

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

THE YPSL BREAKS ITS TIES WITH THE SOCIALIST PARTY

... page 3

Brazil: Socialism Forges Ahead

... page 6

Bevanites Turn to the Unions

... page 2

SEPTEMBER 7, 1953

FIVE CENTS

## Dollars for Shahs

The Department of Justice is strongly opposed to the advocacy, let alone the practice, of the overthrow of governments by force and violence. It appears that the State Department and the president have a much more "flexible" attitude on this question, at least in certain cases. . . .

Recently the government of Iran was overthrown by force and violence by a military clique backed by the Shah, who according to the Iranian constitution is supposed to be a non-political constitutional monarch. Not only did the Eisenhower administration greet the monarchist subversives in the friendliest of fashion, but it is now preparing to keep them in power by subsidizing their bankrupt treasury.

According to a White House statement, "substantial" financial aid will be given the new government as soon as "mutually satisfactory terms" can be negotiated. The excuse given for this decision to help the Iranian subversives is that it will prevent the Stalinists from gaining political power. Although we do not doubt that this consideration enters the picture, we detect, in the background, a strong, oily smell.

## 'Leader of Free World' in Action:

# U.S. Wins a Smashing 'Victory' Over Its Allies on India Issue

By GORDON HASKELL

"At the end of the session, a delegate who had voted against India was asked what his reasons had been. He grabbed his wrist, gave his arm a twist and walked away. The little pantomime expressed a fact that was common knowledge at the UN, last week: The United States had brought heavy pressure to block the resolution on India."—New York Times, August 30.

During the special session of the United Nations General Assembly, the American government scored another one of those smashing "victories" over its allies for which it is becoming famous in the Kremlin and notorious everywhere else.

In the showdown on whether or not India should be invited to participate in the political conference which is to take up the settlement of the war in Korea, the United

States was able to muster only the votes of seventeen Latin American countries, Greece, Pakistan and Chiang Kai-shek's Formosan government for its opposition to India.

Eleven other countries, many of which had clearly indicated a preference for Indian participation, were induced to abstain. And so, even though there was a simple majority in the UN for Indian participation, the two-thirds vote required on this question was blocked by American "diplomacy."

It is quite true that the fate of Korea and the prospects for a peaceful interlude in the cold war will not be determined, or even materially affected, by the presence or absence of India at the political conference. But the American action in blocking the invitation is a symbol to the whole world of the approach of this government to world political problems. To date, the American government has not even hinted that it has a program for the settlement of the Korean war which could attract widespread support either in Korea or in Asia as a whole. Instead, it has shown that its major concern is to set up the conference in such a way as to make it as certain as can be that the United States will be able to dictate policy there, if not to the Stalinists, then at least to the nations which have followed the American lead in the whole Korean fiasco.

### THE WHIP WAS OUT

The sterility of this government's approach could not possibly have been made clearer than it was in the UN debates. Instead of presenting the governments and peoples of the world with a bold program for the unification and rehabilitation of war-ravaged Korea which would put the Stalinist powers on the defensive, which would compel them to demonstrate their own imperialist approach to the question, the United States could only fight to limit the agenda of the conference, to exclude India, to insist that the conference be a two-sided affair rather than a "round table."

By its fearful, restrictive, domineering approach, the American representative

(Turn to last page)

# Behind the Calm Surface On the Labor Front

## What Do the Recent Reshufflings Mean?

By BEN HALL

In the key industries—no strikes. Peaceful contract settlements hold sway. In politics, the unions continue to promise support to Eisenhower when he is right and criticism when he is wrong; at the same time they diligently compose for future use their dossier of crimes committed by the Republicans.

The labor movement may seem momentarily becalmed. Internally, however, it is seething as the relations between the various unions and their respective leaderships begin to be reshuffled. What we are witnessing is a preliminary preparation or adjustment in the sphere of simple organization for the days ahead.

Reuther's election as CIO president was the first significant sign that a group of decisive unions wanted to hold open the possibility of a more militant course even though they were not yet ready for an outright declaration of new policies. Last month, George Meany, new president of the AFL, was asked by reporters in England about the absence of a labor party in the United States. "It's a difference of methods," he answered. "The British felt it necessary to get into the political arena. Since the enactment of a piece of legislation inimical to our whole structure we have had a league for political education. So far, that's all we've felt we should do, but if the necessity demands us to go down the road toward a political party we'll do it."

In a recent article entitled "The role of the AFL in Politics," James L. McDevitt, director of Labor's League for Political Education (AFLE), maintains that the AFL has, except for one period, been intensely active in politics. "Unfortunately, Gompers died shortly after the 1924 election, and the political program

which had been so successful under his leadership fell into disuse. . . . It was the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 which finally forced the AFL formally to organize its political activities once more. . . . Labor had sat on the sidelines not only in 1946 but for more than twenty years previous. Obviously inaction gained nothing. Our enemies had neither respect nor mercy for us."

What is startling here is the reference to the regime of former AFL President William Green, so clear and so derogatory.

### TOWARD UNITY

There is no present prospect for a sudden turn in labor's political policy toward a labor party; Meany is not straining at the leash to form a new party; but his words express, at the very least, a real political disquietude.

We see that labor officials, in increasing numbers, are getting worried about to-

morrow and sense that the unions must begin to concentrate and mobilize their power. A first reaction is a general surge toward unity and united action, spreading virtually through the whole labor movement.

• The United Auto Workers and the United Rubber Workers have both signed no-raiding agreements with the International Association of Machinists, pledging cooperation in organizing plants, avoidance of jurisdictional fights, and joint negotiations with employers where two unions have plants under contract with the same corporations.

• In the meat-packing industry, the CIO and AFL unions have agreed to conduct united contract talks with employers and have been negotiating for organic unity.

(Turn to last page)

Coming shortly in Labor Action—

## The Justice Dep't vs. the ISL

The Documents in a Case of Fundamental Importance to Civil Liberties in the U. S.

For the first time since the establishment of the attorney general's "subversive list," the Justice Department has stated in a formal document its grounds for placing the Independent Socialist League on the government proscription list by administrative fiat. This "Statement of Grounds," with a series of accompanying "Interrogatories," drawn up by the attorney general's office, will be published in full in a coming special issue of LABOR ACTION, together with the ISL's reply. Both documents are preliminaries to a hearing which the League has long requested from the department. Don't miss it!

## LONDON LETTER **TUC Report Issued on Nationalization** **Bevanites Turn to the Trade Unions**

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Aug. 27—The TUC Interim Report for the Trade Union Conference, to be held at Douglas on the Isle of Man, has now been published. This report is the collective response of the Trades Union Council to the explicit instructions of last year's congress that the policy of the trade-union movement must be one of a further extension of social ownership to new sectors of industry.

**The 50-page report is very detailed. In many respects it comes into direct conflict with the policy enunciated by the Labor Party's National Executive Committee in Challenge to Britain.**

What are the main proposals outlined in this report?

(1) The nationalization of water, some agricultural land, part of the chemical industry (specifically, the Imperial Chemical Industries), and mining machinery.

(2) Greater public control over big finance and investment corporations, and the railway-car manufacturer and repair industry.

(3) The renationalization of iron and steel and road transport.

(4) The setting up of development councils for shipbuilding, marine engineering, machine tools industry, and possibly railway engineering and the motor industry.

The TUC Report differs from *Challenge to Britain* on the aircraft and machine-tools industry. The TUC is against the Labor Party's committing itself to aircraft nationalization, if aircraft firms "fall down on the job."

### FOR LAND NATIONALIZATION

The TUC Report makes it clear that the TUC is opposed to nationalization of the chemical industries by the Labor Party, but is in favor of public control after an inquiry to decide the style and extent of control necessary. It "ignores" the engineering unions' plans for nationalizing a large slice of their industry. It emphasizes the need to "modify" the structure of the nationalized boards but sees no reason to change its basic attitude supporting that sector of industry already nationalized.

The major surprises of the report are found in the sections dealing with land and investment policy. The TUC goes further than *Challenge to Britain* in the direction of a policy of public ownership of the land.

It says, "In principle there is a strong case to be made out for the public ownership of agricultural land. . . . There is no reason . . . why a start should not be made." The report urges this in connection with a 10-year program of development, with production targets for crops and livestock with prices guaranteed.

The TUC Report is also more radical than *Challenge to Britain* in its policy of tightening public control over finance and investment corporations.

**We are left with the question, nevertheless: Has the TUC carried out the policy of its congress at Scarborough? In all major aspects the answers are unequivocally in the negative. The TUC has fallen down on the job and evaded its clear, precise, unmistakable instructions from its highest governing body, its annual conference.**

### WATERED DOWN

The Conservative *Daily Telegraph*, in a special editorial entitled "A Tombstone for Socialism," is very pleased with the labors of the Trades Union Council. It says among other things that "The majority [of the delegates at last year's conference] which voted the resolution [demanding further nationalization] were demanding a strong course; all they have is, literally, water, apart from which, and of course the renationalization of iron and steel and road transport, no other industry is recommended."

It is difficult to see how the delegates at the forthcoming Douglas conference of the TUC can accept this report in the light of the specific instructions of last year's congress. Moreover, it will be exceedingly difficult for the TUC to hold back the general demand for higher wages, particularly in engineering and on the railways. The policy of wage-restraint may well break down, and the flood of discontent burst forth.

**An ominous speech—ominous, that is, for the Tories and right-wing elements in the Labor movement—was recently delivered at an Engineers Conference in this connection. J. Mathews of the General Municipal Workers Union, referring to the reactionary antics of the Tory government, had this to say: "Unless it [the Tory government] is very careful, something like what is happening in France could happen here."**

And Mathews was described by the

*News Chronicle* as the most moderate man at this conference of the engineering unions.

### FACE TO THE UNIONS

The idea that "it" can't happen here is quite mistaken. Even Arthur Deakin, the supreme representative of the reactionary trade-union bureaucracy, has threatened to lead "personally" a general strike, if the Tories interfere with the existing setup on the docks and return to the old conditions.

Of course, we must hasten to add that this is hardly evidence of progressive attributes on the part of the trade-union bureaucracy. For even in France, the Force Ouvrière leadership—which if anything is even more reactionary than its counterpart in Britain—has found itself willy-nilly, despite itself, at the head of a massive strike movement which eclipses in scope any movement since the 1936 mass upsurges.

*Tribune*, the Bevanite organ, has come out in support of the French strike—and this has greater significance than might be suspected at first sight.

**Bevanism, which has hitherto been a current primarily of the constituency Labor Party branches with a predominantly middle-class leadership is now increasingly turning its face to the trade unions and their problems. In such circumstances**

**become involved in important industrial the Bevanites will find their main orientation in the trade-union field and may well disputes. It would be a great error to take it for granted that Bevanism can succeed completely unless a serious industrial movement of protest were to propel the larger unions leftward. The French example in the long run is the only one which will test the real strength, the real power of Bevanism.**

### BEVANITE ORGANIZATION

Perhaps at this point a word or so is necessary about a common misconception of the so-called Bevan "group." There is absolutely no foundation for the current belief, apparently common in the U. S., that the Bevanites are an organized group, faction, or caucus.

There is no network of *Tribune* readers' groups or other semi-legal, or even three-quarters legal, Bevanite groups on national foundations. The *Tribune* "group"—if this is the right word to call it—consists of a pretty tightly knit, socially closed association of MPs and regular contributors to *Tribune*. If the number exceeds 100, this would be surprising.

No attempt has been made to enlarge this group of friends, and great care has been taken to avoid any move which could be interpreted as suggesting the formation of rank-and-file left-wing groups inside the constituency Labor Party branches or trade-union branches. The fact is that *Tribune* is indeed the weekly paper of the constituency parties and it is therefore superfluous for it to organize a nationally based left-wing group.

**Of course, at a later stage, groups of some description or other will arise. In the trade unions the caucus method of running conferences is taken for granted, and it is therefore more likely that the future struggles between the left and the right on an organized front will take place there, rather than in the constituency parties which up to now have no history of large organized groupings.**

## The Tories Come Bearing Gifts to Nigeria

### New Turn Faces Labor Party with Need to Formulate Anti-Imperialist Policy

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Aug. 26—The Conservatives have brilliantly outmaneuvered Labor in an important field. They have managed to obtain agreement among the three main political groups in Nigeria for a federal constitution.

I had never thought that I would live to hear with my own ears Dr. Azikiwe, representing the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC), saying, "We feel that the Conservative Party have discharged a service to the cause of human freedom. . . ."

Dr. Azikiwe is by no means a pawn of imperialism. During a meeting sponsored by the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism—which I attended on behalf of LABOR ACTION—he pointed out that since the inception of his organization in 1944, over 40 members had suffered penalties or imprisonment for their views; they had paid \$13,000 in fines, and had suffered the loss of \$36,000 during their recent strike.

**How was it then, that Dr. Azikiwe could make so friendly a statement about a Conservative colonial secretary? It really started in 1947, when a Nigerian delegation came over to see Creech-Jones, then the colonial minister in the Labor cabinet.**

### LABOR MUFFED

The delegation presented the most feeble of demands for greater African participation in their own government. The Labor government described their requests as "far-reaching" and "pre-mature"; once again the old imperialist cant of "They are not ready for self-government" was heard. However, their statesmanship in the Gold Coast overshadowed their reactionary imperialism in Nigeria.

It was, therefore, with considerable suspicion that the National Council for Nigeria and the Cameroons, the Action Group and the Northern Peoples Convention received an invitation from Lytton, Churchill's minister, to come to London to attend a conference to discuss a revision of their constitution.

The first two organizations, representing the more politically articulate South-

east and Southwest of Nigeria, reacted by refusing to come until the terms of reference of the prospective conference were clarified. When however, the Conservative minister accepted as a starting point that they were to discuss the self-government of Nigeria, they agreed to come.

### THE NIGERIAN PICTURE

**Before we proceed to discuss the situation, a short résumé of the socio-political background of the country is necessary.**

"Nigeria" came into being in 1913 as a result of the fusion of three territories under British rule which had been separate since the beginning of British control of that area in the middle of the 19th century. The country is a wealthy one, producing cocoa, palm nuts, skins, tin, gold, uranium, etc.

With a population of 31 million, Nigeria is the largest non-self-governing country in the Commonwealth. The territory can be divided into three parts.

In the North live 17 million Hausas. These people, because of the backward system perpetuated by Islam in the area, are very undeveloped. They have few civil servants and feel that too-quick self-government for Nigeria as a whole would put them under the thumb of the more advanced and politically articulate South. For this reason they have always dragged their feet when it came to discussion of freedom for Nigeria.

Their main political grouping is the Northern Peoples Convention, which represented them at the London talks. Because of their backwardness, last week a "Middle Belt" Party was formed to represent more progressive elements of the center of the country. This new party is more under Christian influence.

The South of Nigeria is divided into an eastern part and a western part. The Southwest has a population of 8 million, mostly Ibus. They are affiliated with the Cameroons. It will be remembered that this latter territory, with a population of one million, was put under British domination after being taken from the Germans following the First World War. **The Southwest of Nigeria includes**

### Parable

We have run across a parable for "practical" liberals—the kind who are so determined to be realistic and un-dewy-eyed that after a while it becomes difficult to distinguish them from anyone else. We have in mind especially the type who insists that liberals ought to stay in the stables of the Democratic Party in order to lead the masses.

The parable comes from the history of the Doukhobor sect, best known for undressing in public as a form of social protest.

It seems that in the course of the history of this sect, one of its leaders, Peter P. Verigin, became notorious for leading a dissolute life of gambling and drunkenness and over-interest in women. On being taxed by his shocked followers, he gave his explanation for his conduct:

There are bad Doukhobors in hell, he explained, and he had to get there in order to save their souls.

### LADY MEGAN GOES LEFT

A last word on the Liberal Party. According to A. J. Cummings, the political commentator of the *News Chronicle*, Lady Megan Lloyd George, the left Liberal leader, is about to join the Labor Party. The point about Lady Megan that worried A. J. Cummings is that she is known to be sympathetic to Bevan!

Apparently she feels that Aneurin Bevan is carrying on the Radical tradition that her father was so closely identified with in the early part of this century. Yes, even David Lloyd George—the leader of British capitalism in the First World War—had his "Bevanite" days!

The Liberal Party will be seriously affected by this defection. The right-wing Liberal element at the moment is predominant. There can be no doubt that the electorally important Liberal vote is now largely with the Conservative government. The myth assiduously worked out by the right-wing Labor leaders, that this Liberal vote will be won by diluting Labor's policy, was effectively exploded by the bold '45 election. These people never learn.

Lagos, the proposed capital, with a population of about a quarter of a million. The main people there are the Yorubas, of whom there are about 6 million. They are politically the most advanced people in Nigeria. Most of their leaders have had a "Christian" education, but as in the east so-called "paganism" is still rife.

To return now to the London conference: Before the representatives of the three organizations left for London, they issued a long statement, saying that they were coming with the intention of achieving self-government within the Commonwealth by 1956 or as soon as it could be arranged administratively, whichever came first. They also aimed at unifying the country.

### NEW SETUP

The representatives of the South, headed by Awolowo (Action Group) and Dr. Azikiwe (NCNC) were in no mood to be fobbed off with idle promises, but they were ready to compromise. The North wanted self-government but did not think that it would have adequate safeguards against Southern influence by 1956; so it was agreed that they could have self-government then if they wanted it, while the South would in any case.

The form of government of Nigeria was to be a federal one, with residual powers in the regions. There were to be three local Houses of Assembly, each with regional autonomy, and a House of Representatives, directly elected and not chosen through the former bodies as hitherto. There were to be no "special interest" (business) members, no "official" members on the Executive Council, and none other than Africans in the cabinet. The governor must accept elected ministers chosen by premiers. It was extraordinary that a Conservative government should accept such requests.

The constitution, Dr. Azikiwe said, was based on the Soulbury Constitution of 1947 in Ceylon which gave it self-government in two years.

**At the same meeting where Dr. Azikiwe put forward this view, Awolowo of the**  
(Continued on page 5)

## Young Socialist Explains the Issues and the Background —

# YPSL Breaks Ties with Socialist Party

By **BOGDAN DENITCH**  
Member of YPSL NEC.

The accompanying statement of the National Organization Committee of the YPSL, "On Leaving the Socialist Party," explains why we of the Young People's Socialist League, the party's youth section, have now decided to break our ties with the SP.

This serious step has not been taken in haste or through an irresponsible whim, but is the outcome of a process of political development that has extended over the past few years.

Fundamentally, behind this is the irreconcilable difference between the socialist youth and the SP over the war question and, associated with this issue, the question of civil liberties in the U. S. The YPSL's evolution has been continually more and more in the direction of an anti-war Third Camp program, opposed to both American and Stalinist imperialism. The clash with the party's "critical" support of American foreign policy was more or less inevitable.

It is a reflection of the SP's organizational degeneration, as well of the Yipsels' militancy, that instead of the left wing being isolated and driven out of the organization, the entire League as an organization stood by its Third Camp views and democratically elected leadership and has acted as a body. This has been true notwithstanding the heterogeneity of the YPSL's left wing, which includes not only Marxists but also pacifists and Christian socialists who, despite their differing ideological approaches, all fundamentally agree on the Third Camp policy of the League.

### SINCE 1951

The following is a short sketch of the developments which have led up to the present situation. The reason this appears in LABOR ACTION is through necessity and not choice. The party not only has refused the legitimate League committees the right to appeal to its membership but moreover the party's internal press is closed to us. We have had to appeal to our comrades of the ISL-SYL for help in making our views public.

At the December 1951 Convention of the YPSL a renescent left wing gained control. For the first time in

years the YPSL leadership was in the hands of anti-war socialists. The convention broke sharply with the party policy by condemning the Marshal Plan, NATO, and the Korean war, and denouncing the imperialist policies of the two armed camps.

More to the point, the new YPSL National Executive Committee entered into negotiations with *Anvil*, the anti-war student magazine, and shortly afterward the YPSL endorsed the publication and YPSL members joined its editorial board.

As a result of the political realignment in the YPSL, quite naturally the members of the YPSL and Socialist Youth League began to cooperate in many areas. The reaction of the party was relatively mild—the SP concentrated its attacks on the YPSL policy on *Anvil* (at least one local attempted to forbid the Yipsels to sell *Anvil*) and on the new YPSL policy toward the SYL, which was symbolized by a joint tour undertaken by national functionaries of the two socialist youth organizations in behalf of *Anvil*.

The reason for the relative equanimity of the party was simple: on the new NEC there were three comrades absolutely "loyal" politically and organizationally to the party; three comrades who, although for a Third Camp line, were unwilling to push the disagreements too far; and only three intransigent left-wingers, who were soon isolated.

### LEADING TO THE BREAK

The orientation of the majority in the YPSL was to press for changes in the party, and a considerable number of Yipsels appeared at the 1952 convention of the party, where they sparkplugged the "left wing." During the 1952 campaign most disagreements with the party were submerged in the effort to get the SP on the ballot. During the fall of 1952, however, the YPSL NEC rejected the SP NEC's designation of the ISL-SYL as "totalitarian" and the SP's ban on SYL participation in the campaign.

Changes began to occur after the campaign in the League-party relations. Several factors were responsible for this. There was a change in YPSL personnel—a new national secretary, objectionable to the party, was elected—and the YPSL left-wingers who had previously been more closely oriented to the SP became more and more discouraged about the prospects for change in the party. The terrible failure of the SP campaign and the outright sabotage of that campaign by the right wing had their effect. The complete ignor-

LABOR ACTION is glad to publish, at the request of the comrades of the Young People's Socialist League, the document "On Leaving the Socialist Party" and the accompanying article by Comrade Bogdan Denitch of the YPSL. We most cordially welcome the political development that has taken place in their organization and look forward to fruitful collaboration and the friendliest and most comradely relations in the next period. As for the criticisms of the SYL and ISL which are held by the YPSL comrades, we are sure that they can be greatly clarified, and misunderstandings removed, by common experience and discussion in the next period. The comrades of the YPSL have our most sincere wishes for further healthy development, and we enthusiastically share the objective of unifying the anti-war forces of the socialist youth as speedily as possible.—Ed.

ing of the more radical sections of the platform by the party leadership and the refusal of the Call to publish any anti-war material contributed to the growing tension between the League and the party leadership.

One of the most embittering developments was the beginning of the unity negotiations between the Socialist Party and the Social Democratic Federation. The same party leadership which so fastidiously refused to "contaminate" itself by any contact with anti-war socialist organizations like the Libertarian groups or the ISL-SYL showed a complete willingness, if not anxiety, to unite with the SDF, which is the very best example of pro-war socialism and "totalitarian liberalism" in the U. S. The SDF leadership made it clear that they considered the party left-wing and the Yipsels in particular to be "communists."

The break became almost inevitable after the 1953 convention of the YPSL. This convention marked the consolidation of the YPSL left wing; all of the organizational disagreements that had divided the YPSL majority went overboard. The result was a clear and vigorous Third Camp program, a condemnation of the unprincipled attempts to unite the SP and SDF, and a solid left-wing NEC on which eight out of nine members were committed to the Third Camp and to attempting to achieve some

(Continued on page 4)

## Statement by the Young People's Socialist League's Committee ON LEAVING THE SOCIALIST PARTY

Socialists of our beliefs are generally found in mass social-democratic parties. This is true, for example, in England, in Germany, in Scandinavia and even in France. This is so because, with all of our criticisms of these parties, the only way in which we can avoid a sterile sectarianism and carry our program to the mass of the workers in those areas is through the mass social-democratic movement.

This does not mean that we do not recognize the dangers inherent in these parties, which are often bureaucratic and lack an orientation toward workers' control. It is because, in the struggle for socialism, the struggle against bureaucracy and degeneration must be fought in the mass organizations of the working class. This is not possible, however, either in the consciously totalitarian parties or in the parties where rank-and-file apathy responding to a divorce from the political arena makes political struggle impossible. Therefore, wherever they exist we try to work in the mass social democratic parties.

Where such parties do not exist, we work through organizations with which we find ourselves in principled agreement, and attempt to propagate socialism and participate in the labor political arena to the best of our ability. However, a third possibility also exists: that of a socialist party or organization that is not a mass workers' party and with which we have disagreements, but which is nevertheless democratic, engaged in serious political work, and has a political life of its own. In the last case we, accepting the discipline of the organization, work within it to win it to our conception of socialism. This, of course, assumes sufficient agreement on political questions to begin with.

### THE MOVEMENT WE WANT

In America we are opposed to forming an organization which would have an official ideological discipline, or would attempt to act in its inner life as a revolutionary party. We consider such organizational forms dated, sectarian and out of touch with the needs of the American scene. The American workers' movement, when and if it begins to stir, will throw up spontaneously a new political leadership and adopt forms that are as yet to be devised. This is the reason why it is worse than useless to have official revolutionary doctrines. Where the leading committees "carry the word" in the form of official Marxist dogma, the rank and file is prevented from developing its own initiative and the movement is sterile and dogmatic.

"Historically the errors committed by a truly revolutionary movement are infinitely more fruitful than the infallibility of the cleverest Central Committee"... (Luxemburg—polemic against Lenin.)

This is particularly important today when official Marxism often serves as a cover for inflexibility and intellectual bankruptcy. The philosophical questions are not themselves political and we take no position on them. We believe that, in the examination of the means for the achievement of its ends, the party ought not to be restricted to any set of traditional ideas but rather should foster complete freedom in the choice of relevant theories for the support of the political program. This is why we want a movement where all ideas must prove themselves in free discussion and action, and none must have the "protection" of official status. Out of action and free discussion the YPSL has developed a Third-Camp program that already has long-range programmatic implications.

### KEY POLITICAL QUESTIONS

We want to make it perfectly clear that we are not proposing a watering-down of our political program. The movement we seek to build begins on solid political agreement:

- A principled Third Camp program of opposition to both war camps.
- An uncompromising civil-libertarian position.
- An orientation to the working class as the class that can transform society.

The above general considerations govern our approach both to the Socialist Party and the ISL-SYL. These considerations lead us to the conclusion that we must break with the Socialist Party. Further, that this break must be based on principled political disagreements, unacceptable to the declining Socialist Party which resulted in the bureaucratic attempts by the party to discipline the YPSL. These considerations also make us support the formation of a joint youth organization based primarily, but not exclusively, on the YPSL and SYL.

We have made it clear in the past that the two key political questions today, the two questions that determine the nature of the organizations, are the attitude toward the imperialist conflict between the two war camps and the attitude toward defense of democracy—which is usually illustrated by the stand of any organization on the question of civil liberties for the Stalinists today.

The Socialist Party meets none of the criteria of organizations in which we find it desirable for anti-war socialists to work. It is very clearly not a mass social-democratic organization, nor does it either directly or

indirectly involve any significant sections of the workers in political or educational activity. Unfortunately, the party does have one major characteristic of social-democratic parties: a low level of membership participation in the actual running of the organization, and a low level of political education and understanding in the rank and file.

The Socialist Party, despite the efforts of its anti-war wing which wins conventions but never gains actual control of the organizational apparatus, is a party with whose program we cannot be in principled agreement. While anti-war sentiment is often expressed by the rank and file through its convention, the party through its press, its committees and functionaries consistently supports the American camp. The Call actually complained about the reluctance of the U. S. Department of State to employ socialists in the service of American imperialism.

The party's support of the American camp in the field of foreign policy is extended to its very weak stand in the face of the witchhunt. The party has shown every reluctance to attack the liberal defenders of the Garrison State; it has failed clearly and principledly to defend the rights of the Stalinists who are currently the main victims of the witchhunt at home.

### THE NATURE OF THE SP

The party's stand on ERP, the North Atlantic Pact and rearmament is in conformity with the needs of the American camp. In view of the YPSL's clear and unequivocal opposition to both imperialist camps and its opposition to the war preparation at home, we found ourselves in constant conflict with the party.

The Socialist Party is incurably sectarian and traditionalist. The very "radicalism" of the people who are opposed to liquidating the party as an electoral instrument was based on traditionalism and a reluctance to change time-honored ways of operation. While running a protest campaign last fall, the party in its main center presented a program indistinguishable from that of the liberals; by this it showed that it had no principled reason to stay out of the mass organs of labor politics, since if it entered it would not have a program of its own to counterpose to that of the labor bureaucracy.

The bankruptcy of principle of the party is best illustrated by the fact that it even considered unity with the Social Democratic Federation. That fact alone tells us all we have to know about the political nature of the SP. The SDF stands in the forefront of "pro-war liberalism," of chauvinistic defense of American imperialism, of

(Continued on page 4)

# YPSL Breaks Ties with SP — —

(Continued from page 3)

form of left-wing socialist unity in the youth field.

Following the convention, the party set up a committee to "investigate" the YPSL, and the new national secretary of the YPSL was refused any access to the national office as well as refused any pay for over ten weeks. This simply pointed up the fact that the party was now getting ready to move against the YPSL and was willing to use all forms of organizational and political pressure against the left wing.

## SP INTERVENES

This summer, in line with its approach toward more effective unity and cooperation, the YPSL approached the SYL in New York with the proposal that during the summer the two organizations co-sponsor forums and cooperate in some other fields of activity. This was accepted, and a very successful and popular forum series was begun. The immediate response of the party was to suspend the New York District of the YPSL, after first attempting to bribe the Yipsels with the offer of financial assistance. The national organization of the YPSL backed its New York section and appealed the whole matter to the party NEC, which met in Reading this July.

The party NEC not only upheld the suspension but went further. It elected a subcommittee with broad powers to go into the whole question of the YPSL and forbade the National Office of the YPSL to send any communications to its membership other than those cleared through the party. Through this censorship the SP hoped to prevent any appeals to the rank and file.

The YPSL National Committee, meeting a week later in New York, met under those conditions. Throughout its sessions members of the party subcommittee were present to present the party's viewpoint. However, the party now faced the most homogeneous League leadership in its memory. The YPSL NEC vigorously endorsed the actions of its New York section and of the League officers, and went on to outline the conditions under which they would be able to remain in the party.

These conditions were described in the "Perspectives

Statement" of the NEC. The statement clearly indicated that the League perspectives were toward organic unity of all Third Camp socialists in the youth field; that while they were willing to maintain individual membership in the party, the League was oriented toward unity with the SYL, the Libertarians and other Third Camp socialists.

The YPSL agreed to refrain from pushing its policy until it received an official answer to the "Perspectives" statement from the party. In the meantime the New York Yipsels remained suspended and no national mailing could go out to the membership informing them of the nature of the dispute.

On August 19 the party NEC subcommittee reported by mail to the NEC. The report was unfavorable and by mail ballot the SP NEC reaffirmed its opposition to any joint activity with the SYL, and the YPSL was prohibited from going ahead with the "Perspectives" policy.

## YPSL STANDS FIRM

Meeting the next day, the YPSL National Organization Committee balloted the NEC of the YPSL on two propositions: (1) to go ahead with the "Perspectives" statement, and (2) in view of the fact that the YPSL was unwilling to accept party discipline, to instruct the resident committee and the National Office to begin taking the necessary steps to break the ties of the YPSL to the party. Both propositions carried overwhelmingly on the National Executive Committee.

The National Organization Committee then began to take the necessary steps for a full membership referendum to formalize the action and to give the rank and file a chance to repudiate its leadership. This turned out to be all but impossible, since the party, acting through its subcommittee and its national secretary, refused to cooperate with the referendum, i.e., to present its own case; and it suspended the entire National Organization of the YPSL.

The suspension was followed by the confiscation of all YPSL property that the party could get its hands on and a letter to the membership informing the membership of the party's action, instructing it not to cooperate

with the democratically elected national YPSL leadership, and informing it that the party was taking steps to "reorganize the YPSL."

Assured of the backing from the National Executive Committee, the YPSL resident committee took steps to safeguard the organization. It urged all national officers to withdraw from the Socialist Party; it prepared a statement to the membership informing it of its actions; it instructed the local YPSL groups to meet and take sides. As soon as the new National Office is established, a membership referendum is going out to determine the membership of the YPSL, which is now independent of the party.

## MEMBERS BACK N.O.C.

Votes from the field indicate that the vast majority of "key members," members and alternates of the NEC, are staying with the League (at the most, out of 20 members and alternates of the NEC one member and two alternates are staying with the party); the New York District, the largest section of the YPSL, at a membership meeting voted to stay with the YPSL and cut its ties to the party. All indications are, from correspondence and previous questionnaires, that the rest of the country is following the same pattern.

The party will keep at most 12-15 Yipsels nationally. In effect, the entire national leadership, most of the membership and the whole periphery remains loyal to the YPSL and its Third Camp program. Thus the organization is assured of continuity and the party is forced to have its followers split from YPSL.

The political perspectives of the YPSL can be found in the statement on page 3 entitled "On Leaving the Socialist Party," and little can be added to it. During the coming period the YPSL will exist as an independent organization and attempt to absorb the independent socialists who have been forced out of the SP in the previous years as well as normal expansion. The YPSL is committed to attempting to achieve full organic unity of all Third Camp socialists in the youth field. This perforce indicates that in the next period close fraternal cooperation will exist between the YPSL and the SYL as well as with the Libertarians.

# On Leaving the Socialist Party — —

(Continued from page 3)

"critical" defense of the witchhunt, of pandering to the labor leaders now in power.

Yet despite its willingness to unite with this political monstrosity, the party has refused to enter into the Liberal Party in New York City—the Liberal Party being politically indistinguishable from the SDF with the exception that it is a labor-based American equivalent of a European social-democratic party.

The heterogeneity of the Socialist Party is such that completely opposing tendencies stay in: pacifists and pro-war socialists; civil-libertarians and comrades more than willing to cooperate with the FBI; ultra-sectarians and people who join the Democratic Party out of agreement with its program. This range has made it impossible to develop a coherent program of any kind. Running through the arguments of the party loyalists is a Stalinist conception of the party, i.e., the equation of the party with the struggle for socialism.

Thus the Socialist Party not only separates us from those socialists with whom we are in basic political agreement (and who will have nothing to do with the SP) but also from the mass of the liberal and progressive youth who have no respect for the party and are antagonized by the party's sectarianism.

## NO HOPE IN THE SP

The Socialist Party's organizational condition makes it useless for the YPSL to work to try to transform the party internally. In the first place, internal discussion in the party is severely limited; for example, the party's internal organ goes to less than 10 per cent of the party's membership (including the YPSL)—this being the extent to which we could seek to try to reach the rank and file with our views. The party's active centers are few and for most part show a real hostility to any attempts to discuss basic policies of the movement.

The party's "left wing" is in reality very small, if we exclude comrades who support radical-sounding policies out of traditionalism and then turn around and elect an NEC which is unwilling to carry out such policies. Our continued stay in the party sapped the energy of our organization in sterile internal struggles and diverted our energies from our educational work.

Although we thus characterize the Socialist Party of today, we feel it necessary to add comment on how this situation came to pass, and about the individuals involved. The reason for the degeneration of the Socialist Party does not primarily lie with any specific policy which the party developed, with Norman Thomas or any other individual, or with the personal failure of those who remain in the party.

The Socialist Party is weak today for the same reason that the entire radical movement is weak: tremendous changes in the objective circumstances which condition the political life of the United States. In a period of such change, no individual or policy could have held the party together.

Moreover, we openly declare our admiration for the personal sacrifice and dedication which many who remain in the party have always manifested. While disagreeing with them on their organizational and political orientation, we recognize the depth of their personal conviction. In short, we regard most of those remaining in the party as democratic socialists who have given much in the struggle against American capitalism.

Even at the moment of criticizing them severely, our personal feelings toward them are fraternal, as toward comrades.

To sum up: We feel that the YPSL's constructive work is continually impeded by its ties to a party which not only meets none of the criteria for the type of organization we can work in but which is a barrier to serious educational and political activity. Today when socialist organizations are small, principles become much more important, since the question is always: For what do we educate, and whom do we seek to reach? On both of these points, we find no agreement with the Socialist Party.

We are politically committed to building a new youth organization with the Socialist Youth League. While we defend these commitments, we have no intention of suppressing our criticisms of the ISL and SYL, of their organizational and political traditions. We have a different evaluation of Russian bolshevism, and do not consider as ours the tradition of Trotskyism. To the extent that these questions arise we must find ourselves in firm opposition to them. We consider those traditions essentially alien to democratic socialism. We consider organizational ideas that grow from these in the same light.

Our basic reason for pressing for unity is our conviction that those questions will not arise in a new organization, and that to the extent that they do, we will be able to combat the views which we consider at least potentially undemocratic effectively. More pressing is the broad political agreement that does exist.

## THE EDUCATIONAL TASK

A youth organization is essentially an educational one. To the extent that we engage in specific activity it is in order to further our educational work. The form best suited to such work is that of a flexible organization ranging from our comrades of the SYL to the militant pacifists. It is through the ferment of ideas and discussion developing in such a movement that the best training can be given.

We have our own ax to grind too, and want to make it perfectly clear that in a new organization we will try to win the rank and file to our approach. Thus the unity should be unity in political action and the discipline should be organizational and not ideological discipline.

While space does not permit a full discussion of our differences with the SYL, one example should suffice: The organizational habits of the SYL are such that rank-and-file initiative is subordinated to the "guidance" of the executive bodies; little of any spontaneous political life seems to flow from the ranks. To make one thing clear—we do not consider the SYL undemocratic; as a matter of fact, both the SYL and ISL in theory and practice have a much higher level of democracy than does the SP. It is a subtler question—that of the inability to accept differences as normal, the conception that there is one "correct" approach to any question and that the role of the leading committees is to continually hammer away at those holding differing opinions (even though they are given full internal rights). Education is thus conceived of as a means of "fortifying the ranks." But the method of fortification which is chosen is the inculcation of devotion to a fixed set of principles rather than the teaching of the means by which the problems raised by political activity may be solved.

In the youth field we want to avoid an organization where internal struggles detract from the basic educational work. Therefore we desire to emphasize publications, discussion and study as the basic functions for the new youth organization. Therefore we want the loosest construction of the terms "discipline" and "executive authority" at the present time. We are not in principle opposed to discipline, but we believe that discipline should be suited to the work being undertaken at any time and the discipline of an educational organization must perforce be very different from that of an organization engaged in a struggle for power.

## FOR ANTI-WAR COOPERATION

However, we realize that youth work is not and cannot be an end in itself. Our general approach to youth work derives from our flexible organizational approach but it is specifically molded by the needs of the youth field today. Our attitude toward the ISL should be obvious. We need an adult political organization. The reason we are not willing to be a part of the ISL today is because we hope that the ISL itself will develop toward a broader and more flexible conception of socialism and that the new youth organization will be a factor influencing it in this direction. We have stated what our conception of a socialist organization is and we will try to influence the ISL in this direction.

However, the broad programmatic and political agreement that already exists is sufficient for us to support close cooperation and fraternal ties between the new youth organization and the ISL, and it extends to our willingness to support LABOR ACTION as the political organ of Third Camp socialism.

In conclusion:

The recent developments have made some of this discussion academic. The Socialist Party's NEC, through its subcommittee on youth affairs, has rejected the YPSL's proposed plan of activities, which included an orientation to Third Camp unity in the youth field. The YPSL National Executive Committee thereupon reaffirmed its determination to go ahead with its proposals and instructed the National Office to begin breaking ties with the party. This was to involve a membership referendum of the youth to determine whether they would back their elected committees or stay with the party. The party's response was to suspend the national organization of the YPSL, to refuse to permit the referendum, to confiscate all YPSL property, and to begin to reorganize the League.

The YPSL, through its committees, has broken all ties to the Socialist Party. A membership referendum is now in process to determine how many Yipsels will stay with the party. All indications are that all but a handful of the League will stick by its democratically elected leadership and its Third Camp program.

The national organization of the YPSL calls on all its members and sympathizers to stay with the League, to refuse cooperation to any rump committees bureaucratically set up by the Socialist Party; and to keep working—

AGAINST BOTH IMPERIALIST CAMPS.

FOR A SOCIALIST THIRD CAMP.

Adopted August 27 by the  
NAT'L ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE,  
YPSL

# Youth and Student Corner

## U. OF CALIF. BALKS AT ARMY CENSORSHIP

BERKELEY, Aug. 22—The University of California has decided to drop out of the United States Armed Forces Institute correspondence courses program, rather than give in to demands by the military that they have the right to "disapprove" faculty members. The Berkeley *Daily Gazette* says that U. C. spokesmen confirmed the report today and are taking the action along with 13 other universities cited by the Defense Department in Washington recently.

Military censorship over the correspondence program was outlined in a new clause appended to contracts coming up for re-signing: "The contractor will not employ or retain for the performance of services under this contract such persons as are disapproved by the government."

The original action against complying as an educational "contractor"—"We build 100 per cent American minds"—was taken by the University Extension Department which administers the U. C.

correspondence section, and it was not placed before the Regents or President Robert Sproul for prior approval. Irascible U. C. Regent John Francis Neylan, of "Sign or Get Out" fame during the 1949 loyalty-oath fight, agreed with the administration for the same reasons behind his "inexplicable" opposition to the state Levering Act oath directed against the university: It's "not a question of loyalty . . . [since] our policy since 1940 [has been] not to hire Communists." Rather: "We will not permit anybody to dictate to us," was the issue, as we take care of those "subversives" ourselves.

Another U. C. spokesman felt "this was a step toward government control of higher education," indicating the high level of principle involved. President Sproul, who has a frenetic desire for good public relations and a principles-be-damned attitude, is thus presented with a *fait accompli*, and will probably not get the chance to "compromise" in his usual fashion.

## 'OUT OF THE PAST' Raymond Postgate Resurrects A Colorful Scottish Socialist Pioneer

In the following vignette, the noted British socialist historian Raymond Postgate resurrects a little-known colorful character of the movement, who might well have been included in Postgate's notable book *Out of the Past*. The piece appeared recently in the *British Reynolds News*.—Ed.

By RAYMOND POSTGATE

May 24, 1953, was the anniversary of the birth, a hundred and one years ago, of the second oddest pioneer of a socialist movement. (The oddest? Lassalle.)

His name was Robert Bontine Cunningham Graham; he was a Spanish don and also a Scottish laird; his blood was bluer than Queen Victoria's—in fact, by descent from Robert II of Scotland he probably should have been king himself. At least the family believed so, and he always behaved as a most flamboyant aristocrat.

He was tall, thin, wiry, with a pointed, dark red beard and red hair; he was completely fearless, utterly romantic, rich when he was not heavily in debt, and more at home on horseback than on foot.

He spent much more time out of Britain than in it. He bred horses on the Argentine pampas, fought three years in guerrilla warfare, ran a ranch in Brazil, visited forbidden cities in Morocco disguised as a Turkish doctor—anything, almost, that was fantastic and dangerous.

With all that, he was in many ways as gentle a man as ever stepped; it was because of his hatred of cruelty of any kind that he became a Socialist (before Keir Hardie) and founded the Scottish Labor Party (15 years before the Labor Party).

He was thrown into a canal and kicked by roughs; his head was broken by the police when he and Burns broke the cord on Bloody Sunday in Trafalgar

Square in 1887—in any struggle like that he was supreme.

At other times his sober and "ideologically correct" colleagues thought him impossible to work with and so erratic as to be useless.

Yet even they realized that his six years in Parliament—ending in 1892 and almost a lone campaign—were an achievement no one else could have carried through.

He was there to insult the callous and rich Liberals and Tories who lived off the miseries of the Glasgow slums, the Cradley Heath nail workers, the London waterfront; and nobody with less authority and dash than he could have done it.

When Mr. Speaker called on him to withdraw one particularly harsh insult: "I never withdraw," he thundered: "I said what I mean," and stalked out of the House without anyone saying a word to him.

"I will not be oppressed here," he said to the Government Benches, "by the grunting of innumerable pigs, even though they are of Guinea. In the House of Commons one would expect to sit in good company, unelbowed by gamblers, pimps and players."

Naturally, it made them furious. The Liberals wanted to give money to African missions. "There is a Darker Continent east of Temple Bar than that through which the Zambesi, the Congo and the Limpopo flow. Those who explore it are not commonly awarded honors. You see, the people who live there are not Negroes, only Englishmen, the cheapest, most submissive animals ever created."

Of course, the Fabians, the Labor Party, the ILP and the TUC were quite right. His fantastic behavior, his speeches, his dress, his love for the eighteenth century showed him to be a man who was essentially looking backwards.

And one must always be looking forward, mustn't one? Even if all you see is Vyshinsky. You and I have said so so often in perorations. It must be true.

### Disagreement

From the magazine *Modern Sunbathing and Hygiene*:

"Q.—Are there any Communists in nudist parks?"

"A.—Communists and other subversives are specifically barred from membership in the American Sunbathing Association or participation in nudist activities. There are no known subversives in American nudist parks."

On the other hand (reports an AP dispatch on August 19) the Spanish archbishop of Tarragona has charged that "Spain's enemies are trying to destroy her religious unity by introducing immodest clothes in the country. . . . He said Communists were supporting a campaign under which foreigners appear in scanty bathing and other costumes."

# WORLD POLITICS

## Issues in the German Social-Democratic Campaign

By JACK WALKER

With the rejection of Adenauer's rigged-election law (LABOR ACTION, Aug. 17) by the Bundestag or Lower House, a new compromise was worked out on June 25 by Alfred Onnen, a deputy of the Free Democratic Party, second largest party in the Adenauer coalition with 54 seats. The compromise came on the heels of open condemnation of Adenauer's law by most of the bourgeois press and even *Ketteler Wacht*, an organ of Roman Catholic labor, as being too partisan.

The most immediate purpose of Adenauer's old "reform" was to obtain a 66 per cent majority in the Bundestag, change the constitution, and permit ratification of the General Contract with the Allies and the European Defense Community (EDC), which is presently held up as the Supreme Court of the Constitution deliberates upon the "outdated" restrictions on German rearmament that went into the constitution of the federal republic in 1949.

The new law is a less democratic modification of the 1949 electoral law, although it is similar "in principle," being a combination of direct election and proportional representation (PR).

Formerly it took only 5 per cent of the total vote in a *Land* (one of the states in the federal republic) to be entitled to PR on the list of 40 per cent of the seats held open; now it takes 5 per cent of the vote in the entire federal republic to get minority representation, apart from direct election to an office.

The effect of this change is obvious. In 1949 there were only two minor parties—that is, parties outside of Adenauer's Christian-Democratic Union and Christian Social Union (CDU-CSU) and outside the Social-Democratic Party (SPD)—that achieved 5 per cent of the vote. These were the Free Democratic Party, with 11.9 per cent and 52 seats; and the Communist Party, with 5.7 per cent and 15 seats, which, however, has declined since that date.

The effect of this anti-minor-party move might be to drive many of their supporters to the larger parties—CDU-CSU or SPD—rather than "waste" their votes. For instance, the conservative Bavarian Party, which exists only in Bavaria and has 17 seats and 4.2 per cent of the vote, might join the CDU-CSU rather than forfeit its six "List" seats.

Other changes now introduced are in the number of Bundestag seats, increased from 402 to 484, and the manner of selection, changed from 60 per cent direct vote and 40 per cent PR in 1949, to 50-50 in 1953.

### ECONOMIC ISSUES

Other factors bearing upon the election are the political consequences of the East German workers' uprising, which supports the SPD's "reunification first" plank, and the current economic situation.

It is true that West Germany has experienced a phenomenal economic recovery through Marshall Plan aid, foreign trade, and external sale of war materials after Korea, so that the balance of trade has become much more favorable; but the position of the German worker is only beginning to reach pre-war levels. In an election pamphlet entitled *Fifty Facts*, the SPD shows that the West German workers lag behind the workers in Northwest Europe and England in terms of standard of living. At the same time the German bourgeoisie is making huge profits which it is not only able to reinvest in industry, but with which it has access to all the luxury goods manufactured in any part of the world.

A second economic-political point is the issue of co-determination, as modified from the May 1951 provisions to the greatly reduced July 1952 features. It was this issue that led to the defeat of Christian Fette, right-wing head of the Typographers Union, by Walter Freitag, a pro-Shumacher-type head of the Metal Workers Union, for the presidency of the German Trade Union Federation (DGB) at the October 17 session of the DGB convention in 1952. Instead of trying to fight for strengthening the principle of co-determination, Fette was repeatedly accused of wasting his two years in office, with one of the speakers on the rostrum, according to the *New York Times* (Oct. 19, 1953), saying that he had been occupied with stumping the country on behalf of the European defense plan.

The 1951 co-determination law had placed labor representatives on the board of directors of iron, steel and coal industries equally with management, in 8 of the 11 *Laender*, with labor having 4 members to management's 4, plus 3 neutrals. This in turn permitted labor to be represented on the Board of Management that was appointed by the Board of Directors to run the plants. The usual procedure was a 3-man board: one technical member, one commercial member and one labor member on the board.

By contrast, the 1952 law, which provoked talk of a general strike among union officials and even led to a series of strikes in May when it was before the Bundestag, made no provision for labor directors on the management board. Instead, representatives of the union occupy one-third of the seats on the Board of Directors (sitting above the Board of Managers) and not only are they a minority, but in most cases they must be chosen from within the plant rather than from more experienced and capable "outside" union personnel.

A third economic issue is the question of land reform, which was never carried out successfully by the Adenauer government, which only re-distributed about 400,000 hectares (1 hectare equals 2.47 acres) of land out of the SPD-estimated 4.5 million hectares available under a 100-hectare limit, for resettlement of 90,000 families.

Even the amount redistributed was done by voluntary selections of land by the estate-holder, so that it was usually poor in quality. The SPD wanted *Land* and Kreis parliaments, the German Trade-Union Federation, farmers' trade associations, and provincial refugee authorities consulted to assure a fair carrying out of the reform, but this had to be avoided under the Adenauer program. The SPD program of a 100-hectare (247 acre) limit or a valuation of 130,000 Marks, which it modified to up to 200,000 Marks value for 100 hectares in Schleswig-Holstein, where an SPD *Laender* majority existed, was prevented from going into operation by the British Military Government (under the Labor government) in December 1947, and it was subsequently halted by Adenauer's regime.

It thus appears that the three major factors that might raise the SPD vote would be: (1) reunification, (2) co-determination, and (3) a fairer distribution of the social product.

# Nigeria —

(Continued from page 2)

Action Group from the West also spoke. He said he thought it was strange that freedom had to be fought for, but "the world is a jungle in which strong beasts overpower weak beasts . . . it is futile for a stag to look with sorrow at the lion who has pounced on him."

Self-government, he said, was not something that can be given away—it was not a matter of negotiation. "*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*," he quoted—"I fear the Greeks even when they come bearing gifts"—and he added that the British government was trying "to out-Greek the Greeks."

What was regretted by everyone was the absence of Northern representatives at this meeting. All the way along they had been cautious, as they felt that the British administration was maintaining a balance which would be upset unfavorably for them by a completely federal government.

Nevertheless it is quite clear that the march of history will give Nigeria self-government by 1956. The Tories have come to an intelligent imperialist realization that you can economically and politically exploit a friendly power much more satisfactorily than an enemy.

This turn in Conservative policy augurs badly for Labor unless they take action. If the Tories manage to settle the Kenya issue by one means or another, their solution to the Sudan problem and the Nigerian may be followed by accord on the Suez Canal. They will then turn to Labor at the next election and say, "Beat that!" The Labor Party conference is more acutely than ever faced with the task of formulating a different and more progressive foreign policy.



### LABOR ACTION

September 7, 1953  
Vol. 17, No. 36

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

# Brazil: The New Capitalism and

By JOAO MACHADO

The economy of Brazil, like that of other South American countries, is pre-eminently a colonial one. Agriculture is the main basis of the country's economic life; and industry, in spite of the fact that it has been growing continuously, still is relatively low in importance.

Agricultural work is directed toward an intensive exploitation of tropical products—coffee, sugar, etc.—produced for export. This fact holds the country completely dependent on the general conjuncture of the world market. The oscillations of the market make any kind of long-range economic planning impossible, and, as has already happened in the past, they may ruin whole branches of our economy. On the other hand, the restricted limits of the internal market make any independent production impossible.

**In the last couple of decades, however, many social factors have come into play to modify this situation.**

In Brazil, the Second World War played the rôle of a great transformer, with a revolutionary effect on the economy. The great imperialist powers, mainly the United States, being engaged in the world-wide struggle, had neither political nor economic forces available to maintain their domination over our social development. The pressure which the competition of their manufactured products exercised over our market disappeared, making way for native industry. Brazilian industry grew to such an extent that the country was enabled to export clothes and other goods, and it contributed to creating a relatively big and secure internal market.

## Industrialization

The period of the war was the period of capitalist apogee in Brazil. It can be said that true capitalist relations have begun to appear in this country only during the last two decades. Before the 1930s, the center of gravity of our economic life lay exclusively in the countryside, and the cities played only a secondary rôle. In 1930 the recently developed bourgeoisie led a revolution, against a government which represented the semi-feudal agrarian owners; and the dictatorship of Vargas triumphed.

It is characteristic of all backward countries that the bourgeoisie appears relatively late on the national scene and that, unlike the capitalism that developed in the earlier epoch, it is not strong enough to achieve its revolution by liberal means.

**During the Vargas dictatorship, the country underwent radical transformations. The cities, which were formerly mere centers of handicrafts and consumption, began to grow rapidly, and large-scale investments of both national and foreign capital were made in industry.**

Here we observe another peculiar characteristic of semi-colonial capitalism. Due to its lack of capital and economic strength, the native bourgeoisie cannot build the economic basis of capitalism by itself. It is obliged to accept government aid, principally in the industrial branches that require big initial investments

## Socialist Movement Forging Ahead, Stalinists

and have a low profit rate, like power production, railways and heavy industry. And so from its very beginning the economy is nationalized and statified to a high degree, and the government itself becomes one of the biggest capitalists. This fact endows political life with some peculiar features, for it follows that the section of the bourgeoisie that controls the state machinery also thereby controls an important sector of the economy.

The industry which was built during this period, with the consent of the imperialist powers, was, of course, only complementary to their own economies, and thus it had no perspective of an independent existence. The first traces of a self-sufficient economy began to appear, as we have mentioned, during the Second World War.

## Effect of Imperialism

**Shortly after the war, American imperialism took energetic steps to regain the positions it had lost during the war. Toward this end it deployed weapons in both the economic and political fields, such as loans and commercial and mutual-security treaties. There were, for instance, unmistakable signs of some American influence in the overthrow of Vargas' dictatorship in 1945. Another trump card in the hands of the imperialists is the absolute control which they wield over all national sources of power.**

The Light and Power Company which controls all national sources of hydraulic power, besides draining the country of the profits which it exports, seeks to bring about a scarcity of electric power, being reluctant to construct electricity plants. Standard Oil recently used every means in its repertory in order to get from the legislature a concession for the exploitation of oil; and only a popular campaign of protest prevented its success. The importation of petroleum derivatives costs the nation \$4 million a day, and the United States refused to provide technical assistance for the construction of a refinery, which had to be bought in France.

Some two years ago, a law was enacted that limited the export of profits obtained here by foreign capital, but it had to be shelved shortly afterward because of the United States' "energetic protest" and refusal to make further investments.

**Nevertheless, imperialism has had indisputably a revolutionary effect on our development, by constructing the infra-structural basis of a new capitalist society here, by violently introducing capitalist relations into our economy.**

## The Agrarian System

To complete this sketch of Brazilian economy, a few words about agriculture have to be added.

Our agriculture has a peculiarly contradictory character, both progressive in a sense and also backward. The former is represented by the almost complete domination of capitalist relations in agriculture, which is organized in immense enterprises of a purely commercial character. The high degree of centralization and the expropriation of the peasants which it has effected make our agrarian economy, at least in the economic sense, readier for collectivization.

**The backward aspect is the system of property, which is oriented toward the extraction of the maximum profit for the absentee landowner, which ruins the soil through its irresponsible and antiquated technique, and cruelly exploits the peasant laborers. They live like slaves, shackled to the land, because they are always in debt to the landowner, from whom they must buy their means of subsistence. The child death rate is one of the highest in the world; tuberculosis and venereal and other diseases are decimating the population.**

Our present agrarian system bases itself on "the ruinous exploitation of the ultimate sources of wealth, the earth and the workers."

The most important social phenomenon in this country was the rapid development of the urban proletariat during the Second World War and in the years immediately following, a development which was closely connected with the growth of industry in the same period.

Industrial progress in semi-colonial countries is not a steady and continuous one, but rather it is subject to violent variations depending on external circumstances.

Before that period, industry was handicraft in character, and small-scale manufacture was its predominant form. The small and highly specialized proletariat, generally of foreign origin, had a high degree of class-consciousness and a pretty good standard of living, which was easily maintained because of the scarcity of specialized labor. The greatly increased number of workers that was suddenly required by industry was recruited among the peasants, who are accustomed to very low wages and therefore contributed to lowering the general wage rate because of their competition.

## The New Class Struggle

**The class-consciousness that had used to be characteristic among the former workers diluted itself among the more backward masses; and this considerably facilitated the destruction of the proletarian class organizations by the Vargas dictatorship, which replaced them with a state-controlled dummy trade union. In this work of destruction Vargas was assisted by the Stalinists, whose tactics were to destroy what they could not dominate themselves.**

The unclass-conscious and disorganized proletariat fell easy prey to a highly organized and class-conscious bourgeoisie.

A substantial part of the Brazilian bourgeoisie is made up of Italians and German Jews who had escaped from Hitler Germany in the 1930s. All of them had had long previous experience in the class struggle, as bourgeois, gained in Europe; and it must be admitted that they used this experience very efficiently.

Not only terror and deportation were the means employed to annihilate the workers' organizations and class feeling; there was also social-assistance laws of various kinds and a relatively progressive labor legislation, while of course strikes were matters for the police. They used both the carrot and the club.

**But the bourgeoisie is far from forming a united bloc. There are permanent conflicts between the landowners and the industrial and financial bourgeoisie. This shows up, for example, in their differing attitudes toward imperialism: the former accept it as a guarantee of their foreign trade, and the latter, mainly the middle classes, oppose it as an industrial and commercial competitor.**

## Demagogues—Right and 'Left'

One of the most significant facts about Brazil's political life is that an important part of the nation, the peasantry, does not participate in it at all. Their social and economic conditions do not allow them to organize and fight for their interests. Besides, the majority of them cannot vote because of widespread illiteracy; and those who can vote do so in accordance with their employer's desires.

Up to about three years, all of national politics—insofar as such a thing existed—was dominated simply by bourgeois disputes. The conditions we have described explain why the workers could not intervene as such. They fell under the domination of various demagogues, rightist or leftist in coloration.

**The Stalinists, profiting by this situation and by the fight against the dictatorship (a fight**

Books long out of print  
Just received from India

**Leon Trotsky:**

**THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION**

(From October to Brest-Litovsk)

111 pages paper covers \$1.00

**N. Bucharin and**

**E. Preobraschensky**

**ABC OF COMMUNISM**

143 pages hard covers \$2.00

while they last, order from

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

# The New Working-Class Struggle

## Decline, Bourgeois Parties Look for Dictator

that ceased immediately after our entrance into the war), succeeded by means of cheap demagoguery in gaining the support of a part of the anti-imperialist petty-bourgeoisie, as well as of a part of the most active and class-conscious workers. In this way they soon turned into a very powerful party.

The majority of the proletariat, however, fell into the hands of the right opportunists.

Ex-dictator Vargas, calling himself "the father of the poor," managed to gain a vast popular support, because of his personal prestige and by promising everything to everyone. He formed his own party, called the Brazilian Labor Party (PTB). This popular support was the main force which brought him to power in the last election.

### Awakening

The people's hopes that Vargas' return to power would improve things was chiefly based on their belief that he would put an end to the kind of administrative incompetence and inefficiency which had characterized the former Dutra government. They expected that he would better the economic situation, which had worsened since the end of the Second World War, that is, since the end of the Vargas dictatorship; the dictatorship had become associated in the popular mind with the better standard of living which had then existed.

The rest of the workers and part of the petty-bourgeoisie enlisted under the banner of the "Social-Progressive Party" (PSP) of Ademar de Barros, former governor of the state of Sao Paulo and one of the biggest thieves in the country's governmental history. Vargas' PTB and De Barros' PSP formed an alliance in order to put Vargas back into power in the 1950 election.

**But in the last few years the disastrous business situation and, mainly, continuous inflation have had strong repercussions in all sectors of national life.**

**The standard of living sank so low that the workers awakened; disillusioned, they withdrew in large masses from the PTB of Vargas and its similars. A sharp class struggle started for better work conditions and higher wages, in order to regain the former levels or at least to maintain the present ones.**

### The Stalinists Decline

Today, as a result, the conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is dominating our politics. This is abundantly proved by the recent strikes in Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo, the walkout of 200,000 men, the strike in the merchant fleet.

At the same time the Stalinists also have lost a great part of their prestige. This has resulted from their extremely opportunistic policies, such as alliances with the bourgeoisie, popular fronts, etc.

L. C. Prestes, the party leader, shortly after being released from the prison where Vargas had kept him jailed for ten years, made a political alliance with him. Moreover their policy of political strikes and agitation following the swings of the Russian political line of the moment, regardless of Brazilian specific conditions, diminished their influence in the working class. Political repression and illegality also contributed to the party's decay.

The constellation of forces in the state of Sao Paulo, the big industrial center, reflects the new state of things very well.

The bourgeoisie, having lost its "proletarian" supporters, grouped itself in an alliance of seven parties, including the PTB and the PSP, which up to now have been antagonists.

### Socialist Gain

**The Brazilian Socialist Party and a small Christian-democratic party presented a second**

**candidate, a man with great popular support because of his personal integrity and record of opposition to the government. His electoral campaign based itself on promises to suppress the administrative abuses in the city council and to bring about a more equal distribution of the city services in the poorest quarters.**

The popularity of this campaign made him a serious competitor to the official candidate.

The bourgeois coalition fell into a panic because his victory would represent (and actually did bring about) a great loss of prestige for the official parties among the masses, and would put an end to a process which was turning the city council into something like New York's Tammany Hall or worse.

**The coalition put up a third candidate to divide the opposition vote, but the maneuver failed. So they had recourse to an extreme step: they paid 20 million to the Stalinist party to make possible the presentation of a fourth candidate, who might succeed in doing what the third had failed to do. The CP accepted the deal not only because of the money but also because, during the campaign, they would have the opportunity for legal propaganda in favor of their usual slogans about "peace," Korea, the U. S.-Brazil military pact, etc.**

Of course, no one can prove definitively that the CP received the money, but there is a significant fact which goes a long way to prove it. Since the CP, an illegal party, could not put up a candidate under its own name, one of the minor parties withdrew from the coalition and let the Stalinists use its label.

**In spite of all that, the opposition won a smashing victory, with double the number of votes obtained by the three other candidates put together.**

### Toward Peronism?

This unexpected result showed not only the general flight from the bourgeois parties but also a break in the discipline of the CP. The low number of votes it obtained (18,000) proves that the majority of its rank and file did not vote for its candidate. Similar phenomena took place in three other big cities.

All these events created a political vacuum around the bourgeois parties and interests. They seem to understand this quite well, and intend to awake a wave of reaction.

By placing new men at the top, the recent ministerial changes resulted in an apparent end to the old policies. The minister of labor is trying to put into practice a new policy of concessions to the workers in order to regain their support for the discredited PTB. He is having some success, chiefly among the paid staffs of the trade unions.

The importance of this maneuver is increased by the fact that here the law allows the existence of only one trade union for each field, so that if the government gets its hands on the present trade unions, it will dominate the whole organized labor movement.

**The appointment of a well-known former fascist to the ministry of foreign affairs, and a series of intrigues and replacements of officers in the army, indicate that the bourgeoisie intends to build up a "strong" government, that is, a dictatorship of the Peronist type. The ideal man to realize this task is already in power, namely, the ex-dictator Vargas.**

On the other hand, the solution of the fundamental national problems such as the agrarian question, industrialization, building up of new sources of power, cannot be delayed any longer. Private enterprise is incapable of realizing this task which can be done only by the state. And thus a strong government also becomes an objective social and economic necessity for all classes, bourgeoisie, proletariat and peasants.

The greatest immediate problem in this country is this: Will this government be of a Peronist type, or will it have progressive features, like those of the present government in Bolivia?

And the main task of the democratic forces of Brazil, and particularly of the socialists, is to organize a mass movement against the imminent Peronist danger.

**The Socialist Party is the only party which could possibly undertake the historic task of organizing such a movement. Until now its strength has been practically equal to zero. But its last electoral successes, in spite of the fact that they were a symptom of a revulsion from the government more than an expression of a socialist consciousness on the part of the people, fortified it tremendously. (In Sao Paulo alone, for example, nearly 1000 workers have entered the party in the past few months.)**

### Socialists' Dilemma

As in all socialist parties in the world, there are two factions in the Brazilian Socialist Party. The right wing (majority) believing, or pretending to believe, in the government's new "good intentions," opportunistically advocates that the socialists support its policies. The left wing (minority) fights for a stern opposition to those policies. At the party's national congress, held during the past week, the two factions reached a compromise by deciding to form a vague national democratic front for industrialization and agrarian reform.

This democratic front is designed to unify all the classes whose interests are contrary to the dictatorship, and principally to win the support of the army, or at least of the democratic section which exists in it. This support is very important because of the first-class role played by the army in the politics of the backward countries. We are now engaged in a race against time, that is, in a fight for the formation of a democratic bloc before the totalitarian forces will be ready to deliver their blow.

**Another question the Socialist Party must answer is this: With whom, and on what class basis, shall we participate in this democratic front?**

The right wing wants the party to identify itself closely with the petty-bourgeoisie, arguing that our proletariat is too immature and lacks the class-consciousness to understand and actively support the socialist political line. It regards the work of direct propaganda among the workers as being of secondary importance, and the solution it offers is to organize a movement from above which will be joined passively by the workers afterwards.

They are right in certain aspects, but they close their eyes to the impotence and lack of revolutionary vigor of the liberal section of our bourgeoisie.

Brazilian socialism now faces a dilemma: either it will succeed in mobilizing the workers around its banner, or it will face, in the near future, the specter of Peronism. And unfortunately, the second seems to be the more probable.

Sao Paulo,  
July 20, 1953

Just released —

#### "Songs of the Wobblies"

New LABOR ARTS recording of famous IWW songs, on 33-1/3 LPs, unbreakable \$4.00

Now available on 33-1/3 LPs—

#### "Ballads for Sectarians"

The first LABOR ARTS album . . . song satires on American Stalinism . . . \$4.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Mail orders will receive prompt attention. All orders must be accompanied by payment.

# U.S. Wins a 'Victory' —

(Continued from page 1)

at the UN made it possible for Vishinsky to pose as the moderator, the man of good will, the representative of a government which thirsts for agreement on a wide basis.

If the diplomatic battle on the question of India's inclusion in the conference left any doubt as to how and with whom the United States lines up in world affairs, the Moroccan problem which, by chance, came up at the same session of the UN put the cap on it.

On the India question, the United States whipped a reluctant France and Britain into abstention, in order to make its deal with the reactionary Rhee government in South Korea, and with reactionary imperialist sentiment in the Republican Party at home. On the Moroccan plea for a hearing, the United States lined up with the imperialist interests of France and Britain, who do not want a precedent set for any international intervention into their suppression of colonial countries, under the claim that these are purely "domestic" problems.

## CANADA MURMURS

In pursuing its line of "practical" power politics, the American government does nothing but alienate the peoples of all countries. Its stand on Morocco placed it in opposition to the peoples of the whole of Asia, Africa, and Latin America without gaining any support or sympathy from the peoples of Europe, or even of Britain and France. Its stand on India drove a shudder down the backs of the most loyal American partisans in the whole world. Even though the votes were won in the UN, the over-all result was a loosening of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, an additional shove to anti-Americanism everywhere.

While the UN was in session, one of the chief British figures on the military side of NATO made a speech in Canada in which he urged the Canadian people and government not to become too dependent on American policy. Field Marshal Montgom-

ery, speaking in Toronto, stressed the importance of political leadership in NATO, and said that without political agreement among its members, its military efforts could "do no good."

Following on the heels of this speech, the Canadian press expressed the feelings of the government and wide sections of the Canadian population on the United States' course in Asian politics. The Ottawa Journal stated that once the UN session was over, the Canadian government should inform the United States State Department privately, but in the strongest terms, that in its view American policy in Asia "is capable of doing almost incredible and perhaps irreparable harm."

"It is disturbing," the Journal editorial continued, "to see Uncle Sam whip seventeen South American countries into line to enforce upon the world an Asian peace not to the world's liking."

## REBUKES

Writing in similar vein, the Toronto Globe and Mail stated that:

"It is extremely regrettable that a group of United Nations members led by the United States, a group constituting a minority of the whole Assembly, has succeeded in blocking the invitation to India to take part in the Korean peace conference." It viewed the American action as a further sign of the "subservience" of this government to Syngman Rhee, who had threatened to boycott the conference if India attended. It rebuked the American government for a lack of a sense of proportion, and declared that Rhee, as a political figure, compares to Nehru, India's prime minister, as the head of "the most obscure banana republic compares to President Eisenhower."

These papers speak for the relatively conservative Canadian government. They reflect a toned-down version of the widest popular sentiments not only in Canada, but in Europe and Asia as well. Their chief objection to American policy is not simply that the United States slapped

just about the whole of Asia in the face by its action, but that this action indicates that this government proposes to try to use the same methods in its whole Asian policy. They know that this cannot work, and they fear that if it is attempted, it can drag the whole world into war.

There are wide strata of the American people who realize that this government's policies are at best futile, at worst disastrous. Comment in the more liberal papers, both Republican and Democratic, has been highly critical. They wish that the government were not so "stupid" or "childish" or "narrow" in its views and actions.

## IT ISN'T ONLY STUPIDITY

But the point which they miss, and it is the vital point, is that the stupidity of the government's foreign-policy does not flow solely from the mental incapacity of Eisenhower, Dulles, Lodge and their colleagues. Such critics understand that the government should not have fought to exclude India from the conference, but they do not understand that behind the government's fear of Indian participation lay its basic imperialist approach to the weaker nations of the world.

It is still a fetish of American liberalism to insist that this country is not imperialist because it does not seek to establish an empire on the model of the old British or French empires. That is self-delusion of the worst kind. It permits men of good will, of basically democratic intentions, to give critical support to this government and its foreign policy, because they hope that in doing so they will be able to assist in its "modification" or "liberalization."

The disaster of the last session of the UN is just a beginning. We can be sure of that. The only way in which the government can be prevented from dragging the country into one crisis after another in the foreign field is by the frank, outright, uncompromising opposition to its whole imperialist ideology and its imperialist approach by a wide section of the American public.

## 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 Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

# Behind the Calm in Labor — —

(Continued from page 1)

• In the maritime industry, the CIO Marine Engineers Beneficial Association and the AFL Masters, Mates and Pilots have been considering a merger. Curran of the NMU-CIO and Lundberg of the SIU-AFL have been exchanging conciliatory notes promising to cooperate in the exchange of wage-rate information.

• In the oil industry, CIO, AFL, and independent unions maintain a joint action committee to promote the common interest.

• In the department store field, the CIO Retail Union and the independent Distributive, Processing, and Office Workers which originally left the CIO with the Stalinists have already agreed to merge. A protracted strike called by the latter union at the Hearns department store in New York City has been fully backed by the whole CIO, an immediate dramatic example of the need for unity.

• In public utilities the CIO Utility Workers Union has been talking of joining with the AFL Electrical Workers Unions which shares control in the field.

• And then, in the pure spirit of unity, the Blacksmiths Union and the Boilermakers Union, each more than 60 years old, have already consummated a merger into a single new union.

## CIO-AFL TALKS

Above all, there are the unity talks between the CIO and AFL. A joint agreement to end raiding and jurisdictional

disputes between the two federations has already been worked out and needs only formal action by both bodies to go into effect. Meanwhile, conferences to explore the possibility of a final merger will continue.

The widespread sentiment for unity is the best expression of the real situation. The basic causes of the CIO-AFL split have now been outlived and the needs of the working class can now be best served by a united front against the employers and their administration in Washington.

The potentialities of unity were displayed in the days of the United Labor Policy Committee which conducted the unions' walkout from all war boards in protest against the policies of the Truman administration. But the breakup of the committee by the AFL's sudden and arbitrary withdrawal was a setback for labor; it helped to perpetuate that lack of confidence which is at the bottom of all subservience to capitalist parties.

## CARPENTERS' STEP

As the prospects for unity rise, the more conservative sections of the CIO and AFL begin to press for greater recognition and bargaining power in affecting the course of the future labor movement.

Most crudely was this the aim of the Carpenters Union in withdrawing from the AFL at its last executive council meeting.

Of all labor unions, the Carpenters are perhaps least interested in a unity which would end jurisdictional disputes

and bring the CIO industrial unions into the same federations with it. Woodworking is in decline, yielding to plastics and metal. The Carpenters Union seeks to maintain its strength by claiming jurisdiction over everything that was ever made of wood. It is in a state of constant warfare with other unions, as it tries to maintain its own position at their expense. One of its rivals is the Machinists Union, now cooperating with the UAW-CIO. Hutcheson, the Carpenters' president, is a rare bird: a Republican union official.

## MACDONALD MANEUVERS

In total disregard for the general aim of unity with the CIO, Dave Beck of the Teamsters Union succeeded in carving away a section of the CIO Brewery Workers and taking them into his union. Beck was guided by the narrow aim of bolstering his own personal power; the secessionists from the CIO were motivated by an aim just as narrow: they are Stalinists concerned with cutting ground from beneath CIO President Reuther. Thus came the alliance between a conservative labor official and Stalinist unionists.

In the CIO, David J. Macdonald, president of the Steel Workers Union, continues a subterranean campaign against Reuther, a fight which began at the last CIO convention. His method is adapted nicely to the atmosphere of pending unity. He accepted appointment from Eisenhower on a government investigating committee without clearing it with the CIO; he thus declares his independence of the Reuther CIO regime. At the same time, he stimulates rumors of a pending split of the Steelworkers from the CIO, carefully staging an impromptu conference with John L. Lewis in order to speed the rumor on its way. If Reuther cannot speak for the Steelworkers when he negotiates with the AFL, his bargaining power and that of the CIO is reduced; he can command fewer concessions; his prestige declines; and Macdonald can rise, relatively speaking, in the power hierarchy. Such seem to be his motivations.

In any event, the causes of the surge to unity are so deeply rooted and the sentiment for it so widespread that it seems likely that AFL-CIO unity will at last succeed.

Hear

**"WHY WE SPLIT FROM THE SOCIALIST PARTY"**

by

**Bogdan Denitch**  
Member, YPSL NEC, and N. Y. District Secretary

at SYL-YPSL JOINT FORUM  
**Friday, September 11, at 8:30 p.m.**

or at LABOR ACTION FORUM  
**Thursday, September 10, at 8:30 p.m.**

Both at LABOR ACTION HALL  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

**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 .....