

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

WHO WERE THE LEADERS OF  
THE EAST GERMAN REVOLT?

... page 6

Ellis Island: 'Concentration Camp'

... page 3

The Liberal Party's Initiative

... page 2

JULY 13, 1953

FIVE CENTS

## How to Aid the German Workers' Revolt And Destroy Stalinism Without War

There is a way in which the American people can follow up the historic uprising of the East German workers against the Russian power, with a blow which, at one stroke, would raise the German people's struggle to new heights, stimulate anti-Stalinist resistance everywhere, and add a powerful cross-punch to the attack from which Moscow is now reeling.

It is so simple, so obvious, so immediately dictated by the events, so democratic, and so revolutionary in its consequences that it cannot be expected from the Washington government. But for the American people it is a matter of elementary practical common sense.

That is for the U. S. to give back to the fighting German workers that which the latter are demanding from their Russian masters—the prerequisites of that sovereign independence and unification for which the East Berlin working class rose against the Kremlin terror, prerequisites which are held back not only by the Russians but also by Washington.

Let the U. S. declare tomorrow:

"People of Germany! You have shown in action that YOU are really the allies of all the free people of the world against the Stalinist menace. You, and fighters like you, are our real bulwarks against Moscow's totalitarianism—not our 'ally' Syngman Rhee; not our 'allies' in France, who are faced in Indo-China, Cambodia, with the same sort of resistance action for liberation which you unleashed in June against the Russian war camp; not our 'allies' in London who have killed more fighters for freedom in Kenya than the Russian tanks killed in Berlin; not our 'ally'

on Formosa whose butchered victims in China would form an army greater than all the Kremlin tommy-guns in East Germany; not our would-be 'ally' Franco. . . .

"People of Germany: With unarmed hands, you rose up against the totalitarian oppressors who, you were told from all sides, were impregnable to anything less than atom bombs. And, because there is no power among all the big powers of the earth which is as strong as the fury of a revolutionary people fighting for its own freedom, you administered to the Russians the most disastrous defeat which they have suffered since the Second World War, a blow from which they will never really recover.

"YOU did this, who are not members of the NATO war alliance against Russia, who are not on our charity list, who are not the possessors of fleets, planes, cannon, tanks and fortified places. YOU did this, while we of the Washington government have done nothing but feed the flames of the Russian menace in every part of the globe in which we have meddled.

"You did this because you want to free your land of the foreign troops of the oppressor, because you want to take back your country, because every foreign soldier on your streets was a daily reminder of the sovereignty and independence which has been taken away from you, because real national sovereignty means also an end to the puppet government which is the agent of the foreigners and is a precondition for the reunification of the whole of Germany.

"We note with shame that, although we profess to be the leaders and inspirers of the free world against Moscow, no audible voice among the tens of thousands who fought in your cities against that Muscovite power was raised in sympathy for or allegiance to our banner.

"We know the reason for that. If we did not know it, we are reminded of it now: For we too have our soldiers, foreign soldiers of an imposed occupation, sprawling over your country, the other half of your country. We too have our tanks readied in seized buildings, troops on the alert in barracks and military encampments. We

too are in your land as occupier-conquerors. We too stand in the way of sovereignty and unification.

"From this day, we withdraw our troops and military forces from your soil. From this day we return to the German people its own country, its national independence and honor—returning it not to the political descendants, cousins and blood-brothers of the Nazis, but to the German working people who were yesterday the first victims of Hitler and are now the first mass revolutionary fighters against Hitler's successors as tyrants in your homeland.

"We can give you back only half your country, the western half which has been in our hands. We cannot, now, give you back the eastern half which we helped to hand over to Moscow at the end of the war. Fight for it! The oppressors cannot withstand your assault, because you are not alone. Your action has already inspired the peoples who strain against the Kremlin's whip to rise up and fight. Your action—and, we know, our action—will enflame millions of others, from Poland to Czechoslovakia and Hungary, to follow suit.

"You are not alone because we of America are now your allies—really your allies for the first time—and not your overlords. We do not deny before the world that we want to help you in every way to free yourself, now that you are free of us. Our arsenals are now really your arsenal of democracy. We urge no adventurous armed putsches upon you, but what you need you will get, with no strings attached. We ask nothing of you but what you already have given—proof of your will to fight for your own freedom from every encroachment on every side, including ours.

"It is not you who are alone. It is the small gang of tyrants in the Kremlin who are alone, now. They will not be able to depend on their own soldiers, who are Russian workers and peasants, to attack your revolutionary forces. They will not be able to rely on a single company of German police or of German soldiers who at last see, to their west, the banner of a free and independent German state, whose liberated people are calling to them as brothers, and who see around them the revolutionary fury of their own comrades and fellow workers. The isolated dictators of Moscow will not be able to depend on a single regiment from their satellites, where the ground is also getting red-hot under their feet.

"You will fight in the ways that the working class knows, which are not in the manuals of NATO. And you will win, you and your fellow enslaved peoples of Poland and Czechoslovakia and Hungary and all of East Europe, because that is how the Russian empire will crumble from within."

### First Step

This is how America could contribute to the struggle of the German people against Stalinism, to the blowing-up of the Moscow power from below, to the prevention of the Third World War.

This is only the first, elementary, obvious and indicated step which cries aloud to be taken now—the first entrance on the road of a truly democratic foreign policy, instead of the atom-bomb diplomacy and power-politics of an imperialism which itself seeks to dominate the world, and looks on the Russian empire as its imperialist rival.

This is in the interests of the American people, who have no profit in bleeding themselves for the kind of "foreign aid" which props up every reactionary

(Turn to last page)

(Turn to last page)

## Korea: The Naked and the Dead

By H. W. BENSON

In Norman Mailer's novel *The Naked and the Dead*, a platoon of soldiers are whipped along by a fanatical sergeant in a futile and senseless trek up a mountainside. In the destruction of their individuality and the suppression of their humanity there is the grandeur of tragedy until their ranks break in a mad, precipitate, uncerimonious scramble downhill, driven by a swarm of bees.

Until it felt the stings of the Rhee government, the U. S. political and military command of the Allied forces in Korea pursued with tenacious and methodical stupidity the road of a great historic debacle. Eight years after the "liberation" of Korea from Japan and three years after the outbreak of the Korean war, truce negotiations reached their consummation. The country remains divided as before, only now it is a political and material shambles, its resources in ruins. Such a conclusion was attained only after the expenditure of millions in wealth and several hundreds of thousands of casualties including 25,000 U. S.

war dead. This achievement might have been sealed by a harmonious Great Pact and hailed as a great victory in the empty solemn declarations of dignified statesmen.

But as Rhee balks, the process threatens to disintegrate into a gigantic farce compounded of a series of ludicrous misadventures. The threat may not, in the end, materialize but its very possibility serves to highlight what has always been implicit in the Korean war, and to underline the dilemma of a capitalist United States faced by the possibility of a Third World War without dependable allies among the masses below or governments above.

Apparently it now requires only a trifle

to unleash a sample demonstration of the real attitude of the masses of Asia toward the United States. One reporter for the *New York Times* writes: "It would be natural for a truce to give a signal for an outbreak of anti-Westernism, which in Korea as in all the Far East, always is just below the surface."

### SOMEWHERE ALONG THE LINE

Rhee's demand for a permanent reactionary war for the unification of Korea under his own military-police dictatorship finds its echo among some U. S. politicians in a dwindling enthusiasm for the truce. Senator Knowland, acting Republican leader, who previously had called upon Rhee to accept the truce, now announces that if he were Rhee, he would not settle the Korean war "without a united Korea" and blames both the Truman and Eisenhower regimes for a deterioration in relations with the South Korean ruler.

Another Republican Senator, Ralph Flanders, sees the Eisenhower adminis-

# Liberal Party Initiative Sends Democrats and GOP Scurrying

By SAM FELIKS

The Liberal Party has seized the initiative in the 1953 New York City mayoralty campaign. The early nomination of Rudolph Halley as its independent candidate has set the Liberal Party forth as the playmaker in the election.

The usual past procedure has been for the Democrats and Republicans to lead the way in choosing their standard-bearers with the Liberal Party trailing along making deals, usually serving as the tail to the Democratic donkey. This year's demonstration of independence coming before the old parties have announced their machine-picked candidates was greeted with virtually unanimous condemnation and denunciation (with the exception of the N. Y. Post) by the city's press. They can tolerate a Liberal Party that tails along behind the Republicans and Democrats, but not a real "third party" which challenges the two old parties.

## POPULAR DECISION

There can be no doubt that this was a popular decision with the rank and file of the Liberal Party. The overwhelming—according to some reports, near-unanimous—sentiment expressed at the local clubs was for an independent candidacy. Any decision to enter into fusion, or rather confusion, with the Republicans would have been greeted with apathy and indifference by the ranks, if not disaffection.

Now there is an opportunity for a vigorous campaign with the enthusiastic participation of the local assembly district clubs. It is the opportunity for the Liberal Party to go forth as the alternative to the corrupt and bankrupt old parties, to present a social program winning the support of the labor unions, and point the way to independent political action by the labor movement in the rest of the country.

This marks the third consecutive year that the Liberal Party has run an independent candidate for a major office or as the head of the ticket. In 1951, it was the victorious Halley campaign for president of the New York City Council; last year it was the Liberals' Vice Chairman George S. Counts' campaign for U. S. senator—in both cases, running against Democratic and Republican candidates. Although Counts did not come near winning, he ran considerably ahead of the rest of the LP ticket, including Adlai Stevenson. Both of these campaigns helped to strengthen the sentiment for independent candidates which a Halley campaign cannot but help consolidate.

## "GOOD GOVERNMENT"

In all of these instances, the decision came after the failure of an attempt at a coalition. The leadership of the Liberal Party seeks to enter coalitions, generally with the Democrats, as a matter of policy. It seeks to act as a "balance of power" to tip the scales in favor of "liberal" candidates, and runs independent candidates as a last recourse.

Even aside from the futility of this policy from the point of view of the Liberal Party itself, the fact is that this line helped to bring its own antidote. The Democratic and Republican bosses resented what they considered the Liberals' attempt to abrogate their god-given right to handpick the "people's choice." Increasingly they showed hostility toward the LP and insisted that the LP accept their clubhouse hacks, such as Joseph Sharkey and John Cashmore, as the price of coalition.

There has thus been set up a tendency for the Liberal Party leaders' policy to fall between two stools: it did the party no good, and it antagonized the old-party bosses. The widespread rank-and-file disgust with the coalition policy pushed in the direction of the way out, for this time at least.

The maneuvers toward coalition or fusion this year almost left the Liberal Party tied to Tom Dewey's political machine. "Good government" is as usual the political cliché of New York City politics. Every political party and its candidates tries to wrap itself in the mantle. But a standard "good government" coalition would have been an especially strange collection of bedfellows this year.

The Republican Party's name is mud in New York, but it is traditionally the initiator of the "good government" coalition. The issues in the campaign are not merely crime, corruption and clean streets. New York City is in the throes of a deepening financial crisis. Mayor Impellitteri's administration has proved itself hopelessly incompetent to show any way out or to put up a fight for increased state aid.

Faced with the abdication of political leadership in New York City, Governor Thomas Dewey forced a reactionary program on the city: a rent increase, transportation fare increase, and a transit authority empowered to indefinitely raise fares plus the continuation of a city sales tax. It was a program resting firmly on the backs of the working people and those least able to pay.

## DEMS SCRATCHING

It was this Republican Party that the leaders of the Liberal Party negotiated with for a fusion candidate. Fusion meant an attack against the Democratic Party's incompetent gangster-influenced machine and a soft-pedaling of any criticism of the Dewey program. It meant supporting a candidate who would at best be Representative Jacob Javits, who has managed to mumble a few soft-spoken differences of opinion with Dewey's attempted annexation of New York City. What possible basis for fusion existed between these two opposing forces is difficult to see.

It would have meant another capitulation by the Liberal Party, and those are the terms the Republicans were demanding, which is the reason fusion fell through. It does not do the LP any credit to recount the circumstances under which it entered these negotiations, and any decision to back any Republican would have had to be forced down the throats of the rank-and-file members.

The Republicans are now left scurrying around to see if they can scrap up a few "independents" with whom to effect their fusion movement. Likewise the Democratic bosses are turning up all stones looking for a candidate who can win. His only qualification needs to be a minimum of connection with the O'Dwyer and Impellitteri administrations. It shows a certain amount of insight on their part to realize that any candidate who has to defend these two administrations would have a difficult time in winning. And the Democratic machine is in serious need of patronage.

## DEWEY'S PET

Since there will be no Liberal and Republican fusion, there has been talk of fusion between the Democrats and Republicans around Manhattan District Attorney Frank Hogan. The Republicans have let it be known that they could support Hogan, who is Dewey's pet Democrat and close friend. The fact that it is being given serious thought by the Democrats indicates how effective they can be expected to be in fighting the reactionary Dewey program.

The Democrats are so "opposed" to the so-called Dewey dictatorship that they are willing to consider a coalition with the Republicans in the mayoralty election. It certainly gives credence to the persistent rumors of collusion between the Dewey administration in Albany and the Democrats in City Hall, jocularly termed "Uncle Tom's Cabin," in the division of political rule in New York State. This also shows that the old parties recognize the danger to their political rule by the Liberal Party, and are willing to consider joining up against their common enemy, their other differences notwithstanding.

If the "fusion" forces centered about the Citizens Non-Partisan Committee were really serious about their ideas of good government, then they should be flocking to the support of the Halley candidacy. No other political party comes close to their ideas of government. However, they are only interested in fusion around a Republican, or perhaps a Democrat like Hogan. Their interest in good government ceases at the point where it means supporting an independent Liberal Party campaign.

## SUSPECT ADVICE

There have been newspaper reports that "independent" Democrats have been urging Halley to enter the primary for the Democratic Party nomination. While there is as yet no indication that this

counsel is being taken seriously, it certainly would be a bad mistake to muddy the waters of the independent campaign. Even from the point of view of the Liberal Party leaders, a defeat in the primary would provide an unencouraging start for the Halley campaign; and it is precisely in a primary fight that the old machine is least vulnerable.

More important, the issue in the election should not merely be the corruption, incompetence and lack of program of this or that Democrat, but of the Democratic Party. A run by Halley in the Democratic primary would mean that he would lose substantial political capital as an independent and appear as a challenger within the Democratic fold.

It would not help to present the Liberal Party as the party which is the alternative to the old politicians, but would tend to present Halley as only the "good man" who should be elected. This, to be sure, would be of a piece with the LP leaders' rutted line of policy which has been holding back the development of the party as such, but it would be more than ever a near-sighted error this year.

## ITALY Results of the Election— Dollars Didn't Win

By GABRIEL GERSH

Anyone who still believes that a combination of dollars and military aid can defeat Stalinism had better closely examine the results of the Italian elections. Whoever won the election (it looks as if nobody did), the U. S. certainly lost it.

De Gasperi, who has been prime minister in Italy's pro-American coalition government since 1948, is still bewildered by the election results and the U. S. ambassador, Mrs. Claire Booth Luce, is still speechless at the sight of what the "ungrateful" Italians have done to her friend.

However, before the campaign started it seemed as if the result had been fixed by an extraordinary election law, which De Gasperi had pushed through the Chamber of Deputies. In Italy, under the old election law, the number of seats allotted to each party was exactly proportionate to the number of votes cast for it. But the idea of the new election law was to ensure that any coalition of parties which secured over 50 per cent of the votes cast would be given 65 per cent of the seats in the Chamber of Deputies.

The center parties did not like such blatant fixing, but it was strongly supported by the U. S. as the best method to defeat the CP party coalition. The outcome of the election seemed certain, especially after Ambassador Luce threatened that the flow of dollars would be cut off unless Italy voted for the Right.

## WHY CP GAINED

As it turned out, Italy voted "wrong." The De Gasperi coalition, which included the right-wing Socialists and a few smaller parties, got 49.8 per cent of the total vote. So De Gasperi missed his rigged majority by 1 per cent. What was striking about the election results was not the gains of the Fascists and Monarchists, but the success of the Communists and the Nenni Socialists who joined with them in the Popular Front. These increased their vote by over a million.

How did this happen? The facts are pretty clear.

(1) A great number of Italians swung to them because they were disgusted with the rigging of the election.

(2) The Stalinists and the Nenni Socialists received unexpected help from Britain. Coming in the middle of the election campaign, Britain's stand on Korea and its determination to get high-level talks with the Russians in spite of American opposition proved an embarrassment to De Gasperi and a godsend to his opponents. During the campaign, De Gasperi avoided any mention of Churchill's peace gestures. Both Togliatti and Nenni, campaigning with the slogan "Peace" and "Independence from America," supported him.

(3) Anti-American feeling is growing

## Test Case

From WDL BULLETIN

Recent developments indicate that a crucially important labor precedent of employer intimidation and the right to organize may be argued in the case of the Federation of Shorthand Reporters (CIO).

Each member of the union has been served with a summons for illegally violating anti-trust laws by conspiring in restraint of trade. The employers claim that the workers cannot join a union—because they are independent contractors—and has attempted to frighten the strikers into returning to work by threatening legal action against them.

The white-collar field is becoming more important to labor, and the precedents involved here, of intimidation and the right to organize, concern every branch of the union movement.

Helping the union is the Workers Defense League, which recently aided the CIO union in negotiating a loan for strike relief. This took some of the burden off the membership of the Reporters Union, whose members have been cooperatively sharing their earnings.

to unusual proportions because U. S. economic aid has enriched the upper classes and has not helped the peasants and working classes. Ever since 1948, when Marshall Plan dollars began to pour into Italy, the effect of American aid has been to bolster up reactionary, capitalist elements which have obstructed the road to social and economic progress. As a result, Italy is a country where the clash between rich and poor is more stark and more offensive than anywhere else in Western Europe.

That is the great wrong which so many Italians thought to put right by their votes—those of them who dared to defy the church edict that this attempt to remedy human suffering in this world might be repaid by more suffering in the next.

## DEVIL'S APPRENTICE

Here is the real source of Communist Party strength in Italy. The election results a few weeks ago repeat the warning given in 1948. But few listened. The leaders of the West were too busy protecting free enterprise, changing electoral laws, aiding Franco, rearming Germany. The Italian elections should help to remind the West that the defense of the status quo cannot defeat Stalinism. The miseries of the destitute and the dispossessed, the social irresponsibility of landowners in Southern Italy, the abuses of private capitalism—these are the social evils which breed the indignation which is exploited by Stalinism.

Those who have been eager to curdle Europe's blood by stories of the military danger from Stalinism should pause to consider what has happened in Italy. If the follies of the past four or five years are repeated in the future, the Stalinists might have a chance of gaining victory in Europe without firing a shot.

Italy indeed provides the best example of how not to fight Stalinism. Togliatti, the CP boss, is a clever man. But he could never have won any success without the unflinching help he has received from the foes of social and economic reform.

A great thinker  
on the problems of  
American socialism—

Marxism in the  
United States

by LEON TROTSKY

35 cents - Order from:  
Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

## Workers Defense League Fights Deportations

# Ellis Island: 'Concentration Camp'

Two women, one a veteran of Aschwitz and Ravensbruck, the other of the Greek underground, are up for deportation from the United States. The Workers Defense League is helping both of them.

One is from Poland. She entered the United States on a student visa after having received an American scholarship. Her father among those murdered in the Katyn massacre. Her mother was left behind the Iron Curtain. She herself became seriously ill as a result of imprisonment in Nazi concentration camps during World War II.

According to Immigration, she entered the United States illegally and is therefore subject to deportation back to Poland. At the time when she had her hearing, she was unable to secure a lawyer for lack of funds. Because of this, she had to make her own argument on appeal.

The Workers Defense League was only recently contacted on the case. As soon as the necessary information is gathered, Rowland Watts, National Secretary, has announced that the League will prosecute the case with all of its resources.

The second case involves a woman who worked in the Greek underground during World War II. Lelas Tsamapoulos entered the United States legally and was naturalized. Married to an American citizen, she had one child before she had to return to Greece in order to help her aged mother. Her son became ill during this period (he was totally paralyzed) and she could not return to the United States.

The war intervened. During the war, she engaged in illegal activity, translating BBC broadcasts into Greek and distributing them among the underground. The radio was hidden in their house in Athens. Her son had recovered by then and was a member of a Greek guerrilla band.

Mrs. Tsamapoulos returned to the United States in 1946. She had been denaturalized in 1939—for failure to return to the U. S. At present writing, her son is a member of the United States Air Force, stationed at Sampson, New York.

The Workers Defense League attempted to explore all legal measures to prevent deportation. When these did not look promising, Mrs. Tsamapoulos' son, Demosthenes Hariton, contacted Congressman Delaney of New York. A special bill has now been introduced into the House of Representatives to allow her to stay in America.

Commenting on the cases, Rowland Watts told a group of League members, "The Polish case is the logical absurdity of an immigration procedure which sends anti-fascists to Spain, anti-Titoists to Yugoslavia and Indonesian nationalists to their homeland in the midst of a civil war. We hope that something can be done because Poland is more significant in the popular imagination than Spain or Yugoslavia. In the Tsamapoulos case, the bill in Congress provides an individual solution, but leaves the whole question of immigration procedure, and our basic attitude toward aliens, unclear."

### ISSUES IN THE PAVLOVICH CASE

The Workers Defense League has challenged the McCarran Act procedure which allows an alien to be deported as a result of anonymous accusations against him. A last minute habeas corpus writ for Alexander Pavlovich, a Yugoslavian national, stayed his deportation on these grounds, but an adverse decision recently handed down by the District Court means that the case will be fought on appeal.

At the hearings on the habeas corpus writ, the government did not attempt to hide the basis of its action. The federal attorney argued that the Immigration Department had secret records which could not be opened to Pavlovich or his WDL lawyers, but which conclusively proved that he should be deported. The secret, anonymous accusation, unanswerable because it is never publicly spoken, was again in evidence.

Rowland Watts and Carl Rachlin, representing the League in the case, pointed out that such procedure is contrary to all principles of the Anglo-American law

and is tantamount to star chamber justice. They cited a recent U. S. circuit court decision reversing the conviction of a conscientious objector on the very grounds that he had been barred from seeing the FBI record on his own case—a record which the government used against him.

Another issue in the Pavlovich case involved a weakening of the protection of alien rights. Under the old law, the attorney general was to "determine" whether or not deportation would subject the alien to physical persecution. But under the McCarran Act, he is only required to give "an opinion." Immigration officials have interpreted this as meaning that even the raising of the question of physical persecution is no longer a right, but merely a privilege.

If the issue in the Pavlovich case is not challenged, anti-Francoists could be deported to Spain, anti-Peronists to Argentina, and anti-Communists to Russia, without ever being aware of the evidence used against them. Pavlovich is a Yugoslavian who engaged in anti-Titoist activities when his nation was allied with Stalin. The question involved is not that of the political relationship between Yugoslavia and the United States, but the right of an alien to challenge the evidence against him in a deportation proceeding.

### ANTI-FASCISTS

Pau Molina is a Spanish anti-fascist with whose case WDL friends are familiar.

Some time ago, the League won court action against the Immigration authorities because of their attempt to deport Molina without a fair hearing.

Now Immigration has instituted new proceedings against him.

According to the Spanish Military

Code, if Molina returned to Spain he would be tried according to Summary Military Procedure. This provides: that the judge determine what evidence will be admitted, that the judge fix the means of proof; that the defense attorney be allowed one interview with the accused and four hours in which to prepare the defense; that the judgment be executed immediately, except in the case of a death sentence which may be appealed to Franco for executive clemency; that in no case shall there be the right of legal appeal from any decision on procedure or sentence (Articles 922-27).

Alfonso Estramera is a political refugee from Spain. During the Civil War, he served as a member of the Loyalist Navy. When Franco was victorious, he escaped from the Fascist troops by swimming a river in the night and fleeing to North Africa.

United States Immigration wants to deport him to Spain. They do not feel that he will be subject to physical persecution if returned, and will not accept the League's contention that the Franco government is a repressive dictatorship.

Estramera has been an open anti-fascist for over twenty years. According to Title I, Book II, Chapter on Treason, Article 132 of the Spanish Penal Code: "Any Spaniard who, outside of the national territory, communicates or circulates news and false rumors . . . or commits acts of such a nature as to diminish the credit and authority of the State, or tending to compromise the dignity and interests of the Spanish nation" is a felon. The law provides a penitentiary sentence.

Under the thought-provoking question "Is Ellis Island Becoming America's Concentration Camp?" the Workers Defense League has appealed for financial aid which will permit it to fight cases of deportation to totalitarian countries which it has taken up. "Help save them from probable death in their totalitarian homelands—from life imprisonment on Ellis Island," says the WDL appeal.

### LONDON LETTER

# Britain's Health Service Today

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, July 1—Recently in one of the big teaching hospitals in London, a request was made to patients to bring their own soft drinks since the hospital could supply them only to those who are poor or very ill. An executive order for economy in the National Health Service had finally filtered through the web of bureaucracy down to the administrators of policy.

In fact, this is a small effect of the alarming growth in cost of the NHS, which now stands at about 420 million pounds (\$1.1 billion) per year.

As is well known, the National Health Service, started in 1948, gave free medical treatment, drugs and medicines, artificial limbs, spectacles, etc., to any patient. It has meant that no one in the United Kingdom, whether resident or visitor, has had to go without medical treatment. Furthermore, unlike some of the previous insurance schemes both here and in the U. S., the services of the best consultants, physicians and surgeons have been enrolled. For example, one famous operation is done privately by a London surgeon for \$1000 and later that same day may be performed for a workingman without charge.

### SOARING COSTS

Since the inception of the scheme, the demand for treatment and cost of treatment have been rising. Only with regard to spectacles—of which 12,000,000 pairs were supplied in the first rush—and dentures has demand fallen off. As was expected, the 12 cents per prescription introduced by the Conservative government and the \$3½ for spectacles and dentures produced no greater fall in the demand than was expected after first needs had been fulfilled.

Why is it that the cost of the National Health Service has been soaring? First

it should be said that the economies resulting from the charges on spectacles, dentures, prescriptions and dental care have been trifling. The nominal charge bore no relation to the cost of these items; it was fixed. Many of the people who could least afford to pay for these services and needed them most, i.e., children under £1, were exempt from such charges.

In general, the following reasons have been advanced:

(1) General rise in prices of all commodities, especially expensive technical apparatus.

(2) More public use of the services offered. This is especially the case in the rural areas.

### NO PRICE TAG

(3) Unlimited use of the most expensive drugs. Frequently, in hospitals, the doctors who prescribe aureomycin, terramycin, cortisone, etc., as well as more common drugs, have qualified since 1948, and have therefore never known the prices of drugs. Similarly, the use of X-rays at \$2¼ a plate, of laboratory tests at \$½ each (average) has become a commonplace. This is not to suggest either that medical supplies are wasted, or that tests are performed unnecessarily; but it means that they are done without consciousness of their price.

In the 13 major teaching hospitals in London—which are, of course, exceptional in the height of their standards—it cost the Service \$84 a bed per patient per week, except in one (Guy's) where the cost was \$92.40. This is partly so because these are teaching hospitals; yet all difficult cases requiring expert attention are referred to teaching hospitals, and anyone is at liberty to attend these as any others. A major item in the expenditures of these hospitals is the drugs.

Apropos of drugs, there is another

## Oil for the Fire

We offer without comment the following "theoretical" (if not, indeed, downright philosophic) justification for book-burning in the raw, as set down for Hearst by his columnist Dr. Ruth Alexander:

"The idea of 'burning the books' sounds dramatic and sinister. It originated in our time with Hitler and is identified with the Nazis.

"Actually, burning books which spread communism is no more 'evil' than burning the bedclothes of a smallpox patient, which might spread smallpox.

"Of course burning every book which spreads communism will not destroy the Communist idea in minds already infected. But it will retard further spread of the poison. No one could object to people learning about communism in order to fight it, but learning about it in order to follow it is another thing. Since most books about communism in the last 20 years have been written with the idea of getting followers, a good case can be made for burning the books."

This is followed by a subscription-plug for that upright, downright, forthright—and just plain Right—magazine *The American Mercury*, which Dr. Alexander warmly recommends for all bookburners:

"If we have the sense to burn books and to read *Mercury* we will have taken a long step toward—"

Toward what?

"—toward fumigation of our minds."

Bringing up oil for the flame-throwers along comes also the *New Leader*, which editorially deplors "the ill-advised shouts over 'book-burning'" (July 6). This magazine—which may be sued for copyright if it gets to read any more like *The Freeman* than it does now—argues that the overseas libraries were designed to be propaganda centers against Communism. So "the question of the overseas libraries is solely one of administration . . . selecting the best books for the [propaganda] job." As for the inclusion of non-Stalinists in the bookburning, that "did more harm than good" but we are not told just how much good it did. This mistake was made either by a reactionary "or else a crypto-Communist interested in sabotaging U. S. overseas propaganda by alienating the American people from it." Hmm, maybe McCarthy?

### SUCCESS

(4) A much smaller contributory cause of the rise in cost of the NHS has been the "Dankwert's Award." This was a decision by a Royal Commission over two years ago that doctors should be no worse off than in 1939. They therefore increased the capitation fee payable per annum per patient from \$2.12 to \$2.80; this fee is paid by the government out of insurance contributions to the doctor for every patient for whom he is responsible, irrespective of how many times—if at all—the patient requires the doctor's services during the year. If a doctor has, say, a wife and two children, he must have at least 2000 patients to be able to live at the standard his work demands; so far the promised clinics have appeared only in prototype, and doctors do not get paid holidays.

When all is said and done, despite the enormous cost and the big burden on general practitioners, the National Health Service is proving a great success. After five years one can be satisfied that it provides general treatment, services and supplies of a higher over-all standard than anywhere else in the world. That, for a country perching on the cliffs of economic instability, is something for socialists to be proud of.

# Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

## ATTACKS ARTICLE ON ROSENBERG HYSTERIA

To the Editor:

Benson's article (LA, June 29) entitled "Hysteria, Panic and Fear in the Rosenberg Execution" was a clear example of emotional journalism, perhaps even "hysteria"-journalism. There was not even a pretense of objectivity in the presentation of facts and in the over-all slanting. Let me state a few considerations that point up my case.

First, I want to say that I, as a socialist, and I hope, as a humanitarian, was never in support of the death penalty and had hoped for clemency, and not only to offset Stalinist and anti-American propaganda abroad. There undoubtedly was a "lynch spirit," "hysteria," and even some chauvinism in the land manifested by those who wanted to see the Rosenbergs die.

But a socialist, even an old-fashioned liberal, can decry this atmosphere without appearing to support the line of reasoning and even "hysterical atmosphere" created by the Stalinist propagandists and their fellow-traveling "liberals" of the *National Guardian* crowd, and, yes, even some of the *Nation*-type liberals and their fellow ideologists of the *New Statesmen* laborite-liberals in Britain.

One can be opposed to the execution without associating oneself in any way or manner with the Stalinoid arguments, for these very arguments, in their distortions and half-truths and allegations, are themselves based on, in addition to Stalinist cynicism: hysteria, panic-mongering and even chauvinism. Benson's article reads like something out of the *National Guardian*, too strong even for the late Stalinoid-liberal N. Y. *Compass*, let alone the *Nation's* Stalinoid-tinged group around Del Voyo and Alexander Werth.

This subject is too vast to be explored in a letter or one article. Reams of paper have been used for the facts, charges, smears, accusations and plain propaganda outbursts on all sides of the

question. Whether Benson's article is the ISL or LA viewpoint, I don't know. But if it should be, then it fails to present not only a socialist but even an independent liberal viewpoint. It is entirely one-sided in tone and presentation of facts.

Benson does not even mention the role of the Stalinists, their fellow-traveling liberals and dupes, and the foreign anti-American professionals who tried to make this case into another Sacco-Vanzetti martyrdom; and certain Jewish groups, mostly in Israel, who injected anti-Semitism into the case.

Not a few American Jews, anti-Stalinists themselves, regardless of their politics, have hinted at anti-Semitism in the case because the defendants were Jews. And haven't the Stalinoids charged anti-Semitism against the government? The *Guardian* long ago appealed to "all Jews" everywhere and liberals to oppose this "persecution." This is known as chauvinism in reverse, to use anti-Semitism as a weapon where it does not apply. One Israeli writer claimed "that no Jew could possibly commit such an act as treason and/or espionage." The Jews are "different," therefore the "Rosenbergs are innocent. Is this an unfair point?"

One may say it does not apply here. But the Rosenberg defense-support used and encouraged every device; however fantastic, to create prejudice in the land, as if they hoped to prove anti-Semitism in the case by creating it in the public mind. Benson's article is an attack on the hysteria from one side. How about from the other?

I'm not silly enough to charge Stalinoid leanings to LA, but LA's apparent position does not sufficiently disassociate itself from the Stalinoid line, the line, not the crowd. What should a new reader think, after feeling the agitational tone here?

Contrast Benson's article and the ISL telegram for clemency with an LA article

of December, 1952. Here the writer hits the CP-Stalinoid crowd for falsely injecting "civil liberties" in this case. I had imagined then that the ISL position was a simple affirmation of hostility to hysteria on both sides and an appeal for clemency without using the Stalinoid line of reasoning.

The ISL had always taken the position that it would defend genuine civil liberties against all comers, but not those convicted of espionage and related acts, not to mention the work of agents of a ruthless foreign government. I'm sure it still holds this viewpoint, but no one could ever guess it from Benson's article.

He speaks of "injustice" here. To whom? Yes, we may oppose all death penalties on humane grounds. But this is not the crux of the Benson argument. Again, I ask, what "injustice," even granting legal or illegal irregularities, granting cold-war hysteria, vengeance of formal "justice."

Haven't socialists always said, "We are not responsible for the legal acts of the government because of its class character?" Then why raise technical issues of legality to buttress an agitational article of dubious validity and no objectivity?

Again, I ask readers to re-read the December 29 issue for an objective appraisal of the case, so far as it went. Here, no civil liberties or "crime" or "injustice" is raked over the coals.

Actually, there have been few LA articles on the case since it opened. It, LA, had apparently not considered the case to be worth the space and argument that simple civil liberties-cases warrant. Whoever doubts this analysis may check his file of LAs for the last two years or so. Then, why, even a friend may ask legitimately, does LA and the ISL suddenly come out just before and after the execution with articles attempting to show the "injustice" of American bourgeois law?

We all have our opinions of the vaunted "justice" of bourgeois-class-courts and governments. But why did LA fail to present this line for the last two years and regularly, if it felt the conviction and/or death sentence was an "injustice?" Why wait till now?

The ISL telegram to Eisenhower asking for commutation of the death sentence appeared in the LA issue of June 22 on the front page. It charged the penalty was "an outrage against the humanitarian and political interests of the American people. To execute the Rosenbergs is a crime committed in the name of justice and a disgraceful aping of Stalinist methods. It encourages a know-nothing-chauvinism and hysteria."

This strong language is, at least, one-sided. The Benson article is worse and prompted me to break my silence. This type of reasoning is not in the socialist tradition at all. Nor is it clearly based on humanitarian (old-fashioned liberal) grounds. It is pure-and-simple political propaganda, partisan agitation, perhaps, to show the world that "we too are real liberals, opposed to this (injustice?)."

Everyone is entitled to an honest opinion, no matter how wrong or lop-sided, but I ask again why LA and ISL did not present this argument earlier, to appear as consistent defenders of judicial attacks on something, even if legalities, technicalities and lack of precedents? This belated jump into the "super-liberal" bandwagon (and what bedfellows these assorted "liberals" are!) looks not quite genuine to the objective reader and I make full allowances for the ISL desire to "look good" before the liberal crowd that hangs on the Stalinist coattails, to woo these people away from Stalinoidism by showing a "rebel" militancy equal to the shows put on by the CP fronts.

Was the late ISL flareup really, at bottom, a tactical maneuver, even if sincerely conceived as something else? One may kid himself as well as others, psychology teaches.

Yes, we are all in danger of being swayed by the cold war struggle, to lose our sense of balance to be torn from a position of objectivity, or at least opposition to both war camps. We are all human and may succumb a bit to hysteria and even chauvinism. That is why a simple forthright stand for clemency and opposition to hysteria and prejudice on both sides, disassociating ourselves from both camps, is necessary.

We need not apologize for "our" government to the world, to win support of Stalinoids (and so-called "neutralists" abroad). As long as we have class government we can expect injustices and

## STEADFAST

To the Editor:

... One thing I would like to say. I believe that recent events demonstrate the correctness, in general, of the League's position. I believe, too, that we are on the threshold of a new epoch. In the last few years, unfortunately, many otherwise good people have given in to a mood of despair, and have either abandoned political action completely or joined one of the two warring camps of reaction. The League, however, has remained steadfast. This, to me, and to many other people, has meant a great deal. . . .

B. D. N.

Berkeley, Calif., July 2.

hysteria and hypocrisy in the legal decisions. But spies should not expect mercy. Their job is one of ruthless work and can expect no kid-gloves' treatment. Even socialists recognize the right of a nation and government to defend itself against espionage and overt acts of treason where civil liberties are not the issue.

The Rosenbergs are to be pitied because they are children of a fateful age of ideological struggle, willing tools of a sinister movement and world power. Their sincerity is no issue. They were Americans, and traitors as well as spies. Isn't their deed worse than that of U-Boat foreign spies who were executed here during the war? They at least fought for their country, a right historically recognized. The system of nations may be wrong in principle, but espionage for one's nation is less condemned than that against one's nation.

Who attacked the "injustices" against Lord Ha-Ha, the fascist British traitor who only propagandized? Who defends Alger Hiss, or would, even if he had been sentenced to death? There is no propaganda value in his name for the Stalinists or anyone else. One must belong to a minority group, it seems, before the Stalinists, their dupes, certain anti-Stalinist radicals and minority-defenders will make a big issue.

Had the Rosenbergs been named Smith, the agitation would have been less, here and abroad. Both from the Stalinists who want to show up America as discriminatory, and from sincere minority spokesmen and liberal-radical affiliates, chauvinists or not, who have different standards for conduct and treatment based on ethnic considerations.

Why blast Eisenhower so much? Or the Supreme Court majority? Why not Truman, who refused clemency? Why not, above all, Judge Kaufman for giving the death sentence? And why not, above all, the impersonal cold war and the imperialist struggle which creates Rosenbergs, Kaufmans, Blochs, and the pro-con camps in this case? And why not a word against Stalinist-espionage apologists?

I feel that Benson's slur against the N. Y. *Post* as a capitulation was unjustified. "Maybe" Wechsler is "scared"—maybe he believes his line as sincerely as LA believes its strange, last-minute superdisplay of "me-too" liberalism. I dislike having to criticize LA on these grounds, but silence is no virtue, even for a good cause or a good paper or a good group. . . .

Harold WEST

Los Angeles, July 3.

## Comment

First of all, Comrade West should take his own advice and check the LA file. Besides the articles from last December that he mentions, our views on the Rosenberg case were fully presented in our editorial of January 19. If he missed it then, we referred our readers back to it again when we published the ISL telegram. This editorial adequately took up the nature of the Stalinist campaign, their "anti-Semitic" angle, the attitude of socialists toward spies and their fate, and stated our motives for favoring commutation of the death sentence. It likewise discussed the case strictly in the framework of the cold war and imperialist struggle, but since the Benson article did this even more cogently, we can less understand West's next-to-last paragraph.

It is perfectly true that LA did not seek to "campaign" throughout the long period of the Rosenberg case on the issue. We stated our position. When the case came to its climax—and above all,

(Continued on page 5)

## THE DEATH PENALTY IN THE ROSENBERG CASE

To the Editor:

One fact more than any other ought to stand out as a result of the Rosenberg case, now that it is over. That is the unwarrantedness of the death penalty. It seems ironic that in Mexico a man caught red-handed in the act of killing—I refer to Leon Trotsky's assassin—remains alive today, behind prison bars, while in the most powerful country in the world, two people, the effects of whose crime are highly problematical, were electrocuted.

The purpose of justice is not to exact retribution, but to quarantine persons who, having harmed society, might, if undeterred, commit harm again and wantonly. There is no more justification for the death penalty in one crime as against another. If its purpose is to warn prospective offenders while relieving the state of the burden of caring for convicted ones, then capital punishment is equally justifiable for petty larceny as for murder or treason. There are few among civilized people who would contend that this would be a wise course of conduct, however. Thus, the severity of the penalty is in practice to be gauged by the degree of anger which it arouses; capital punishment is modern society's

last recourse for vengeance, now that the use of torture is prohibited. Some countries, like Mexico, however, have taken a further step in the direction of civilization and humaneness, in abolishing the death penalty.

It will be a good day for mankind, I think, when the United States steps up beside Mexico and declares that it, too, forswears this barbarism. And if our "practical" politicians are not sufficiently persuaded by the humanistic merits of such a move, they might reflect that "Frank Jackson" may conceivably yet confess to his crime and reveal its details and his co-conspirators. Unfortunately for the U. S. government, it can expect no further testimony from the electrocuted Rosenbergs. Even though such testimony might one day have been given, once the spies saw that their martyrdom was to be a living one, and even though this additional information might have been of great use to the U. S. government, this government felt that vengeance had to be placed before its own security. To put it mildly, this is very much locking the barn before getting the horse in!

There are few enough circumstances in which the killing of human beings is to be condoned. I cannot think of any, except in armed revolt against an implacable tyranny, in which this practice deserves support—least of all as a means of defense by a stable industrial nation of 160 million people against two spies. Any nation of such strength, even in the most desperate straits, even on the brink of defeat, should hesitate before resorting to such a drastic measure. And the United States, needless to say, is far from being in any sort of peril at this moment.

An article on penal practices by Bernard Cramer or Carl Darton might be appropriate in this connection. It is a long time since I have seen anything like a comprehensive statement of the socialist conception of the proper methods of dealing with crime.

Roy HOLLISTER

P.S. I think your coverage of the New York political scene in the last three issues is an excellent idea, very well carried out. Also, I've been following the Iron Curtain rebellions with great interest in the *Times*, *Trib*, *Monitor*, &c., &c., and feel well qualified to say your summary of the events is unsurpassed.



LABOR ACTION

July 13, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 28

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Asst. Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

BOOKS and Ideas

The Russians in Focus

Russia in Descriptive Terms

THE RUSSIANS IN FOCUS, by Harold J. Berman.—Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 209 pages, \$3.

By PHILIP COBEN

Harold Berman, a Harvard Law School professor and a specialist in Russian law, has here undertaken a wider task than his other books, Justice in Russia and Soviet Law in Action. As he puts it, it is not to bring any new knowledge, ideas or interpretations to bear on Stalinist society, but simply to give "a short, concise statement of some of the basic characteristics of every-day Soviet life, a closeup of the Soviet system, presenting in a simple and understandable way elementary truths about the situation of the Russian people."

That pretty well conveys the character of The Russians in Focus and what can be expected of it. Twelve subjects are covered in as many chapters: the army, the peasantry, the workers, the family, education, medical care, the press, religion, economic planning, law, the Communist Party and the regime of terror. In terms of the author's aims, it seems to me a pretty good assemblage of much descriptive information.

It should be added that, in line with the aim, there is no attempt at documentation—Berman offers to give any reader the sources of information for any fact presented—but factually the book is sound enough.

LIMITED AIM

He has tried very hard not to make the book read like an "indictment." He writes that Russia "is full of blacks and whites, goods and evils, yeses and noes." But since Berman is under no illusions about Stalinism, he does not fall for any Stalinoid-type "objectivity" such as con-

siders a statement in the constitution about freedom as important as the realities of Russian life. In point of fact, the "whites," "goods" and "yeses" that he brings out are in many cases useful reminders of aspects of Stalinist society which, for the sake of understanding, should not be overlooked in the heat of denunciation.

A good illustration of this is in the field of Berman's specialty, law, on which he naturally has a very interesting chapter. He takes care to emphasize that Stalinist jurisprudence has, to a limited degree, a life of its own and makes an attempt at self-consistency.

Only occasionally does he fall into the superficial kind of "on the one hand and on the other hand" pattern, as when he writes: "By an appropriate selection of facts, one may draw a picture of the Soviet worker as a slave of the state and its bureaucracy, or as a protected and privileged member of the ruling class. It is easy to say that the truth lies somewhere in between—but that does not untangle the paradox." But his own selection of facts gives no hint of how any honest case could be made for any view that the worker is a "privileged member of the ruling class," even if he is not literally a slave of the state. Likewise his reference to Russian anti-Semitism is a weak one. And his chapter on planning is doomed to be rather unenlightening because of its approach.

But such criticisms, while they will affect the value of the book for many readers who are looking for something else, are in a sense unfair, since the author did not set out to satisfy them. His aim, as we mentioned, is limited. At most, as in the case of so many books on Russia, we might object to the title, which seems to promise more than is really intended.

Readers Take the Floor

(Continued from page 4)

when the political atmosphere around the case simultaneously reached its climax in the lynch spirit of the last few days—we took up the question again. Others may criticize us (from a point of view diametrically opposed to West's) for not devoting more space to the case, but West's reiterated jibes using words like "last-minute," "belated," etc., are not in accord with the objective, unemotional facts.

Secondly, we do not find that West is being excessively objective and unemotional when he permits himself to write—and repeat—that the Benson article "associated" itself with the Stalinoid arguments, "reads like something out of the National Guardian," etc. The sole and exclusive basis for this language is the fact that Benson did not attack the Stalinists all over again. If this were really all of West's complaint, he would at least have written a different kind of letter. In any case, although it is often necessary to do so, we do not believe it necessary to denounce the Stalinists in every article; in this case, the subject was that which was happening currently, which in point of fact was the Supreme Court's bow to the panic and hysteria of the country and the fear-stricken rushing-through of the rather, irreparable act of electrocution.

We do not at all understand how our correspondent can ask "what injustice" Benson was writing about. His excellent article was in its bulk devoted to the question of justice which Justice Douglas and the court had to act on at the

last moment, and to which the court majority gave such short shrift. It was Douglas, Black and Frankfurter who questioned the justice of the court's action, and also ascribed it (in their own more measured language) to the panicky hysteria of the political climate. West, however, writes as if the question of justice referred to the conviction of the Rosenbergs. This, perhaps, explains why he thinks it necessary to argue that spy cases are not civil-liberty questions, etc. He does not, however, mention the question which alone was the subject of the article.

The "slur" on the Post was the rebuke to that worthy liberal paper for arguing that "the good name of America came out intact" (no less) because look what the Stalinists do in East Germany. . . . Surely West must have other thoughts on this than to cast a "slur" on Benson's awfully mild comment, which had nothing to do with Wechsler's being "scared," insincere, or capitulatory, these being phrases invented by West.

We understand from West's letter that he was opposed to the Rosenberg death sentence on "humanitarian (old-fashioned liberal)" grounds and objects to our "political propaganda, partisan agitation." It is a pity that on this more important aspect of the question than his lengthier strictures, he implies a point of view only in passing. No, we do not take a humanitarian-liberal attitude toward the case or the death sentence in it; we take a political-socialist attitude toward it, naturally "partisan." We could better understand West's objection (as well as language and tone) if it came from one who did indeed believe that "the good name of America came out intact" from this death sentence which was conceived in the crucible of the cold war and executed in a climate of hysterical vengeance.

As it is, we can only question what exactly is the approach he is taking, not only at this point but also where he makes a distinction, which seems very important to him, between a foreign spy who acts for his "own" nation (presumably out of patriotism) and the "worse" spy who engages in this occupation out of ideological belief. . . . We would ask him to reconsider what the political foundations are of his very sharp reaction to Benson's trenchant analysis of the monstrous atmosphere around the last days of the Rosenbergs.—Ed.

Orwell's personal account of the Spanish Civil War

HOMAGE TO CATALONIA

by George Orwell

\$3.50 Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 West 14 Street, New York City

Youth and Student Corner

SOCIALIST PARTY SUSPENDS NEW YORK YPSL

By ARTHUR HART

In the face of growing opposition against its perspective of merging with the Social Democratic Federation, the Socialist Party has resorted to organizational measures to defeat an important internal oppositional tendency. It has suspended the entire New York district of the Young Socialists (YPSL), its youth group. The New York YS is the largest and most active part of its national youth organization and at the same time a main source of dissent with its political course.

Technically, the district was suspended by the New York local of the SP; thus it retains the right to appeal its suspension to the National Committee of the SP, and in the mean time remains part of the national Young Socialists which is still unaffected by this latest move. While it is entirely possible that this step was taken as a "threat" in order to intimidate the YS, or a section of it, and the suspension will be lifted when the wiser, cooler, and politically less hostile National Committee meets, other alternative possibilities present themselves.

The local party committee which suspended the YS represents in the main the view of the National Office of the SP, which in turn exercises the leading influence in the National Committee of the Party. It is difficult to see why the suspension should have been imposed if its movers thought there was a good possibility of its being rescinded by a higher body. Such a procedure would only strengthen the position of all sections sympathizing with the political orientation of the YS and stimulate them to more militant activity against the national leadership.

POLITICAL AX

It would appear far more likely that the party considers the present suspension as the definitive test of strength not only with the YS, whose anti-war views are well known, but with other sections of the party that are in various degrees anti-war also. It will certainly be such a test for the Young Socialists nationally. To permit the permanent suspension from the party of their most numerous and active leading section would inevitably mean complete capitulation to the SP. For the party, assuming that it perseveres in maintaining the suspension, will undoubtedly move to reorganize a New York section, perhaps with right-wing elements who are not now even in the YS, and then try to impose

the leadership of this section on the national organization.

While the details are unknown to us, the general reason for the suspension is absolutely clear and indisputable. It is a move to rid the SP of an organized and vocal opposition to its program and leadership. The issues which the YS have raised in the clearest fashion are all fundamentally connected with the desire of the Young Socialists to fight the drift of the party to the right, toward support in various ways of the American preparations for war, toward alliance and unity with the pro-war SDF, etc.

The Young Socialists, on the other hand, have been developing a militant and consistent program of opposition to the war, toward an orientation to third-camp movements abroad, and toward collaboration with other anti-war groups in the United States. It has been this development which has brought YS and the Socialist Youth League into ever closer relations in all fields of common activity.

YS's "CRIME"

In a number of fields the YS and SYL are now engaged in joint activities. The two groups are preparing joint statements for public circulation, cooperating in student work on campus, and working closely together in other projects. The New York sections of both groups are now holding a summer series of very successful joint forums.

These joint activities with the SYL were the formal grounds for the SP's suspension of its youth group. The underlying aim obviously was to hinder and prevent the YS from developing and promoting its political, that is, anti-war, position in collaboration with other anti-war tendencies.

This is proved beyond a doubt by the fact that, in contrast, the SP takes absolutely no action against its prominent spokesman, Norman Thomas, when the latter undertakes to build a dual socialist organization with non-SP and ex-SP members. It even advertises the meetings of this group, called the Union of Democratic Socialists, in its organ the Socialist Call. And the SP appoints the same Norman Thomas as its representative to the Stockholm congress of the Socialist International.

The difference between the SP's treatment of its anti-war tendency and its most pro-war spokesman demonstrates the political content and direction of its "discipline."

Solidarity Rally on German Revolt by SYL

By JACK WALKER

BERKELEY, Calif., June 29—"The East German Workers' Rising" was the subject of a successful open-air meeting held by the Berkeley Socialist Youth League at the University of California's Sather Gate during the noon hour today.

About 75 summer session students heard the main speaker, Jim Roberston, Berkeley SYL organizer, deal with the recent and still continuing demonstrations and strikes in East Germany. He divided the subject into several parts: the evolution of conditions and issues in Germany since the end of the war; the immediate causes of the uprising; its extent and political and class character; the likely consequent future developments; and finally the over-all historic significance of a workers' struggle against Stalinism as a vitalization of

the Third Camp concept on an international scale.

The audience was very attentive and interested in the talk, although their questions showed they did not agree with Robertson's interpretation, especially in its socialist Third Camp direction. In the course of the educational exchange following the presentation the speaker proved the socialist orientation of the bulk of the West German working class as well as the lack of "fascist" or capitalist manifestations in the East German events.

To many of the listeners this was probably their first contact with the SYL as they did not attend regular semesters at Cal, and had only seen LABOR ACTION as it was distributed to them before the place of registration, about two weeks ago. Sales on the "red rack" outside Sather Gate increased noticeably as a result of both activities.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York

- I want more information about the Socialist Youth League. I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME ADDRESS CITY ZONE STATE SCHOOL IF ANY

# Who Were the Leaders of the East

By MAX SHACHTMAN

There have been anti-Stalinist actions before, both outside of Russia and even inside of it. But yet they are not the same thing as the rising that occurred in Berlin.

Inside of Russia it has happened any number of times, before, during and since the Second World War. There have been many cases of small isolated strikes, long strikes, by desperate, atomized leaderless workers who would almost rather die than to continue to submit any longer to the depredations and abuses of their masters. Invariably, according to all the reports about them, they were blown to bits by the platoons of the GPU. And the heroism of the workers involved left an imprint on the minds of only a tiny handful of people. The world at large, outside of Russia, heard very little of these struggles.

Similarly in the cases of the multitude of peasant actions that occur almost all the time in one place of the Russian empire or another—actions against the bureaucratic bandits sent to keep them subjugated and silent.

**Outside of Russia there has been more than one case, dozens of cases in fact. The first big inspiring movement was that of the Ukrainian Partisans, the so-called UPA which arose in the Ukraine, both parts of it, in the course of the Second World War, with the cry "Against Hitler! Against Stalin!"**

This movement displayed a heroism and a tenacity that is almost incredible under conditions that are almost impossible to believe could exist, and it had the honor of lighting up the first dawn of the new day after the many gloomy years of ineffectual calls to resistance issued in Russia by the revolutionary movement, in particular by the Trotskyist movement, the old Trotskyist movement.

## Class Struggle Under the Iron Heel

But in the first place the UPA was essentially a guerrilla movement, arising directly out of the conditions of the war in that particular part of Europe at the time, and limited by these conditions. And secondly, it was primarily a peasant movement, moreover a peasant movement constantly on the move. And for these two reasons it was doomed to instability, to insecurity, to a gradual wearing-down and unfortunately to obscurity. Similar and analogous movements have been known in Poland ever since the Stalins took power there, but they had the same or greater natural and military handicaps.

Of greater importance and of sounder foundations have been the spontaneous movements in Czechoslovakia. Like the working classes in all the Stalinist countries—it is a feature of them all—the Czech workers, almost from the beginning, starting only shortly after the Stalinists took complete power in the country, have been on a more or less permanent general strike, inside the industries, inside the plants, inside the factories, inside the mills, on the railroads, even on the farms. It is a characteristic means whereby the working class of these countries, starting with Russia herself, carry on the class struggle against the totalitarian regime.

But with the new developments in the Stalinist regimes which have come into the open since the death of Stalin, this peculiar durable general strike has already broken out into open demonstrations in the plants and in the streets in various cities of Czechoslovakia, particularly in connection recently with the vicious so-called currency reform.

## Spontaneous—and Organized

**But all of these taken together, and certainly any one of them, fail to have the scope and significance of the Berlin events of the middle of June.**

It is true, as all the more or less bewildered reports in the newspapers agree, that the movement in Eastern Berlin and thereafter in Eastern Germany was a spontaneous movement. It was indeed a spontaneous movement, as are all genuine mass movements. Genuine mass movements cannot simply be commandeered from above, no matter how widespread is the support enjoyed among the population by those whom the "above" represent. They have to conform to a sentiment in the masses; they have to represent it—truly, or not quite so truly as the case might be. In that sense the outpouring of the mass, whether on order or request from above or by the mysterious movement which often sets masses in motion without anybody—the masses themselves included—knowing who it was, is nevertheless an authentic popular movement.

**But in this case what was undoubtedly a spontaneous movement was at the same time, I am convinced by everything that has appeared about it, also an ORGANIZED movement. In that respect I think it is fundamentally different from virtually all the movements we have known under Stalinism in the past—and by movements in this respect I mean movements that have appeared openly in the streets, in direct combat with Stalinism.**

*We publish here a part of the lecture given by Max Shachtman on July 2 on the subject of the East German workers' revolt, as transcribed from a tape recording made by friends. This section deals mainly with the German action itself; Comrade Shachtman continued with a discussion of the international significance and impact of the event.—Ed.*

All sorts of people—and this is a second feature of the Eastern Berlin affair—were in the demonstration. It was perhaps the broadest mass movement against Stalinism that has been witnessed. Many of the correspondents who were on the scene were somewhat puzzled by the variegated class character of the demonstration. They saw people who were obviously workers—building trades workers in particular, who, in Germany, are very easy to recognize—and they saw people with briefcases. People with briefcases in a country like Germany means middle-class people—employees, government people, civil-service people, etc. They saw housewives with big shopping baskets—which shows, already, not a proletarian housewife. They saw moderately well-dressed people in the demonstration.

But however true and gratifying it is that everybody, so to speak, plunged into the demonstration, the outstanding fact about it is that it was initiated by organized workmen. They were the moving spirit of it, they were its spinal column, they were its heart, and above all they were its mind.

## The Berlin Proletariat

**And when we speak of organized workingpeople we're speaking of the Berlin proletariat. And comrades and friends, there has never been a proletariat, certainly not over a long period of time, like the Berlin proletariat—never.**

Almost throughout the history of one century of the socialist proletarian movement it has been unique. Always strongly organized; always permeated to the marrow of its bones with the spirit of solidarity and organization; always permeated with the spirit of discipline—very often too good for it—but nevertheless discipline. And courage!

Berlin differs, you must know, from New York among other things in this respect: it is a strongly industrial center. While New York is dominated by a working-class population, it is a different working-class population in the kind of work it does and in the kind of plants in which it works.

This tradition of organization, of class consciousness, of socialist class consciousness, of discipline and courage, was manifested in East Berlin two weeks ago as though it had never gone through the purgatory of fascism and the exhausting paralysis of the division that made it possible for fascism to come to power 20 years ago.

So while it was an authentically popular demonstration and uprising, it was initiated, carried on and dominated from start to finish by the Berlin socialist proletariat—the old proletariat who existed and flourished and thought and acted before Hitler, and the young proletarians who, in the multifarious ways known to the working class, were trained by their older working-class brothers.

## Communist Background

I feel confirmed in my belief that this was an organized demonstration as well as a spontaneous one, that it was an organized demonstration and not merely a spontaneous one, by the reports which uniformly agree on one thing: on who literally started the demonstration and who constituted the massive bulk of the demonstration.

You must have read the reports in all the newspapers: that it was started by the workers of the Berlin construction industry, the building-trades workers; and that it got its most weighty support, once it got started, from the workers in Henningsdorf, a suburb 12-15 miles from the center of Berlin, which is industrial through and through and the seat of the famous Henningsdorfer Stahlwerke, the steel works, famous in the class struggles of Germany for years and of Berlin in particular.

**Now what is very interesting about both of these groups of workers is their past. They share a common past, and for some reason they are almost exactly the opposite in politics and tradition from their similars in the U. S. The steelworkers of Henningsdorf and the building-trades workers of Berlin have in common a Communist past.**

And not by accident—the case was not that somebody pretended he was a member of the city committee of the Democratic Party and got elected to the building-trades council in Berlin, or something of the sort. Year in and year out both of them—both unions—both industries—from almost the beginning of the post-World War I period, almost from the beginning of the creation of a Communist Party in Germany, regularly elected Communist shop-council stewards. They were known as fortresses of the Communist Party, and not by skimp majorities—they were really fortresses of the Communist Party!

The Berlin building-trades industry, the Henningsdorf steel works—to mention the two that were involved in

this case, there were others of course—were among the proletarian sectors where the Nazis could never penetrate. Social-Democrats in these industries inclined to the left rather than to the right. That gives you some idea of the political past of the workers who were primarily involved in these demonstrations.

When the Communist Party in the old days before Hitler called its big demonstrations, its big parades, outstanding among them were the Berlin building-trades workers, dressed in the heritage of the old guild costumes that they affected on those occasions: great big broad-brimmed black hats, and great big broad-breached black pants. And that seemed to enhance their brawn. I can almost see them walking down the streets now in Stalinist Berlin and infusing into the Stalinist Volkspolizei, into the Stalinist soldier, not an impression of contempt but an impression of worryment. They were something to look at! And if some have died since the old days—Hitler took power 20 years ago, people have died, many of them murdered—those who replaced them have, no doubt, been brought up in the same fundamental tradition of revolutionary, militant, uncompromising socialism.

## Revolutionary Slogans

**Because I have to add to that story of their tradition the fact that there has been a complete break with Stalinism both in the building trades industry and in the steel works, among these workers who participated. Nowhere else is there a deeper, sturdier hatred of Stalinism and of the so-called Communist Party of Germany than among these workers. These places are no longer fortresses of Stalinism; they are fortresses of the proletarian socialist enemies of Stalinism.**

These former Communists are unquestionably united today with the Social-Democratic workers, the members of the SPD, the socialist party of Germany, in those industries and enterprises. One need not have any inside information to come to that absolutely firm and sound conclusion. What could possibly divide the former Communist Party workers of those areas and industries from the former Social-Democratic Party workers? Nothing, absolutely nothing. And that was perfectly clear from the slogans that were chanted with such organized and prepared firmness by those who appeared in the demonstration. The differences of the past no longer relate to anything in the world today. There cannot be a division between them—that's in the past.

**The fourth thing that was interesting about the East Berlin affair and which justified the conclusion that this was not only organized but well organized, intelligently organized, wisely and cunningly organized, was the systematic and integrated character with which the crowd put forward their slogans. These slogans were all revolutionary political slogans.**

The ostensible ground upon which the building-trades workers left their jobs on the first "socialist" street in Berlin, Stalinallee, was lost sight of in the demonstration, in the uprising. It was as if they were ready to acknowledge, publicly, that this was only a pretext for manifesting their opposition to the regime.

You know, surely, how it started. The Stalinist rulers, or subrulers, of what is referred to as the "workers state" of East Germany—by many people, none of whom is a worker in East Germany—issued a decree that the production norm in the building-trades industry would be lifted 10 per cent. And although in this mighty totalitarian state these workers had but to lift their finger in protest to get the decree withdrawn by the rulers of the German more-or-less "degenerated workers state," that did not prevent them from going out into this demonstration which was half uprising and half demonstration. On the contrary, it only stimulated them.

## From Sipo to Vopo

And the minute they went out—although they came from different parts of the city and converged upon one key point where their employers who rule them, the employers' state, the government offices, are located—they said virtually nothing of the 10 per cent increase in the production norm. All their slogans were political, all their slogans related to the question of rule, of politics, and because they were directed against the regime and violently against it, uncompromisingly against it, demanding nothing from the regime, except its demise, they were revolutionary political slogans.

"Ivan Go Home" was the one heard most often. "Down with the Volkspolizei!" This is an old and, in its original form, beloved slogan of all German workers, above all, of the Berlin workers. They have had "Po's" before. There was the hated Sipo of the Weimar republic—the Sicherheitspolizei—the security police; and the word Sipo on the lips of a Berlin worker was not pleasant to hear, if you were a member of the Sipo! There was likewise the Schupo—the Schutzpolizei, the "protective police," and on the lips of the Berlin workers it had no less hateful a significance. And after these representatives of the democratic Weimar republic were transmogrified into the police of the Hitler regime there were added to them also the Gestapo—the Geheime Staatspolizei—the secret police of the late Goering, and that only deepened the hatred of the German workers.

**And to them all—and you might say summing them all up—was now added by the Stalinists the Vopo, the Volkspolizei, which added insult to injury by calling itself a people's police. And it is interesting that among the slogans most popular on the streets two weeks ago was**

# German Uprising Against Stalinism?

**"Down with the Vopo!"—down with the armed agents of the Stalinist regime in Germany.**

"Down with Ulbricht" was the third of the popular slogans. Ulbricht is the principal Stalinist quisling in Germany, together with front man Grotewohl, who is kept there only because he was a former minor functionary in the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and who is a handy man for the Russians to have around because nature deprived him of the elementary lime deposits to make up a backbone. They are known, nevertheless, by all the workers for what they really are.

The workers demanded nothing of Ulbricht and Grotewohl—no "give us this or that." No: Vacate! Disappear! Or as they say in vulgar Berlinese: *Verrecke!* (croak).

**What they demanded positively—not of Grotewohl and not of the Russian tanks, but as an assembling slogan for all the people—were two things: Unite Germany, and free elections. To demand free elections in the U. S. is to demand something very serious, but not revolutionary. In a Stalinist country free elections is a revolutionary demand—revolutionary from every point of view. And the slogan for the national unification of Germany is a revolutionary and democratic slogan which quickens the heartbeat of every authentic German today.**

## The Hand of Experience

It is impossible to believe that these were merely the spontaneous utterances of so many atomized individuals in East Berlin. These were slogans drawn up not artificially, not to be "injected" into the Germans or the Berliners but drawn up because they so pregnantly summarized the most passionate feelings of the Berliners. They were drawn up by people who were accustomed to summarize pithily that which is in the heart of people.

To make no bones about it, no people in our time have shown themselves to be more skilled, more thoughtful, more experienced, taking it all in all, at doing precisely that than those trained in the Communist or the Stalinist movement. I do not hesitate for a moment to acknowledge their skill and experience in this respect. The demonstration was not organized by anybody who never had had anything to do with demonstrations, let alone demonstrations that are uprisings. It was organized by experts, by experienced people, skilled people, people with know-how in these matters.

Among Social-Democrats, including good ones, how many of them have experience in organizing uprisings? at least, lately, that is, since 1848? Not so with one who has been in the Communist movement, above all in the Communist movement of Germany and the Communist movement of Berlin, where the organizing of demonstrations (and insurrections) was publicly taught in detail, in technical detail, by the CP of Germany up to the day that Hitler took power, which openly published a magazine devoted to the art of insurrection.

**The way in which they went to the places where they went; the way in which they converged upon the strategically located centers; the way in which they attacked those who were to be attacked and refrained from attacking those whom it was pointless or inexpedient to attack; the lack of aimless wandering which is the special characteristic of spontaneous demonstrations that have no organization, preparation and leadership; the immediacy of their assault on the prisons to liberate all political prisoners; the speed with which they reached government buildings in order to try to take them, with which they reached buildings of the Stalinist party and did take them—for the time required to destroy the paraphernalia: all these speak of a prepared organized demonstration, all these things speak of the existence of an underground revolutionary organization throughout the German Stalinist territory.**

Read the serious correspondents who wrote about the Berlin uprising two weeks ago, not the sensation mongers but those who tried to understand the spectacular, bewildering event that was occurring before their very eyes. Some of them had seen uprisings before, evidently. They knew their features, their characteristics, what leads up to them, what follows them. This one was a mystery.

There was no organization—(Otherwise they'd have heard of it, wouldn't they? The first thing an underground movement does naturally is tell an American correspondent!) And yet this had the appearance of an organized movement! Yet they knew of no leaders; they knew of no headquarters; no newspapers; no dues payments; no meetings; no constitution, above all. It was interesting to read the reports—that's what puzzled them all.

## Is an Underground Possible?

But we can say with utter certainty: there is such a movement. There is such an organization. It must embrace thousands in the sense that thousands follow it, almost unquestionably, but it contains as its actual staff only few. These people learned not only in the hard school of the Stalinists in the old days but they learned in the even harder and more unrelenting school of life under the Gestapo.

**You may ask yourself: Is it possible to have an underground illegal organization in a country dominated by that most experienced and most all-persuasive spy organization in the world, that most skillful and powerful underground apparatus that history has ever known, the GPU? Would it not penetrate it? Would it not expose it and explode it?**

In Russia, perhaps; or at least, in Russia with less difficulty, for reasons which I believe will occur to you yourselves if you reflect but a moment. In Germany, no.

In the first place, there is no reason to doubt that among those who have taken the courageous responsibility of organizing this revolutionary underground movement, this nameless and faceless movement for which nobody in the West speaks or can speak, there are those who at one or another time were in the service of the GPU or got their training in it, know its methods and know how to avoid the consequences of these methods to themselves. That's in the first place.

But more important than that is the social and political environments of this movement. The militants of such a movement live among a people that almost uniformly hate the Stalinist regime. We have forgotten, we who hardly know very much what happened only a few years ago. They have not. They know what happened when these Stalinist "liberators" came to their country; they know the shame and the shambles that came with the cannon of the so-called Red Army. They know its hideous record. Nothing has happened to appease that deep national hatred for a country that has deprived them of everything—above all, their honor, their country, their dignity as people of it; and that has submitted them to a degradation which in one respect is deeper than that which they suffered under Hitler.

In such an atmosphere an illegal underground anti-Stalinist movement is doubly and trebly protected by the population, protected from infiltration, protected from espionage, protected from harassment of all kinds. In any case, that it exists is to me incontestable, for to contest it makes a miracle out of what happened in Berlin and the rest of the cities of Germany a couple of weeks ago; and in spite of the Roman Catholic Church, this is not the age of miracles, not even in the struggle against Stalinism.

## Aims of the Uprising

**What was the aim of this half-demonstration, half-uprising? To judge this is at the same time to judge: Was it a success or a failure, was it a victory or a defeat?**

If we proceed from what is apparent to the naked eye, if we proceed secondly from what seems like a reasonable analysis of what was behind the demonstration, it seems clear that insofar, as it represented conscious thinking people accustomed to advancing not on the basis of some capricious whim of emotion of the moment but on the basis of thinking and planning and preparing, their aim was NOT to take power now from the Stalinists. That's not possible. Rather, what seems to me to be the aims are the following.

It was a test of arms, the first one between the German working class and the Stalinist ruling class in the eight years since they took power in that country. It was a feeling out of the enemy, a feeling for the enemy's soft spots, for the enemy's reaction. It was, as it were, a patrol in mass.

I cannot believe that this represented the total strength that can be mustered by the German working class against the Stalinists. There is much, very much, in reserve.

**Their aim was, if possible, to disgrace completely the quisling government of Grotewohl and Ulbricht, and in this aim they were brilliantly successful. In this they achieved a complete and unalloyed victory.**

Think only of this fact: The so-called native government of East Germany, of the Democratic People's Republic, as it is called, the "German" government of the Russians cannot cope with a demonstration of unarmed workers!—with the arms at its disposal! This isn't an unarmed government. Arms at its disposal—by that I do not mean Russian arms; I mean its so-called Volkspolizei.

Like any more or less normal government, it sees a demonstration in the streets which seems to be somewhat critical of the regime; it calls out its police; the police either stand and stare, or cheer secretly, or if they attack the demonstrators, are attacked so fiercely in return that they are helpless. What is such a government? It's a sham, a shambles; it is in reality non-existent; it is a puppet; it is powerless; it cannot cope with so elementary a situation.

## The Puppets Collapsed

Bear in mind these weren't 10,000 workers with rifles. These were workers with trowels, with mallets, with iron pipes and steel bars, with paving stones from the street, the ordinary equipment of militant workers in a violent demonstration, but not in a revolution by armed people—like, let us say, Russia in March 1917 or in July or in November. There the workers bristled with rifles, with machine guns, armored guns. If the government was somewhat frightened by that, it was more or less understandable. If the entire government dressed up like a woman and fled in a motor car, it was entirely understandable.

But here: paving stones, a mason's trowel, and young people with matches—the government cannot cope with that. It collapsed. And the only way in which this demonstration could be curbed was by wheeling into position the instruments used to overthrow the biggest military power on the Continent up to 1945: Russian tanks. Not as many were employed as against Hitler, but significantly—tanks! Cannon, machine guns set up on barricades, and Russian troops with sub-machine guns.

At one stroke this brilliant demonstration revealed

what to you and other refined political people was obvious all the time, but which had not been quite so obvious to the entire world, and now is. The government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Eastern Germany is a puppet, an impotent puppet, a helpless tool in the hands of the Russian occupiers. And to the German people above all, this means much.

## "Liberalization" Myth

**Then, another aim—I cannot conceive of its not having been in the minds of the organizers and initiators of the uprising—was to discredit completely, as it deserves to be discredited, the myth that so many melonheads are swallowing whole, about a new policy of "liberalism" that is being adopted by the new government in Russia.**

It is true—say certain intellectual vacuums who direct newspapers, who are even congressmen, though that is not saying much, and senators and people in various chancelleries of the world—it is true that the new Muscovite regime is not entirely free of the narrow-minded and oppressive and essentially oriental government of Stalin; but it has shown a genuine desire to liberalize its regime and, given a favorable reaction in the West, the regime may organically develop into a democracy, or anyway, as much of a democracy as Russians can ever have, given their particular type of soul.

This is seriously listened to by statesmen; books are written to explain it—one has just been written which is applauded by no less a statesman than George F. Kennan.

But the organizers of the demonstration know better. They know what Stalinism is, and their timing was exceptionally shrewd, if you agree with me that the 10 per cent increase in the production norm was not and could not have been more than a pretext for so extensive and violent a reaction.

**They set out to prove, among other things, what may not need proving to you and me but which needs proving to many millions: that the Stalinists, especially the present breed which has taken over in the interregnum between one Stalin and another, will if necessary make all the concessions you can think of, all the concessions you can ask for, EXCEPT to give up the power, or one fraction of the power, to rule over, exploit, oppress, dominate the peoples under their heel.**

In this the new Russian rulers show wisdom, in my judgment. It is altogether intelligent on the part of the present Moscow regime to make concessions. It is altogether wise on their part to talk like editors of the *Nation* on all the great political questions of the day. It is altogether wise to make the concessions they have made and the many more they will make. But to create the myth that they will, little by little, as soon as they gather their wits about them, fully give up power and be like ordinary citizens along with other ordinary citizens, to accept that—what phrase can I use that will be least offensive to everybody? To accept that is not to have a full understanding of the Stalinists. In a lower voice I add: it is to have no understanding whatsoever of the Stalinist regime or anything else. But in a loud voice I say merely: it is to lack a full understanding of Stalinism.

## We Exult in Their Victory

The Berlin uprising showed that the minute the Kremlin gang feels that one ounce, one millimeter, or a fraction of it, of their power to rule, to dictate, to determine whether or not when concessions shall be made—is endangered, then it acts like the most reactionary, crassest, most sadistic regime we have ever known—with tanks, bayonets, machine guns, martial law, drumhead trials, executions, shootings on the spot, mass prisoners, and shooting of their own troops if they fail to carry out the orders to shoot those who are fighting for freedom.

And even if the organizers of this magnificent demonstration did not have that in mind, if it was only a by-product, it is a rich and wonderful by-product of the East Berlin uprising.

That the organizers of this demonstration existed as a compact, planful group is further confirmed in my thinking by the fact that they seemed to realize—and so well, so wisely—that an out-and-out old-style blood-bath against the demonstrators by the Russians was impossible now. And in that they were right. The Russian Stalinists were ready for it—what else do tanks mean? They were ready for it if they had to, as an absolutely last resort. But as we read what happened, carefully, we see that they were reluctant to fire.

The demonstrators took this into account. They did not go too far. They went as far as the specific aims they had in mind required, but they did not go so far as to produce merely martyrs.

**The Russians wounded many, they killed dozens, a hundred, all over East Germany. We mourn for everyone who died, we grieve for everyone who was so much as hurt by the barbarian Stalinist regime. And we exult in the victory that the demonstrators achieved. But in this cruel age of ours, when the law of survival dictates struggle first of all, when the smallest patrol action in the inaccessible and unimportant hills of Korea brings far more casualties than occurred in East Berlin, we can say, in our mourning, that the price paid for all that was achieved was small, and this is a tribute, I think, to the sense of responsibility in the minds and hearts of the militants who had the responsibility for this demonstration.**

# The Naked and the Dead — —

(Continued from page 1)

tration pursuing the same line as Truman: "Somewhere along the line, the same influences which guided the Truman-Acheson administration got hold of our new administration."

But it seems that former President Truman is somewhat dubious over the looming truce. According to his confident Leonard Lyons, New York Post columnist, he feels a deep sympathy for the position of Rhee. "In explaining his reference to Mr. Rhee as a patriot, he [Truman] said, 'Sure. Just put yourself in the other fellow's place. If this nation was split by the Mississippi, I'd try to get Missouri over to our side.'" (New York Post, July 6.)

But no one has any idea of what to do, least of all Robert Taft who said, "Congress hasn't got any plan of its own."

Right now, the United States faces this insoluble dilemma: either to continue an endless and issueless war at the behest of Rhee or sign a truce and risk a rupture with him. To continue the war, however, is not merely to persist in an effort without perspective; it poses the immediate danger of a rupture with the supporters and half-supporters of the United States in Western Europe and India who are rapidly losing all taste for the war. A shattering blow would be struck at the whole shaky Western alliance in order to maintain an alliance with a reactionary dictator.

But if it is impossible to "go it alone" in war with Rhee in the teeth of world opinion, it is also difficult to sign a truce without him and without apparent support from the Korean masses. How difficult it would be is made clear by press reports and analysis of the on-the-spot situation.

(1) South Korean troops now man 100 miles of the 155-mile war front. Thus far, they seem loyal to Rhee and to his commands. The Republicans campaigned in 1952 for the withdrawal of U. S. units from the front and their replacement by increasing numbers of Koreans. Far from solving anything, the preponderance of Korean troops intensifies the new problem.

(2) Lindsey Parrott, in the Times, refers to "the almost complete reliance of the Western allies on the manpower and services the Koreans consistently have supplied since the fighting began." A Korean force controls the supply lines. Koreans man the docks and railroads.

### UNTENABLE

(3) Most of the intelligence the United States acquires concerning conditions and events in Korea comes from Koreans. Without Koreans, "some observers believe the United Nations forces in Korea would be little more than a body of well-equipped men without objective, information or lines of supply. The problem then would be how to extract this 'army' from the peninsula rather than how to keep it as an entity in control of the situation." (Parrott.)

(4) If U. S. armies remained while a truce was in effect but while fighting continued between Rhee and the Stalinists, their position would become increasingly untenable. If the Stalinists took

over rails and ports, U. S. forces would face a critical situation as all avenues of retreat were cut off.

(5) Under such conditions, the U. S. forces would be lucky if they could evacuate Korea with what soldiers could carry on their backs and nothing else. If Rhee carries out his threat to fight on, reports the New York Times on July 5, "most military observers" are convinced that "the UN will have no choice but to pull out of Korea." Thus the most

futile war in our history would be finally liquidated.

Walter S. Robertson, U. S. assistant secretary of state, has been meeting day after day with Rhee to seek some desperate compromise. If he succeeds, a total collapse of the U. S. military position in Korea would be avoided. But the fact that such a collapse is possible on the very eve of an uneasy peace-truce reminds us of the political senselessness and bankruptcy of the Korean war.

### NO MYSTERY

## The SWP Is Silent

By ALBERT GATES

Immediately after the outbreak of the Berlin events and as soon as its tremendous historical importance became clear from the reports, we of the Independent Socialist League understood the need of setting in motion the biggest possible solidarity movement with the German workers. We therefore tried to establish contact with every labor, radical and socialist organization that we thought would be interested in such a movement.

While the official labor movement either disgracefully ignored its elementary duty to its brothers in Germany or were only mildly interested, we found an enthusiastic response from a number of the smaller organizations or their leaders. Warmest response came, we are glad to note, from our comrades of the Young People's Socialist League (affiliated to the SP) and from the Workers Defense League, which took the initiative in calling the conference which produced the excellent and heartwarming demonstration against the Stalinist assassins in front of the Russian UN Delegation Building in New York.

One organization was not asked to the conference. It was the Socialist Workers Party. The fact of the matter is that many, if not most, of the organizations and individuals represented in the demonstration were antagonistic to inviting the SWP because of its semi-Stalinist policies and its corresponding methods in relations with other organizations.

### INVITATION—R.S.V.P.

Nevertheless, we of the ISL felt that despite all political differences, the need for joint action in solidarity with the German workers was paramount at this crucial hour. Therefore, regardless of the attitude taken by others, we believed that we should at least discuss with the SWP the possibilities of such joint action. The following letter was thereupon sent to the SWP on June 23, just before the conference called by the Workers Defense League:

"You have no doubt been greatly stirred by the German events of the past week or so, as we have been, and we believe it is possible for us to express jointly in some public manner our solidarity with the German working class of East Germany.

the Communist regime" in the face of a seething revolutionary upsurge throughout the length and breadth of its empire.

Only the all-time world-record-breaking bumbler in Washington, who every other day admit openly in public statements that they are politically bankrupt of any ghost of an idea on how to "take the initiative" in the world, can think that they can win the love, gratitude and alliance of the German people by dumping their surplus butter, eggs, wheat and other white-elfant commodities on the counter in Germany, in exchange for a signed receipt from Adenauer selling the German people into the Western war camp.

This is a token of the foreign policy of the Third Camp, which is outside the bounds of possibility for the American government of millionaires and military men, which pretends to be the leader of the "free people" of the world, but which is really history's last stand of world capitalism. It is within the hands of the American working people, who need a different government, the government not of a different set of dealers but of a different class—the working class, which alone can be interested in a genuinely democratic foreign policy.

### The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

### Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print) \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY \_\_\_\_\_  
ZONE STATE \_\_\_\_\_

### The Handy Way to Subscribe!

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2.  New
  - 6 months at \$1.  Renewal
  - Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

NAME (please print) \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY \_\_\_\_\_  
ZONE STATE \_\_\_\_\_

"We have therefore set up a subcommittee which is ready to meet with a subcommittee of your organization for the purpose of discussing with you what kind of joint public activity is possible to express this solidarity with the German workers.

"We trust that we may hear from you quickly in reply to the above proposal."

More than two weeks have elapsed since the letter was sent. Has the SWP agreed to discuss with us what possibility exists for joint action, or has it refused? Neither—it has simply failed to answer our letter or even to acknowledge it.

For anyone who knows the SWP, this settles the matter. It will not even consider a solidarity movement with the Independent Socialist League, and it goes without saying that it will not consider such a joint movement with anyone else. The sterility of the narrow-minded, sectarianism for which the SWP is renowned has seldom been so crudely underlined as in the present case.

### DEFENDING THE SOVIET UNION

However, there is a special circumstance which throws a special light on the SWP's indifference to any joint expression of solidarity with the German workers who fought with fists and paving blocks against the tanks and machine guns of the Stalinist executioners.

The factional struggle that broke out with such violent intensity in the SWP recently disclosed the existence of a substantial minority in the leadership which the SWP majority itself was obliged to characterize as "capitulators to Stalinism." The characterization is, to put it very mildly, entirely justified, even if the skirts of the majority are far from being as clean in this respect as they might be. Be that as it may, this minority was stigmatized by the main party leaders as capitulators to Stalinism.

Now, it so happens that these same "capitulators to Stalinism" are at the head of the New York organization of the SWP, where they have their main strength and most prominent figures.

The main speaker at the SWP's first public meeting on the German events was one of the most frenzied of the capitulators, George Clarke. Naturally, he was eminently fitted to speak for the SWP against the Stalinist assassins whom he regards, believe it or not, as the leaders of the world revolution today.

The writer of the main article with which the Militant first greeted the German events was another spokesman of the capitulators, one Frankel.

And the head of the New York SWP organization, who would not dream of joint action against the Stalinists unless the Stalinists gave their permission, is another star-of the capitulators, M. Bartell.

The silence of the SWP is now perhaps a little easier to understand. The SWP capitulators can congratulate themselves on the success with which they are . . . marching alongside the "world revolution" and . . . "defending the Soviet Union" from its opponents.

### SUBSCRIBERS — ATTENTION!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the wrapper.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

1 7 - 2 8

If the above number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

**RENEW NOW!**

## How to Aid German — —

(Continued from page 1)

government in the world in a futile attempt to build up a world Maginot Line of Chiangs, Rhees, Francos, Churchills and American foreign legions.

This is a first step in a world policy which relies on the world revolutionary forces which are fermenting all over the earth, in Asia and Africa as well as behind the Iron Curtain and in Europe, and not on the preservation of the capitalist status quo, which is decaying before our eyes in this period of history through which we are all living.

This is "how to stop the Russians without war"—or rather, with the class war, which will in any case break out over the heads of Americans as well as Russians in all quarters of the globe. It is within the grasp, provided only we do grasp it without regard to the fact that this class war and national struggle combined is sure to engulf the old capitalist system as well as the new Stalinist system of terror.

Only political idiots—who may, it is true, also be competent in brass, like Omar Bradley—can talk about the Kremlin's deciding to start the Third World War "as a method of stabilizing