

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 31, 1952

FIVE CENTS

The U.S. Department of Arm-Twisting

... page 3

L.A.: Cop Brutality & Jim Crow Bombs

... page 2

The Case of the FFRF: An Exchange  
Boris Shub's Defense and a Reply

... page 6

## New York Rally And Picket Lines Condemn Franco's Assassinations

By MARY BELL

NEW YORK, March 26—An overflow crowd of several hundreds more than filled Freedom House tonight in a rally to protest the execution of trade-union and political victims by the Franco dictatorship in Spain. It was sponsored by the Sociudades Espanolas Confederadas, a non-partisan Spanish aid group, the International League for the Rights of Man, the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom, the Workers Defense League and the League for Industrial Democracy.

The meeting was chaired by Frances Grant of the League for the Rights of Man. The speakers, who vigorously denounced Franco and the U. S. policy of aid to the murderous totalitarian regime, were:

Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO and president of the Electrical Workers (IUE); Norman Thomas; Roger Baldwin; Professor Robert Alexander of Rutgers, just returned from Spain, author of *The Peron Era*; Dr. Eduardo Santos, former president of Colombia; Stanley Isaacs,

Republican member of the N. Y. City Council and member of Americans for Democratic Action; and Jesus Galindez of the Spanish group.

Picket signs which had been carried by the demonstrators in front of the Spanish consulate flanked the rostrum and vividly proclaimed the reason for the meeting. (Turn to last page)

By BEN HALL

The United Auto Workers (CIO) educational conference in Cleveland which opens on April 3 will be treated to an impressive political-social-economic variety program. Advance reports on its agenda announce the appearance of speakers from all walks of life. Unlike the staid and sober atmosphere of so many ordinary union gatherings, this conference will do more than concentrate on the humdrum realities of everyday routine.

It will peer into the somewhat speculative future, for example, in its lectures and discussions on servo-mechanisms while it probes the possibilities and consequences of the replacement of man by machines in the days to come. Other items on the agenda will give an even freer hand to imagination by posing such bold questions as: Should there be morality in American politics? In a spirit of the fullest freedom, matters of science and sociology will come up for discussion and debate.

Of equal interest, even more urgent if less academic, is another question: What does the UAW intend to do to offer political leadership in 1952, to the American labor movement and to the American people?

Where and how this problem will be treated remains a little hazy. We can say with assurance,

however, that this point belongs on the agenda of a UAW conference; for unlike any other union in the United States, it strives to become the "vanguard of America, the architect of the future."

1952 brings a presidential election. Eisenhower's stock rises and his hopes of victory mount. His chances of moving into the presidential mansion and giving a sharp conservative turn to domestic policy are great. And, ironically enough, his opportunities stem from the growing disappointment and disillusionment with the Truman administration. What shall labor do in '52? Surely this will be a paramount

At the last UAW Educational Conference, in 1949, a highlight was the address by Prof. Robert Lynd. See page 4 for a key passage from his talk.

The entire address was published by the UAW in pamphlet form. It's still eye-opening reading. And you can still get it from the UAW office, or from Labor Action Book Service, 114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

thought at the Cleveland sessions. In 1948, the International Executive Board of the UAW solemnly announced that it would take the leadership in working for a new political alignment in the United States that would see the formation of a new progressive party of the people. And Walter Reuther felt moved enough to tell the UAW membership that he would personally dedicate himself to that aim. Several years have passed during which time the UAW's political policy has shown few signs of change.

A year ago, all labor representatives on government war boards resigned against what they called the reactionary trend in all national policy. They denounced the administration in Washington and demanded drastic changes. At the UAW convention last year, one-third of the votes were cast for a resolution calling for the formation of a labor party. Although this resolution was not carried, the majority resolution which was adopted, with the support of the UAW leadership, proposed that the UAW take the initiative in calling upon the CIO to convoke a national political conference of labor in preparation for the '52 elections.

But the labor movement returned to the war boards. The UAW convention resolution has been awaiting action since.

The steel union has just gone through negotiations with industry and has participated in Wage Stabilization hearings that seemed interminable. At long last, the board issued its recommendations. Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson hastens to repudiate the board recommendations. His reasons are simple: the board should have recommended that the union get less. Such is the elemental reasoning of a typical representative of big business, appointed by Truman to one of the most powerful economic posts in government.

Last year Truman refused to remove Wilson despite the vociferous demands of the unions. This year he remains to stick a knife into the steel workers.

Fittingly enough, the UAW conference meets this week. Time for the UAW to begin to apply some of its own resolutions.

## Anti-Franco Picket Line Demonstrates Before Spanish Consulate



Organized by the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims, whose formation was reported in last week's issue, picket lines paraded during four days before the building housing the Spanish consulate in New York City and before the Spanish tourist office. On Thursday and Friday, from 12 to 1 p. m., the scene of action was the consulate at 515 Madison

Avenue (photos above); on Monday and Tuesday from 5-6 p. m., at the tourist office. Upper left: Roland Watts, national secretary of the Workers Defense League, leading the picket line; lower left: Albert Gates, secretary of the Independent Socialist League; lower middle: Norman Thomas of the Socialist Party.



# Calif.: Cop Brutality and Jim Crow Bombings

## Police Orgies of Thuggery Shock Los Angeles to Protest and Action

By REX HILL

LOS ANGELES, March 17—A city whose official spokesmen and civic leaders often praise it "as one of the best governed and most progressive cities in the world" had the spotlight turned on it today. At a City Council hearing this afternoon two main problems remained to be clarified and solved: (1) ever-increasing allegations of police brutality in dealing with prisoners, suspects, and especially Mexican and Negro people who cross the cops' path; and (2) a series of home bombings in an area where some Negroes are moving in, culminating in twin blasts against Negro-occupied houses only yesterday, the day before the much-publicized hearing. Several of the police victims were members of minorities.

The charges of police brutality, even in routine investigation, got their impetus only after six youths were beaten badly after arrest last Christmas Eve by, it is charged, some fifty police, and also following a case in which two East Side community leaders, Anthony P. Rios and Alfred Uloa, complained of having been beaten by drunken policemen.

### CHRISTMAS ORGY

Other persons, who apparently had been afraid to make similar charges previously, were now emboldened to speak up. The seriousness of the matter is evident when we note that the FBI claims it "has been secretly working on the brutality charges for some time."

### DETROIT

# Attack Continues On Civil Liberties

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, March 23—The retreat on the civil-liberties and democratic-rights front continued unabated here, with one important exception.

There was the action of Flint Buick Local 599, which voted at a membership meeting to ask the House Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate "Communists" in that local, even though most local leaders and the regional director Robert Carter denied that "Communists" ran the local.

The Michigan Republican attorney general was very happy to seize the occasion to send special investigators to question "subversives" in that local union. The Republican Party in Michigan would be only too happy to investigate every local union from now until the election next November.

The Detroit Federation of Teachers at a meeting attended by over 300 persons voted 2 to 1 against defending Mrs. Maki, an art teacher of 23 years seniority, who was accused at the hearings of being a member of the Communist Party. Her work record was defended by teachers, the school principal and the children.

The Musicians Union expelled J. Yanover, a violinist with the Detroit Symphony Orchestra, for refusing to testify at the hearings on charges that he was a member of the Communist Party.

### ART IN THE DOCK

Thanks to the eternal vigilance of that prominent Detroit figure

Their ears were twisted and pulled. Their bare feet were stomped on by heavily shod cops."

One victim had to be taken to General Hospital for treatment "of head injuries, a fractured jaw, and two black eyes." Another suffered "a ruptured kidney, a cracked rib, a spinal injury and two black eyes." Other youths said they were stripped and the cops kept beating them until they slipped in the prisoners' blood.

Although some officers claimed they tried to halt the savage beatings, "neither the sergeant nor the lieutenant in charge made any report of the matter to their superiors." Also at 2 a.m. the same night 100 policemen in Central Station held a big Christmas party and some of them participated in the sluggings, according to a witness.

The only ironic note was sounded by one policeman who was reported to "have complained of being struck in the face by an officer who aimed a blow at one of the prisoners and missed." This case is the most important one of the hearing, unless more ugly, hitherto hushed-up, ones are laid bare. There is a strong possibility the police brass will try to whitewash as many officers as possible in more than one case.

### CHARGES POUR IN

Rios and Uloa were cleared of interfering with officers on duty and then they promptly charged beatings after arrest. This second affair may help to shed much light on past brutality by the police, for Rios is influential among the minority groups centered around the Community Service Organization, which held its own hearing on police brutality to minorities before two invited but embarrassed brass more than two years ago.

During this meeting, hundreds of people of all nationalities hissed and booed when the officials claimed that only a few rotten eggs on the force were involved. Again they jeered when, in an attempt to gauge personal feelings, the audience were asked to fill out a form of specifics about the police, a paper which asked each individual to classify himself according to so-called "races," many of them merely national or linguistic terms.

Columnist Roy Avise of the Daily News wrote today that he had many affidavits from persons mistreated by police and who had kept their stories secret because of fear of reprisal. Other columnists have referred to letters from readers who had been afraid of complaints to any police board. Avise said:

"Almost frightening are the wretched pleas of the victims for anonymity pending such time as their stories are presented as part of the whole. . . . They are scared stiff of reprisals from the police. Here are some of the excerpts from their complaints: ". . . they kicked me in the groin and beat me in the kidneys and below the belt with their fists. Then they put me in solitary three or four hours, I guess. . . . no heat and the floor was wet. . . . nothing to sit on. . . . no place to lie down. . . ."

"Another: 'I refused to sign. . . because without my glasses I couldn't read the card. . . . two uniformed officers without badges and two guards. . . . beat me with something flat in the palm of their hands until I said that I would sign. . . ."

"Still another: ' . . . he [a police officer] then struck me with his fist, knocking me to the floor and started to hit me with a chair and when I put up my hands he then started kicking me. . . ."

"Women are no exception: 'I was dressed for bed. . . . when I heard my husband call me. I went to the door and saw my husband down on the ground and the two officers beating him. When I asked what the trouble was and

## Terror Bombings Against Negroes Spread; Threaten More Outrages

LOS ANGELES, March 18—

Yesterday, protest delegations numbering about 200, including representatives of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Negro Labor Council, Marine Cooks and Stewards, and the Civil Rights Congress (the latter two Stalinist-influenced organizations), met with Mayor Bowron in City Council chambers "in an effort to halt a wave of terror bombings aimed at driving Negroes from a West Adams residential district." City councilmen adopted a resolution "condemning" the acts and put up a \$5000 reward for information which would lead to arrests.

William Bailey, a Negro school teacher, fixed up the front of his house after the bombing and said, "I'm going to stay right here." A note was found in his mailbox cut out of news headlines, saying: "Negroes move off Dunsmuir Avenue north of Adams. We will bomb all Negroes."

Two days ago the Baileys were asleep when the bomb shattered the front door, wrecked furniture and scattered broken glass from a window. Across the street another explosion blasted the front of a duplex which was recently sold to a Negro family, who, however, were not yet living there. The bomb was probably intended for the former owner.

### DYNAMITE!

The Greater Los Angeles CIO Council sent "a strongly worded" telegram to law-enforcement officers, saying that the council "strongly feels that this latest attack on the rights of American citizens parallels similar attacks across the country in Cicero, Ill., Groveland, Fla., Miami, Fla., and Dallas, Tex." (Mirror, March 18.)

Governor Warren and the state Assembly announce they will intervene in the bombing investigations. The NAACP wants assurances from the state attorney general that "law-enforcement agencies will be prodded into protecting minority race-families" throughout California. A Negro minister's home in Santa Cruz was burned last autumn. Assemblyman August F. Hawkins (D., L. A.) said: "Personally I am of the opinion that some-

thing much more serious is going to happen—worse even than the Los Angeles bombings. This thing is really dynamite."

Mayor Bowron, meeting with a protest delegation, some of whom heekled him, answered that he feared "the Communist Party is trying to capitalize on the incident as evidence of class friction in the city." He said there would be no whitewash but "we will not let these acts be used for Communist purposes." (Los Angeles Times, March 18.)

Strangely enough, no one has yet publicly suggested any possible connection between the L. A. bombings and fascist G. L. K. Smith's recent public meeting in this city. Fascist groups have not been mentioned in the daily press. Even if such groups are not involved, the propaganda of Smith and his followers could easily influence racists to take violent action against Negroes and other minorities.

We're forcefully reminded of the old Negro who left the recent mass rally presided over by Walter White here. He left early, apparently impatient with the stereotyped official statements from participating organizations about "perfecting our democracy" and the problem of individual prejudice; as he left the building, with tears scarcely held back, he said in a choking voice, "America is just no place for a colored man."

Those who would oppose racism chiefly because it gives America a "black eye" abroad or "plays into the hands" of the Stalinists must take the feeling of the minorities themselves into account. As a letter to the Daily News pointed out (March 17):

"No one espouses democracy for the sake of democracy. A letter writer decries racial discrimination because people in other countries will disapprove. Another writer says Stalin sits in the Kremlin and gloats over acts of brutality against minorities. A radio announcer pleads for racial unity because the Communists want us divided. Now Walter White, a long-time active leader for the advancement of all colored peoples, repeats all this sort thing in an interview."

People might ask themselves why racial violence is increasing all over the country in spite of the fact that speakers and writers daily say we "must unite to fight the Reds." At the moment when America's official spokesmen are trying to sell "our American way of life" to all peoples abroad, why is America itself contracting democracy in every sphere? Why are the attacks on minorities, the attempts at thought-control in the schools, the loyalty probes, and many other assaults against traditional freedom all occurring in the same brief epoch?

One need not be a socialist to see that capitalism and its various political stooges are trying to regiment the country for what they believe is the inevitable showdown with its rival imperialism, Stalinist Russia. As yet there is no strong, organized counterattack by liberals and the labor movement. They are too closely tied to the war effort, bent on proving their staunch support of the government every time a McCarthy blasts a leading liberal or labor figure.

### SMITH'S FINGER?

Michael Straight, noting that Bailey, one of the bombing victims, is a former chairman of the American Veteran Committee's Wendell Willkie Chapter (Straight is national chairman of AVC), called for "intervention by the U. S. attorney general if local and state authorities cannot cope with the situation."

The open intervention in the dispute over the Greek electoral system by U. S. Ambassador John Peurifoy has not only raised something of a political storm in that country, but has also produced a political reaction here.

This political reaction is typical. It takes the form of a discussion of American economic and military support to Greece and other European countries with the purpose of justifying American political intervention. American liberals, who were a bit shocked by the brazenness of Peurifoy's attempt to dictate the Greek electoral system, are now told that at best their indignation comes a little late in the game and at worst represents a failure to "understand" America's new position in world affairs.

### ARM-TWISTING

He starts by referring to the shock occasioned by Peurifoy's action and to the comparison made in certain quarters between his intervention and that of a Russian ambassador in Helsinki. But, he continues, "under the nineteenth-century rules that governed the relations between sovereign nations, the United States has done many things since the war that would never have been tolerated."

### LIBERAL LINE

"General of the Army George C. Marshall did not precisely 'intervene' in the last Italian election. He merely allowed it to be known that if certain political parties came to power in Italy, United States aid to that country would vanish pronto."

Reston goes on to point out that on his recent trip to Tokyo, Ambassador John Foster Dulles did not "tell Mr. Yoshida that Japan had to agree not to sign a peace treaty with Communist China or that she had to sign one with Chiang Kai-shek. Mr. Dulles merely described what he called the 'realities' of the situation to Mr. Yoshida." That is, he told him that if the Japanese government acted contrary to the wishes of the United States in this matter, the American Congress might very well stop further financial aid.

### MARSHALLIZATION

The same happened in the case of German rearmament. Neither the French nor the British government were favorably disposed to the idea when it was first presented to them in the fall of 1950. "But Mr. Acheson," Reston writes, "carrying the ball for the Pentagon, let it be known that unless the Germans were rearmament, the chances of getting congressional support for the European aid program would not be good."

He goes on to describe American intervention into the details of the budgetary arrangements of European governments under the Marshall Plan and North Atlantic Treaty. Under the Marshall Plan the American government gave money only under the condition that the recipient governments would set aside similar sums for internal purposes. The Americans retained the right, and used it, to pass on the specific projects for which these moneys were spent. Under the NATO setup, not only does an American general have over-all command over the military

## REFRESHING CANDOR ON THE PEURIFOY CASE IN GREECE:

# U.S. Is Twisting Arms All Over the World

By GORDON HASKELL

The open intervention in the dispute over the Greek electoral system by U. S. Ambassador John Peurifoy has not only raised something of a political storm in that country, but has also produced a political reaction here.

This political reaction is typical. It takes the form of a discussion of American economic and military support to Greece and other European countries with the purpose of justifying American political intervention. American liberals, who were a bit shocked by the brazenness of Peurifoy's attempt to dictate the Greek electoral system, are now told that at best their indignation comes a little late in the game and at worst represents a failure to "understand" America's new position in world affairs.

The broadest and most thorough treatment of the matter which has come to our attention appears in James Reston's article in the New York Times for March 23 (see also U. S. News and World Report March 28). Reston is one of the most sophisticated and able liberal political commentators in this country. His article is therefore of particular interest, especially since he writes as if he were completely unaware of the real implications of the facts and trends which he describes for his readers.

### ARM-TWISTING

He starts by referring to the shock occasioned by Peurifoy's action and to the comparison made in certain quarters between his intervention and that of a Russian ambassador in Helsinki. But, he continues, "under the nineteenth-century rules that governed the relations between sovereign nations, the United States has done many things since the war that would never have been tolerated."

"General of the Army George C. Marshall did not precisely 'intervene' in the last Italian election. He merely allowed it to be known that if certain political parties came to power in Italy, United States aid to that country would vanish pronto."

Reston goes on to point out that on his recent trip to Tokyo, Ambassador John Foster Dulles did not "tell Mr. Yoshida that Japan had to agree not to sign a peace treaty with Communist China or that she had to sign one with Chiang Kai-shek. Mr. Dulles merely described what he called the 'realities' of the situation to Mr. Yoshida." That is, he told him that if the Japanese government acted contrary to the wishes of the United States in this matter, the American Congress might very well stop further financial aid.

### MARSHALLIZATION

The same happened in the case of German rearmament. Neither the French nor the British government were favorably disposed to the idea when it was first presented to them in the fall of 1950. "But Mr. Acheson," Reston writes, "carrying the ball for the Pentagon, let it be known that unless the Germans were rearmament, the chances of getting congressional support for the European aid program would not be good."

He goes on to describe American intervention into the details of the budgetary arrangements of European governments under the Marshall Plan and North Atlantic Treaty. Under the Marshall Plan the American government gave money only under the condition that the recipient governments would set aside similar sums for internal purposes. The Americans retained the right, and used it, to pass on the specific projects for which these moneys were spent. Under the NATO setup, not only does an American general have over-all command over the military

establishments of European countries, but Americans exercise close supervision over the financing and raising of their armies.

"Accordingly," Reston writes, "what used to be regarded as purely domestic considerations, such as the raising of a national army, or the preparation of a national budget, has gradually become, under this principle of mutual aid, a much more complicated affair, in which the nation that is supplying a large part of the dollar aid is drawn deeper and deeper, sometimes against its will, into the affairs of nations which it does not always understand."

### "MISUNDERSTANDING"

When it comes to making additional appropriations for foreign economic and military aid, the American Congress looks into every detail of the foreign and domestic policies of the countries which are to be aided. Everything, from French colonial policy to the Greek electoral system to the British philosophy of government to the Italian taxation system, becomes a matter for American review.

And Reston seems to be saying that the only misunderstanding is that we still stick by the old diplomatic terminology in which the word "intervention" is loaded with bad meanings. Thus the State Department continues to insist that it does not "intervene" in the internal affairs of other countries, while everyone knows that it does. Its argument seems to be that since any nation is free to withdraw from the "mutual aid" programs, the United States is not intervening when it tells this or that country how to run its affairs.

The most striking aspect of the "mutual aid" relationship which is completely passed over in Reston's article is that the intervention is a one-way street. No European government supervises the American budget, tells the Americans how to organize their elections, or how to collect their taxes (and from recent disclosures about the operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue a bit of supervision somewhere might not be at all superfluous.) It is true that in a completely negative way, European governments—and even more, European economic and political developments—do influence American politics and even the behavior of the American Congress. But every imperialist government in history has been affected by events in its colonies, dependencies, protectorates, and spheres of influence.

What Reston is describing is a classical type of relationship between a dominant imperialist power and its dependencies. The intensity of the relationship, the degree to which the United States intervenes and controls the political and economic life of the different countries varies from case to case. For instance, an American ambassador would not dare to tell a British prime minister publicly that the United States would not dare to state that if the Labor Party were to win the next elections, all American aid to Britain would stop. It is quite probable that the United States would hesitate to intervene that openly against the Social-Democrats even in a German election. Britain and Germany are too vital to the American scheme of things and too powerful to make such open dictation expedient.

The political relationship is, we repeat, an old and time-tested one. The lag in our thinking is not between the norms of diplomacy as practiced between sovereign and more or less equal powers in the last century and what is happening today. The lag consists in the fact that many of our liberals refuse to recognize the similarity between American relations to the

powers of Western Europe and those which obtained between the latter and the Balkan, Middle Eastern and the unconquered Asiatic nations from the second half of the 19th century on.

One thing that is different about the "new imperialism" of the United States is the structure of the economic relationship of the metropolitan country to its dependencies. Western European imperialism grew and flourished side by side with the growth and expansion of capitalism as a world economic system. In its early stages it took the form of the direct economic rape of colonial and dependent countries for raw materials and resources; and in its later stages, of a more systematic exploitation of colonial labor through private capital investment.

### WHITEWASH

But the "new imperialism" takes shape amid the shambles of the capitalist order in almost every country outside the United States. Despite the desperate need of American capital to find external investment opportunities, the decay of the system is such that the private capitalist will not risk direct investment abroad. A vast export of capital and consumers' goods can only be achieved by government action in the form of grants to tottering governments resting on tottering economic and political structures. Thus the economic and political realities dictate the form of American imperialism in Europe and throughout the rest of the world.

The new context of American imperialism makes the job of whitewashing and justifying it easier for our liberals than it was

for the apologists of the old imperialism. (The fact that the job was more difficult in the past, by the way, never stood in the way of its performance. Where there is a will, a way will be found.) It can be demonstrated with relative ease that if the United States were to cease exporting capital and consumer goods (cut off foreign aid) the economies of many countries would collapse and their governments would come down with them. It can be shown, further, that in some instances at least Stalinism would be the most likely successor to the capitalist order, and that in almost every case the widespread chronic economic misery to which capitalism has reduced the masses outside the United States would quickly give way to economic catastrophe.

That is all quite true. But it is also true that American economic aid has nowhere solved the economic problems of the dependent European, Latin American or Asiatic countries, and that if their problems were actually to be solved, the result would be catastrophic for the American capitalist economy. If these countries were to recover to the extent that they no longer needed a surplus of American goods, the outlet for American capital would be closed. The whole of American capital expansion would then have to be absorbed in this country. Only a vast and permanent acceleration of the armament program could possibly take care of this expansion without producing a stunning economic crisis.

CHAUVINIST MENTALITY

It follows quite inevitably that some degree of political control

will go with this stupendous export of capital on a government-to-government basis. The degree is determined by many factors, but the most important ones are the same in the "old" and the "new" imperialisms. They are, first, the weakness of the internal structure of a given country which "invites" political intervention; and second, the importance of the given country to the American over-all political-strategic scheme. The specific context in which the latter is considered in our day is, of course, the rivalry between American capitalist and Stalinist imperialisms which dominate all world relations.

To most American liberals the whole pattern of American imperialism seems perfectly natural, even humanitarian, and in any event inevitable. They are only shocked a little when, now and then, the diplomatic curtain is raised for a moment by a cross bit of public intervention like Peurifoy's in Greece.

The one thing which most of them are quite incapable of comprehending is the fact that the peoples of the rest of the world, who for some reason are not American chauvinists, cannot see the picture as they see it. James Reston usually comprehends these things better than most of his colleagues. His article ends on a note which is so ambiguous as to raise a suspicion of irony, as is often the case with him:

"The response here is always that what we are doing is not 'intervention'—since anybody who doesn't want to participate in the mutual-aid program can get out. But somehow this point never seems to be explained in terms that our Allies can understand."

### ISL FUND DRIVE

## Pace Needs Stepping-Up Toward Midpoint

By ALBERT GATES

Fund Drive Director

Contributions to the 1952 ISL Fund Drive reached \$694 this week, with the standings therefore shuffled slightly. This is still far behind the pace necessary to meet the total quota, but gives the drive a total of \$4767 and makes certain that it will pass the midway mark by the next report.

First place still belongs to Oregon with 130 per cent, closely followed by Streator which remains at 100 per cent. The other branches are climbing slowly. Pittsburgh with 60 per cent has moved into third place, dropping the SYL down a notch.

The SYL has now contributed a total of \$869.50 and its units stand as follows: Chicago \$358, New York \$202.50, Berkeley \$94, Detroit \$62, Northwest \$30, Madison \$10, General \$28, St. Louis \$25 and New Haven \$20.

St. Louis joined the list of contributors, with a payment which gave it 52 per cent of its quota. Payments were also received from Los Angeles, Detroit and Newark, the latter going over the 50 per cent mark.

On the whole, however, the payments have been altogether too slow, and the majority of the branches with the larger quotas still remain under 50 per cent. It is true that we have been promised a number of contributions for the month of April. But that is the final month of the drive and the weekly average necessary to complete the national quota will be around \$1400. Several good lump-sum payments will do the trick, but it will mean that each branch will have to step up its individual drive.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

## Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Percent
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$12,500</b>	<b>\$4767.50</b>	<b>38.1</b>
Oregon	50	65	130
Streator	25	25	100
Pittsburgh	150	90	60
Socialist Youth League	1,500	869.50	57.3
Newark	300	162	54
St. Louis	50	26	52
Cleveland	200	100	50
Buffalo	650	300	46
Oakland	500	220	44
New York	4,000	1,448	36.2
Los Angeles	600	200	33.3
Detroit	750	240	32
Chicago	1,800	555	30.8
Boston	50	15	30
General	1,000	276	27.6
Youngstown	100	25	25
Philadelphia	300	70	23.3
Baltimore	25	5	20
Seattle	300	55	18.3
Akron	75	0	0
Reading	75	0	0
Indiana	50	0	0

### CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

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

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1952 Fund Drive.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

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

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates.)



# 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!

### 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. \_\_\_\_\_

# Why Morrison Misfired in Pravda Debate

"On August 1, 1951, an unusual event took place: for the first time in the history of the Stalinist USSR, Pravda's pages published an article hostile to the USSR."

So begins an editorial in No. 19-20 of Vpered on the exchange between the then British Foreign Minister Herbert Morrison and Pravda, which made the headlines a few months ago. (Vpered is the organ of the Marxist wing of the anti-Stalinist Ukrainian resistance movement.) The "ideological duel," says the editorial, was of considerable significance in illuminating the political positions, strengths and weaknesses of the rivals, and it adds its own comments.

"Before we take up an analysis of both articles," writes Vpered, "it is worthwhile to examine why Pravda was courageous enough to do such a thing as allow the publication in its pages of a really free discussion between the two hostile governments and systems (not the peoples!), presenting this discussion also for the perusal of the Soviet population." It was forced upon Pravda, obviously, but not by the pressure of internal public opinion, which does not exist in the open and moreover is no guide for Pravda's contents; it was forced by the pressure of public opinion abroad, to show the Western philistines that Pravda is

not afraid to publish an article by someone like Morrison.

"Besides, the 'peace' propaganda again and again demands some special step by Stalinism, some kind of new sensation (the Western philistines cannot live without new sensations). Therefore this duel in Pravda must first of all be looked on as an event in international politics and only in the second place as one of internal importance."

### OPPORTUNITY LOST

Vpered then summarizes Morrison's charges and the Kremlin's reply; Morrison details the lack of democratic freedoms in Russia, its iron curtain against the West, its aggression, etc. Pravda counterposes "freedom of the people from exploitation, from economic depressions, from unemployment and misery"—what it is reminding the people of is their freedom from capitalist exploitation; it boasts of the numerous "workers' organizations" and papers in Russia and defends the rule of the state party, charging that Morrison wants to restore their rights to the capitalists; it goes through British imperialism's aggressions and counterposes its own "peaceful" record, etc., etc.

Vpered seems to think that Pravda's rejoinder would tend to convince the "average English-

man," since the latter "does not know the truth about Stalinism" and does know the truth about the charges which it makes against British imperialism; and therefore ruefully chalks up the duel as a "smashing defeat" for the West. That, we think, is a gross exaggeration; the "average Englishman" is not as naive about Stalinism as he is represented. But the kernel of truth is certainly this: Morrison's case as he presented it is surely no "smashing victory" for the West, as could and should have been the case.

And Vpered cogently shows why it was impossible for Morrison, a leader of the British Labor Party and a minister of the Atlee government, to make the points which could really have made a decisive impact both on the Russian peoples and on Stalinist sympathizers in the West. Essentially it is because Morrison, "socialist" though he be, was implicitly offering only capitalism as the alternative to the hated Kremlin system.

Because of his politics, says Vpered, Morrison "could not say, for instance, that it was quite all right and agreeable to him that the Soviet peoples had thrown out the bourgeoisie and all the Denikins (White Guards), Kerenskys and Skoropadskys, and that it is not for the benefit of these that he, Morrison, demands freedom," that, on the contrary, he demands freedom in the interests of the workers and of the workers' anti-

capitalist movements.

He could not and did not agree that the destruction of capitalism in Russia was a positive aspect, nor declare himself an enemy of the restoration of capitalism. The point he should have made is that in the USSR there is no freedom not only for the capitalists (which is what Pravda stressed) but also for the workers; that in the concentration camps today, it is not bourgeois who are imprisoned (they have not existed for a long time) but the workers and revolutionaries, enemies of capitalism.

### UKRAINE AND MALAYA

"But Mr. Morrison's tongue cannot turn itself to say this. Nor is he able to say anything more convincing about the USSR's imperialism," because the policy of his own government is imperialist. "If he were to talk about the national oppression of Uzbekistan or the Ukraine, then what shall he do with Malaya and Africa? And there is really no reason for sorrow that he did not agree to the BBC's broadcasts in Ukrainian"—as some elements in the Ukrainian émigré press proposed—"because there are no broadcasts in Malayan. The Malaysians apparently understand English as well as the Ukrainian peasants understand Russian..."

"But Morrison's article, even though to a very small extent, has some positive significance. The Soviet reader, after reading his ar-

ticle in Pravda, will draw some conclusions. Of course, he will agree with Pravda about the restorationist and imperialist intentions of Morrison, but he will also be thinking about his own fate: why he, the Soviet man, who long since has been against the restoration of capitalism, should yet have no freedom but rather go into the concentration camps. Mr. Morrison does not say this in his article, but perhaps the article as a whole will suggest such a thought. This is its only positive side.

### BOTH TOLD TRUTHS

"Considering this the probable positive result of Morrison's article, then it is possible to put an equation mark between the two rivals in the duel, and conclude that they both told the truth about each other but passed over in silence the truth about themselves..."

"The second conclusion is that the West, together with 'socialists' like Mr. Morrison, is completely hopeless with respect to its ideology and propaganda. It will never be able to tell the truth about The Truth (Pravda) and about Stalinism, and therefore will never discover and prove the real contradictions and lies which rule inside the USSR.

"The third and last conclusion is that Stalinism can be successfully fought only from the Left, from the standpoint of revolution, not of restoration. But, then, we always said that."

# Reminder for the UAW Educ. Conference

Reminder to the coming Educational Conference of the UAW-CIO: One of the highlights of the last such conference, held in Milwaukee in January 1949, was the address by Professor Robert Lynd, professor of sociology at Columbia, author of Middletown, etc., under the title "You Can Do It Better Democratically." Following is a key passage from that address. The whole of it was published by the UAW in pamphlet form and is still available.

From where I stand, democracy as a weapon can be overwhelmingly on labor's side, if you will pick it up and use it. And the current business propaganda identifying democracy with capitalism as two sides of the same coin is a sheer "phony," and can be shown to be so.

If labor is to seize the initiative, I am convinced that it has got to go political. And I don't mean reward your friends and punish your enemies! I mean go political all out and through and through. I mean a labor party.

And I don't believe that a labor party will be worth a damn if it simply tries to take over the Democratic Party and go on within our present setup. Your policies all the way through the union and in your labor education would have to be politically oriented. You would have to talk about class and what class power as we have it today does to all of us people, and how it blocks efforts to get through decent, badly needed democratic legislation.

I don't hear capitalism being talked about much through all the parts of this conference that I have heard. A labor party would have to make up its mind about capitalism. And a labor party would have to make up its mind about democratic national planning. National planning is a powerful democratic weapon lying open to your hands. Business won't touch democratic planning, for that is the thing it is fighting and the last thing it wants.

But don't fool yourselves about this: business can and will eventually capture the planning movement and use it for fascist ends, if you don't beat them to the draw.

### LONDON LETTER

# The Handwriting Is on the Wall

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, March 19—Over the last week, Aneurin Bevan's position within the Labor Party has become clearer. The rebuff suffered by the "shadow cabinet" (the party's ex-cabinet) at last Tuesday's parliamentary group meeting was repeated on Thursday when the National Executive Committee met at Transport House.

Despite the attempt by Jack Tiffin of the TGWU and Lincoln Stevens, the steel workers' leader, to drive Bevan out of the Labor Party, the conciliators won the day. Aneurin Bevan emerged the victor after the NEC meeting; he had won Joseph Reeves, of the Royal Arsenal Cooperative Society, over to his position and he had neutralized two other members of the NEC, H. W. Franklin (Railwaymen) and Captain Mark Hewitson (NUMW), who abstained on the mild censure vote.

By this morning the Bevanites appear to have successfully held up the imposition of the new standing orders requiring more rigid discipline in the party, and thus secured their third important victory over the last week.

### BELETED DISCOVERY

The weekend saw many ex-ministers and leading spokesmen of the Labor Party contributing to the great inquest on Labor's six years of government. At the Cooperative Party meeting on Saturday at St. Pancras Town Hall, Hugh Dalton re-emphasized his opposition to West German rearmament and said that the international subcommittee of the NEC had instructed him to meet both the French and German socialists to gauge their views on this burning issue.

The same afternoon, at a Fabian Society conference on "Anglo-American Relations," John Strachey said that the Labor Party had fundamental differences with the American government over Far Eastern policy. This is a somewhat belated discovery particularly af-

ter the "unfortunate" revelation which Churchill sprang on the Labor front benches over the latter's secret commitments with Washington in the event of the spread of the Korean war. Herbert Morrison, the former foreign secretary in the Labor cabinet, is still trying to recover from his blunderings during that debate!

The wild attack by Douglas Jay, former financial secretary to the Treasury, on the Butler Tory budget as "the most reactionary of the 20th century," is a measure of the weakness of the Front Bench now that it feels its ground being taken from beneath it. Douglas Jay's irresponsibility and demagoguery merely prove how hard the right wing is trying to "steal Bevan's thunder" without committing itself to support for a reduction in armaments expenditure.

### CP COMPLAINS

The writing is on the wall, "Mene, mene, tekel, upharisim," the right wing is found wanting, and all the sleight-of-hand tricks will be of little avail. Even "responsible" trade-union leaders, like Walter Padley of the NUS-DAW and Fred Kelland of the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, have pointed out the inevitability of demands for wage increases and the prospect of widespread unemployment. Such a development will add to Bevan's support even

more than now.

An amusing comment on Bevan's speech attacking certain reactionary elements in the U. S., over the weekend, was written into yesterday's Daily Worker editorial. The editor complained that Bevan's attack on Russia as well as American policy was "unfair." The Stalinist editorialist grumbled: "Can Mr. Aneurin Bevan never criticize America without at the same time indulging in an unfair and unnecessary attack on the Soviet Union?"

Truly the King Street people are worried by Nye Bevan! It is difficult to know who has more sleepless nights these days—the august members of the Carlton Club or the furtive occupants of the CP headquarters on King Street!

One of Bevan's weaknesses at the moment is his failure to participate in the major fields of re-thinking of Labor's problems that have affected all layers of the Labor movement. Problems of industrial democracy (what forms should it take?), nationalization (more or less? other forms of social ownership or no?), education (comprehensive schools?), the press monopoly (how to democratize the press)—these questions have not had the very necessary participation of Bevan and his friends. The answers to such questions will help to determine Bevan's place in the future as a pioneer of British Labor's next stage forward.

# Youth and Student Corner

## Detroit: Lessons of a Struggle at Wayne Univ.

By BOB DENNIS

DETROIT, March 22—Readers of LABOR ACTION are familiar with events which surrounded the recent appearance of the House Un-American Committee in Detroit. One of the consequences was the suspension of a Wayne University student.

When Lorraine Faxon Meisner was called before the kangaroo committee to testify on her Stalinist affiliations, she invoked her privilege under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution and refused to testify. While on the witness stand she giggled and treated the whole affair as a joke. Her stupid behavior helped to bolster the reactionary witchhunters that are now riding the broomsticks of intolerance in Detroit.

The same day as her testimony, the president of Wayne University, Dr. Henry, dispatched a telegram in which he declared that her refusal to answer questions was "prima facie evidence of guilt" and her failure to cooperate with the committee an evidence of bad university citizenship. He thereupon suspended her pending an appeal to the Council of Deans.

A Student Council meeting that same day was packed with students who were visibly disturbed about the entire affair. A group of liberals called a meeting and over 40 students attended.

The students constituted themselves as the Committee for Student Rights. They decided that they would work for the readmission of Meisner into Wayne University. However, this group, inexperienced in organization and politics, was very confused as to how to fight the campaign and what to do.

### WEAKNESSES AND THEIR CONSEQUENCE

When a motion was made to make it clear that the committee was opposed to all forms of totalitarianism, whether Stalinist or fascist, a very heated discussion ensued. The anti-Stalinist liberals in the committee seemed to believe that excluding the Stalinists would mean they themselves were practicing "McCarthyism." Local SLID members pointed out that belief in civil liberties for totalitarians did not necessitate taking responsibility for defending their ideas. However, the original motion was defeated and a very mild one substituted. A leaflet was prepared for the students which included the anti-totalitarian statement, much watered down, together with a resolution on the Meisner case. The student body received it with mixed feelings because many thought that the committee was a Stalinist front and refused to have anything to do with it.

Those who came to a second meeting of the committee did so because of personal contact with members whom they knew as anti-Stalinist.

By this time the liberals realized that in order to effectively fight against this abridgment of student rights they would have to make it clear that they were not acting out of sympathy for the Communist Party. A new resolution which strengthened the first was introduced and passed without difficulty.

### BOOKS and Ideas

# Herbert Philbrick's "I Led Three Lives" How They Get That Way: Confessions of an Informer

I LED THREE LIVES, By Herbert A. Philbrick. McGraw-Hill, 323 pages, \$3.50.

By SAM ADAMS

This book is not a thriller, even though citizen, "Communist" and counterspy Herbert A. Philbrick tried his best to make it so in writing of his experience as an informer for the FBI. But the fact is that Philbrick was a rather unrepentant turncoat like Louis Budenz who consciously served his Stalinist masters for more than a decade, as he now does his new ones; nor was he a Whitaker Chambers who for years functioned in the Stalinist underworld; nor a Cvetcic, a Bentley or a planted agent of the FBI, in the ordinary meaning of the term.

Philbrick was a young pacifist and active church member who got hooked by a Stalinist front and who was made use of by the Stalinists. Unlike hundreds and thousands of others who did not realize their roles as dupes and continued on in the Stalinist movements, or those who simply dropped away, from causes and activities which they deemed worthy because of Stalinist machinations, Philbrick did perceive it quickly. With a feeling of indignation and patriotism, he immediately informed the FBI of the situation in which he was placed as a Stalinist-appointed chairman of the Cambridge Youth Council in the Boston area.

From then on his role as a "dupe" continued, but now under the guidance and counsel of the FBI. Under advisement or instruction, Philbrick was extremely active and soon became a "contact"

Despite this change for the better in the program of the group the same kind of indecision was still prevalent. There was a tremendous amount of vacillation and no clear ideas were presented to move the group on. Proposals to carry out a mass rally and an educational program and to enlist mass student support nationally were accepted but not carried out. Although the committee had grown to about 85 students many militants who wanted to fight the administration's decision did not join because the committee did not appear to be doing anything.

The committee instructed its steering body to circulate a petition among the students if the Student Council failed to take the initiative on its own. The Steering Committee failed to have a petition ready in time. The Stalinists managed to inveigle some unattached liberals into writing a petition, which they then presented to the committee for endorsement. Not having an alternative petition the committee decided to circulate the one prepared by this other small group.

### STOP THE GAS HOUSE GANG

Its circulation was desultory and listless. By this time the effect of indecision and failure to take the initiative was taking its toll. A general feeling of demoralization began to set in. When the administration finally expelled Meisner the best elements in the group were conscious that an opportunity to fight had presented itself and been lost.

Despite these failings it must be remembered that this committee is the only student organization at Wayne University that has the support and wide representation which makes future plans and activities possible. The problem is to reactivate this group around a series of proposals which would extend its purpose and make it possible to move on to new perspectives. The committee members realize this and it remains to be seen what will be done.

It cannot be denied that there is a real need for a group of this nature at Wayne. Political groups are outlawed on campus, outside speakers are carefully screened, and proto-fascist elements are taking the initiative. A group of thugs and athletes belonging to the Gas House Gang recently managed to get a conservative majority elected to the Student Council. Committee candidates were defeated.

Certain proposals for giving the committee a new lease on life are now being presented. A campus newsletter on academic freedom, the call for a Midwest conference on democracy in education, the setting up of federated watch-dog committees on other campuses, the organization of a mass student meeting with well-known speakers, and the effective organization of a political campaign for the Student Council are proposed.

The Socialist Youth League hopes that this group will be able to realize its potentialities by becoming a rallying point on campus for student liberals. Students on other campuses can help the Wayne group by extending the protest through their own organizations and sending copies of their resolutions to the committee.

Stalinist political perfidy and understood its allegiance to Russia, decided to oppose Browder's proposal, which he argued even on the ground of the Stalinist distortion of a socialist conception of a party.

Mere opposition to Browder's proposal adversely affected his standing in the organization. But when the switch came with Ducloux's letter attacking Browder, a letter written in the name of the Cominform and Moscow, memory of Philbrick's opposition strengthened his party position and enabled him to gain even greater access to party councils.

The book, for the most part, is a pedestrian story of the way in which the Stalinist Party functions, its devious politics, opportunism, fundamental disregard for the real interests of the American working class, and above all its slavish devotion to the Stalinist dictatorship in Russia whose agent it is. In all these respects, it is not a new story, for it has been told far better by more politically astute individuals, and especially by genuine socialists who knew Stalinist treachery at first hand.

The book has interest if only for one reason: it tells how a rather innocent and inexperienced individual enters a Stalinist organization and then turns into an informer, describing approximately the way in which he functioned as an agent. He does not, however, tell the whole story.

### SINCERE TOOL

As every reader of LABOR ACTION knows, we have no brief for Stalinism or any of its parties. It is the great enemy of mankind and threatens the world with a totalitarianism more severe than any heretofore known. It does this by perverting into its opposite the greatest ideal that man has known, socialism. In doing this, Stalinism has assisted reaction of every kind all over the world. But to shrug one's shoulders just because Stalinism is the first victim of the increasing anti-democratic tendencies in the country, the vicious loyalty purges emanating from Washington, is to aid reaction and to assist Stalinism everywhere. It is well to bear in mind that the activities of the FBI in the political field are not confined to the Stalinist organizations but embrace all political movements of non-conformism and socialism. Reviewers of Philbrick's book point out that it is an unusual book. The author is not a roaring demagogue and dollar patriot. He is, apparently sincere in his belief in the capitalist system of "free enterprise." His description of this society is an ideal one and appears quite naive in the light of the harsh realities of monopoly capitalism. He warns against "guilt by association" and the wicked activities of the many senatorial and congressional committees which hold kangaroo-court sessions under the doctrine that an individual appearing before them on any charge whatever is presumed guilty and must prove innocence. Yet at the same time Philbrick opposes making the Stalinist party illegal because it would hinder the "counterspy" work of the FBI and make supervision of the party more difficult. Having been an informer for years, he cannot help but confuse his "democratic ideal" with his "counterspy" intelligence. For he was, after all, a police agent.

**The FIGHT for SOCIALISM**  
by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

\$1.00 Cloth-bound \$2.00

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS  
114 W. 14th St. New York 11, N. Y.

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 13 March 31, 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: WAtkins 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, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL  
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

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.



# THE CASE OF THE FFRF: An Exchange

## Boris Shub: In Defense of FFRF

To the Editor:

In the interests of brevity, I shall limit myself to a few observations about the two publications distributed by Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom to which you take exception.

(1) *Toward a Russian Policy* by R. Gordon Wasson:

As I understood the essay, its primary purpose was to combat the uninformed cold-war strategists whose ignorance of Russian history leads them to identify the Russian people with the Communist dictatorship. I did not find it to contain very much more than a resumé of the better pages of Russia's cultural past and the obvious conclusion that tsarism was far less oppressive than the Communist totalitarian dictatorship. Oddly enough, there are still some Americans who think that pre-Bolshevik Russia was a howling wilderness, populated by abject serfs and whip-cracking Cossacks; that the Soviet dictatorship was, and is, therefore, a logical continuation of "Russian barbarism" (a phrase that has appeared quite often in the U. S. press). R. Gordon Wasson attempted to remind such people that this land of barbarians gave Russia such giants of the human spirit as Pushkin, Lermontov, Lobashevsky, Gogol, Herzen, Chernyshevsky, Bielskiy, Tolstoy, Glinka, Moussorgsky, Tchaikovsky, Turgenyev, Mendeliev, Chekhov, etc. At one time or another, most of these men came into some conflict with the tsarist censorship. But the important fact is that tsarism, even in its most reactionary phases (e.g., under Nicholas I) did not destroy these great spirits or prevent their message from reaching the world. Nicholas I did not—and could not—compel Pushkin to rewrite *Boris Godunov* to his taste. The present Communist tyrant who rules Russia has forced Russian writers, scientists and composers to debase their work, to write paeans to the various Five-Year Plans. The difference in degree is the difference between day and night, between a society which left an immortal legacy to mankind, and an Orwellian nightmare. Would the present Communist tyranny permit a new Gogol to subject its bureaucracy to the merciless criticism and ridicule of *The Inspector General* or its collective-farm serfdom to the crushing indictment of *Dead Souls*? To ask the question is to answer it.

Today, unfortunately, there are racial extremists of a new school who call Communism a Russian plague. Instead of the forged *Protocols of Zion*, they quote the forged "Testament of Peter the Great" to prove that "Muscovy" is engaged in an "eternal conspiracy" against Western civilization. The primary advocates of this school of potential genocide are some of the leaders of the ABN, who already practised genocide against Poles, Jews, Russians and Ukrainians in Galicia and the Soviet Ukraine during World War II. If the ABN leaders were the only carriers of this deadly virus, they would deserve little attention. Unfortunately, the ABN is supported by the so-called Scottish League for European Freedom and their cause was given wide publicity in this country by British Major General J. F. C. Fuller in his *Saturday Evening Post* article of October 27, 1951. Moreover, this racial nonsense—which would have us abandon the fight against Stalin's despotism in favor of a crusade against Russia as such—is echoed by some self-appointed American spokesmen for the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. (The details are discussed in *How to Help Stalin Win the World*.)

### Comparison with Stalinism

If we turn to the ugliest feature of tsarism, the system of Siberian exile and *katanga*, the difference in degree again becomes decisive. Such open and avowed enemies of the old regime as Lenin, Sverdlov and Stalin suffered less in Siberian exile than the ordinary, non-political, Soviet citizen endures in his daily life. If you have any doubts on that score, I refer you to Lenin's letters, written from Siberia. I am not aware of the existence of Soviet camps in which enemies of Communism receive anti-Communist literature and write blueprints for the overthrow of Bolshevism. I know of nothing in the history of Soviet treatment of political prisoners comparable to Stalin's hunting and fishing expeditions while in Siberian exile. I have spoken to many Russian revolutionaries who fought tsarism not only by political agitation but by bombs as well and who spent years in Siberia. In no case have I heard from them anything remotely comparable not only to the tortures of present-day Kolyma, but even to the concentration camps of the early twenties, during Lenin's rule; camps in which liberals, socialists and Kronstadt sailors perished in tragic obscurity.

Finally, tsarism never held more than 50,000 at Siberian penal labor (*katanga*)—as distinguished from exile under conditions such as those which Lenin and Stalin were forced to "endure." Of these 50,000, no less than 32,757 were criminals, only 500 revolutionaries (according to the *Small Soviet Encyclopedia*, which tries to prove that tsarism was a dreadful tyranny). As against these 50,000, most of them common criminals, we now have an estimated 10-15 million inmates in Soviet concentration camps. In other words, tsarism imprisoned its active enemies, and generally treated these as human beings (there were no "confessions" exacted by torture under tsarism), while Stalin's despotism imprisons the people—and treats them as beasts.

As far as the comparative living standards of tsarist and Soviet Russia are concerned, I refer you to the excellent analysis in Max Shachtman's "Is Russia a Socialist Community?" (*The New Internationalist*, May-June 1950). Shachtman completely demolishes the myth that the average Russian is better off today than he was in the last years of tsarism—and that is one of the major points R. Gordon Wasson makes in his pamphlet.

### Pamphlet's Main Purpose

(2) The FFRF study *How To Help Stalin Win the World*:

The main purpose of that study was to disabuse American opinion of the dangerous theory that Communism is a specific Russian pestilence, inflicted by *Russians* on other peoples; that while Russians love all forms of despotism, including the Communist brand, the other peoples of the Soviet Union love freedom and hate Communism. FFRF takes the position that all the peoples of the Soviet Union are united in their hatred of the present police state. It seems to me that that is the only position decent democrats and anti-Communists can take, based as it is on the undeniable fact that the Russian people have suffered purgatory under Communist rule. Despite the obvious sanity of this approach, the racial anti-Russian (as distinguished from anti-Communist) line

The discussion on this page deals with LABOR ACTION's article of last week on "The Case of the Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom," by Hal Draper.

Copies of that article were mailed by LABOR ACTION to the 22 members of the FFRF's national committee whose names were listed in the article, as well as to the FFRF office.

Boris Shub, whose reply appears here, is a member of the national committee of the Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom and active in the organization. He is co-author of *Since Stalin: A Photo-History*. (Not to be confused with his father David Shub, author of *Lenin: A Biography*).—Ed.

does have its advocates here and abroad. In the early days of Bolshevik rule, anti-Semitic racialists tried to pin responsibility for Communist dictatorship on the Jews. They argued that because the Bolshevik leadership included such Jews as Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Volodarsky and Uritsky, Bolshevism was part of the "eternal Jewish conspiracy" against Christian civilization. When Hitler picked up this doctrine, he translated it into genocide. It did not matter to these hate-mongers that the Socialist-Revolutionary who tried to end Communist dictatorship by killing Lenin was Fanya Kaplan, a Jewish woman who had also fought tsarism by revolutionary terror. It did not matter to them that the assassin of Uritsky, head of Lenin's Petrograd secret police, was a Jewish student. The anti-Semites weren't interested in the facts; they were interested in spreading racial poison—and the Hitler record shows how far they succeeded, and with what disastrous results for all mankind.

Today, unfortunately, there are racial extremists of a new school who call Communism a Russian plague. Instead of the forged *Protocols of Zion*, they quote the forged "Testament of Peter the Great" to prove that "Muscovy" is engaged in an "eternal conspiracy" against Western civilization. The primary advocates of this school of potential genocide are some of the leaders of the ABN, who already practised genocide against Poles, Jews, Russians and Ukrainians in Galicia and the Soviet Ukraine during World War II. If the ABN leaders were the only carriers of this deadly virus, they would deserve little attention. Unfortunately, the ABN is supported by the so-called Scottish League for European Freedom and their cause was given wide publicity in this country by British Major General J. F. C. Fuller in his *Saturday Evening Post* article of October 27, 1951. Moreover, this racial nonsense—which would have us abandon the fight against Stalin's despotism in favor of a crusade against Russia as such—is echoed by some self-appointed American spokesmen for the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. (The details are discussed in *How to Help Stalin Win the World*.)

### The Unifying Principle

The point that *How to Help Stalin Win the World* tries to make is simply this: What is the common denominator that can unite all the peoples of the Soviet Union, Russians and non-Russians alike, in a force strong enough to crack and ultimately destroy the present despotism? FFRF takes the position, as I see it, that the common sufferings of all these peoples under totalitarian tyranny, their common desire to live, breathe and think as free human beings is the best potential driving force for a democratic revolutionary movement strong enough to overthrow the Stalin gang. There is nothing in this position which favors Russians over non-Russians, or which challenges the undeniable right of any non-Russian people in the Soviet Union to determine—after the common enemy of all has been destroyed—whether they wish to remain in the same country with the Russians, on a federal or federation basis, or whether they wish full national independence for themselves. We, for our part, do not possess the intimate knowledge of the desires of each of the 179 nationalities to tell them whether they do—or do not—want to remain together with the Russians after the present tyranny has been destroyed. We believe, further, that none of the émigré groups, whether Russian or non-Russian, really knows what choice the various peoples will make, when the question is put to them under democratic conditions. This much, however, does seem to be plain: It is better to help all, Russians and non-Russians alike, to fight against their common enemy and ours—the Stalin regime—than to stoke the fires of race hatred. If there is anything in this position which is undemocratic or unsound, I am at a loss to discover it.

If you find what, in your opinion, seems undue emphasis on those factors which point to a community of interest among the various peoples of the Soviet Union, in their common agony under Soviet tyranny, it is only because a whole body of vastly distorted literature has attempted to convince American policy makers that Russians are "Mongolians," "Asiatics" and "atheists," whereas all the other peoples of the Soviet Union, down to the most primitive tribes of Central Asia, are freedom-loving "Westerners." If you think this picture is exaggerated, may I commend to your attention the literature of the Scottish League for European Freedom, the ABN and other organizations who want to commit the United States to much the same type of war as Hitler waged. Believing as we do that total war, fought under the banners of national hatred, would be a calamity for the United States and the rest of the world, we have tried to find the best way for turning Stalin's war against all peoples into a united revolutionary struggle of the Russians and non-Russian peoples against the Kremlin tyranny.

BORIS SHUB

## Hal Draper: Shub's Open-Door Policy

By HAL DRAPER

Surely Boris Shub must have sent his letter to the wrong address . . . ?

Of course there are tantalizing passages which sound as if he is intending to reply to last week's article; but this too must have been the result of an unfortunate mix-up in his correspondence. It certainly cannot be "in the interests of brevity" that he neglects to make even a single observation, let alone a "few," about any pertinent point in the article, and devotes 95 per cent of his letter to elaborating on precisely the same features of the FFRF which I presented quite adequately under the heading "The FFRF's Positive Side."

Obviously the other person—the one for whom the bulk of his letter was intended—needs a useful lecture, with details, on the folly of identifying the Russian people with the Moscow dictatorship; on the degree to which Stalinism is worse than tsarism; on the fact that tsarism did not destroy many great artists whereas Stalinism does; on Stalin's hunting and fishing trips in Siberian exile; on the fact that Stalinism has pushed the living standards of the masses lower than pre-1914, complete with proof from Max Shachtman; that Great-Russians and Ukrainians are united in their common hatred of the Kremlin's police state; that Communism is not a Jewish plot; etc., etc. *We don't need it.*

Shub's all too brief "reply" breaks down every open door in sight, as well as several which he carpentered himself; then he chops them into kindling wood; after which he laboriously reduces them to chips; and he does not neglect to pulverize them industriously into finely sifted sawdust.

### Nothing Helped

It did me absolutely no good, apparently, to devote a passage to the FFRF's "main propaganda theme" on distinguishing the people from the regime, with the comment that it is "fine, of course." It didn't even help to repeat this all over again in discussing Wasson's pamphlet. So I wrote it down for a third time in introducing the FFRF's *How to Help Stalin Win the World*. Then, at the risk of deadly tedium, five paragraphs later I said the same thing for a fourth time. . . . What's the good? Shub has a tropism for open doors, and not one will escape his merciless hatchet.

We made a special point of writing that "it is one thing to agree that Stalinist totalitarianism is far more brutal than tsarism ever was; Wassonism is quite another matter." Does this stop Shub from belaboring the italicized point in the interests of brevity? Not at all. I had merely opened another door for him. The inevitable followed.

With laudable objectivity, as I fondly believed, the article praised the section of the FFRF pamphlet which lambasted the reactionary anti-Russians of the ABN. This, it seems, was a tactical error. Encouraged, Shub hauls out his trusty kindling-maker and chops splinters not only out of the ABN but also out of its allies from Scotland to the *Saturday Evening Post*.

Is Shub naive or does he merely think we are? No doubt his lecture on open doors is very necessary for large numbers of people; but his letter was addressed as a reply to an article in LABOR ACTION. Having been exposed to the teachings of the Shub family, father and son, I am aware that Machiavellian dodges are the exclusive vice of those bad Bolsheviks and Leninists, and are not to be lightly imputed to honorable Bolshevik-baiters. That, naturally, is why it must be that . . . Boris Shub sent his letter to the wrong address.

But just in case he didn't—

The FFRF, of which Shub is a leading member, is pushing the distribution of a pamphlet (the one by Wasson) which, we wrote, gives "the most glowing and gilded picture of the Russian TSARIST regime that this writer, at least, has seen outside of avowed monarchist propagandists."

### The Questions Were Labeled

To prove this rather amazing charge, we devoted nearly 24 square inches of space to nothing but quotes and summary of the indicated section of the pamphlet, with the flat statement that we were leaving out "no qualifications, ifs and buts." The resultant picture of tsarism as presented by Wasson, it may be said without fear of contradiction, is nothing short of hair-raising. We need only recall the very first item: Wasson's assertion that the tsarist nobility never found their rank an "economic asset" under tsarism, and enjoyed no privileges or power worth mentioning!

And Shub, who is sure death on open doors? He "did not find it [the Wasson atrocity] to contain very much more than a resumé of the better pages of Russia's cultural past [the emphasis is mine, the fraud is Shub's] and the obvious conclusion that tsarism was far less oppressive than the Communist totalitarian dictatorship." After which he goes to work, chop-chop.

The pains we took in discussing *How to Help Stalin Win the World* were even more futile. We had asked two questions, both labeled "QUESTION" and both with genuine question marks after them: (1) In view of the space devoted to the ABN chauvinists, "why is there not a single word said about the Great-Russian elements who

(Continued bottom of next page)

## A Minor Sidelight on a Political Issue —

# Tsarist Bonds and the Paris Bourse

In February the Paris stock exchange noted a significant increase in the exchange rate of pre-war German bonds. The direct impetus to this phenomenon was the news about a possible settlement of a series of questions connected with German debts, including the loans. In consequence, in accordance with the "multiplier effect" principle, there was also a jump upward in pre-war Austrian, Rumanian, Hungarian, Yugoslav and Greek bonds.

But what accounts for the fact that the old Russian tsarist bonds of 1906 and 1912 took an upward jump and once again became the subject of exchange transactions?!

This increase is still not a very significant one: the 1906 loan went up from 30 to 45 francs, and that of 1912 from 7 to 30 francs per bond. But it is still a fact that there has been a rise of interest in the old tsarist loans.

The Swiss daily *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* for January 21 explains this development by the speculations of an American "syndicate" which is not further identified. But it seems to us that something more significant is hidden behind this rate increase: Is it a "coincidence" that this windfall occurred exactly simultaneously with the sensations centering around the SONR? It will be very interesting to observe further changes of rate in the future in connection with the events inside the Russian émigré. . . .

### Kerensky's Pledge

In connection with the activities of the SONR last year [for this, see LABOR ACTION for March 3, "How Not to Foment Revolution" in Russia].—Ed.] there have been various gossips around who have been saying that involved in the SONR's activities are very important U. S. banking circles. Some malicious German commentators privately said that the Russian émigrés had agreed to very advanced economic-financial pledges—perhaps to the recognition of broad economic concessions, or to the recognition of the old tsarist debts. It is also quite possible that they agreed to both.

The same German circles also said that the

*Translated and somewhat condensed from Suchasna Ukraina, March 3, 1952, the bi-monthly paper of the Foreign Representation of the Supreme Liberation Council of the Ukraine (UHVR), published in Munich, Germany. It is the organ of the right wing of the Ukrainian anti-Stalinist resistance movement, of which Vpered represents the left wing.—Ed.*

American bankers agreed to support the SONR's idea of a "united and undivided" Russia simply because the pledges of the Russian émigrés concern the territories of the Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Caucasus and other non-Russian areas. Obviously it is easier to sell goods which are not your own; it is easier to trade, say, in Ukrainian railroads, mines and steel plants. . . . Being well acquainted with the Russian émigré politicians, particularly those from Kerensky's circle, we cannot make light even of these gossips.

But the reaction of the Paris stock exchange—this is already not merely a matter of gossip. It is a very realistic picture of what has already happened or may happen in the near future.

Hence we have an explanation of the phenomenon of Kerensky's candidacy and of the whole concept of a "united and undivided" Russia. It is well known that Kerensky and his government factually and formally considered themselves as the legal inheritors of the tsarist regime, and from this standpoint Kerensky waged the war "to a victorious end." Several times Kerensky declared at that time that he would carry out "all obligations with respect to the Allies." Today he has no obligations other than taking care of the transfer of all the old financial obligations of the tsarist empire, plus some "small concessions."

The case of the tsarist debts was already a subject of long debate in the 1920s. The non-recognition of the USSR by several states, including the U. S., was caused by the fact that the Bolsheviks refused to recognize the international

debts of the late tsarist empire. Moscow defended itself with the claim of legal nationalization, including the nationalization of foreign investments, and with the declaration that it was not obliged to assume responsibility for the debts of an empire which, as it said, had ceased to exist. In other words, the debtor had been liquidated. When the USSR became a world power and an ally of the victors in the war, there could be no question of anybody returning to the issue of the old tsarist debts.

### No Road Back

But the case looks different if the question is raised of the destruction of Stalinism and the restoration of the "democratic" regime in the USSR—the question which up to now has been raised only in the political-propagandist sphere. In this case it is possible to raise once again the issue of the old tsarist debts, under the claim that those values now exist in the form of industrial units, railroads, etc. The questions of obsolescence and legal expropriation through nationalization can possibly be gotten around through the political restoration of the *status quo ante*, including the personal composition of the new government.

One cannot reject the guesses that, behind the Paris stock exchange's reaction, are hidden someone's concrete plans; for no one will pay money for mere sheets of paper. We cannot have any influence on these speculations, but we can once more remind the foreign politicians and financiers that we will never accept any old tsarist debts nor any concessions in the Ukraine. Perhaps it is not necessary to convince anybody that, throughout the whole USSR and in the Ukraine in particular, nothing is more hated, outside of Stalinism, than the restoration of the old reactionary system. The revolution was not made so that, after its betrayal by the Stalinist terror, it should return to the tsarist system of Siberia. Maybe this cannot be seen by the Russian émigré "democrats" but this has to be made clear to everybody who is interested in Eastern Europe.

Yevhen VRETSIONA

# The Case of the FFRF: An Exchange —

(Continued from page 6)

take a national-chauvinist position with respect to the nationalities?" adding that these were the greater obstacle to united action. (2) In view of the detailed historical sketch of the relations between tsarist Russia and the Ukraine, "why is it that the infamous national-oppressive crimes of tsardom got off almost scot-free?"

These were not poor defenseless open doors, and so Shub has nothing to say. This fact, however, is by comparison a positive contribution, since it means that the charges stand, though no one could ever fell from Shub's "reply" that this is what our article was about.

We then pointed out how the pamphlet's whole last section explains the answer to the above two questions. The point was made, again in advance of Shub, that it was not up to us to tell the Ukrainians whether they want to separate or federate; it was up to us only to defend their right to separate; and we added: "But this is quite different from a scarcely concealed attempt to argue away the very grounds upon which a Ukrainian people can be meaningfully distinguished," and stressed that the pamphlet's "aim is to cast doubt on and discredit the legitimacy of the Ukrainian . . . national aspirations. . . ." And, we proved it, as is now confirmed by Shub's discretion in declining to say a word about it.

### The Line of the Pamphlet

This and nothing else is what, we said, constitutes the line of the pamphlet which covers up for the Great-Russian chauvinists, of the Kerensky type. And Shub (real poison on open doors) finds another one wide open and yanks it off its hinges with a mighty yank. This is what he actually writes, just as if it had anything to

### A basic pamphlet—

**"SOCIALISM:  
THE HOPE OF HUMANITY"**  
by Max Shachtman

Read it! 10 cents

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

do with a syllable in our article: "If you find what, in your opinion, seems undue emphasis on those factors which point to a community of interest among the various peoples of the Soviet Union, in their common agony under Soviet tyranny . . ."

The need for anti-Stalinist unity between the Great-Russian and national opposition arises from nothing but their common agony. The little point we made was that Great-Russian chauvinism stands in the way of such unity even more than do the ABN racists—and that the FFRF covers up for the former.

But Shub—who really didn't have to try to justify the FFRF's political works if he had nothing to say—will take up only safe questions like the greater oppressiveness of Stalinism as compared with the tsarist autocracy.

### Some Lesser Evils

Very well: Stalinism is worse than tsarism. Let's pretend that we had not made sure to say so last week and that it took Shub's letter to bring it up. *What follows?*

To help Shub out, we will go further than he, stating nothing but truths unlike Wasson. Stalinism is also a more oppressive regime than Hitlerism was, for most of their respective peoples. There are more prisoners in Stalin's slave-labor camps. Hitler did not use his concentration camps to work victims to death; consider the proportion of survivors. Would Kurt Schumacher have survived in Kolyma? Even known anti-fascists were left alone in Germany for a long period; could Gustav Noske have lived as long under Stalin as he lived under Hitler? Hitler had nothing like Stalin's iron curtain. He had no comparable penalties for (say) reading late to work. Living standards were far higher. Read David Rousselet's account of his life in a Nazi camp and ask if it was not practically idyllic as compared, say, with Jerzy Gliksmann's. "Much has been heard" about Hitler's gas chambers (we are using Wasson's own clever formulation) but the Stalinist regime has liquidated at least nine national republics, murdering and deporting their peoples; can such "differences in degree" of genocide be ignored? . . .

To continue further along these Wassonian lines is too much for my stomach, but if worst comes to worst perhaps Shub will yet live to write such a pamphlet. Beg pardon, that's probably a slander; he may merely form an organization which will push its distribution; or at any rate he may write disingenuous letters to incredulous socialists

explaining why there is really nothing extraordinary about doing so, chop-chop.

Shub made a mistake in equating Stalinism with the "Orwellian nightmare" of 1984. Stalinism is, I hereby maintain, a "lesser evil" in comparison with Orwell's Oceania, where the most intimate character of personal life is completely destroyed. This is a qualitative leap from Stalinism and not even a "difference in degree." Some day we might write a Koestlerian novel about a citizen of Stalinist Russia named something like Shub who is faced with the horrible prospect of conquest by Orwell's nightmare-land, with its TV spy-screens in every room and glade. . . .

### How to Help Stalin

Well, what does follow for Shub and his friends? It is not pro-tsarism, of course; Menshevism is good enough. It is at least this:

Willingness to embrace, in the purported cause of fighting Stalinism, anything and anybody who is not of that brood—no matter how foul his visage, no matter how bloodied his knout, no matter how discredited in the eyes of every decent person, no matter how many necks that ally has wrung or backs he has trampled on in order to shake his grimy fist at the Kremlin on Shub's side.

Just as so many, including so many would-be liberals, hold their noses and go along with the policy of aid to and alliance with the butcher Franco. For can it be denied that Franco is not as bad as Stalin?

And therefore the peoples who live in common agony under the Kremlin's heel suspect, seeing this Western capitalist alliance of "liberators" and "revolution-fomenters," that they are being offered a new rival set of exploiters, and oppressors—friends and glorifiers of the old exploiters whose knout they once knew on their own backs. Their suspicions are confirmed when Washington's agents carry on shabby love affairs with the most reactionary Russian-émigré elements; when the American Committee (Lyons-Kirk outfit) plays footsie with the NTS-fascists; when the FFRF helps put an ikon in the lily-white hands of the tsar; when the big U. S. press glorifies the regime of the discredited Kerensky.

This is truly *How to Help Stalin Win the World*. It is not only madness, it is not only stupidity, it is not only betrayal of the ideals of socialism and humanity, it is not only part of the political and social bankruptcy of a whole society—it is also the intellectual and moral decay of every element which gets involved in supporting that society.



# N.Y. Rally and Picket Lines

(Continued from page 1)

picketing had been carried on by the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims, composed of a number of militant organizations, including the Independent Socialist League.

"Barcelona: Franco Murders Spanish Workers!" "Valencia: Spanish Worker Faces Death!" "Vittoria: Basque Workers Face Trial!" "Seville: 75 Union Workers Condemned to Death!" These were some of the placarded slogans of protest against the continued regime of butchery in Spain.

The chairman, Miss Frances Grant, stated in her introductory remarks that the purpose of the meeting was to protest against the persecution of workers and political opponents by Franco. She said pointedly, "If we had raised our voices loud enough fifteen years ago, the ghosts of Spanish freedom would not arise again and again to reproach us."

## CENTURY'S TRAGEDY

James Carey spoke officially on behalf of the CIO and revealed that he would shortly appear before the Senate Committee on Foreign Aid to present the case of labor against Franco.

Carey's speech was a lengthy, rounded and militant denunciation of pro-Franco actions and the apathy surrounding causes such as that of the anti-Falangist militants of Spain today. "One of the tragedies in this second half of the 20th century," he said, "is man's inability to respond to tragedy." He spoke of the other great tragedies—the extermination of 7 million European Jews, the enslavement of 15 million workers in Russia, the threat of a return to barbarism. Such things, he said, seemed to block out the feeling of the meaning of human slaughter.

He referred to the case of "nine obscure men in Spain—as obscure as Sacco and Vanzetti." He pledged the CIO effort, in the case of Spain today, to try to restore the real meaning of "brotherhood."

Carey also suggested that a message to the people of Spain be sent on the anniversary of the Spanish republic.

Norman Thomas attacked American policy which "for the sake of a few bases condoned the crimes of General Franco. Let

there be no aid for Franco Spain!" he declared. He called for telegrams to congressmen and delegations to Washington, saying that he had himself wired his sentiments to Secretary of State Acheson. He scored the fact that, in an election year when candidates universally seek the favor of the people, it apparently doesn't pay them to speak out against Franco.

Thomas viewed the fight against Franco partly in terms of its effect on U. S. policy abroad. "We are here," he said, "because it might yet be possible to make the U. S. live up to its claims. Franco must not be supported lest we betray the cause for which America stands."

Roger Baldwin, former director of the American Civil Liberties Union, speaking for the League for the Rights of Man, militantly expressed "solidarity, unity, friendship and comradeship with those men and women—all of them—who are struggling in Spain today against the oppression and terror of the Franco regime," as well as with those who struggle against tyranny everywhere.

## TREASON IN '30s

Baldwin recalled his chairmanship fifteen years ago of a committee against Franco for Loyalist Spain, when anti-fascism was more popular, when aid was sent to Spain, when the U. S. arms embargo was vigorously fought by friends of Spanish democracy. "The treason of the democracies," he reaffirmed, "was responsible for the victory of Franco, not the weakness of the Spanish people. We have to fight against the libel that the alternative to Franco is communism." He criticized the "arms and anti-communism" character of the struggle against totalitarianism today.

Jesus Galindez told the story of the CNT (National Confederation of Labor) harassment by Franco, culminating in the announcement last February 20 of the execution of eight of their members. This announcement provoked many protests, up to the British House of Commons, and was the basis upon which the United Spanish Societies began to plan this meeting.

The executions were denied by the Franco regime, but on March 12 it was officially announced that five were to be executed in two days and four others were to be sentenced to life—as "common criminals." Their real "crime," Galindez pointed out, was their participation in the Spanish underground after entering Spain from the French border.

"It is clear that these 30 members of the anarchist group 'Liberation' were fighters in the underground," he said. "Why was the court-martial held two years after the arrests? Why did they not have lawyers to defend them, but officers of Franco's army? Why were they executed in such haste? Why were they shot in the manner of political offenders?"

"We charge that in Franco Spain a new persecution has been started recently against democratic unions and political groups who are forced to act in the underground because, since 1929, there has been neither free labor nor freedom of thought."

Galindez reminded the audience that there were twenty-seven leaders in Barcelona awaiting trial for participating in a political strike, as well as many others in other parts of Spain. These were not accused as common criminals; all were fighters in the underground. In Vittoria, the defendants were openly accused of being leaders in the general strike of April 1951. They too were charged with crimes against the state.

## FRANCO'S FOES

Professor Robert Alexander voiced the common liberal objections to aid to Franco Spain by the United States. He declared that the executions and stepping-up of persecution by Franco is proof positive that the latter is not going to change his regime to suit the Americans, as some like to believe, simply on account of U. S. aid. Franco is behaving as though "thumbing his nose at the U. S.," he charged, especially in view of the fact that most of the "crimes" for which the victims are being held or executed were committed years ago.

Alexander, who had recently returned from an ECA mission to

Spain, also stressed that the current opposition within Spain to Franco consists of socialists, anarchists and Republicans, giving the lie to Franco's myth and that of some Francoist apologists, that the only alternative to Franco is Stalinism. He also spoke of the adverse effect on the American anti-Franco fight in this country of the dispatch of an American ambassador to Spain.

Of great importance also, Alexander said, was the aid and comfort given to the Stalinists in Spain by the reversal of U. S. policy. The disappointed under Franco now tend to listen to the Stalinists, because the Russians at least continue to speak against Franco while the U. S. has definitely ceased doing even that.

Speaking on behalf of the "hispanic world of the West," Eduardo Santos made a compassionate plea in Spanish for the victims of Franco, and against all similar tyranny.

Stanley Isaacs of the City Council singled out the cause of the labor leaders persecuted by Franco and said of U. S. policy, "We're betraying everything we believe in." He pledged the support of ADA to the anti-Franco cause.

## RESOLUTIONS

Telegrams of support and encouragement were received from Rudolph Halley, president of the N. Y. City Council, and from members of the Spanish republican government-in-exile.

A resolution was presented for adoption by the meeting by Roland Watts of the Workers Defense League, dealing with the invitation by Mayor Vincent R. Impellitteri to the mayor of Madrid to attend as an official delegate the U. S. Conference of Mayors to be held here soon.

The resolution asked that Mayor Impellitteri rescind the invitation as an affront to mayors of democratic communities and their constituents as well. It is also to be sent to Mayor David Lawrence of Pittsburgh, president of the U. S. Conference of Mayors, to ask that he inform the mayor of Madrid that he would not be welcome or acceptable, and to Dean Acheson.

Roger Baldwin offered an amendment, which was unanimously accepted, to delete the provision of the resolution dealing with the Spanish mayor's not being permitted into the country, since such a restriction smacked of the McCarran Act. The motion was therefore restricted to the sections dealing with withdrawal of the invitation and asking the conference to state that he is not welcome. Norman Thomas remarked that Mayor Seidler of Milwaukee has already protested.

Another resolution asking that aid to Spain be made contingent upon the guarantee of freedom and urging the U. S. to exert its efforts on behalf of political prisoners was offered. This was amended for the floor to strike out all reference to contingencies and it was carried in its amended form.

## MORE TO BE DONE

This first successful meeting on behalf of Franco's victims was not highly publicized and the picket lines which preceded it have been ignored by the big dailies. The organizers of this meeting were said to have been doubtful about filling the hall. Yet its success, with the modest efforts thus far made, indicate the latent enthusiasm which exists for a real effort in behalf of Franco's victims.

The participation of the CIO and support by the AFL is of great importance. Up to the present they have confined themselves to press statements, speeches and governmental pressure by top officers. To be really effective and achieve results, it is necessary to educate and move the ranks of labor. Such an undertaking is eminently feasible if the leaders only want to undertake it. An hour's nation-wide labor stoppage in behalf of Franco's victims, or some similar action, would be the most effective step that could possibly be taken, more so even than a dozen meetings.

The Spanish tragedy has not been forgotten and the spirit is alive to help save the present victims of Spanish totalitarianism. But much, much more remains to be done.

# Detroit: Witchhunt Goes On

(Continued from page 2)

for the second time in 19 years, gave the Rivera murals a clean bill of health with the verdict that it could find no trace of ideology in them. This, we presume, is supposed to be a good thing.—Ed.]

## REUTHER'S CASE

Within the UAW-CIO, the important event was the explanation given by Walter Reuther, UAW president, to a caucus meeting of about 500, for his actions against Ford Local 600 officials. By and large, they were accepted by this active cadre of the Reuther caucus.

Reuther charges that the criticisms in *Ford Facts* are not anti-Reuther but anti-union. That is

why it was necessary to shut it up.

He used two major illustrations to try to prove his point. After the last UAW convention, *Ford Facts* had a sensational full-page story headlined "Betrayal." This article blasted the delegates who ran against a dues increase and then voted for it. This was termed a betrayal of the rank and file. The article also blasted the role of Reuther. It criticized the salary increases to top officers and to international union representatives.

This article, according to Reuther, was used by other unions to defeat the UAW-CIO in elections. Therefore, the Stellato regime is guilty of anti-union activities.

Another major article that

burned Reuther up was the recent criticism of the UAW unemployment conference in Washington. Reuther's program of fighting for more steel and copper was denounced as a "bosses' boy" program. The article ridiculed claims that the conference accomplished anything. It accused Reuther of hand-picking the delegates to that conference.

Of course, readers of *Ford Facts* know the extremes which criticism of Reuther reach at times in that paper. Does a paper have the right to be wrong? Does a local union officialdom have the right to criticize the policies of the top officers of the union, even if that criticism may be picked up by someone else? Reuther's answer is No!

## "ADMITS" BAD HABIT

The basic trouble with Reuther's rule is that in practice it signifies that NO criticism will be tolerated, for ANY criticism may be picked up by other unions, like CP-controlled unions, and quoted against Reuther and the UAW.

Let us take the current issue at Ford Local 600. Suppose a local union votes that the placing of an administrator over Local 600 was bureaucratic; this action is noted in the next issue of the local union paper; then a CP-controlled union quotes the local union paper as calling Reuther "bureaucratic." Under the present rule the local union leadership is subject to the same charge of anti-

unionism as Reuther levels against Ford Local 600 officials.

Perhaps the best way to capture the flavor of the "new democracy" in the UAW is to quote Reuther's attitude toward opposition. He explained that at recent conventions he had been often criticized by his fellow officers for giving the minorities too much time on the floor. He said he would have to admit that the criticism was just. He did have a habit of being too tolerant. But the ranks should remember that opposition did have its uses. It was like a flea on a dog.

## It kept the dog in action!

The exception to the trend here was the action of the Wayne County CIO Council in criticizing Sheriff Baird for firing a deputy who was once a member of the Communist Party. Highlight of the discussion on this question was a speech by Harry Southwell, president of the powerful Local 174, who warned the delegates that, unless the trend was stopped, militant trade-union leadership could be placed in the same position, simply by a listing of their names by the committee.

Labor Action FORUM • New York


## JURISPRUDENCE and the COLD WAR

Speaker: STAN GREY

Thursday, April 3 at 8:30 p.m.

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

### HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE



## LABOR ACTION

The Independent Socialist Weekly  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Please enter my subscription:  NEW  RENEWAL

Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00  
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

NAME ..... (PLEASE PRINT)

ADDRESS ..... APT.....

CITY ..... ZONE ..... STATE .....

Bill me  Payment encl. (stamps, currency or postal note)