However, it could have conveyed that idea, particularly in the context of the paragraph.

Editorial Note

Our Nov. 26 issue published "The Suppression of Marx's Works in Stalin's Russia," an article by Maximilien Rubel, which we translated from the French magazine *Preuves*. The author, Mr. Rubel, has written requesting that we note two things for our readers' information, which we willingly do:

(1) The publication of his article in LABOR ACTION was not authorized by him.

(2) One paragraph and a footnote were omitted in our translation. The first (at the end of the first part) read:

"It is permissible to establish a certain continuity between the various secret police forces which have followed each other since 1918, from the Cheka to the MGB; if the suppression of all political opposition was inscribed early in the Bolshevik tradition, it remains true that a jump has been accomplished from civilization to barbarism: the treatment inflicted by the Stalinist autocracy on the works of Marx and Engels—a treatment which parodies at one and the same time of mummification and falsification—demonstrates in exemplary fashion the extent to which Stalinism is the absolute negation of all culture."

The footnote: "To his misfortune, Riazanov did not have the opportunity to leave us a new testimonial to the historical vision of Marx concerning Russia; has not his own fate shown that this vision was justified?"

We regret that we did not secure Mr. Rubel's authorization. Both cuts were made in type to get the article on the two pages devoted to it. We can assure Mr. Rubel that, while the longer sentence may imply a certain criticism of Bolshevism, LA has before this published articles of interest with passages which were not our own views.—Ed.

Important than piques. The YS's anti-war line is now on paper; that is very good; but if they are to work along its lines they can hardly avoid collaborating with other anti-war groups—as, indeed, Davidson has worked with the SYL in California, with excellent results.—Ed.

Truman: Fair Deal on Shelf —

(Continued from page 1)
 sage as "platitudes," "soothing phrases," and "generalities," in a contemptuous editorial.

"FIRST THINGS"
 We cite the Republicans not because they are unbiased authorities on the merit of the president's effort but because the nature of their reaction is indicative. "The same old political hash warmed over," said GOP Senate floor leader Bridges—"bankrupt of ideas." The line is effective because it is true. The fact that the enemies of the "Fair Deal" administration can take this tack should give pause to those who cling to hope in Fair-Dealism. For there is little that remains of what they look on as the Fair Deal.

Last January, LABOR ACTION's headline on Truman's 1951 message read: "Fair Deal Is Dead, Cold-War Deal to Rule." The cold-war deal ruled Truman's message even more absolutely this week.

"At the outset, I should like to speak of the necessity for putting first things first as we work together this year for the good of our country," began the president. The "first things" were the preparations for the third world war, the girding of the nation for the present war in Korea, and the cold-war diplomacy that accompanies both. Truman made clear that these "first things" left precious little room for anything else.

BACKDOWN?
 It would have been difficult for him to have given more cursory and vaguer mentions of his Fair Deal domestic planks without inviting the Republicans to crow in victory over his open abandonment of the policies they have been gunning for.

He did not call for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. His paragraph on the subject plainly hinted acceptance of—or reconciliation to—an amended version along the lines of the changes proposed by its sponsors. The retract is covered with the remark that "even the sponsors of the act now admit it needs to be changed." But will he fight such a modified anti-labor law? Taft apparently thought he saw the sponge being thrown in. The senatorial "T" in the T-H combination "was heard to observe as he left the House chamber that Mr. Truman 'kind of backed down' in his opposition to the Taft-Hartley labor law," reported the *Herald Tribune*.

The mention thrown to civil rights is of a piece with the toothless "FEPC" order which the president has already issued in order not to antagonize his Jim-Crow Dixiecrat allies. "We need to take action toward the wider enjoyment of civil rights," he sermonized. "Freedom is the birthright of every American." After claiming that the executive has made "real progress" in the field, he added: "Further advances require action by the Congress, and I hope that means will be provided to give the members of the Senate and the House a chance to vote on them."

Not even a platitudinous statement on what further advances he proposed to fight for. At this point, even "the same old political hash warmed over" would have been more forthright.

The *Southern Democrats*, reports the *N. Y. Times*, got the idea. Truman's civil-rights program "was restated, they held, in a manner 'not designed to create new fire' or to put sufficient heat behind it to force administration leaders to carry it to a test that would result in all-out filibusters. . . ."

In a country where, Truman and his supporters themselves

have been telling us these last few months, a pall of fear hangs over critics and dissenters (even if these gentlemen ascribe this appalling state of affairs solely to "McCarthyism") Truman had no more than a parenthetical ten words on a relatively minor aspect of civil liberties, when he referred to "protecting the rights of individuals in congressional investigations." He did not mention protecting the rights of individuals in the star-chamber proceedings of his own loyalty boards and subversive-listers.

NOT A BONE
 We must keep down inflation, he exhorted—after having devoted over half of his speech to calling for unstinted support to the war spending program. How the two are to be done together was left vaguer, except that "We can control inflation if we make up our minds to do it," with a bow to the price and wage controls, suitably qualified to death.

"We must move right ahead this year to see that defense workers and soldiers' families get decent housing at rents they can afford to pay," he orated. And here the advantages of making a State of Union speech "against sin" are most obvious. He did not feel called upon to explain how his administration's most recent boon to housing squares with his platitudes. Only a couple of weeks ago, it was a leader of the real-estate lobby, Coogan, who was appointed to head the Armed Forces Housing Agency of the Department of Defense. (The AFL called this "one of the most brazen things that has happened in Washington in some time.")

These, without going further, are perhaps the leading domestic issues on which Truman's liberal and labor supporters would have given a cheer if he had thrown a couple of bones in their direction. He did not.

They will not feel compensated by his summary of foreign poli-

cy and the international situation, if what he said can be called that. It was perhaps a concession, indeed, that in his review of the world he did not mention the strong pro-Franco turn which his administration took this year!

NO TRUMPET BLAST
 This is not the occasion for a review of Truman's war policies, nor is his message much of a handle for such a review. Again, as the *Herald Tribune* had it, "Since the president speaks only in generalities, one can make only a general comment."

It is sufficient to list what he calls the "credit side" of the ledger. (1) Korea—where the "credit side" consists of a stalemate militarily and where Truman does not even speak of the political effects in Korea and Asia of U. S. policy. (2) Indo-China and Malaya—where the same is true, only more so. (3) The Japanese treaty, "combined defense" in Europe, and the entrance of Greece and Turkey in the Atlantic Pact. This section of his message comes to some kind of life only when he devotes paragraphs (almost as long as the above points together) to poking paltry fun at Vishinsky's notorious reply to the U. S. disarmament proposal, "I could not sleep because I kept laughing."

If this is an adequate report to the American people on the course and consequences of U. S. foreign policy and its problems, it is a joke as bad as Vishinsky's.

There is nothing in all this, on the domestic or international issues, to give labor even an illusory feeling that the Fair Deal in 1952 stands for something workingmen can fight for (and vote for) with enthusiasm, as a fighting faith, as a representative of their own interests. There is nothing for them to rally to. Truman's call for "unity" cannot be theirs. It is, in fact, the "unity" of the present Congress—around the "Republican" bloc— which has defeated

even the mildest concessions. They cannot stand much more of such unity.

Not fictitious unity but a call to an assault on the bastions of privilege and profiteering is what they hoped for from the Fair Deal. Instead of such a call they have gotten copybook maxims and clichés. They thought they had heard such a call in the famed whistle-stop campaign which Truman put on in 1948, and which elected him. Now even the promises are buried in a mush of words.

Labor leaders may try to see bright spots in the president's routine message but it will be a tough job of rationalization.

"The Truman administration is played out. It has lost control of Congress, and it can no longer carry its measures by leadership and party discipline but only by appeasement and propaganda." These words by columnist Walter Lippmann (Thursday) bear the same contemptuous note that we

saw before: Are they true or aren't they?

But in politics as in diplomacy, appeasement can neither beat the enemy, nor is thereby encouraged, nor maintain friends, who are alienated. The appeaser falls between two stools.

Labor can stop reaction in this country—whether it is the cruder kind of the Taftites, or the appeasement-road of Truman—and defend its own interests by refusing to cling to a Fair Deal which has lost whatever attractive power it once had. As Truman appeases his right wing, if it tries to hang on. There is only one way to put an end to such a drift.

That is for labor itself to put "first things first"—which means organizing to protect the people's interests and labor's rights from the inroads of a war economy and a bipartisan war program, through independent action in a labor party.

Adenauer's Price —

(Continued from page 7)
 against Stalin's Russia and for a revolutionary socialist war against Stalin, and in spite of the fact that we are against the division of Germany.

Only a socialist victory could give peace, justice and international democracy for all peoples. Therefore the American working class, the British and the European working class must adopt their own internationalist socialist policies, opposed to those of Russian and U. S. imperialism. And therefore the Polish workers and peasants cannot support the new American policy for another partition of Poland and its delivery to the German bourgeoisie. They cannot fight Stalin in the interests of U. S. capitalism. They will not be cannon-fodder for the Anglo-Ameri-

cons, as in the last war.

The Polish people fight Stalin, but from the standpoint of their own interests. The Polish people fight for a free, independent and democratic Poland, that is, fight for a free socialist Europe, for socialism. This fight has nothing in common with the policy of Truman, Acheson or Adenauer.

This is a fight for a new, free socialist world, for a socialist federation of Europe, without Stalin or Adenauer, in which all questions will be settled by the peoples, in the spirit of international justice and democracy. In this fight the Polish workers and peasants can only wait for the help and support of the American, British and European workers, and not the help of Truman or Churchill.

Eisenhower's Brass Hat —

(Continued from page 1)
 gyrations on Korea, when it was possible to take a few pot-shots at President Truman.

So far as Eisenhower's distinctive political program goes, it consists mostly of ceremonial political pronouncements, weighted a little on the Republican side in emphasis upon individual initiative as opposed to governmental bureaucracy. These are random samplings: "Individual freedom is our most precious possession." "How far can a government go in taxing away property rights and still not leave the government the master of the people instead of its servant?"

The general is against cradle-to-grave security and considers that a "paternalistic government can gradually destroy . . . the will of the people to maintain a high degree of individual responsibility."

As president of Columbia he was opposed to hiring known Communists but was opposed to loyalty oaths and for the teaching of the facts of Communism.

ON LABOR

Eisenhower's position on labor is unknown. After his interview last year with Truman, Krock reported that they had differed on labor matters, but he did not specify in what way. Shortly thereafter, Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the United Automobile Workers (CIO), made a speech at the CIO convention on November 9 attacking Eisenhower as unfriendly to labor and hence unqualified for the presidency. Mazey does not, of course, speak for all of labor nor all of the CIO and his remarks are in contrast to past positions of the liberal-labor wing.

••• If Eisenhower's position on labor

matters is unclear, his position on civil rights is equally cloudy. Yet the utterance of views on this burning question is of quintessential importance so far as Dixiecrat support goes, for now is the time when these "states' righters" and white-supremacists are ready to embrace a Republican, even a "Trumanite Republican," as against a Truman Democrat.

Taft, on the other hand, touched off the Great Debate on foreign policy. He has never fully retreated, whatever his opportunistic gyrations, from the position that Russia will not start a war, that the Atlantic Pact was a great mistake, that no American ground troops should be sent to Europe, that the UN is a failure and that American defense should be primarily devoted to keeping the adversary away from American shores. If Taft became the candidate of the Republican Party, there would be a foreign-policy issue; with Eisenhower, none. With Taft, the domestic issue would be of some weight; with Eisenhower, it is not known.

But whoever is the candidate, if the field narrows to a choice between the two, the Republican Party is a split party. Therein lies the difficulty of selecting a representative candidate. The Eisenhower wing overlaps the official position of the Democratic Party.

MILITARY GLAMOR

Will Eisenhower win the Republican nomination? His most formidable opponent is the Republican machine which puts into office the Tafts, McCarrans and McCarthys. There is little doubt that he is a stronger candidate to win the allegiance of the country at large. He has the military glamor so fashionable in an age of wars. Life

magazine speaks of the "charismatic" quality of his leadership, akin to that of Churchill and MacArthur, that is, a vague, magical, miracle-working quality. His identification with success in war and his personal charm and careful public relations, which have built him up into the "citizen-statesman," may find ready appeal among a people disgusted with the antics of little men.

And what of the Democrats? Truman is the only strong possibility emerging on the Democratic horizon and his administration has been so punctured by the shots of the witch-hunters and fraud-probers. Yet, especially if Eisenhower were to become the Republican candidate, the Democrats would need their biggest gun, if he chooses to run—but coyness is the rule here, too.

DIFFERENCE NARROWS

There is, however, no guarantee that Truman wants to run. Justice Vinson and Douglas are being mentioned. There are other peculiarities. The story recurs in the *New York Times* of January 8 that Truman may not run if Eisenhower receives the Republican nomination. If Taft receives it, however, the theory goes, then Truman will run. Such rumors of course nowadays must all bear the suspicion of being politically planted trial balloons.

But these rumors reinforce the similarity of the essential programs of the Eisenhower wing of the Republicans and the Truman wing of the Democrats. Add the story of Truman's offering the Democratic nomination to Eisenhower and the labor leadership's erstwhile similar position, and the inescapable political truth follows: The fundamental differences between the two parties are of no

importance so far as overriding issues of the day are concerned. The Dixiecrats in the Democratic Party and the Taftites in the Republican, are important schismatic groupings; but the Republicans and Democrats meet at the center of the political spectrum, regardless of party labels.

It should be remembered that while the influence of the Taftites may not be written off, the Republicans have served up their "internationalist" candidates in the last several elections.

The biggest political dilemma at this moment confronts the labor leadership which, because it represents a different social class in society, the class of the exploited and underprivileged, has to attempt to find class reasons for giving its support to the party of another class. The small and hitherto unclarified differences upon domestic problems between Eisenhower and Truman will be difficult to base a political choice upon. If the choice is made in that manner, how will labor justify the muck and mire and mink coats?

If it's a Truman-Eisenhower contest, the situation could scarcely be more ideal, so far as the objective political scene is concerned, for the inauguration of a Labor Party, which would at last offer a distinction-with-a-difference for the American people. If Truman chose to favor the Eisenhower candidacy, labor would be in an impossible position if it did not use the occasion for the formation of a new party of labor. In any case, year after election year, the antics of the labor leaders appear more like justifying the postponement of a new party and rationalizations for the old than fervent political support to them.

Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL America's leading Marxist review