

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 9, 1952

FIVE CENTS

**Bevan's Book: A Review of Reviews**

... page 6

**The Amazing Stories of El Campesino**

... page 7

**World-Federalists and the Third Camp**

... page 8

**Supreme Court vs. the White House**

... page 3

## Truman's Role in Steel: Help or Hindrance?

### Washington Reaps Its Reward from Rhee

By LARRY O'CONNOR

Syngman Rhee's government in South Korea continues to make a mockery of the contention that what is at stake in the war there is a conflict between totalitarian and democratic principles or systems of government.

Under the South Korean constitution, a new president must be elected by the National Assembly sometime before June 23. As Rhee's opponents happen to have a majority in the Assembly, it appears that the president is determined to arrange things either so that no election will take place, or in such a way as to terrorize the Assembly into voting for him.

During the week of May 25 Rhee had eleven members of the Assembly arrested on charges of plotting the overthrow of the government, and a twelfth on a murder charge. At last report, about twenty members of the Assembly were reported to be in hiding to avoid arrest.

When asked why the members of the Assembly were arrested in view of the constitutional provisions which give them immunity, Dr. Clarence Ryee, a government spokesman, said that they had been caught "in flagrante delicto" (in the act of committing a crime), and hence immunity did not apply to them. He went on to say, however, that they had not yet been brought to trial as further evidence of their guilt still had to be collected!

#### U. S. EMBARRASSED

In another move to ensure complete control over the Assembly, Syngman Rhee declared martial law over the Pusan area around the capital. Despite a vote of 96 to 3 against this edict, Rhee has refused to rescind it. Further, on the weekend of June 1 a battalion of South Korean national police (from 500 to 600 men) were brought into the capital on the pretext that they were to attend a police convention. Oppositional Assembly members claim that their homes were searched on Sunday night, and many of them slept in the building where the Assembly meets to avoid going home.

It is quite understandable that the American military authorities and the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea are deeply concerned over these developments. A violent political struggle in South Korea among factions of the ruling class

is all they need to make their already difficult position intolerable. On the other hand, the suppression of the most elementary aspects of parliamentary democracy by Rhee is just so much more grist to the Stalinist propaganda mill.

#### RHEE PROMISES . . .

Hence General Van Fleet has been to see Rhee, and so has the ranking civilian representative of the American government, Edwin A. Lightner. The United Nations body mentioned above was moved to warn the government that its actions "transcend the boundaries of Korea," and to request Rhee publicly to release the imprisoned members of the National Assembly.

(Continued on page 2)



By BEN HALL

When the steel union leaders canceled their strike call in January, they assured their members that a friend of labor sat in the White House and that this man, whose heart brimmed with concern for the laboring man, would never, never use the Taft-Hartley Law against them. Now, five months later, after devious and protracted negotiations, the union is forced into a strike that promises to be stubborn, bitter and long.

The rosy optimism of January gives way to a sneaking suspicion that the friend of labor is not so friendly, that he may try to force the union back to work under a Taft-Hartley injunction obligingly granted by the courts, which on this count would undoubtedly prove tractable enough; or merely pass the buck to a Congress with an ax out for labor.

The intervening five months have been months of disturbing experience for a union which placed such great hopes in the Truman administration. Briefly the story is this: The union went along with Truman every inch of the way; it imagined that he was on its side at every juncture; and when the fight was over, at least the first few rounds, the union looked for what it had won and found . . . zero.

#### Toeing the Line

Negotiations were first opened with the steel monopolies in November and dragged out their futile course for two months when steel contracts expired and the union readied for a strike. Truman appealed for a strike postponement; the union postponed. The Wage Board kicked the case around until the middle of March when it proposed its compromise settlement, which the union accepted.

The companies stalled and the union scheduled a strike for April 8. Truman seized the mills; the union called off its strike plans. Then Judge Pine declared the seizure void. The union struck. A day later, the U. S. Court of Appeals turned the mills back to the government; Truman appealed for a work return; again—the union deferred, work resumed. The actions of the union were so coordinated with those of Truman, and his moves appeared (superficially) so adjusted to the demands of the union that we might expect the United Steel Workers union to support him to the hilt in his dispute with the steel companies and with the Supreme Court.

(Continued on page 2)

### State Dep't Wriggles On Passport Blockade

By GORDON HASKELL

Two recent cases in which the Passport Division of the State Department has refused passports to prominent American citizens wishing to travel abroad have aroused something of a storm of protest in liberal circles over the arbitrary powers vested in that department. It is to be hoped that the storm will blow up strong enough to bring about an actual change in the abridgment of the right of American citizens to travel abroad because of their political beliefs or opinions.

The two cases are those of famous chemist Dr. Linus Pauling, who wanted a passport to attend a scientific conference in England, and Dr. J. Henry Carpenter, a Brooklyn clergyman who wanted to go to Japan. The American Civil Liberties Union has strongly condemned the procedure under which these men were denied passports, and has demanded that either the State Department or Congress should provide for hearings or other means by which people denied passports may defend themselves against whatever the charges against them may be.

It appears that the Passport Division is getting a bit sensitive to the outcry which has been raised against it. In the case of Dr. Carpenter the head of the division went so far as to state that the

passport had been denied because of his "political activities," although these were not specified. Usually the department informs those whom it has proscribed only that their travel abroad would "not be in the best interests of the United States."

The ACLU has pointed out that this "amounts to a serious charge, which, if it is not clarified by a full and fair hearing, will cast a cloak of doubt and suspicion over Dr. Carpenter. As a citizen and a recognized leader in his field, he is entitled, without delay, to an opportunity to answer whatever evidence the State Department may possess against him. Anything else is a bald violation of the spirit of due process of law which is fundamental to our democracy and to which our government and its agencies should scrupulously adhere."

#### BOLD CLAIM

Apparently smarting under the criticism leveled at it in these matters, the State Department has issued a "full" statement on May 24, for the first time explaining its position in passport matters. In certain respects the statement is at least clear, because it boldly and baldly dares to set forth the department's contention that it has the unlimited right to deny passports to American citizens for whatever reason it chooses. In other respects the statement is

(Continued on page 2)

### McGranery Fingers ADA

The character of Truman's new attorney general, James P. McGranery, was somewhat crudely evidenced by the new cabinet officer himself during the recent hearings on his appointment by the congressional committee.

One of the witnesses who appeared to testify against McGranery was Richard Dilworth, the ADA Democrat who was elected district attorney of Philadelphia in the last election in a vote which upset the long-time rule of the city by the corrupt Republican administration. Dilworth denounced McGranery as unfit for the office. (McGranery is a Philadelphian also.)

Then, reports columnist Marquis Childs: "After Dilworth left the room when he finished his testimony, McGranery promptly informed the committee that the witness [Dilworth] had refused

to sign a loyalty oath and that was a leader in ADA in Pennsylvania."

The "loyalty oath" which Dilworth had refused to sign was that of the infamous Pechan Act, the state's recent witchhunt law. It was, however, Dilworth's connection with ADA which made the most impression on the committee's chairman, McCarran.

"ADA?" said McCarran. "Isn't that the left-wing organization that Francis Biddle is the head of?"

"Several of your own colleagues in the Senate are members," Dilworth replied. "And it was Mr. Biddle when he was attorney general who approved of the appointment of Judge McGranery to the Department of Justice."

But McGranery's reference to the ADA helped to save his neck.



# Truman's Role in Steel Fight —

(Continued from page 1)  
Court, *Yet nothing of the kind happened.*  
As the constitutional dispute reached its climax, the union shifted to a neutral position. In its statement before the Supreme Court its spokesmen were careful to state that they were not appearing in defense of government seizure any more than they were in support of the appeal of the steel manufac-

turers. They centered their case on one argument: there were no grounds for applying the Taft-Hartley Law to the steel workers. In effect, they were not defending Truman but preparing to defend the union in the next round of the struggle when every bourgeois spokesman will be demanding an anti-union injunction.  
**As the steel workers begin to man their picket lines, a**

**new mood is in evidence. In retrospect, the sentiment of the union members is that the strike should never have been postponed. Or, once postponed, it should not have been called off some months later when it had first begun. Truman and the administration is no longer the trusted friend: suspicion thickens.**  
For these workers have seen their demands tabled for 151 days; they know that

the administration deliberately failed to enforce the recommendations of the Wage Board when it first took over the mills; they have learned that Charles Sawyer, appointed to direct the mills under Truman's orders, devoted his major energies to sniping at the union, so much so that Phil Murray had to repudiate him in public. Whatever Truman's personal intentions may have

been, the actual effect of his intervention in steel, it is now clear, was simply to prolong the endless process of stalling and delay.  
Now the steel workers battle it out, face to face with their bosses. Yesterday they were eager for Truman's participation. Now they are beginning to think: *Keep your hands off.* It is an important lesson for the whole labor movement.

# State Dep't Passport Policy —

(Continued from page 1)  
downright misleading.

The statement starts out by stating that "The secretary of state has discretionary authority in the issuance of passports, both as a power inherent in the exercise of the presidential authority to conduct foreign relations, and as a matter of statutory law."  
It then goes on to say that secretaries of state have in the past denied passports to people on various grounds, and to quote rulings by attorney generals and courts which allegedly uphold this right. Actually, the instances cited have no bearing on the present issue, as they did not deal with cases in which denial of passports to citizens were involved, but rather cases in which the citizenship of the would-be recipients of the passports was in question. The statement says that for many years the secretary of state has been denying passports to fugitives from justice or people who were "mentally ill or likely to become a public charge abroad," or had, on previous trips, engaged in political activities in foreign countries.

ran Act. The effective basis of denial has been simply the decision by some officials in the State Department that a trip abroad by such persons may not be "to the best interests of the United States."  
**JOKER.**  
The department's statement tries to give the impression that some kind of fair procedure protects the individual citizen from the arbitrary application of the powers which the department claims it has:  
"Passports are refused," it states, "only on the basis of very clear and definite reports from the investigative and security offices of this department and of other government departments and agencies and from foreign

governments containing well-authenticated information concerning past and present activities and associations of the applicant." And then comes the real joker: "Any applicant who has been refused a passport has every right and is given every opportunity to request further consideration of his case and may present any evidence or information which he may wish to have considered. The particularity with which he may be informed of the contents of the reports in the department's file depends, of course, upon the source and classification of such reports but it is usually possible to inform him in a general way of the nature of the evidence and the information upon which he has been refused a passport."

What is "usually possible" to the State Department, we have no way of knowing. We do know that in all cases which have reached public attention, the sole and only information given the person to whom a passport was denied was that his trip abroad would "not be in the best interest of the United States." Against this "evidence" a defense may be possible, but just how a person is to go about starting to prepare it no one has yet succeeded in finding out.  
**NO DEFENSE**  
The ability of a person to travel abroad is a minor right as compared to his right to speak or write freely, to join organizations of his choice, and to hold a job. Only a small minority of Ameri-

cans ever seek to leave the country, and only a tiny fraction of these have yet been faced with a denial of a passport. Yet for some citizens travel abroad is an indispensable part of their occupation, and for many it is a very important cultural and educational experience.  
The essentially arbitrary denial of this freedom is another blow at the freedoms of the American people. Every effort should be made by all who are concerned with maintaining the traditional freedoms we have enjoyed and seeing to it that they are broadened to establish the right to travel abroad as firmly as any other right which can be denied a citizen only upon trial and conviction for the violation of a law.

# Washington's Reward by Rhee —

(Continued from page 1)  
bly. The government's reply has been to threaten to throw all UN agencies out of the country on the charge that they are interfering with internal Korean affairs. This threat is not expected to extend to the chief UN agency in Korea, the army. Later Rhee denied making the threat.

So threatening have Rhee's moves become that General Clark, after "a very enlightening talk" with the would-be South Korean dictator, issued a statement of intended reassurance that Rhee would not pull the South Korean army out of the front lines in order to carry on his private war with the legislators! That's all he and Van Fleet were concerned about in the conversation, said the commanding general. At the same time, however, Rhee tightened his censorship of local newspapers and radio, and ordered the arrest of the editor of the *Oriental Daily*, on charges that he had been responsible for an editorial criticizing the government" (to quote the exact words of the N. Y. Times dispatch).

the bit of history involved is damning enough, particularly in the passage which we have emphasized below:  
"Rhee is convinced that he is the only leader who can bring happiness and prosperity to Korea. His record, however, shows failures in many important respects. Even before the North Korean invasion in 1950, the Japanese-built industry of South Korea had been virtually wrecked by cannibalization, looting, misuse and rust. Inflation ran wild. South Koreans were slaughtering each other in bloody riots. Korean police were brutal. Civil rights were practically unknown. Severe restrictions on freedom of speech had been instituted equal to the Japanese 'thought control.' Some of these developments started in the hectic period of United States occupation, but the situation worsened during Rhee's first two years in office. Then, under cover of the war beginning in June 1950, even more fantastic graft and mass political murder became commonplace.

American officials felt, had been away from Korea too long to be representative of the people.  
(2) The 'People's Republic,' led by an experienced underground leader of Japanese days, Lyuh Woon Hyung. To Lyuh's standard flocked labor unionists, intellectuals, former political prisoners, and members of the underground, including Communists. People's Committees were set up all over Korea and maintained order and essential services between V-J Day and the American occupation a month later. United States army authorities rejected and disbanded the Peoples' Republic on the ground that it was 'Communist.' It undoubtedly had Communists among its members, but whether it was Communist-controlled or not is debatable. Its destruction deprived many of Korea's non-Communist liberals of a place to go.  
(3) A loose collection of native rightists built around a few educated and influential Koreans who had remained at home during the Japanese occupation.  
"Faced with these three unpromising alternatives, the United States command decided to set up a military government on an interim basis and allow the Koreans themselves to develop political parties and later hold elections.  
"Once this decision, and the decision to outlaw the Peoples' Republic without trying to 'clean it up,' had been made, the character of the future government had been decided: it was to be reactionary."

## RULE BY FILES

The State Department then goes on to say that its procedures were re-examined in the light of the conviction of the Stalinist leaders under the Smith Act, and the passage of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (the McCarran Act). In this Act Congress stated that the Communist movement represents a world-wide conspiracy. Yet even under the McCarran Act provision was made for public hearings by a board, with the possibility of court review of the board's findings, before any particular organization could be designated as part of this conspiracy for legal purposes. Yet the State Department has decided to deny passports to "a person if information in its files gave reason to believe that he is knowingly a member of a Communist organization or that his conduct abroad is likely to be contrary to the best interests of the United States," in the words of the department's statement.

Planned Loophole  
The Research Institute of New York, an outfit to advise big business, told its clients at the beginning of May "How the owner of a business may cut his yearly tax bill by almost a third!" It explained how to capitalize on the pro-profit tax bill passed by Congress.  
"Here is one illustration," the Institute expounded. "Suppose you are a married man with three children, and your taxable net income is \$100,000. Your tax bill for 1952 will be about \$58,000. But properly handled, by making your children your business partners, the total tax bill will be around \$40,000—a tax saving of almost one-third. This is called a 'family partnership.'"

NO PLACE TO GO  
"For the creation of this unsatisfactory government, the United States was, to some extent, responsible. The political potential available for development when the Americans entered Korea in 1945 was small. It consisted of the following:  
"(1) A group of well-to-do expatriates, among them Rhee, who,

## His Six Convicts

The state of American prisons, which was forcibly brought to public attention by the revolt of convicts in a number of jails, has been further highlighted by the case of Colorado warden Roy Best.  
Best was re-elected, early this year, as president of the American Prison Warden's Association. Now he is under federal indictment, together with eight subordinates, for violation of the civil rights of six convicts during a flogging last July. The Civil Service Commission suspended him pending a hearing on 11 charges of misconduct. The chosen president of the country's wardens is charged with "willful inhumanity to prisoners."

A brief review of this background is supplied by the following excerpt from an article by Dr. C. Clyde Mitchell in the *Foreign Policy Bulletin* of May 1, published by the Foreign Policy Association. Mitchell, a University of Nebraska professor, was U. S. administrator of the National Land Administration in South Korea from 1946 to 1948. Furthermore his article for the most part is more an apologia for U. S. policy than a criticism of it. But his factual summary of

Just out—Summer issue of  
**ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN**  
In this issue:  
Debate on American Foreign Policy  
Faulkner's Writing and the Southern Myth,  
by Irving Howe  
God, the Devil and Jean-Paul Sartre  
Can Asia Avert Totalitarianism?  
plus other articles and student reports  
20 cents per copy Order bundles now  
ANVIL and STUDENT PARTISAN  
247 Lexington Avenue, New York City

# The Steel Seizure and Presidential Power: Supreme Court Rebuffs a 'Kindly President'

By BERNARD CRAMER

This week's decision by the Supreme Court on the steel seizure can be assessed in terms of its immediate effect on the steel crisis or it can be considered more broadly on its own terms, as a verdict on the powers of the president which has an incidental application to a current problem. The two needn't be counterposed to each other.

N. Y. Post's labor columnist, Murray Kempton, reported Murray's relief that the fight was now transferred from the government round to the picket line—the latter was what he knew, the former was a rat-race.  
Not that the relief could be unalloyed either! There is a good deal of the divided soul in the breasts of the labor leadership as they confront the problem of their relationship with a government which they say is a "friend to labor" but which is not labor's government.

Even from the first point of view alone, it would be a very superficial and short-sighted reaction if labor men, rooting for the steel union as we do, set it down as a "defeat" or "blow" for the CIO. Judging by the way in which the steel union leadership has been hanging onto the coat-tails of President Truman's "seizure" policy, subordinating the union struggle to it and making their own independent action dependent on it, they should in all consistency take this very limited view.

Lineups  
What the immediate impact of the court verdict will be on the steel union's fight depends now on action by Truman or Congress or both. And this will be a test of them, and not primarily of the meaning of the court decision. One thing is certain; insofar as it means that the steel union can no longer pursue the course of fawning dependence on Truman's needs (which is not the same as the union's needs), it is no catastrophe.  
Nor can the decision be considered a "blow to labor" from the point of view of the social forces or ideologies which were

ranged on both sides. If the steel companies got the verdict they wanted in this particular case, it is also true that the railroad unions (for their own reasons) were equally gladdened by it. And the railroad workers, as their recent sticky settlement showed, have much more reason for their reaction than the steel workers may have for feeling let down.

JACKSON EXPLAINS  
This was nowhere shown more clearly than in the opinion delivered by Justice Jackson as a concurrence with the majority, and in two separate ways.  
(1) Jackson was now voting to legalize the president's seizure of the steel plants without statutory authorization. But it happens that he was the attorney general at the time when the president (Roosevelt) seized the North American aircraft plant, before Pearl Harbor, in order to break the strike—and did so without statutory authorization. Attorney General Jackson advised the president then that the emergency power of his office was great enough for the purpose.  
Today Vinson twits Jackson on his about-face. How does Jackson wriggle on it?

TRUMAN TREND  
There is good reason, therefore, to comment on the decision as abstracted from the immediate steel issue, though not abstracted from the real issues posed by political trends in the U. S. today. Looming large among such political trends has been the drive of the Fair Deal administration to substitute administrative decree for legislative action, and it was this that the court majority made the center of its attack. The most sinister manifestation of this tendency has been in the field of civil liberties, where the Fair Deal's witchhunt has been keyed to decrees that have been carefully kept away from the possibility of test by court action; the infamous Truman order setting up the subversive list is the most prominent of these.

EXECUTIVE AUTONOMY  
There is nothing progressive, liberal or democratic in the extension of the "implicit" powers of the president to include a well-nigh unrestrained scope of "emergency" action. The relative autonomy of the executive as embodied in the American presidential system is less democratic than (for example) the subordination of the British prime minister to Parliament. If, for some years now, in this country, a so-called "liberal" presidency has been counterposed in labor thinking to a reactionary Congress, with increased dependence on the powers of the former, it has been so because of the political weakness of the labor movement as an independent force.

IMPLICATIONS  
Margolis charged on May 20 that Honig invented his "damaging testimony" in the present trial that the 1934 San Francisco general strike was "plotted in Moscow." Honig had testified that defendant William Schneiderman,

this case were not equally sensitive to the issue they now raise when it concerned civil liberties for unpopular minorities—who were not represented before the bar by John W. Davis. Juridical principles, precepts and precedents take a back seat when social pressures become fiercer. The issue which the Supreme Court "decided" will actually be fought out, not in the courts in the first place, but in the class struggle.

management acquiesced in the seizure, and that many of the employees were in the gates trying to work." (N. Y. Times.)  
The monstrousness of this self-justification is as striking as its illustration of the ability of our judicial-minded "above-the-battle" guardians of the Constitution to talk like company policemen when the occasion necessitates it. The lofty principles about executive powers which flow from his pen under the persuasive influence of the steel bosses' lawyers become marks on scraps of paper when (a) he has non-judicial objections to the leadership of a strike—"Communist insurrection" or (b) when the seizure is solely to break a strike—"management acquiesced in the seizure"; or (c) when he becomes tender about the rights of scabs—"many of the employees were at the gates trying to work."

DOUGLAS WARNS  
(2) In another part of his concurring opinion, Jackson delivers a cruel body-blow on another issue, the Korean war—which, we might remember, was "declared" by the president. The majority opinions in the steel case made much of the fact that "all legislative powers" are vested by the Constitution in Congress. Jackson actually comments:  
"Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of a war is entrusted only to Congress. Of course, a state of war may in fact exist without a formal declaration. But no doctrine that the court could promulgate would seem to me more sinister and

Government Gives Stoolies A Rest in Calif. CP Trial  
By DAVE BERN  
LOS ANGELES, May 30—In the trial of the 14 California Stalinist leaders, the government announced May 21 that its case rests, and the jury was dismissed until June 3, at which time the defense is to begin its presentation, perhaps with its own witnesses. Meanwhile, arguments by the defense concerning 8700 pages of government testimony are taking place on motions to strike the testimony of nearly every one of the 22 witnesses who took the stand.  
The court recessed after the final cross-examination of Nat Honig, Hearst employee, who claimed that as an ex-CP'er he had evidence to prove that the 1934 waterfront strike under the leadership of Harry Bridges was instigated by Moscow.  
In the cross-examination Honig, confronted by transcripts of his testimony in previous trials and hearings, admitted that he had never asked about this aspect in the 1941 deportation hearing of Bridges. Defense Attorney Margolis charged that Honig "tailored his testimony in every anti-Communist case in which he has appeared to fit the prosecution's needs," reported the *Daily News* of May 17.  
Earlier, Honig had explained he was disillusioned with the Stalinist party because they had failed to make good on a promise to let him be editor of the *Western Worker* after an enthusiastic trip from the East. Before this episode and his subsequent role as informer and government witting, he had been a "strong party member."

## LONDON LETTER Labor Ranks Close Up—Tory Disputes Sharpen

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, May 27 — Last week Aneurin Bevan stated at the South Wales Miners Federation Conference that he was sure his views would receive majority support in the Labor Party by the end of the year. Both the Scottish and South Wales miners are strongly influenced by the Stalinists, and it is likely that the Stalinists (for their own reasons, to be sure) will give support to Bevan at the coming Conference of the National Union of Mine Workers.  
But Aneurin Bevan has not compromised, and in all likelihood will not compromise, his anti-Stalinist stand because of this dangerous support.  
What is certain now is that the parliamentary group of the Labor Party is executing a turn to the left. In fact, there has been talk of Bevan's reversing his previous decision not to take responsibility for the policies fashioned in the Labor "shadow cabinet." The truth is that the Labor Party is now so confident of ultimate sweeping victory of the polls that the leadership is becoming bolder, fully conscious of the strong pressure to the left within the party and the trade unions. In short, the leadership is becoming more "Bevanite," reluctantly and very much against their will. However, the official leadership has no choice but to trail behind Bevan, for fear of isolation within the movement as a whole.

Backbench Revolt  
The Tories' situation is going from bad to worse. The chancellor, Butler, has been faced with a first-class revolt from the die-hard backbenchers who are dissatisfied with the excess-profits tax. The militant Tories are in a state of disillusionment. They are unable to turn the wheel of progress back for fear that the Labor movement will bring such an adventure to a very untimely end. The Tory government is suspended in mid-air, unable to satisfy its numerous financial supporters, increasingly isolated from the Tory rank and file, and increasingly losing the moral support of Tory opinion, as expressed in the *Daily Telegraph* for instance.

Other points of interest over the last week have been the publication in the *Star* of "Mr. Atlee's Own Story" in serial form, and Lord Beaverbrook's revelations about the forces behind the abdication of King Edward VIII in 1936. Atlee has not put anything startling on paper as yet, except possibly his description of Zinoviev as the Soviet foreign secretary in 1924; though his characterization of Ramsay MacDonald's action in 1931 as "the greatest betrayal in [British] history" seems to be rather extreme coming from so mild a man.  
On the abdication of Edward VIII, what Lord Beaverbrook has not said is that the reason for his forced retirement was not his "peculiar" choice of an American divorced lady as his wife but his openly expressed concern at the Baldwin government's inaction over unemployment in Wales.

## Government Gives Stoolies A Rest in Calif. CP Trial

alleged new national leader of the CP, had participated in Moscow discussions in 1934 in which the Comintern is said to have ordered the American party to turn the longshoremen's strike into a general strike "as a rehearsal for revolution." The transcript of the 1941 Bridges hearing, when Honig was a witness for the government, indicated that the stoolie had failed to mention Schneiderman or the alleged Moscow plot.  
Even before the final verdict arrives, the lessons of this trial are clear in their implications for American democracy now under assault on all fronts. It is not the Stalinist leaders themselves that socialists grieve for, since we recognize even the relatively weak American CP as an enemy of genuine democracy and the freedom of workers and socialists. It is the character of the seditious law which tries men for advocacy instead of overt acts, the bold use of government spies as witnesses, the official pressure for conviction by a government with imperialist aims at stake which point to the undermining of our traditional rights. And the witnesses' behavior has been a sorry spectacle.  
The Smith Act trials, already condemned by the American Civil Liberties Union, the ADA, the enlightened labor circles, are portents of what we can expect as the cold war "warms up." Not only Stalinists, but dissenters in general and the labor movement as well are in danger, not only from the loud lash of McCarthyite reactionaries, but also from the more silent, systematic throttling by the Fair Deal administration, which instituted the witchhunt by the first application of the Smith Act against anti-Stalinists, invoked the infamous subversive list and loyalty-oath criteria of Tom Clark for government jobs, the echoes of which are now rebounding in industry, education, and the entertainment world.



# 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. ....

# MARXISM FOR TODAY

## SOCIAL INEQUALITY AND CULTURE

By PHILIP COBEN

In the midst of a book review in the N. Y. Times a while back, there was an interesting remark by the paper's regular daily reviewer, Orville Prescott, raising a question—and illustrating the meagerness of a non-materialist approach to history. For Marxists, as it happens, the question is an old one.

Prescott was reviewing *Golden Ages of the Great Cities*, a collection of historical articles, and he concludes:

"Provocative, for instance, is the evidence offered here that the finest cultures which Western men have been able to achieve so far have always depended upon social inequalities—a leisured and wealthy minority and a toiling, poor majority. One of the most interesting questions now facing mankind is whether social inequalities can be decreased without decreasing culture, too. Those of us who believe in democracy believe that they can." (March 25.)

Now, the affirmation of faith in democracy is very fine, and I am not derogating it as part of the answer. The trouble is that if the answer to this question is based only on one's faith in democracy, it misses the main point about the past relation between social inequality and culture. And more important, one would fail to see why, for today and the future, it is social equality which is the necessity for the burgeoning of culture.

Why this difference between yesterday and today on this point? The observation with regard to past societies is, of course, quite correct in the main. One need only think, for example, of ancient Greece—where one of the world's greatest cultural advances blossomed out of the sweat and toil of a slave system—or of the Italian Renaissance, where the princes' largesse which fed the new streams of art and thought and science was derived from the exploitation of poverty-stricken masses.

### The Economic Basis of Leisure

But there is really no great mystery why this was so and had to be so. Such opportunities to think and create can exist only when men, or some men, are relieved of the daily grinding necessity of scrambling every waking hour for the animal needs of existence. In a society whose level of production of the needs of existence is too low to provide this for the whole people, it can be true only for a favored minority—the ruling class which lives on the fruits of other men's toil. Slaves had to do the work of society in order that a Socrates might be able to spend his time in wonderfully perplexed conversations or that a Pheidias might create beauty; and the Italian masses had to live in hovels; if Lorenzo the Magnificent were to be able to fill his palaces with the works of economically unproductive artists.

Anyone who wishes may take an abstract-moral attitude toward this state of affairs; it would be quite sterile; Marxists do not. What we stress is that the historical necessity which made this inevitable no longer exists in our day—as everybody knows.

The historically progressive role of capitalism was precisely to develop the forces of production to the point where plenty for all (which is not a soapbox slogan) is technically possible. And if the social system of declining capitalism, which has long ago done its job, now stands in the way of the social realization of these potentialities, that is why we are socialists.

But what is, in the last analysis, important about "plenty for all" is not merely that it means a full belly for the masses but that it means leisure for all. And leisure, which means not idleness but a respite from the tasks which both the animal world and humanity have in common, is the prerequisite for a truly human culture.

A leisure-class culture based on the exploitation of the great majority by a small minority has a narrow base. The culture of a whole people who are freed from the treadmill of life has all of society as its base—and its reservoir.

It is not therefore a question simply of faith in democracy, but of the objective potentialities of a democracy which is no longer distorted by either economic scarcity or human exploitation.

## Get acquainted with THE SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

For information on SYL program and activities, write to:  
SYL, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 23 June 9, 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, 1879.

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.

# READING from LEFT to RIGHT

VPERED, Nos. 1-2, 1952 (new issue).

This latest issue of the organ of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party (in Ukrainian, with an English page as usual) features the opening of an interesting discussion on the economic potentialities of the Stalinist system (in terms of production level). Two articles represent two points of view.

One is presented by Vs. Felix, who argues that because of its planned economy, even though the planning is bureaucratic, Stalinist economy can surpass American capitalism in 18 years, "and then world history could be facing new and overwhelming facts." A different standpoint is given by another regular writer for *Vpered*, I. M-ko, who "calls Stalinist planning administrative-bureaucratic. It is characterized by an

enslavement of the workers and the shift of the market to rationing for consumers. This change is not dictated by socialist doctrine and not by the necessities of the economy, but by the necessity for the state to control everything from the center and to avoid deviations from the fixed plan. . . . In the bureaucratic planned economy the plan is effected by force, inflation causes a run on goods, hoarding and speculation. . . ."

It is not clear from the English summary whether I. M-ko does or does not agree with the proposition that the bureaucratic Stalinist economy can raise the productive level of Russia so far above its present one as to outstrip the U. S., nor whether he takes up the general question of how the bureaucratic nature of Stalinist state planning acts as a fetter on its forces of production.

# In the Stalinist World

## Houses Have a Housing Shortage

The following sad story is from the *Moscow Pravda* of May 5. It is mainly extreme cases, of course, that are given this "self-criticism" routine in the Russian Stalinist press; but this grimly uproarious tale may remind us of grandiloquent Stalinist claims of other types—and of the hollowness behind them.—Ed.

The youth of Nukus complains of boredom. It does not know where it should go for leisure or entertainment.

"How come?" wonder the members of the Provincial Komsomol Committee of Kara-Kalpak, capital of the Kara-Kalpak Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. "In Nukus there are a great many cultural and other organizations!"

The Secretary of the Provincial Committee enumerates: "There is the House of Popular Art, the House of Culture, the town's House of Culture, the House of Physical Culture, the House of Hygienic Enlightenment, the House of the Pioneers. . . ."

"Correct," confirms the Council of Ministers of the Autonomous Kara-Kalpak Republic and adds, "We allocate big sums for the development of culture and the work of enlightenment."

Yes, the means are available, but . . .

It is said that once the seven directors of the seven "Houses" in Nukus met and discussed their bitter lot. Soft spoken Vladimir Nikolaevich Sarskij, Director of the House of Popular Culture, was the first to speak.

"Seven years ago I was appointed Director of the House of Popular Culture. I was assigned two inspectors, an accountant, a secretary—but I obtained no building. Dozens of times I have addressed myself to the Council of Ministers of our Republic with my request for a building—but to no avail! And for seven years my colleagues and I have drawn our salaries—for what? Ah, friend, Vladimir Nikolaevich continued dreamily, "we had beautiful plans, but they all turned to water. Our House has no house, and that is the whole trouble."

"You do not stand alone in that meadow, Comrade Sarskij," said the Director of the House of Culture, Comrade Telegenov. "Since 1947 our non-existent House exists only on paper; just like your House, it has a complete staff, just like you, we do not know how to kill time. And with that we too draw—it is a shame to have to admit it—our full salaries."

"Do you think my conscience is any easier?" said the Director of the town's House of Culture, Comrade Saizev. "What can we do when our House has no house? "I hold two posts," joined in the Director of the House of Teachers, Comrade Pirshanov. "Earlier on I was Director of the House of Teachers. Later, when

our House was occupied by the Trade Union Council, to shut me up, I was appointed Secretary of it. Now I draw two salaries, but no one bothers about work for the House of Teachers. There is simply no house, yet as before, the shield on the T. U. C.'s house bears the inscription, "The House of Teachers."

"Speaking of shields," interposed the Director of the House of Pioneers, Comrade Madgasin, "in our House there is practically no room. We were assigned a roof in the courtyard of the Pushkin High School and we do our best to work in two tiny rooms. We too have a beautiful shield, but of real work there is no sign."

The Director of the House of

Hygienic Enlightenment seemed about to say something, then simply made a deprecating gesture with his hand.

As the House of Physical Culture has no Director as yet, we will tell its story—and a sad story it is. Six years ago the Council of Ministers authorized the spending of 750,000 rubles on the building of a house of Physical Culture in Nukus. But in the course of six years, the Building Trust got no further than laying the foundations and building the walls of the Sports Hall, which were so badly done that after an inspection, they had to be pulled down.

That is why it seems that in Nukus there are many Houses of Culture, and yet the young have no idea where to go, because none of these houses has an address.

## Rakosi and the Salami Tactic

The following passage from a speech by Mathias Rakosi, Stalinist Fuehrer in Hungary, in which he describes his "salami tactics," is one of the frankest worded discourses of the kind by CP satellite leaders. It was published in *Tarsadalmi Szenille (Budapest)*, Feb.-Mar.

In 1945, after the liberation, like all Communist Parties in countries oppressed by Hitler, we too followed Stalin's directive, and set up the Hungarian National Independent Front, a coalition with the other anti-fascist parties. Nevertheless, we took the initiative in the coalition. We were helped, of course, by the Soviet Union.

One of the coalition parties was the Smallholders' Party, supported by the church, the officer class, industrialists and bankers. At the November 1945 elections they gained an absolute majority, i.e., 56 per cent, the Social Democrats and the Communists 17 per cent each, and the Peasant Party a little less than 8 per cent. We were given the important portfolio of minister of the interior and of deputy prime minister. The Smallholders nominated the prime minister and half of all the other ministers.

In March 1946 we formed the Lertist Bloc within the independent front which included the Communists, Social Democrats, the Peasant Party and the Trade Union Congress. We demanded the elimination of the reactionary elements from the Smallholders' Party, and to begin with 21 deputies were expelled.

After this success we adopted "salami tactics," i.e., we kept on cutting down the power of the Smallholders' Party, slice by slice, so to speak, as you do the salami. In the meantime we strengthened our position and gained the confidence of the people. But we also continued our fight against reaction and managed to rid the country of several imperialist agents—members of the Smallholders' Party.

Then came the turn of the Social Democratic Party. They opposed us on several issues; in fact, they became a gathering point for all reactionary elements. But we have shown them up, and at the August 1947 elections our party obtained 50 per cent more votes than either the Social Democrats or the Smallholders.

We had a longer and more desperate fight against the Social Democrats. They wanted to break up the coalition, and demanded the formation of a new government with the Communists excluded. A new government was formed but the Communist Party gained power in it. We then speeded up progress. We eliminated the Hungarian Independent Party.

At the same time we unmasked the double-dealing policy of the Social Democrats. Their disillusioned followers joined our ranks in ever-increasing numbers, while those who remained demanded the elimination of their treacherous leaders. This was done at a meeting on February 18, 1948, and in June 1948 the Social Democrats were merged with our party.

Thus we realized the two basic conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

When in the autumn of 1948 we acquired the Ministry of National Defense, we began the development of the army on our lines. And, of course, the A. V. H. (state police) was in our hands right from the very start.

### In Lebanon

The Socialist Progressive Party of Lebanon, headed by Kamal Djumblatt, has put forward a public proposal for the creation of a "neutral bloc" in the Middle East between Russia and the West. A meeting of the party decided to oppose creation of the projected Middle East high command and placing airfields and communications at the disposal of the Western bloc in time of war.

# Michigan CIO Denounces State's Trucks Act as Threat to Liberty

A strong statement by the Michigan CIO, in the form of an article in the Michigan CIO News for May 22, has now been issued against the state's new Trucks Act, one of the worst of the state witchhunt laws that have been passed. The article appeared under the headline: "Trucks Act Endangers Democracy. Anti-Commie Law Hits Anti-Comies."

It is noteworthy that the article has now been printed in spite of the fact that the United Auto Workers "ally," Democratic Governor Mennen Williams, hastened to sign the act when it was passed by the legislature, and that UAW men in the legislature voted for it.

The article from the Michigan CIO News is below.

The Trucks Act—the so-called "Michigan Communist control law"—has, since its passage, done everything but control Communists.

The Michigan CIO Council opposed passage of the Trucks bill because of its dangerous catch-all terminology, because there are already adequate laws dealing with sabotage and treason, and because the law would not combat Communism at all.

A striking illustration of the danger of the Trucks Act is Attorney-General Millard's use of this so-called anti-Communist law against an anti-Communist political organization.

Under the broad powers of the catch-all law, Millard

denied a place on the Michigan ballot to the Socialist Workers Party, a bitter foe of the Communist Party.

This was the first use of the law to be made in Michigan. The anti-Communist law has not yet been used against Communists, who have instituted legal action to declare the act invalid.

### PRECEDENT

If the attorney-general can crack down on the Socialist Workers Party under the Trucks law, what is to prevent him from taking similar action against other minor groups of whatever political complexion?

Some political crackpots have said and are saying that the Democratic Party is dominated by the CIO which

in turn is dominated by Communists. In such circumstances, the broad language of the law would permit the attorney-general to declare the Democratic Party to be a subversive organization not entitled to a place on the ballot. Ridiculous? Well, it is possible under the Trucks Act.

The act sets up four broad definitions of a "Communist" . . . only one of the four definitions cites membership in the Communist Party. The act also sets up catch-all definitions for "Communist Party" and "Communist front organizations." These definitions can be stretched to cover almost any political organization.

### DANGEROUS LANGUAGE

The penalty section of the Trucks law is another illustration of the dangerous broad language it contains. Here's what it says:

"It shall be a felony, punishable by a term in the state prison for not more than 20 years, for any person, with the intent to injure the United States, the state of Michigan, or any facilities or property used for national defense, to sabotage or destroy, or to attempt to sabotage or destroy any property, facility or service that is being used in connection with national defense.

"Should any loss of life occur by reason of such sabotage or destruction, or by reason of any attempted sabotage or destruction of such character, the person committing or attempting to commit shall be guilty of murder with malice aforethought and shall be punished by confinement in the state prison for life or for any number of years.

"The word 'sabotage' as

used herein means the willful and malicious infliction of physical damage or injury to property.

"The penalty herein provided shall be cumulative of all other penalties which might be imposed by virtue of the fact that the acts constituting an offense under this statute also constitute separate offenses under other laws of the state.

This section not only leaves "injury to property" to the broadest possible whimsical interpretation, but it makes violators subject to penalties under two or more state laws.

### TOTALITARIAN STEP

A violator could be subject to two life sentences plus 99 years.

The Trucks law is a totalitarian measure. It imperils freedom of speech. It can be used to eliminate political opposition.

It is dangerous and it is unnecessary. There already exist federal and state laws dealing effectively with sabotage and treason. The FBI has proven itself an effective fighter against traitors and saboteurs.

If the Republican-ruled state legislature is sincere in its announced desire to combat communism, it will not use a totalitarian measure to fight a Communist totalitarian group.

There could be no more effective blow struck at Communism in Michigan than passage of a fair employment practises law, minimum wage legislation, decent unemployment and workmen's compensation and a fair tax program.

Social unrest can be curbed only by treating the causes, not the symptoms.

# Supreme Court Decision—

(Continued from page 3)

alarming than that a president whose conduct of foreign affairs is so largely uncontrolled, and often is unknown, can vastly enlarge his mastery over the internal affairs of the country by his own commitment of the nation's armed forces to some foreign venture. . . . The Constitution expressly places in Congress power to raise and support armies. . . ."

But Jackson applies his argument only toward limiting the president's control of internal affairs (e.g., steel); his uncontrolled "seizure" of the bodies of young men to be drafted for an undeclared war is . . . not before the court.

It was Douglas who summarized

the widest meaning of Truman's claims on power: "Today a kindly president uses the seizure power to effect a wage increase and to keep the steel furnaces in production. Yet tomorrow another president might use the same power to prevent a wage increase, to curb trade-unionists, to regiment labor as oppressively as industry thinks it has been regimented by this seizure."

The "kindly president" has already used his decree-powers to regiment minorities. It would be well for labor to think of tomorrow. When tomorrow comes, it will be their independent strength, and their willingness to wield it, that will determine the outcome, and not their trust in either a kindly president or a kindly judiciary.

FOR A SOCIALIST EDUCATION  
Get it EVERY week!  
A subscription to LABOR ACTION is only \$2.00 for a year

**FOCAL POINT**  
1987 Yale Station  
New Haven, Conn.

Registration for the New England Anti-War School

I want to register for the New England Anti-War Summer School. Enclosed is my registration fee of \$5.00.

NAME .....

PERMANENT ADDRESS .....

SUMMER ADDRESS .....



# Surveying the Press Reaction to "In Place of Fear" —

# Bevan's Book: A Review of Reviews

By HAL DRAPER

Since the current *New International* carries an extensive enough review of the main points in the new book by Aneurin Bevan, *In Place of Fear*, we're devoting this space to a somewhat different project—a review of the reviewers.

It would be easy to make this simply a study in the techniques of the journalistic hatchetjob. Many American publications farmed the reviewing job out to an anti-Bevan Britisher, for obvious reasons; they wanted an "objective" defense of America from Bevan's strictures.

And so you get an "objective" review of *In Place of Fear* by, for example, D. W. Brogan, Cambridge professor and author, for the *N. Y. Times* Book Review. Its objectivity is manifested in the sight of all by the fact that he admits that "the book, like the author, has its good qualities" and that Bevan has his "positive virtues," that "Mr. Bevan is not simple-minded about Russia," and that much of what Bevan writes about the Health Service is sensible and interesting. In comparison with the dispatches from London of the *Times's* correspondent Daniell, this is an accolade.

In fact, it is likely that Brogan's several distortions or misleading paraphrases of Bevan's views are not intentional. . . .

One of Brogan's complaints is given in the *Times* headlines: "For Bevan, America is the Villain." This is, to put it mildly, a grossly exaggerated summary. At another point, the reviewer purports to argue against Bevan's criticisms of America's "reckless exploitation of raw materials"; but Bevan's main point on this is not against "reckless exploitation" but American monopolization of the market. In about the same way he makes it appear that Bevan's charges against U. S. cornering of news-print supplies is based solely on his dislike for the kind of stuff which is printed on the cornered news print. (He replies that some British papers are sicker than anything in America, as if that answers *In Place of Fear*.) He reports that according to Bevan "there is no real risk of war" . . .

Robert Wraithman, in the *N. Y. Herald Tribune*, seizes on Bevan's remark that the Stalinists may have invaded South Korea because they thought that the U. S. "had disinterested herself in the Far East." Demands the reviewer: "And as soon as it looked safe it became blameless, did it?" The *Daily Worker* couldn't be cruder.

### Puzzle for Reviewers

But it would not really be very interesting merely to prove that the American press went on a scalping party. As Bevan wrote, in anticipation, on page 127 of his book: "I write this with no real belief that it will exempt me from misrepresentation by those whose job it is to misrepresent."

After all, whether the reviewers were out to get Bevan or not, at least as important an objective for them should have been to understand him. Even from their own pro-American point of view, they are doing their newspaper employers no good turn merely by journalistic hostility. An enemy must be understood if he is to be fought effectively. (For us also, Bevan has to be understood, if he is to be supported effectively.)

And the anti-Bevan reviewers impress me as being a good deal puzzled by the phenomenon of Bevanism. They naturally approached the book with the questions: "Why has Bevanism become so powerful a force?" and "What is this Bevanism anyway?" and it is very unsatisfactory for them merely to argue (even when they hit on a valid point) that Bevan's views as given in his book are weak, confused, vague, doctrinaire, etc. What then is it that has caught on?

The *New Republic's* reviewer, T. R. Fyvel—whose competence on the subject is evidenced by the fact that he virtually wrote Bevan off the books as a serious factor when he resigned from the cabinet—theorizes: "*In Place of Fear* is significant chiefly because Bevan wrote it. Bevan is significant chiefly because, when such qualities were rare as radium, he appeared to be a left-wing politician with personal and original, and not merely derived, political views." Unfortunately, Fyvel does not tell us what these "original, and not merely derived" views are, or what is so original about them; which is a pity because this was his sole chance to say something in a review which otherwise mainly denounced Bevan as "romantic." That doesn't sound very original.

### Mood and Movement

What must puzzle so many of the reviewers is precisely the thing they are strongest in criticizing about the book: its programmatic vagueness. One of the best reviews, Paul Niven's in the *Nation*, wrote not without justice:

"Even in the case of Britain, Bevan's remedies are less impressive than his diagnosis. . . . He remarks that nationalization is only a step toward socialization, but does not illuminate the path ahead. 'Industrial democracy' is defined about as precisely here as it has been in high-toned Conservative Party pamphlets. . . . The central challenge to British Labor in the present decade . . . is the question 'Where are you going and why?' Here and there, in the pages of Mr. Bevan's book, is part of an answer. But the question is not wholly answered, or even wholly posed."

What then is this Bevanism which mobilizes a mounting movement on such a programmatic basis? Is it, for example, merely the fact that Bevan thinks rearmament should go slower than other people believe? If this is Bevanism, then the *Nation* really had a scoop in its May 17 issue when it ran Sternberg's article "Bevanism Wins in America"—which reveals that Washington itself has adopted "Bevanism," for has there not been a slowdown and stretchout in the tempo of American rearmament?

In contrast with American reviews, reviews by British socialists (pro- and anti-Bevan, both) have stressed another angle, more knowledgeably. John Strachey, for example, did it in *Forward*: Bevanism is a mood. Strachey, to be sure, is an opponent of Bevanism; but in the *Bevanite Tribune*, itself, regular columnist J. P. W. Mallalieu wrote (Apr. 4):

"But it [Bevan's book] is not, and is not intended to be, a political program. Rather, it aims to set a mood, just as Morris once set a mood, just as the Webbs set another and different mood, in which the Labor movement can do its thinking and feeling."

Perhaps that makes it official. In any case, it certainly makes sense, though we shall have to reinterpret it. For anyone who tries to evaluate Bevan simply in terms of his formal programmatic ideas, whether from the right or from the left, can have only a quite sterile approach to the British development. We have already mentioned this with regard to American bourgeois reviewers. The same is true, however, for example, for the method of many elements in the British ILP, who criticize Bevan from the left. The same is true, in a quite different way, of the approach taken by Alfred Rosmer in the French *Révolution Proletarienne*.

### Class Roots

The weaknesses of the Bevanite program are not to be counterposed to the progressive and healthy impact of the Bevanite movement on British Labor. (Movement, not merely "mood.") This we have already gone into at much greater length (issues of August 6 and 13 last year) in analyzing the program put forward in *One Way Only*, which is not essentially different from *In Place of Fear*. "More for socialism, less for war"—this is the appeal of Bevanism which attracts, while the Bevanites themselves try to work out their views into a coherent whole. What it justly and fortunately reflects is the desire of the rank and file of British Labor to go precisely in this direction. Their pressures provide the dynamic behind Bevanism.

This is essentially why independent socialists are militantly for Bevan against the Labor Party leadership, and for the Bevanite movement, even though we are not "Bevanites." The victory of Bevan in the movement as a whole would mark a stage forward of tremendous importance, even while at the same time it would mark the beginning of a new necessary development, which might or might not leave Bevan himself behind.

This is the reality behind the description of Bevanism as a "mood." Were the Bevanite Mallalieu and the anti-Bevanite Strachey right in seeing this in *In Place of Fear*? Most assuredly. What perhaps makes the greatest impression on informed socialist readers of the book are those passages (in part, semi-autobiographical) in which Bevan reveals, sometimes deliberately and sometimes in passing, the strong class roots of his approach to politics. There is the long passage on his youth in Wales which could be quoted in extenso. Just as revealing is such an incidental remark as this: "The classic Parliamentary style of speech is understatement. It is a style unsuited to the representative of working people because it slurs and mutes the deep antagonisms which exist in society."

Or: "The first function of a political leader is advocacy. It is he who must make articulate the wants, the frustration, and the aspiration of the masses. . . . A representative person is one who will act in a given situation in much the same way as those he represents would act in that same situation. . . ."

Now, one might well point that the first function of a political leader is to lead, and not merely to reflect, and that sometimes the two are not identical; but whatever Bevan's formulation might be, his words do most certainly reflect the wellsprings of his thought.

It is precisely Bevan's elementary class approach, given the vagueness of his programmatic ideas, which makes it difficult for the bourgeois reviewers to understand his movement, as it is today. From many of them, Bevan's reminiscences about the conditions under which

his thought germinated merely elicit a kind of pitying smugness: *Poor man, he's still suffering from the effects of the "peculiar" conditions of unemployment and depression in which he grew up!* they say in effect. Brogan spends paragraphs on the significance of the fact that he is self-educated. Fyvel: "During those years he certainly saw the reverse side of capitalist society," like a psychoanalyst pointing out why the patient is suffering from a childhood trauma.

But it is Bevan's roots in his class which have made him the "leader" and "representative" (exactly in his own sense) of the aspirations of militant British Labor today.

### Bevan on Marxism

There are two other notes necessary on important respects in which his reviewers have misinterpreted the book. On one they have obviously been misled by a sentence which crops up in a number of reviews: "Insofar as I can be said to have had a political training at all, it has been in Marxism," writes Bevan. This is translated into "Bevan is a Marxist." Now, unfortunately, this is not faithful to Bevan at all. We would that it were otherwise.

Bevan may have learned much, and absorbed much, from his early readings in Marxism, and there need be no doubt that this reinforced his class approach. But for pages following the quoted sentence, Bevan goes into some detail on his differences with Marxism. The Marxist theory of the state, for him, was developed because "political democracy was as yet in its infancy" at the time. "The theory of the class struggle and the conception of the state, as the executive instrument of the ruling class, was an inevitable outcome of such a situation." Marxism underrates "subjective attitudes." He even writes, "History is never a guide to contemporary action," though it is doubtful whether he appreciates what he has so categorically written, especially since he is not loath to refer to history, himself. He makes any number of peculiar remarks, such as the one that capitalism is "unscientific" because it has no "order of values."

If Bevan's "Marxism" were the criterion for him, it would be worth discussing further. Fortunately, this is not so. What I would note, rather, is that John Strachey, an intellectual whose understanding of Marxism is high enough, is at Attlee's side, while Bevan, a self-educated working-class leader, is in the van in the Labor Party. It is, to be sure, the integral union of Marxist ideas with the working class which produces the winning combination; but if it is one or the other. . . .

### Bevan on Stalinism

The second note is that not one hostile review that I have seen was acute enough to point out the weakness of Bevan's views on Stalinism. This could not be for lack of will; they simply didn't get the point. It was enough for them that Bevan's book is full of anti-Stalinism, as it is.

Indeed, Bevan is vigorously anti-Stalinist, and insinuations to the contrary (abundant enough in America) are slender. Yet his book reveals (as far as I know for the first time) the extent of his illusions about this regime which he detests. This was also discussed by Gordon Haskell in the *New Internationalist*, but I would especially emphasize his rosy idea that the process of Russian industrialization itself will bring about the democratization of the Stalinist totalitarianism. The Russian workers "economic enfranchisement is proceeding" because of industrialization; "Political enfranchisement must follow."

Almost every paragraph of his about Russia is full of his misconceptions of the nature of that regime. "It is unnecessary to discuss here whether the Soviet leaders have adopted the only course open to them under the conditions prevailing in Russia." He indicates elsewhere that he inclines toward this very view, since for him totalitarianism is virtually the inevitable result in a backward country which tries to industrialize rapidly. "It is more to the point that they seem unable to appreciate that the same pattern is not everywhere applicable, even if it were desirable." Therefore, he thinks Russia wants to pull out of Eastern Germany! Therefrom also flows his naive pro-Titoism. The trouble with the Russians is that they are "slaves to the future." A blitzkrieg is inconsistent with the "nature" of Russia's economy, "which is sluggish." There is no caste system in the Stalinist dictatorship. The Russian workers are "conscious of emancipation and not of slavery. . . . The picture of modern totalitarianism, held down by a ruthless dictatorship is false. . . . his life is substantially, if slowly, improving. . . . only an insignificant minority of the Russian people are aware of [the slave labor camps]."

It is clearly from this view of Russia that he projects the political program for a negotiated deal between the West and the Kremlin to settle the cold war. It is not that he denies that Stalinist Russia is imperialistic. But to him this policy of the Kremlin is an "outworn category" and sooner or later, naturally, they must find that they have to give it up, and participate with the West in a crusade to help the backward countries of the world in sweetness and light.

This misconception of Stalinism is an Achilles' heel for the Bevan movement, or perhaps it is a time bomb; in any case it is not the least point in the task of clarification WITHIN the Bevan movement that is necessary for British socialist militants.

### Read about Independent Socialism

in the special pamphlet-issues published by LABOR ACTION

### THE PRINCIPLES AND PROGRAM OF INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

### INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE WAR THE FAIR DEAL: A SOCIALIST CRITICISM

10 cents each Order from: Labor Action, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

### BOOKS and Ideas

## "Life and Death in Soviet Russia"

# The Amazing Stories of El Campesino

*El Campesino, Life and Death in Soviet Russia*, by Valentin Gonzalez and Julian Gorkin, translated by Ilsa Barea. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1952, 218 pages.

By ROBERT MAGNUS

Although the general outline of events is fairly secure, there is a great deal about the Spanish revolution which is not clear. Even to this day, the interrelationships within the Republican camp during the civil war are obscured by the mythology of the Popular Front. The struggle between the factions, parties and groups in the anti-Franco camp is still represented as a mere trifle before the grand unity of the "anti-fascist forces." Nothing, of course, can be expected from the Stalinist "theoreticians" in the direction of unraveling the intricate cross-currents and interests which combined and struggled in this heterogeneous "unity." Even the liberals and social democrats—understandably!—are not too happy with the prospect of baring their collaboration with the Stalinists in the task of bridling the Spanish revolution.

It is sad to say, therefore, that today—more than a decade after the end of this great struggle—the Spanish revolution still awaits its historian. The squabbles in the Republican camp have generated more heat than light. The reminiscences, studies and party polemics are helpful, but extremely limited. As far as it concerns Spain, the story of the famous Stalinist general, El Campesino ("the Peasant"), is in this category.

The facile penman of the Comintern transformed this quite ordinary peasant guerrilla leader and pistolero into a great, heroic figure—the "Chapeau of the Spanish Revolution," according to that "swindler with dreamy eyes" Ilya Ehrenburg. This little book punctures that myth once and for all. Campesino—distilled through the prose of Julian Gorkin—appears as a most brutal and politically primitive figure lacking every quality of a genuine revolutionist.

The question immediately arises: How could this swashbuckling, backward Andalusian rise to the position of commander of whole armies during the war? The answer lies in the realm of Stalinist politics during this period. The aim of limiting the struggle to a war against "feudalism" finds its most perfect expression in the peasant-conservative traits of this remarkable ex-bandit and rebel.

### Whitewash on Spain

The section of the book dealing with Campesino's role in the Spanish civil war is short and very uninformative. No new information is presented; nothing is documented. He presents himself as outside of the inner circle of Spanish Stalinism. "During that time the Russian agents, working mainly from the headquarters of the International Brigades at Madrid and Albacete, organized the execution not only of people who opposed the Communists directly, but also of those who showed reluctance in following their directives. And because the Fifth Regiment was on paper part of my command, they could pile the responsibility for a great number of those acts on me."

Not once, however, during the entire civil war, did El Campesino ever intervene against the Stalinist purges and executions behind the lines. His attempt to whitewash himself by saying: "I am a Spaniard. We look upon life as tragic. We despise death," etc., comes off rather flat. El Campesino, no less than Lister, Modesto, André Marty, and the other butchers, is also personally responsible for the bloody repressions of the GPU against the Spanish revolution.

Of more interest is his discussion of the loss of Teruel. He insists, again without adducing any objective proof, that the Stalinists deliberately lost Teruel in order to torpedo Prieto and the Anarcho-Syndicalists. This plan included that of making a martyr out of Campesino himself, who "was not devoted to Soviet Russia above everything." The plot succeeded; Teruel was lost and Prieto was removed from his position. Campesino managed to escape from Teruel, however, thus foiling the plot to get rid of him. The accusation is not new, of course, and certainly fits in with everything known about this episode; unfortunately, no solid evidence is presented to substantiate it.

And that is all about Spain in El Campesino's book!

### Not in the Mold

The main burden of the book, as its subtitle indicates, is a lively description of Campesino's adventures in Russia after he had escaped from Spain. These adventures are so unbelievable, so fantastic, and unfold such a different picture of the internal relations under the Stalinist regime that it is necessary to treat them in some detail. The initial feeling of disbelief in the face of Campesino's struggles against the bureaucratic nightmare of modern totalitarianism, gives way to a feeling of horror that such a living, roaring hell could exist at this moment on the face of the earth.

During the first period of his stay, he was the hero of the hour. His photograph appeared everywhere. All the organs of opinion feted him as the great general of the Spanish people. He complains of being closely watched, however, and was not allowed to wander freely and talk with whom he pleased.

Along with other foreign Stalinists he spent some months at Monino House, a luxury establishment serving the best food and wines, served up by "pretty, smiling, young waitresses, who spoke several languages and knew the art of provocation, both erotic and political." These girls, described also by Godfrey Blunden in *Room on the Roof*, ". . . even in their moments of transport, in what should have been their moments of greatest tenderness. . . . never forgot to listen for a word of criticism or revolt

which they might pass on." After this initial period of screening, he was sent as a student to the Frunze Academy, the highest staff college in Russia.

While Spanish Communist leaders such as Vicente Uribe, Jesus Hernandez, José Diaz and Dolores Ibarruri slavishly submitted to the endless demands of Stalinist orthodoxy, Campesino was of another build; he just couldn't keep out of trouble with the authorities. He didn't want to change his name; he spoke his own mind too often; he was critical and hostile to the official hypocrisy. His outspoken anarchist mentality and peasant bluntness refused to bend to the mold.

While all he wanted was to "re-enter Spain illegally and start organizing the guerrillas against Franco," the Comintern wanted to remake him into a simple Stalinist agent, a military tool of the Russian state. His rebelliousness and curiosity, his refusal to accept discipline, drove him into humorous and futile outbursts of good Spanish slang against the uncomprehending dolts of the bureaucracy. The clothes just would not fit the man. During his final examination he got into a series of violent arguments with his instructors and was expelled from the Academy as a "Trotskyite." Thus began a series of wanderings which carried him all over Russia, and into all sorts of inconceivable relations with the regime.

### Crazy Train

He was sent to work as a forced laborer on the Moscow subway, was spied on, followed and harassed by the NKVD, but still managed to marry a Russian girl—a friend of Stalin's daughter! During the confusion and chaos following the Nazi invasion of Russia, he fled Moscow in a train along with thousands of others. "We called it the 'crazy train' or the 'pirate train.' Both descriptions were true. Our train rocked crazily through the country, roaming about in this or that direction, backward or forward, without a definite goal, except that of finding something to eat for the passengers. We, the passengers, were pirates; we used the train as pirates used their ships, to get to the victims we intended to plunder." The administrative chaos must have been unimaginable for "Sixty such trains were careening about at some stage in Uzbekistan alone. Their passengers, who sacked the countryside, were sometimes sacked themselves."

After this initial period of complete anarchy, the NKVD began to restore order and he was sent to Kokand in Uzbekistan, near the mountain range of Turkestan. Discipline was almost non-existent.

"The Spaniards were only a small part of the army of refugees in Uzbekistan. The whole territory of the Republic, and the neighboring Republics, were at that time crammed with masses of people of all sorts and all breeds—and all uprooted. They had come following a rumor that the regime had lost control of those regions. . . . There were deserters, evacuees from factories and kolchozes, Poles who had been released. . . . political refugees of all nationalities. . . ."

The NKVD men sent to clean up the region merely joined the ranks of the bandits. El Campesino found himself in his own medium and became a very successful Robin Hood, robbing rich kolchoz officials, NKVD men and factory magazines. He explains his actions very simply: "To survive in the society in which I found myself then, one had to be either a bureaucrat or a bandit. I could have been an army bureaucrat or the highest rank. But I preferred to be a bandit and to deal with other bandits, with prostitutes, and with corrupt officials."

The society he describes is a far cry indeed from the monolithism of the propaganda tracts. The officials are corrupt, thieving scoundrels. The masses hate the regime and try to defeat it at every hand. Everyone is out for himself and the devil take the hindmost!

### Kaleidoscopic Bandit

In 1944, after a long period of successful banditry, he returned to Moscow by bribing all the officials along the way. He found it "more totalitarian than ever," but, nevertheless, he managed to keep out of the hands of the ever-vigilant NKVD by sleeping with a different prostitute every night for a month. He was soon caught, deported to Kazakhstan, but escaped from the train and was back in Moscow the next day. He then went to the Spanish Committee, got into a terrible argument with LaPasionaria and Lister, but then, through the influence of his reputation and the connection of his wife, he got an audience with Kailin who befriended him and gave him the necessary papers.

Can this be true? From a bandit to an audience with the Kremlin in one leap? This is not the only unexplainable incident in this bizarre story.

In June 1944, he attempted to enlist in one of the foreign armies being formed to take over the various satellite countries but was turned down as "unreliable." In despair, he penned a letter to Stalin demanding the right to go abroad. He was immediately interrogated by two colonels of the general staff, who tried to wear him down but were only worn down themselves in the process. Finally, everything having failed, he decided to attempt an escape.

After a series of intricate preparations—including the theft of some official papers from Marshal Zhukov's office—he, and two young Spanish friends, headed for the Persian border. After the usual adventures they managed to reach Teheran and were arrested by the British and detained from October 1944 to January 1945. He then escaped from the British only to be picked up by the NKVD (eighty miles from Teheran!), beaten half to death and returned by freight-car to the Lubianka prison in Moscow. Here began the most terrible tortures of the damned for this simpleminded rebel against Stalinist justice.

It is impossible to read the section of the book on the Lubianka prison without gasping. The NKVD knew of his history, of his restlessness and rebelliousness under the Stalinist yoke, and of the fact that he had been captured by the British in Teheran. They also knew that he was no real "political" opponent in any sense of the term. He was an unreconstructed rebel and couldn't stand the barracks regime which passes for a society in Russia. He wanted to leave the country to return to "freedom." This was his only crime. For this he had to be broken as a personality.

### In the Lubianka

According to his testimony, the NKVD was not even interested in the fact that he had turned robber in Kazakhstan. His only real "crime" did not figure in the indictment they were drawing up against him. Remarkable fact. One can only appreciate the artistic integrity and reality of Orwell's 1984 after reading a series of works such as this, concerning the ends and methods of Stalinist justice. The dread Lubianka and its internal regime is the most perfect expression of modern, uncontrolled state despotism.

Everything is planned, down to the tiniest detail, to break the will of the strongest opponent of the regime. The prisoner is humiliated, subjected to constant torments, demoralized and kept under the most rigid and strenuous regime. One example should suffice: "At one o'clock we were given our midday meal. It was an almost unbelievable ritual. A man dressed as a waiter, in blouse and tall cap of glistening white, brought on a silver-plated tray under silver-plated dish covers, for each of us another three and a half ounces of black bread and a hot soup made of tomato and sour cabbage. To have this miserable food served to miserable men in miserable surroundings by a neat, elegant waiter, was a master stroke of refined cruelty, another touch of that buffoonery which was destroying our spirit as much as our abject suffering itself."

After a preparatory period of a month, the period of endless questioning began. El Campesino was interrogated every night for two months and then nearly every night for six months more. Why? To force him to sign a confession that he was an "agent of Anglo-American imperialism." Campesino declares that "their game was clear from the beginning. They meant to pass a harsh sentence on me, but they also wanted to destroy my whole past and dishonor me in the eyes of the world and particularly of the Spanish Communists." Somehow this is not convincing. Why not just shoot him and have done with it? Or, given the complete control of the NKVD, announce that he was killed in an "accident"?

Somehow there is a feeling here that the game is not worth the candle; the extraction of ritualistic confessions, the destruction of the will and the personality, seem almost to be an end in themselves. The whole bureaucratic apparatus seems to have gone out of control and gives the impression of a machine aimlessly following its internal impulses without rhyme or reason.

### One Against the Apparatus

In any case, Campesino managed to hold out. Failure to confess did not lead to freedom but to a forced-labor camp in the Far North. The next chapter of his story begins.

He spent four months in the camps of Butyrka and Krasniya-Presnya, waiting for the "slave-traders" (as the guards who transported the prisoners to their final destinations were called) to pick him up.

In January 1946, he arrived in the town of Vorkuta. The thermometer showed 85 degrees below the freezing point. It was his home for more than a year. He was able to exist and finally to get out of this camp by becoming a Stakhanovite miner. He was given various positions of responsibility and made good use of an injury to become a propagandist for the regime in various camps in the North. Through a high-placed mistress, a wife of one of the camp commanders, he was allowed to spend four months convalescing in the South.

In June 1947 he started on his journey to Samarkand, where he attempted to escape once again. Although he managed to bribe his way to the Persian border, he was caught once again by the NKVD border guards and returned to the city of Bokhara, where he was thrown into a cell which was crawling with rats and snakes. After a few weeks of this treatment his hair turned stark white. He was reduced to "a wretched old beggar, filthy and degraded, with feverish, madly shining eyes." He then spent some months in various prison camps in Turkestan and only managed to save himself from death by accepting the job of burying the prisoners who died in the various huts.

His will to live, after being consigned to the hut for the dying (the "dung heap" as it was called), was rewarded. He was able to recover sufficiently to be fit for work and was sent, in November 1947, to a labor camp at Ashkhabad. From there in turn he was sent to various camps in the Turkestan region, finally to end up in Ashkhabad again in 1949. On December 8, 1949, Ashkhabad was shaken by an earthquake, his records were destroyed and he was released to live in forced exile in Uzbekistan. Once more he made his journey to the Persian border, but this time he managed to escape. The struggle of one man against the apparatus ended in his victory. This saga of rebellion against the horrors of totalitarian despotism was ended. He was free to tell his story.

If the details of this story were not vouched for by the signature of Julian Gorkin (a leader of the POUM during the Spanish civil war), it would have to be rejected as a science-fiction mystery. The utter ruthlessness of Stalinism, the lack of the slightest regard for human desires and human needs in the totalitarian state, makes this book a grim reminder of Stalinism's threat to humanity.



## FEDERALISM AND THE THIRD CAMP

By DON HARRIS

The movement for world federal government has undergone a number of significant changes in its relative short history since the end of World War II. That particular group which commonly calls itself WORLD (after its initials) for some time has been the object of sympathetic interest by independent socialists who found that they were frequently able to work together with its college chapters on behalf of such causes as civil liberties and the defense of the colonial independence movements.

WORLD, in turn, has come a considerable distance from the days when, as one of its leaders writes, "federalists felt that the only obstacles to achieving world government were the people who had not heard about it." The causes for this development have been, on the one hand, the failures of federalists to seriously influence in any way the actual development of international relations in a period of cold-war hostilities, and on the other, the willingness of some of them to undertake an examination of "orthodox" federalist principles in the light of this failure.

WORLD, because it represented youthful elements among American federalists who saw in world government the means for achieving the broader goals of social reform and political democracy, ultimately arrived at the view that the possibilities for achieving world government "depend to a great degree upon practical measures of economic and social reform which can be undertaken now both at home and abroad." It was this linkage of the aims of world government with concrete social and political goals that brought the WORLD group, while it was still the Student Division of the United World Federalists, into conflict with the parent organization (with its completely "non-political" approach, which served as cover for the basically conservative social views of a large proportion of its adherents) and finally drove it to attempt an independent existence.

Numerous difficulties and disappointments since WORLD'S founding convention last fall (see our Oct. 22 and Nov. 5 issues) have served to puncture some of its leaders' illusions that they could proceed to build a large and vigorous movement with little more than enthusiasm and "dynamic leadership." The loss of expected financial support, together with failure of local chapters to stabilize themselves or even continue activity on the level of previous years, has produced a climate favorable to serious discussion of some of the programmatic aspects of the world-government idea in an attempt to build a better ideological basis for the organization.

This is the purpose of its National Policy Institute—which will serve as an arena for the discussion of the basic policy differences which have arisen or found expression in WORLD.

### Three Tendencies

In order to appreciate the point of view from which independent socialists discuss the separate tendencies, it is first desirable to point out that not only is the basic idea of world federation quite compatible with socialist principles, but in one form or another, it has long been a part of the socialist program. What socialists have criticized in the federalist approach have been: (1) its tendency to see in world government a universal panacea for all social problems, a condition for social progress rather than its product and a substitute for a broad program for economic and social change; (2) the political view frequently found among federalists that world government can and should be established on the basis of the co-existence of the presently existing national states including capitalist America and Stalinist Russia. (For a discussion of the implications of this idea see LABOR ACTION for June 6, 1949.)

By adopting what it would call a "functionalist" approach (which means a program of demands for social reforms, democratic rights and national self-determination), WORLD abandoned the notion that the achievement of world government was possible without any further effort than to convince the world's leaders that it was to their best interests to form a world federal government. What WORLD has failed to do, however, is to clarify its ideas with respect to how federalism should relate itself to those forces in international politics which are today dominant, specifically with regard to the power struggle which is going on between Russia and America.

There are actually three different tendencies in WORLD with respect to this vital problem. All three are a product of the attempt to solve the problem of how it is possible to conceive of world government coming into existence when the major powers (America, Russia) are both seen to be opposed to all attempts to limit their freedom of action on the international field.

The "universalist," who defends the traditional federalist view, maintains that a world government can have any meaning in terms of its ability to preserve peace only if it encompasses all powers, or at least all of the major military powers, in the world. For as long as any great power remains outside of the control of the hypothetical world government, it must necessarily remain a threat to peace. Thus, the argument runs, a genuine world government must be a total affair engulfing all

countries of the world irrespective of their character.

The political consequences of such an approach are obvious. Inasmuch as it proclaims the necessity of universal world government, and this without prior change in the character of (say) totalitarian Russia, it leads either to the conclusion that some way must be found to "bring Russia and America together" to agree on at least the one principle of world federation, or failing that, that nothing else is really possible.

The major critics of "universalism," the "partialists," find it easy to point out that empirical evidence (Russia's evident unwillingness to "collaborate" or even peaceably "co-exist" with "the West" for any length of time and the fact that Russia's leaders are not subject to the control of "public opinion") makes it necessary to proceed without Russia as far as actually adopting any kind of immediate perspective for establishing an international authority. The way to get world government, the "partialists" argue, is to establish limited federation, composed of all countries exclusive of the Stalinist-dominated regimes. This would, presumably, eventually result in "breaking down Russia's resistance." This would be accomplished either through the establishment by such a non-Stalinist world government of a preponderance of military power—which would consequently convince Russia's leaders of the advantage of entering such a federation—or through its ability to "defeat Communism ideologically" by solving the problems of hunger, disease, etc. This is the kind of idea which is found throughout the writings of federalists, who in turn have picked it up from liberal opponents of current American foreign policy.

Yet basically, the "partialist" approach is at once a repudiation of federalist principles and a move in the direction of supporting America's foreign policy. Within UWF it takes the form of support of the Atlantic Pact and similar measures of American diplomacy. Within WORLD it leads to accepting the "necessity for interim defenses against aggression," which concretely means support of American-sponsored and American-controlled agencies of international power.

### Arguments Cancel

Within the framework of federalist opinion, the "universalists" point out, and rightly so, any combination of non-Stalinist nations which includes the United States must necessarily become an instrument of American power politics in its struggles against Stalinist imperialism. Any federation of (say) the United States and Cuba must place the former in the position of the dominant power which could utilize its dominance for the purpose of furthering its own national interests. And any federation of nations in which the United States participates under present conditions of international conflict would necessarily tend to become a coalition of nations directed solely against Russia.

The "universalist" critics of partial federation without Russia point out that any such federation could be neither democratic nor conducive to peace. One of its main functions would have to be military preparations against Russia, and given America's participation the leaders would include "its 'preventive war' advocates, its professional anti-Bolshevists, its 'American Century' backers, and its Senator Pat 'War Is Inevitable' McCarrans." (Federalist Opinion, February 1952, page 6.) Furthermore, as the same author points out, "socialist countries and others which insist on planning . . . their own economies would be unlikely to join." (Ibid., p. 7.)

As we have seen, neither the partialists nor universalists have proposals for successfully overcoming the impasse which federalism faces in connection with the present power conflict. One proves that world government is impossible with Russia, and the other proves it impossible without her. And the fact is that the arguments on both sides are correct. It is undoubtedly this which has led to the development of what, broadly speaking, can be called a "Third Camp" approach, which is the name its own exponents use.

Beginning with the idea that genuine world government can not be an instrument for either Russian or American aggrandizement, and recognizing that both these powers pursue reactionary policies in the field of foreign policy, the Third Camp tendency espouses the idea of immediate limited federation of countries capable of opposing both totalitarianism and imperialism. It is thus "partialist" in terms of immediate goals, but like other partialists, universalist in ultimate ambitions. The decisive difference, however, lies in its estimate of the role which America can play in any partial federation (the Third Camp elements would, by implication, exclude present-day America from membership) and the forces which are to be relied upon for its construction. The colonial countries, and particularly India, are viewed as potential reservoirs of Third Camp strength.

Unfamiliar and confusing as federalist terminology may be, and unclearly formulated as many of its ideas are, it is possible for socialists to see a number of points of agreement with this kind of Third Camp approach. More importantly, with the kind of concrete demands which WORLD as a whole puts forward, they will see the basis for the continued development of WORLD in the direction of a consistent democratic program on both domestic and foreign policy.

Thus WORLD today is one of the few groups in America

which unequivocally and unconditionally opposes the present attacks on civil liberties, and calls for support to "the peoples of the colonial areas in their endeavor to win political self-determination. . . ." And finally, it calls for "enlarged programs of social and technical assistance and world economic development, under international control whenever possible."

Unexceptionable as this last demand may appear, a great deal of confusion surrounds its use, confusion which must be dispelled as a condition for real progress. To some, influenced by the federalist tradition of "personal involvement" which produced a Garry Davis, the idea of "aid to backward areas" is interpreted in personal terms as a need for federalists to go to Afghanistan and teach school or dig canals. Worthy as such actions may be, they are obviously no substitute for a political platform.

### Social Change the Key

More generally, this concept is linked up with the idea that "the West" (by which is usually meant the United States) must "provide a better alternative to the world's peoples than that offered by Communism." And the way in which this is to be accomplished is by such measures as will abolish poverty by raising the standard of living of backward peoples, promoting industrial development, abolishing racial prejudice and, as one federalist put it, "perhaps even more fundamental reforms."

As a general statement of the conditions which will provide a progressive alternative to Stalinism, in colonial and semi-colonial lands, these proposals are quite correct. It is an entirely different matter when, as is frequently the case, these are posed as the tasks of the American government, as part of its struggle against Stalinism. This distinction may not appear to be of too great importance (which is undoubtedly why the two things are so frequently confused) until it is asked: What kind of policies are compatible with America's over-all aims in the cold war?

Since the atom-bomb droppers and the "War Is Inevitable" people occupy powerful positions in the government, and most important of all, since American policy is decisively influenced by the socially conservative elements who find it "convenient" to support reaction rather than rebellion, doesn't this mean that America is committed by the very nature of its social structure to play a role on the world scene which is the direct opposite of what liberals propose for it? The example of Point Four serves to emphasize the limitations on American policy. Not only has actual Point Four aid been infinitesimal, but it has been applied almost exclusively to projects which were of some immediate or direct importance to America's war effort.

For America to be able to implement the kind of democratic foreign policy which is demanded (and quite rightly so), internal social transformation would be necessary. That is why the very promulgation of such ideas as support to national independence movements, technical aid to backward countries, etc., implies a corresponding program of social change for America also. World's programmatic demand for the defense of civil liberties and the extension of civil rights already recognizes this interdependence of foreign and domestic policies. Yet it still appears apologetic whenever it is forced to mention that a large proportion of those forces on which it would have to rely to build a genuine international movement are already committed to some other form of social system than free-enterprise capitalism. It has not yet come to recognize that espousal of anti-imperialist policies in foreign policy implies a concomitant struggle against the forces and interests which would seek to defend the status quo within our own society.

Democratic anti-imperialist forces exist in large numbers throughout the entire world today. Their weaknesses stem from their lack of organization and mutual support. It is for the purpose of helping them to achieve a position of real independence that independent socialists advocate their mobilization through independent federations of nations, specifically in Western European union and an independent federation of Southeast Asian and Middle Eastern countries.

Such partial federations, because they would be organized independently from and in opposition to the dominant power blocs in the world, would be able to accomplish the democratic and social tasks which lie before them. And by so doing they would provide that progressive "alternative to communism" which could lead to the overthrow of Stalinism as well as be the stimulus for far-reaching social changes in America. With this perspective it is possible to look forward with some hope to the time when all countries including a new Russia and America, could join in brotherhood and freedom in a genuinely democratic world federation of nations.

Get acquainted with the  
**SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE**

Write to:

SYL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City