

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

THE CERTIFICATION
OF HARRISON SALISBURY

... page 7

RUSSIAN WRITERS
INDICT THE KREMLIN REGIME

... page 6

NOVEMBER 1, 1954

FIVE CENTS

Resistance Grows In West Germany Against War Role

(ICFTU Information Bull'n)
DUSSELDORF—Opposition to the rearmament either of West or East Germany and to the introduction of labor service was voiced by the DGB trade union youth conference which met in Dusseldorf from 24 to 26 September. The 300 delegates representing 670,000 young trade-unionists also went on record for the reunification of Germany.

The conference refused to receive representatives from the Communist-controlled trade unions of the Soviet Zone.

(Peace News)

By HENRY HOLM

BERLIN—... It is thoroughly understood in Germany that in a new war the German people will suffer a deplorable fate.

On one occasion, General Gruenther, chief of NATO forces, said that the German divisions would be used only to cover the retreat of the European army behind the Rhine, where the real resistance would be set up.

What does that mean for the territory east of the Rhine?

As the Germans see it, it almost certainly means "scorched earth." There are too many Germans who have seen the policy of scorched earth work out in Norway, Poland, and Russia.

Everywhere between the Elbe and the Rhine, right now, all bridges are being mined, in order to be blown up in case of such a retreat.

The people see this, and sometimes they have been resisted. In several places, where the workers under the occupation powers had cleared a cave beneath the bridge for the dynamite to be put in, people from neighboring villages filled those hollow spaces with concrete on the following night.

Several mayors—and let no one suppose them to be Communists—have openly refused to deliver key or plans for such a purpose; for example, the mayors of Bamberg and Duisburg.

At Bamberg the city councillors gave out a statement saying those bridges had been built to cross over the river, not to be blown up.

It is no secret that near Kaiserslautern some 30 atomic cannon from the United States have been installed, able to fire at a range of many miles (some say 80), using shells like the Hiroshima bomb. Dr. Adenauer thanked the U. S. for these guns. The inhabitants of Mannheim, Ludwigshaven, Mainz, living 80 miles west of those guns, have not.

Meanwhile, countless Germans believe that General Gruenther's plans are obsolete. After the H-bomb tests in the Pacific, many are saying that instead of scorched earth between the Elbe and the Rhine, there is now more likely to be a belt on which H-bombs will be dropped all the way between Hamburg and the Swiss frontier. This prospect is even less attractive for those who happen to live in that region.

The unpopularity of rearmament is not limited to youth or to political leftists. The big Krupp firm has even refused to accept orders for repairs of American tanks, "for reasons of principle." Krupp is prospering now with non-military activity, building a large steel factory in India, constructing the first bridge across the Bosphorus.

The German Rearmament Pact: Big Step Onward to a Dead End

By GORDON HASKELL

The Paris treaty for the rearmament of Germany is being hailed in the United States as a major victory for the Eisenhower administration, as a great step toward the unification of Europe, and as a major bulwark against Russian Stalinist aggression.

That is all campaign oratory, designed to rescue the Republicans from a defeat which they smell on the Paris treaty, and about the state of the capitalist world on the morning after it was signed, are not such as to cause jubilation anywhere except in carefully staged television-show cabinet meetings.

And it is clear that if this is a great victory for the West, it is one of the least understood victories in history. The diplomats responsible for negotiating the treaty are most restrained in their estimates of it. And nowhere—neither in Germany nor in England, in France nor in the Benelux countries—have the people taken to the streets to dance their joy at this great achievement for peace.

Quite the contrary. In all these countries there has been ample demonstration during recent months that large sections of the population, very likely majorities in each case, are opposed to what has been achieved at Paris.

The German Social-Democratic Party and the Trade Union Federation (DGB) have both come out against the rearmament of the country under present circumstances. In the British Labor Party

conference, German rearmament got an exceedingly slim majority.

In France, the National Assembly has recently voted against admitting West Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which is one feature of the Paris treaty. It remains to be seen whether a majority can be had in the French Assembly for the rearmament of Germany on any terms, and even if such a majority should develop its popular support would be extremely questionable.

In fact, popular support for this treaty is so doubtful that there is no real assurance that the treaty will ever actually come into effect.

In West Germany, the Free Democratic Party has attacked the agreement on the Saar signed by Adenauer as a violation of the policy laid down on this question by the coalition which keeps him in power. The Social-Democrats have declared open war on the Saar agreement as a sell-out of German interests to the French.

In addition, it is clear that the treaty does not give West Germany her sov-

eighty. Allied troops will continue to be stationed in Germany not on invitation of the German government, but as a "right" reserved in the treaty. If the "right" to maintain troops is continued, it is quite likely that with it would have to go the "right" to take measures to safeguard these troops against any developments, political or military, which might endanger their security. This is the old "emergency" clause in the former contractual agreements which has been found so onerous by Germans of every political view. Adenauer ducked questions on this matter from the Social-Democrats on the eve of his departure for Paris.

VAGUE VERBIAGE

In France, Mendès-France is seeking to reshuffle his cabinet to assure himself of support in the Chamber of Deputies. Opposition to German rearmament in France is appeased somewhat by the advantage gained in the Saar agreement, and in any event the French have to consider the very dark prospect of trying to form another government if Mendès-France should fall. Yet even though domestic considerations may have a heavy bearing in gathering political support for Mendès-France, and thus for the treaty, there is no absolute guarantee that the Assembly will ratify it.

Even if ratification by all the governments involved is achieved, the resulting structure will be exceptionally unstable.

(Turn to last page)

Left Wing Captures German Labor Movement, Blasts Rearmament Plan

By A. STEIN

What can only be described as a peaceful revolution took place at the recent congress of the German Trade Union Federation (DGB), held at Frankfurt on October 4-9.

A young and militant group of trade-union leaders wrested control of the DGB from the hands of the old conservative bureaucrats who have dominated its councils since the federation was formed in late 1949.

With the accession of this new group to leadership, the period of class peace in West Germany has now formally come to an end. Ended too is the policy of political neutrality which the old DGB leadership tried to follow in its effort to conciliate the Adenauer regime. The Adenauer government and the West German bourgeoisie can now look forward to a less comfortable period of "social peace" than they have enjoyed since the Federal Republic was established.

Although we have not as yet received a complete account of these heartening developments, the new policies adopted by the DGB Congress and the names of their outstanding proponents in the execu-

tive council enable us to give LABOR ACTION readers a more complete picture of the origin and background of the overturn in the DGB. Like all "sudden" changes in nature and society, this one has been quite a while in the making.

FEAR ARMY

Because international attention is fixed upon the feverish American drive to arm West Germany, the resolution on foreign policy adopted by the DGB Congress received the greatest emphasis in the foreign press and merits first consideration. The 391 delegates, representing six million German workers and employees, came out against rearmament and the inclusion of West Germany in NATO until all chances for negotiating the reunification of Germany have been exhausted.

By taking this stand, with only four votes against it cast by delegates who wanted an even more sweeping condemnation of rearmament, the slightly less than 400 delegates reversed the DGB position taken at its last congress two years ago. At that time a resolution opposing West German rearmament and membership in NATO was unanimously defeated. This time it was to all practical purposes unanimously adopted.

The reasons that inspired the stand of the DGB are eloquently expressed in the resolution which states in part:

"For the internal development of the Federal German Republic, the rearmament and organization of a German army as laid down by the London agreement would bring the danger of the creation of a militaristic, authoritarian state. This would in turn defeat the efforts of the German workers' movement to erect a political, social, and economic democracy."

NOT ONLY SOCIALISTS

A delegate from the building workers union summed up the feelings of the entire congress when he declared: "Democracy will be trampled under foot by those who will shelter behind the bayonets of the new army."

It is also noteworthy that opposition to rearmament is not restricted to those sec-

(Continued on page 3)

LONDON LETTER

British Dock Strike Spreads Despite All Threats

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Oct. 20—The strike of the Stevedores to protest against compulsory overtime has been spreading. 43,000 dockers in London, Southampton, Hull, and Glasgow are now out. 283 ships are idle, and about \$250 million worth of imports and exports are being held up.

But the bus strike for a minimum wage of \$28 a week has collapsed, partly due to lack of trade-union support, and also because of lack of public sympathy. After about ten days partial strike, led by a busmen's unofficial committee, the men went back to work without gaining their demands. Further than that they agreed to work overtime, which had been one of the main issues at stake.

Among the side effects of the strike has been reduced overtime at the Vauxhall car works as the cars produced are not being shipped away, and also difficulty in disposing of refuse in Camberwell, one of London's boroughs.

The bus strike naturally caused a great deal of inconvenience to the general public of London. Furthermore, it was not union-supported. But the dockers have, so far, put the public to no trouble. The fact that imports and exports are piling up is of no immediate concern, to the public.

The right-wing press has, however, been carrying stories to show how damaging to the national economy the hold-up is, how much perishable food is going bad, and how many hospitals are not receiving their medical supplies.

The dockers are in a much more power-

ful position than the bus drivers because they have union backing and are paid strike pay while not working. It is obvious that they can go on until union funds run out.

It should be noted, however, that only about half the strikers are members of the Stevedores' union. The other half belong to the Transport and General Workers Union. The executive of the union, and the General Council of the Trade Union Congress, have advised the men to go back, but they have ignored the call.

TORY THREAT

A week ago, as we reported, 2600 members of the TGWU were unable to be persuaded to return to work at a mass meeting called by the executive of this union. More members of this union have come out since then. I was amused to read an article by Percy Cudlip (editor of the *Labor Daily Herald*) asking, "Has Deakin lost touch with the rank-and-file?" I would have thought that the answer to this was obvious.

Not only have the General Council of the TUC and the executive of the TGWU called on the strikers to return to work. Sid Walter Monckton, the minister of labor, has told the strikers that unless they return to work by next weekend, he will call in the troops.

This very dangerous move may bring out all the dockers throughout the country. Industrial workers nowadays do not react favorably to the threat of the "big stick."

Sir Walter has gone one farther. He

has set up a Court of Enquiry to look into the causes of the dockers strike. This court consists of Sir Richard Evershed (the Master of the Rolls), a large industrial contractor, and a member of the General Council of the TUC.

Even if the Master of the Rolls could be assumed to be impartial, it is perhaps obvious what opinions the industrial contractor will have. Also, the members of the TUC must know of the decision of this body calling off the strike. Altogether then, the court starts off as a not very disinterested body.

The two protagonists—the chairman of the National Association of Port Employers and the secretary of the Stevedores' Union—have already put forward their main views. The stevedores wanted to establish once and for all that overtime was absolutely voluntary, and that there was no obligation for a docker to explain why he was unwilling to work it. The union, represented by Barrett, wanted a return to the pre-war system of voluntary overtime which had worked very well.

CHALLENGE DEAKIN

The Dock Labor Board said that the men worked in teams. There was no ultimate obligation on any particular worker to work overtime. If he was unwilling to do so, the team could either work undermanned or for longer hours.

The attitude of the TGWU, which is only appearing at the court officially as observers, is that the strike is a case of a "Communist" minority fishing in troubled waters. As Deakin left Seymour Hall where the Court of Enquiry was being held, a Mr. Marney, unofficial leader of 200 strikers assembled outside, tried to present him with a document asking employers and the TGWU to ban compulsory overtime. Deakin pushed the man aside.

Shouts of "You are overpaid," "You don't represent us, Mr. Deakin," and "Prove that the strike is Red-inspired" were heard.

It is a foregone conclusion that the court will recommend the men go back to work, and in my opinion, it is only a matter of time before the employers accept the principle of voluntary overtime.

However, before the Court of Enquiry presents its findings and these are considered by the various parties, two to three weeks will have passed without industrial peace. If the government does carry out its threat to call in troops, the whole 80,000 dock workers in the country may come out before them.

Thomas, Muste Join Davidson Defense; Arrest of Other C.O.s Is Threatened

The case of Vern Davidson, agnostic C.O. who refused induction into the armed forces, has taken on new importance with the arrest of Don Thomas in Wisconsin and the pending arrest of David McReynolds in California. Thomas, like Davidson, is an agnostic and thereby disqualified by the law for exemption as a conscientious objector (the law provides such exemption only for those who base their objections to war on belief in a "supreme being"). Thomas refused induction and was arrested earlier this year.

McReynolds refused to state his religious convictions to the draft board because he felt that exemptions should be granted on the basis of sincerity and not religious belief. As a result he was denied a C.O. classification and refused induction on August 26. He has not yet been arrested. Both Don Thomas and David McReynolds are, like Davidson, members of the Socialist Party.

Recognizing the civil liberties question involved in automatically refusing agnostics a C.O. classification, Norman Thomas has supported the Davidson Defense Committee in its efforts to appeal the case, and A. J. Muste has accepted membership on the Defense Committee.

Davidson's case, on appeal from the lower court, will be decided by the appellate court in December or January and may provide a precedent for Thomas, McReynolds, and others who may take similar positions. The brief in the Davidson case holds that the requirement that a C.O. believe in a supreme being is a violation of the constitutional separation of church and state. The defense also

THE CASE OF THE SUBVERSIVE CORPSE

By A. F.

There is a ghoulish humor even in the witchhunt. The question now being disputed in the highest governmental circles is: Should a dissolved organization be declared a Communist front or not?

New York State says no. The Justice Department and the Subversive Activities Control Board say yes. The highest courts in the U. S. will have to decide this question.

The issue is raised over the corpse of the International Workers Order, a fraternal organization for insurance benefits and political propaganda. It was originally organized in a split from the Workmen's Circle by left-wingers and Stalinists and became completely Stalinized. The Stalinists used the organization as a source of jobs for the faithful, money for the "cause" and a "broad" base for operations. In all this there was nothing illegal or even unusual. There are many benevolent organizations with political leanings. The IWO was simply the pro-Stalinist outfit in the field, as the Workmen's Circle was the social-democratic.

Then came the cold war and the witchhunt. The New York State Department of Insurance revoked the IWO charter on the ground that it was a "Communist conspiracy" masquerading behind an insurance group. And the New York courts upheld this outrageous violation of democratic rights.

In the meantime the Subversive Control Act was passed, and the SACB was appointed to register Communist organizations, list their members, etc. The board ordered the IWO to a hearing, to show why it should not be listed. The receiver appointed by New York State to liquidate the organization refused to allow IWO officials to go as representatives. Instead he himself appeared as the IWO official representative (thus opening himself to the charge of recording himself as head of a Communist front organization).

The receiver argued that the board should not place a dissolved organization on the list. The federal authorities argued that though the organization was no longer legally in existence, it still should be branded so that past membership and leadership could be properly "labeled." The board upheld the Justice Department and proceeded with the hearing.

At first the report had it that the board has decided to list the IWO. This week a report said that the board had changed its mind under pressure from the New York State Republican machine and that at any rate it would wait for a judicial decision.

maintains that Davidson was refused a hearing and thus denied due process under law.

In addition, the FBI report which is used by the draft board in deciding C.O. classifications, has been subpoenaed by the defense, since the "summary" of the report submitted to Davidson contained factual errors against which he has had no chance to defend himself. Thus far the government has refused to surrender the report.

The Davidson Defense Committee, 132½ Ashland Ave., Ocean Park, Calif., is at present appealing urgently for funds to support its work.

NOW—IN ENGLISH
THE FAMED "VOLUME 4"
OF "CAPITAL"

Karl Marx's
HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC
THEORIES

PART ONE

Langland Press—337 pages—\$5.00

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

Pittsburgh Ad Brings Out a Sight To Gladden Wilson's Dog-Loving Heart

By GERRY McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, Oct. 25 — There are plenty of bird dogs in the Pittsburgh area.

Democratic Party cynicism came to light in the free-food program in this city where roughly one fifth of the population is eligible to receive free food. In the teeming slums of the northside of Pittsburgh, the Food Board in this Democratic-controlled city and county were issuing food stamps with the admonition: Better change your registration to Democratic and be sure to pull the second lever. The Republicans have protested indignantly—after all, it's their free food since it comes from the national administration.

The second event showed how willing—how desperate, even—the thousands of unemployed miners and steel workers in this area are to hunt jobs. A scrap company in this area is engaged in tearing up some old streetcar tracks south of Pittsburgh. They put a three-line want ad in several small newspapers in the area as follows: "Male laborers report to Mr. Kon at job site, Donaldson's Crossroads, Route 19, Monday, Oct. 25, at 8 a.m." That was all. The company wanted to hire 50 workers.

Unemployed workers began to arrive long before it was light. By 8 o'clock, there were more than 700 cars at the designated crossroads. When the hiring foreman showed up to pick 50 men, he was confronted with 2000 eager applicants. Dismayed, he left the scene and hired his crew along the road from among men still arriving.

In the meantime, state police were attempting to disperse the desperate job

seekers and break up the traffic jam which had piled up around the area. So bitter was the disappointment that when the lucky few who had been hired started to work, the other applicants crowded around them and made them stop. Police finally dispersed the men.

The applicants came from as far as 50 miles away. Many of them were miners whose compensation has already run out. One of those who was disappointed told a newspaperman: "Most of these guys just want to make a few bucks. A lot of them, including me, haven't worked for a long time. They're willing to do anything just so it's a job."

THE CITY IS SAVED

If the leaders of respectable Pittsburgh society were unable to come up with jobs for the jobless, they at least have produced a minor sensation to amuse the hungry. Matt ("I was a Communist for the FBI") Cvetic, Pittsburgh's leading stoop-pigeon (no mean title these days) has dramatically disclosed that the city of Pittsburgh has in its employ an alleged Communist! Cvetic, now a Republican politician, revealed that the menace to the peace and safety of the steel center had slyly insinuated himself into the Department of Public Works where he was engaged in the highly secret and vital work of sending out water bills! If he really is a Communist, perhaps his salary explains it—he is paid \$3100 a year. Pittsburgh's Fair Deal Mayor and Democratic National Committeeman David Lawrence immediately started legal proceedings to fire the man and cut off his princely income.

Labor Action FORUM • New York City

THURSDAY, NOV. 4 — 8:30 p.m.

A. J. MUSTE

Reviews His Experiences in Europe

And on the following Thursdays at 8:30 p.m.

Nov. 11—AL GATES on the results of the election.

Nov. 18—STAN GREY reviews David Riesman's latest book, "Individualism Reconsidered."

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Left Wing Captures German Labor — —

(Continued from page 1)

tions of the DGB which are directly under SPD influence. The correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, writing from Bonn on October 10, remarks:

"Among the votes in favor of the resolution, therefore, were at least 25 to 30 of the men who represent the Catholic workers and who normally vote in a Federal or Land election for Dr. Adenauer and the Christian Democrats. The movement against rearmament has therefore been extended beyond the strict party boundaries of German Social-Democracy."

Just as heartening is the fact that the resolution was not adopted on pacifist grounds. The congress voted down an alternative resolution disapproving all German rearmament. What the resolution rejects is this rearmament by the Adenauer regime which can only have reactionary social consequences and is detrimental to the genuine national interests of the German people, that is, the reunification of Germany and the restoration of complete sovereignty.

STALINISTS SILENCED

Furthermore, should the Adenauer regime or the American press attempt to insinuate that the trade-union movement fell under Stalinist influence, the record of events at the congress speaks for itself. One Stalinist proposal to send a delegation to Frankfurt was rejected. Another Stalinist motion for a meeting with East German trade unions was also turned down. And when a Stalinist speaker attempted to have the resolution reworded, the Manchester Guardian reports, he was shouted down.

In taking the position of the SPD for its own, the DGB took a step forward. It has abandoned a spurious and impossible political neutrality and now stands in direct opposition to the Adenauer regime on the major political issue of the day in West Germany.

The bond between the SPD and the trade unions has now been strengthened, and the results can be beneficial for the future of the working-class movement of West Germany. The SPD need no longer restrict its opposition to the ineffectual parliamentary arena. It now has a non-parliamentary striking force at its disposal which can be effective if the SPD and DGB leadership wish to use it.

TEST AHEAD

The question remains, of course, as to how the DGB leadership will react if and when the London agreement clears all hazards and Bonn attempts to organize an army. The projected army can only be fashioned by withdrawing workers from industry, since the pool of unemployed is now too small to supply the needed manpower.

The test of how serious the new DGB leadership is in its opposition to West German rearmament will come when it must back up its excellent resolution with deeds. And this moment may not be very far away.

Turning its attention to domestic issues, the Frankfurt congress of the DGB adopted a new program of economic demands containing the following important points: the right of the workers to a larger share of the national income (this means calling for a raising of the general wage level); wage increases in proportion to increases in productivity; and a five-day forty-hour week at the same rate of pay as the current 45-hour week.

To an American reader, this program may not appear very original or striking in the scope of its claims. But for the German workers to realize each and all of these demands will call for the most persistent kind of struggle against a well-organized and class-conscious bourgeoisie that yields nothing unless it is confronted by a superior power.

NEW LEADERSHIP

This fact was dramatically demonstrated in the recent wave of strikes that gripped all of Western Germany and involved every trade-union federation from the metal workers to government employees. For months before the strikes began in June and July, the workers had been negotiating fruitlessly for modest increases in the base wage rate and had seen their demands rejected by the employer groups.

The result was a wave of strikes that by early August involved more than four million workers and employees and had affected every branch of industry, communications and government. The determination of the workers not to accept the status quo had its effect on the employer groups, who finally yielded.

The new program was introduced and sponsored by Otto Brenner, president of the Metal Workers union with its one and a half million members, the largest and most influential of the 16 unions which make up the federation.

And behind this fact lies the story of the struggle that has been going on in the top leadership of the DGB. For Brenner symbolizes the new generation of trade-union leaders who are dissatisfied with the class-collaborationist, conciliatory policies of the old leadership.

It was the Metal Workers Union which initiated the great strike wave in June through some of its local unions in West Berlin and in Baden-Wurttemberg. From there, the Metal Workers later extended their actions to Bavaria and North Rhine-Westphalia. By July, the other unions had caught the fever and were prepared to follow the lead of the Metal Workers.

RIGHT-WING DEADHEADS

The action taken by the Metal Workers was in direct contradiction to the line laid down by the DGB central leadership at the beginning of the year. To catch the flavor of the thinking behind the old line, we have only to read a release issued by the DGB News Service on January 16, 1954, which reads:

"For some months and weeks now, sensible and responsible personalities have been attempting to create a favorable climate for negotiations between both social partners, the trade unions and the employers' associations. They are rightly of the view that a good relationship between both organizations is the premise for a continued beneficial and healthy development of social life in the Federal Republic."

U.S. Air Force Mag Smears SPD in McCarthyite Style

By D. EHRE

The West German socialist newspaper *Die Freiheit* of September 24 calls attention to a various attack on the Social-Democratic Party and the West German trade-union federation (DGB) which appears in the *Raider*, a pictorial magazine published by the U. S. Air Force Command for the officers and airmen stationed at the Landstuhl Air Base.

The main article in the September issue of this air force magazine deals with the activities of the Communist Party in Western Europe under the lurid title of "Conspiracy on the Continent." To show the GIs what the West Germans think of the Communists and how they are dealing with the problem, the article quotes some of the leading political figures active in the district of Kaiserlautern, where the air base is located.

Sepp Quarz, the local secretary of the Free Democratic Party, the right-wing party of German big business, is quoted as saying: "Communist agents are very effective and have already penetrated in all official governmental administrations, in the big industrial plants and in the Bonn government itself. Most of these agents have come into West Germany as refugees from Eastern Germany, and this makes the job of uncovering Communists all the more difficult."

Quarz laments the fact that the West Germans cannot send their people as refugees into the Eastern zone!

Speaking of the Communists and the SPD, Quarz declares that "A lot of Communists resigned since 1945 from their party and joined the Social-Democrats. It is they who form the dangerous left wing of the SPD. Communist ideology and that of the SPD are basically the same."

Then coming to the question of the DGB, Quarz felt that the Communist influence in the centralized trade unions was strong and deadly. He concluded his remarks by saying that "Trade Union boss Walter Freitag is the perfect Communist, though he of course does not belong to the Communist Party."

What was expressed in so outspoken and brazen a fashion by Quarz was repeated in more moderate fashion by the representative of Adenauer's CDU, Emil Demmerle.

Die Freiheit points out that the article does not report the views of the numerous Social-Democrats and trade-unionists who were also interviewed by the writer of "Conspiracy on the Continent."

What the DGB leadership meant by a "beneficial and healthy development" was made crystal-clear when in April the Executive Board recommended to its member unions that they "desist from agitating for wage increases and to accept the status quo in the interest of internal stability." (*N. Y. Times*, April 24, 1954.)

The passivity of the DGB leadership, its refusal to conduct any sort of a struggle for higher wages and against unemployment, resulted in an unhappy situation for the trade unions. During the last three-quarters of 1953, union membership had declined absolutely and relatively. In June 1953, for example, trade-union membership totaled 6,451,000 out of a labor force of 15,806,000. By September 1953 membership had declined by 15,000 while the West German labor force had increased to slightly more than 16 million. And the decline in trade-union membership continued through the early part of 1954.

By February 1954 not only were the trade unions losing members but the number of unemployed had risen to more than two million, and it seemed that the West German economy had reached the peak of its expansive climb.

It was this alarming condition which led to the crystallization of a new program for the trade unions sponsored by the Metal Workers Union at the very time when the DGB leadership was calling for a maintenance of the status quo.

WEAK THEORIES

The theoretician of the opposition in the top councils of the DGB is Dr. Victor Agartz, a staff member of the DGB's Research Institute in Cologne. In the December 1953 issue of the Research Institute's publication, Dr. Agartz pub-

lished an article under the title of "An Expansive Wage Policy."

In this article he came out in flat opposition to the official line of maintaining the status quo and gave all the reasons why the trade unions should demand higher wages. His main argument was that the West German economy was faltering and that an increase in consumer income was needed to maintain and extend the upward swing.

Although we don't have the space to deal with Dr. Agartz' theoretical exposition in detail, it is worth pointing out that it is modeled largely on the ideas and practices of the American trade unions, above all, the United Auto Workers. How weak and incorrect Dr. Agartz' reasoning is, the subsequent developments in West Germany have shown.

The expansion of the economy, based primarily on its exports and restoration of its heavy industry, not on an increase of domestic demand, has resumed, and has resulted at the present time in the virtual elimination of unemployment. Today the Bonn government is considering the importation of foreign workers to fill the manpower gap. Rearmament and the creation of a military force will give a further stimulus to the economy and create the danger of an inflationary situation.

Furthermore, the crucial question must arise: Who is to pay for this military program? The underconsumption theories of Dr. Agartz are already irrelevant to the issues confronting the West German labor movement.

PACE-SETTER

However, the fact that the economic situation rapidly altered for the better toward the middle of 1954 did not prevent Brenner and Agartz from pursuing their demands for a more militant trade-union policy. And more decisive is the fact that Brenner's Metal Workers Union has acted as the pace-setter for the entire organized movement in its struggle for higher wages. Brenner's call for the five-day forty-hour week has now become the official policy of the DGB.

In passing, readers will be interested to know that Brenner has called on the industrialists to open their books to workers' committees if and when they claim they can't meet the trade union's demands.

The new DGB leadership, represented by Brenner and Agartz, has saved the German trade unions from slow rot and disintegration and restored the militancy and self-confidence of the German working class. Their ability to lead the workers in struggle when the situation demands it has already been partially proved and is far more significant at the present time than the obvious weaknesses of their theoretical ideas. And with the continued expansion of the economy and a prospective labor shortage, the German working class is in a strong position to fulfill its demands.

HOW WILL THEY REACT?

How the new leadership will react to the larger political and social issues that face the German workers and the country as a whole remains to be seen. For example, will they raise the demand for a vote of the German people themselves on the rearmament deal? Such a slogan can be a powerful weapon to mobilize mass support. They cannot hope to restrict themselves to merely fighting for higher wages, a shorter work week or more social-security measures.

The creation of an army will provide the German bourgeoisie with a powerful instrument of repression. To counter this aggressive ruling class, the German workers must strive for control of the essential levers of economic and political power. That means, they must work to install a socialist government, for nationalization of the heavy industries, and for turning co-determination into an instrument of struggle instead of class-collaboration as it has been till now.

The resolution against rearmament and for the reunification of the country shows that they are aware of this. And if the record which the new DGB leadership has already established means anything, the German bourgeoisie is in for a very uncomfortable period of struggle in the days ahead.

YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

YOU and SCIENCE

SOCIALISM AND WEATHER CONTROL

By CARL DARTON

Can socialism change the weather? Recent experiences with such ravages of nature as the torrential rains and floods of the Midwest, the smog of the West Coast and Hurricane Hazel in the East have been thought-provoking. Just when man is acquiring ever-greater control over natural forces, and when the only problem appears to be how well he can control himself, nature breaks out of its course and sends him cringing before its fury.

But is it too utopian or far-fetched to ask whether socialism can do anything about it?

Today, when so much social and economic effort is wasted upon man-made destructive purposes, a socialist cannot help but feel that in a more rational society we would not need to be as subservient to the willful forces of nature as we are now.

It is relatively easy to make a case for this in the instance of the smog which has plagued Los Angeles daily for almost a month now. And this condition has been recurring and getting worse, year after year. This smog is said to be a combination of smoke and hydrocarbon particles which, with fog, under static air conditions, hangs heavy over the city.

"Over the city" is not entirely true. The smog comes down into the streets and houses and produces such irritating effects upon the eyes, nose and throat as to be almost insufferable. Though health authorities may state that the concentration of harmful particles is well below toxic limits, it is difficult for one who has been exposed to their depressive effect day after day to believe that it is doing him any good.

The death of an infant, suspected to be the result of the smog, does not help to comfort the people. Under the smog, public officials of Los Angeles and California mill around, hoping that the wind or rain will give a temporary respite at least.

Various explanations have been given for the smog, from the presence of such mammoth dams as Boulder high in the mountains which prevent the natural movements of air currents up the valleys and keep the air static over the city. But aside from uncertainty over the cause of the static air condition, it is apparent that smog would not occur if there were not such masses of combustible wastes given off by such man-made agencies as automobiles, oil refineries and other industrial plants, as well as backyard incinerators.

NOT EQUIPPED

There can be no disagreement that what man has made, he can unmake. But of all the adverse factors which contribute to the smog, each private interest resists doing any more to correct it than he is forced to. It comes down to the old question, who is going to bear the cost of socially desirable corrective measures.

While public agencies pass the buck, an ill-informed public stands apathetically and helplessly by, still gasping and coughing in the smog. This is another instance of how society today is not socially and politically equipped to deal with the economic and technical problems of our complex industrial civilization.

The heavy deluges during which the city of Chicago and its environs received

nine inches of rain within thirty-six hours—more than many grazing lands to the west receive in six months or a year—suggest another problem. But the dumping of rain clouds where they are needed, before they can cause deluges where they are unwanted, is not entirely in the realm of science-fiction. Man has made but weak efforts thus far to control rainfall, but enough has been done to indicate that much greater success is possible.

Rain-making by cloud-seeding has already become a profitable industry, but its full social use is seriously hindered by narrow regional economic interests. Thus, without common and equally shared social and economic goals and interests, science and technology does not have the opportunity to spread benefits over all.

As to Hurricane Hazel, we recently saw figures to prove that even if all or surmised existing H- and A-bombs were exploded in its path, they would be ineffective in diverting the storm into non-populated areas. But can anyone think of a better use for such bombs? Besides, it might save the consciences of untold scientists if their ill-begotten products were devoured by the hurricane.

Seriously, and without appearing to be taking demagogic advantage of the suffering of large numbers of people, we wish to make two rather obvious points regarding the weather, science and society:

- (1) Society today is poorly organized and ill equipped to help its members when they are harassed by the rampages of nature, even when science could help.
- (2) Science and technology today, as the result of antiquated political, economic and social concepts and relationships, have not been given half a chance to solve many of the broad problems encountered in man's struggle against nature.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, publication date Oct. 20:

- New World Writing No. 6*, Mentor, 50¢. J. B. Rossi: *Awakening*, Signet, 25¢. Louis Auchincloss: *A Law for the Lion*, Signet Giant, 35¢. Sara Harris: *The Wayward Ones*, Signet, 25¢. James Baldwin: *Go Tell It on the Mountain*, Signet, 25¢. B. S. Ballinger: *The Beautiful Trap*, Signet, 25¢. R. F. Mirvish: *A House of Her Own*, Signet Giant, 35¢. Mason & Ohanian: *God's Wonderful World*, Signet Key, 50¢. C. N. Heckelmann: *Hell in His Holsters*, Signet, 25¢.

Get All Your Books from
LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street, New York City

READ ABOUT SOCIALISM

The Fight for Socialism cloth \$2 paper \$1

by Max Shachtman

Socialism: the Hope of Humanity10

by Max Shachtman

Marxism in the U. S.35

by Leon Trotsky

Plenty for All: The Meaning of Socialism25

by Ernest Erber

The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism10

(LA Special Issue)

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street, New York City

Reading from Left to Right

H-Bombs and Hurricanes: Is There a Connection?

Apropos of the weather question discussed on this page by our science columnist Carl Darton, the New Statesman and Nation commented as follows on September 18:

The millions of people throughout the world who insist that there is something more than a coincidence between freakish weather and the H-bomb explosions are to have their suspicions investigated by the UN. Its specialized agency, the World Meteorological Organization, has instructed the secretariat to make a study and to call for relevant information from all member states, including the U. S. and the USSR. This is a remarkable concession to modern folklore by an organization of weather experts who have consistently poooh-pooed the suggestion that the bomb explosions have somehow triggered off atmospheric repercussions on a world scale. True, they have been prepared to concede that an

H-bomb explosion, equivalent to millions of tons of TNT, creates its own local weather, since its heat causes powerful upward currents as well as vaporizing sea water. Most meteorologists would, however, contend that even explosions of the size already made could not seriously disturb the weather system generally. There is a great mass of atmosphere around the earth, and it is held that a man-made explosion would be no more than pushing a thumb in a mattress. But there are factors other than explosive disturbance or heat and it has been argued that the scattering of radioactive particles in the upper atmosphere could provide the nuclei for rain formation and might even interfere with absorption of solar rays and the mechanism of weather generally. At the moment there is not enough evidence, consistently and scientifically acquired, to convince the weather men, but they have admitted the prima-facie case for an inquiry.

Scientist Says A-Bomb Slaughter Figure Was Faked

Speaking of atom bombs, Exposé (October) prints an old clipping which, it points out, was generally suppressed in the country's newspapers. The following item is from the Washington Daily News back in June:

LOS ANGELES, Calif., June 24—Atomic scientist Dr. Stafford L. Warren said that three to four times as many persons died in the Nagasaki and Hiroshima atomic bombing than was ever admitted.

Dr. Warren, medical director of the atomic energy project of U.C.L.A. and dean of its School of Medicine, said yes-

terday "the government wanted to minimize it (the deaths) because the truth is pretty fearful."

Dr. Warren declined to say whether he meant the government of the United States or of Japan. He spoke at a luncheon of trucking officials.

"The announced totals were something like 80,000 in each city, but there actually were three to four times as many persons killed," he said.

Dr. Warren said he visited the devastated cities after the bombings and talked with police and civic officials before making his own estimate of the totals.

Earl Browder Exposes Dewey, Taft—and Browder

I. F. Stone's Weekly (Oct. 18) carries an article by Earl Browder on the anti-Communist witchhunt in which the ex-CP leader makes the point that, in the palmy days of the People's Front and the wartime honeymoon (but not during the Stalin-Hitler Pact), association with his good Communists did not make "respectable" people shudder. The piquant parts of his piece deal with the shady past of Dewey and Taft. In 1938 Taft spoke together with Browder before the American Youth Congress, now on the subversive list. As for Dewey, in the following story it is difficult to decide whether Browder is exposing himself or Dewey:

In 1937 an ambitious and able young Republican named Thomas E. Dewey made his first election campaign for the position of District Attorney of New York County, traditionally strongly Democratic. His organization felt the

need to gather votes wherever they were to be found, and solicited Communist support. The issue came to me, and I said, of course, support Dewey. This was done through a Trade Union Committee, headed by a well-known Communist named Louis Weinstock. When Dewey won the election that committee gave him a "victory banquet," at which he was photographed arm-in-arm with the toastmaster, Weinstock.

Of course, Dewey was as innocent in this association as Oppenheimer was in his which began about the same time, though the motive was different. It was a political marriage without love on either side, purely one of expediency. Dewey got his office, and the Communists got some racketeer enemies cleaned out of the New York Painters and the Food Workers Union, which enabled us, together with our allies, to lead these unions for the next eight years.

Not in the Headlines

CLIPPINGS

FORT BENNING, Ga., Oct. 9 (AP)—Dr. Francis E. Jones wants to make a more efficient killer out of the U. S. soldier.

In his opinion a serviceman who uses two bullets to kill one man is 50 per cent off.

A psychologist on loan from George Washington University to the army, Dr. Jones is evolving and testing methods to make more competent killers. . . .

MANILA, Oct. 18 (AP)—The Philippine Army has banned showing of the Hollywood film "Viva Zapata," starring Marlon Brando, in Cebu City and other provincial towns on grounds it tends to endanger the security of the state.

INDIANAPOLIS, Oct. 21 (AP)—Professional boxers and wrestlers must take a non-Communist oath hereafter before they can appear in Indiana rings.

This was decreed today by Arch Hindman, executive secretary of the State Athletic Commission. He said new license application forms now being printed will carry this question:

"Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party or any organization which advocates the overthrow of the American form of government?"

FBI NOTES

From a Pittsburgh paper we glean an item about the Pittsburgh chapter of the Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI, Inc.

From that description it would appear that this is a national organization—perhaps, indeed, the liveliest political movement in the country.

To get back to Pittsburgh, however, we wish to report that the chapter elected new officers. Their occupations are piquant. All of them work for big corporations. One is an industrial relations director; another is a security director. The other two are assistant vice-president and treasurer of their corporations, respectively.

Don't FBI agents do any honest work even when they graduate?

SUBSCRIBERS—ATTENTION!

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

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

18-44

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

RENEW NOW!



LABOR ACTION

November 1, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 44

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

Assistant Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Arab Student Conference Adopts Radical Program Planks

On September 14-17, 1954 there was held in London a conference of Arab students which had been organized by the Arab Student Union in the United Kingdom. While we know little about this particular organization and its politics, we are certain that the views which this conference adopted reflect the thinking of many Middle Eastern students; they will be of interest to readers of Challenge. We therefore present below excerpts from the programmatic statement of the conference.

We note that the resolutions of the conference are vague on the question of precisely how to achieve the progressive developments which these students desire, as well as in regard to the social forces and political movements they look to for their achievement. Not included among the excerpts below is the statement of these Arab students on Israel, which regrettably seems to express the perspective of a second round of war against that country. For a discussion of this question see the exchange of views between Clovis Maksoud and Hal Draper in previous issues of LABOR ACTION.—Editor.

I. NATIONAL

(3) All citizens who have lived in the Arab homeland and worked in its interest have equal rights. Arab unity cannot be achieved by means of schemes formulated by politicians in the interest of imperialism, but by its natural course—the people's struggle for liberation and unity.

(4) One of the great obstacles to Arab progress is the wide gap between the people and the ruling class.

The Arab people, therefore, resent any form of government not based on true and genuine representation of the people themselves and chosen, in complete freedom, by them.

(5) The conference recognizes that the present economic situation in the Arab homeland is the main cause of our social problems and of the great gap that separates the working class from that class which has gathered, illegally, the national wealth in its hands and at the expense of the people. The conference, therefore, considers the following steps essential:

(a) The abolition of feudalism and the reconsideration of the distribution of the national wealth.

(b) The nationalization of all monopolies, foreign and local and the protection of Arab wealth against foreign exploitation.

(c) The planning of the national economy in such a way as to encourage production.

(d) The provision of a suitable standard of living for all citizens.

(6) The latest Anglo-Egyptian agreement did not fulfill the national aspirations of the Arab people in Egypt, and in other parts of the Arab homeland, for their complete freedom and liberation from their bonds of imperialism.

(10) The conference stands for the liberation of women from the injustice of our present society, and for their obtaining the full rights of citizens and hence giving them a role in the building up of our future society.

II. INTERNATIONAL

(1) *Adopting the Policy of Neutrality.*

The Arab Student Conference resolves that whatever policy the Arabs may adopt in the international field should be inspired by the Arab people's welfare. The Arab people did not benefit by being involved in the present international struggle; besides, we believe that our people do love peace, and do not like to have their countries a field for another destroying war. Thus we consider that "Neutrality" toward that international struggle is the only guarantee for our people's welfare, and the fulfillment of their hopes for independence, freedom, and prosperous life.

(2) *Liberation and Independence Movement*

We as Arabs consider the liberation of our nation our primary duty, and that the struggle in any part of the Arab homeland for liberation and independence is part of our struggle as a whole. Thus we support and participate in any liberating movement against foreign influence, and for achieving our full freedom, unity and a prosperous life for our people.

In the meantime we, as a nation which suffered such foreign influence and rule in its most cruel and unjust forms, do

support all the movements in the world which aim at freedom, independence, and prosperity for enslaved nations.

(3) *International Treaties and Pacts*

We, the conferees, regardless of our different beliefs and opinions, believe in friendship among all the peoples of the world; and in the necessity of their cooperation, based on mutual benefits and equality. Thus we support such friendship and cooperation; and furthermore we believe that it is far better for our countries to establish commercial and economical relations, if necessary, with countries which have no imperialistic ambitions in our homeland.

In the meantime, however, we struggle against all international pacts and agreements which aim at depriving us of our own wealth, and tying us with imperialistic and enslaving powers, or employing our potentialities and youth for another world war. We declare our definite intention not to acknowledge any agreement which enslaves us and converts our homeland into a satellite of big imperialist powers.

(4) *Economical, Technical, and Military Offers*

The old methods of imperialism have been known to our people through their continuous struggle for their independence. Today, the same imperialist powers, with the very same intentions, are trying to conceal those intentions by new forms of approach; in order to remain in their positions in our homeland, robbing its wealth and employing its potentialities for their own good.

A modern face of imperialism are those military, economical and technical offers which such imperialist powers are employing today, in order to dominate and benefit from our national wealth. Those technicians and military experts are only the preliminary missions to look for agents, and prepare their ways for their influence. Therefore, we, as citizens who resent imperialism in all its forms, object to any acceptance of such offers, which conceal the real intentions of imperialism.

III. CULTURAL

(2) Enough universities, scientific and technical institutions should be established to meet the policy of compulsory and free education in its three stages, in order to create a new generation capable of carrying the responsibilities for civilizing and progressing the Arab world. Coeducation should also be encouraged in the primary schools.

(3) All possible means should be employed for the elimination of illiteracy.

(4) The conference express their protest against the French imperialist attempts to suppress the Arabic language in North Africa.

YSL Class in N. Y.

WEDNESDAYS
at 7:30 p.m.

Nov. 3—Labor Party

Nov. 10—Workers' Control of Industry

Nov. 17—Socialist Perspectives

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

AT UCLA—

Civil-Liberties Campus Group Emerges from Oath Fight

By RALPH HODGES

LOS ANGELES, Oct. 24 — The first phase in the struggle against the new ROTC loyalty oath is now over at UCLA. By official count there were four non-signers, and sixteen others who qualified their statements in some way: either by admitting past or present membership in one of the listed organizations, or "association" with one of the groups deemed to be "subversive," or by pleading the First or Fifth Amendments.

The disposition of these latter cases is now to be left up to the Department of Defense and, by implication, to the FBI.

Meanwhile, these twenty young men are now enrolled "informally" in ROTC, which means that while they will receive units and matriculation credit for ROTC, they will not be allowed to carry guns nor wear the uniform in drill.

Thus the fight against the oath itself has suspended for the time being and it has not ended with a victory for civil-libertarian forces. Now, however, the issue has shifted to the question of ROTC itself and also to the broader question of student rights and civil liberties as a whole.

Within a week or two a definite organized move will be made to hold an initiative vote among the UCLA student body on the question of the desirability of compulsory ROTC. If the initiative should succeed, then the Student Legislative Council will be required to send a letter to the University of California Regents demanding the withdrawal of compulsory ROTC from the university.

SUCCESSFUL MEETING

Although it is doubtful that the Regents will accede to the demand, it is important to note that Defense Department interference in the affairs of the university (both in the ROTC case and in the issue of army "clearance" of university professors who teach military personnel) has been very hostilely received by the Regents. There is a chance that some pressure might be exerted to have the rider to the appropriations bill, which set up the oath, dropped. In any case there now exists the possibility of involving many parts of the community over the issue of compulsory ROTC and the encroachment of military influence in the sphere of the hitherto freer university world.

Probably the most encouraging development at UCLA which resulted from the ROTC loyalty oath issue has been the formation of an organization for the establishment of a local American Civil Liberties Union unit which will take in students,

faculty members, alumni and university employees, as well as residents of the Westwood area where the university is located. A very successful meeting was recently held at which more than 45 people—including faculty members, graduate students and undergraduates—attended in order to discuss the setting up of the local ACLU.

The main speaker was Paul Jacobs, ACLU board member and union negotiator, who spoke about the general state of civil liberties in the United States and also about the function and policies of the ACLU. Edgar Warren, director of the Institute of Industrial Relations, chaired the meeting.

In the main, the local unit will function as an educational group; however, through the maintenance of liaison with the local group, the main office of the Southern California ACLU (to whom the local unit is directly responsible) will be able to exert direct pressure upon the university administration and will provide a needed link with the general community. Past experience has demonstrated that the best weapon against the repressive measures undertaken by the administration is that of publicity and general community protest.

Thus, for perhaps the first time since the academic loyalty oath issue, a real basis now exists at UCLA for the formation of an effective civil-liberties organization.

The YSL's Aim

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

JOIN THE YSL NOW!

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

114 West 14 Street

New York 11, New York

I want more information about the Young Socialist League.

I want to join the Young Socialist League.

NAME

ADDRESS

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

SCHOOL IF ANY

TWO REASONS WHY THE 'NEW LOOK' WORE OFF RUSSIAN WRITERS INDICT THE REGIME

By S. ABRAMS

Several weeks ago, LABOR ACTION carried a highly enlightening chronology of the Kremlin's swift retreat from its new policy of relative freedom for the creative writer [October 4: "The Literary GPU in Russia]. What the facts show can hardly be disputed.

Once again the regime has bound the creative writer in the total straitjacket of official censorship and dictation from above. As is always the case in affairs of this kind, a bloodless purge of no small dimensions has decimated the ranks of those responsible for order in the literary world and silenced the voices of those foolish enough to take the new line seriously.

Editors of such literary magazines as *October* and *New World* have been dismissed, members of the Union of Soviet Writers have been expelled, and wholesale denunciation of "anti-social writers" has filled the columns of those literary newspapers *Pravda* and *Izvestia*.

While this regressive development will no doubt cause pain to the apologists for the new democratically-minded Malenkov regime à la Isaac Deutscher, we are more interested in observing at close range the contents of the works that incurred the titanic wrath of the Kremlin hierarchy. Where there is smoke, there must be fire.

If Malenkov & Company were frightened in so short a time by what came to the surface, perhaps they have good reasons. Perhaps this is a case where we are confronted, not by a non-existent "socialist realism" but by plain, ordinary realism, an accurate and faithful reflection of the grim realities of Russian life.

What we have especially in mind is the furious reaction of the regime to a play *Guests* by L. Sorin, which appeared in the second issue of the magazine *Theatre*. The attacks launched against Ehrenburg for his trivial fantasy on the woes of a creative artist are a mild summer breeze compared to the lightning and thunder which Sorin's piece evoked. When we read the criticisms of this play in the official journals, we are not surprised. Sorin's drama is a head-on attack on the bureaucratic ruling class.

The plot of the play is fairly simple. A jurist by the name of Kirpitschev, who works and lives in Moscow, takes his family off for a visit to his relatives in the country. In the course of the play, deep-going antagonisms between Peter Kirpitschev and his father and sister come to light and finally lead to a complete break. The causes of the rupture are worth a detailed presentation.

Ruling Class in the Pillory

Kirpitschev is not merely a jurist, a functionary; he is, according to his father and sister, a corrupt bureaucrat. Peter's father criticizes his son with the authority of an Old Bolshevik. He is depicted as a companion-in-arms of Dzhherzhinsky and a "Hero of the First Five-Year Plan."

To his son he says, "The country became stronger and wealthier. And then besides the tireless, industrious worker there appeared, unnoticed, gradually, such people as you, well-fed, arrogant bureaucrats, who have lost all contact with the people."

In itself, criticism and exposure of a bureaucrat, or bureaucratism as such—*Literaturnaya Gazeta* of May 27, 1954 points out—would not at all be an unhealthy theme for a drama. After all, the regime day-in-day-out conducts such a struggle against the bureaucrats who have betrayed their trust. But, it says, what must be understood is that such traits as the heartless and selfish Peter Kirpitschev exemplifies are hangovers from the days of capitalist barbarism, and the state is devoted to their destruction.

But, says *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, the dramatist Sorin is only interested in presenting the dark, negative side of Russian life. And his explanation for the existence of bureaucratic corruption is a defamation of the Russian people and its state. For his sister Barbara finds the source of this corruption in Russian society itself: She says: "It is contained in one word—power." And *Litera-*

turnaya Gazeta adds: "The high functionaries in ours, the most democratic of countries, who enjoy the confidence of the toilers and serve them, corrupt everything therefore because—they are functionaries. . . ."

Literaturnaya Gazeta carries the argument one step further and says: "In Barbara's statements the tendency comes to light that sees in the careerists and bureaucrats something similar to an intermediate layer in our society."

And the truth is that this idea is presented not only by the critics of the bureaucrat and bureaucracy, but by Kirpitschev himself. In defending his own cruel behavior toward ordinary people Kirpitschev says: "It is a harsh piece of work to hold a responsible post. . . . One may want to be soft and kind, but it is really impossible. The mechanism of the state is, don't you know, like an orchestra. If you want to play along with it, then you have to go along with the rhythm, keep time with the beat."

At this point, *Literaturnaya Gazeta* interjects: "For Kirpitschev, this notion of the state as a cold, blind, leveling force is natural. The dramatist had the duty to destroy this calumny, to expose it and through the logic of his figures to refute it. But in fact, the dramatist hides behind them and the conversation is broken off with a remark by Peter's wife, who, apropos of her husband's self-defense, says, 'How profound that is,' and shifts the conversation to another theme."

The limits of the "new freedom" under Malenkov, then, are exactly the same as those under Stalin. Every novel, drama or poem dealing with social themes must have a "positive hero" and whatever criticisms are directed at this or that feature of Russian life must be attributed to capitalist hangovers, remnants of bourgeois ideology, against which the Russian state fights mercilessly.

Realism Is a Crime

But perhaps if the novelist or dramatist is not permitted the right to extend the range of his public criticisms, may he find solace in depth, by treating of the purely private joys and woes of everyday life? Here too the regime has reverted to the old pattern.

The function of literature must be to create an ideal image of the all-powerful state on which the happiness and well-being of each individual depends. The idea that the individual may have a life separate and apart from the state, that he may pursue goals which can bring him in conflict with the state, is, in a totalitarian society, a subversive one.

This is the substance of the regime's attack on Vera Panova and her novel *Seasons of the Year*.

When this novel first appeared in the spring of this year, it was highly praised by such critics as P. Gromov in *Svezda* and Marietta Schaginyan in the March 28 issue of *Izvestia*. Both Gromov and Schaginyan were delighted with the novel precisely because it dealt with ordinary life in an honest fashion.

Marietta Schaginyan could find no higher words of praise than to say that "Nowhere in her novel does Vera Panova fall to moralizing." And as a foreign critic has observed, this means she does not mouth the official ideology.

Gromov in his turn summarized the heart of the novel in the following fashion:

"People fall in love and marry; if they don't get along, they separate; children are born, and they must be educated; young boys and girls finish high school or they don't have the material means to do so. They go to the university or they go to work; they leave the university or their jobs; people celebrate birthdays and the New Year; they think of how to increase their wages and to get more living space; people amuse themselves, expect a child or accompany their dear departed ones to the graveyard."

The delight of Gromov and Schaginyan was short-lived. A detailed criticism of Vera Panova's novel appeared on May 27 in that great literary organ *Pravda*, which also happens to be the official organ of the ruling state party.

As in Sorin's case, *Pravda* accuses Panova of paying "too much attention to the shadowy sides of the Soviet reality." Furthermore, "The heroes of this novel do not exhibit the characteristic features of our exceptional time."

To describe the ordinary cycle of the seasons, of the change from spring to summer, from fall to winter, what does that matter! Only a petty-bourgeois literature, says the *Pravda* critic, is concerned with ordinary people. "Our writers are called upon to present in positive artistic form the people of the new type in the whole: exalted magnitude of their human value." But such people are not present in Panova's novel.

One of the leading figures in the novel is the student, Seryosha, who suffers from tuberculosis. Seryosha keeps a diary which is filled with comments on his infatuations, his love-poems and his day-to-day experiences.

Rarely do any remarks on the official reality intrude. And this, of course, is one of the crimes committed by Panova.

Seryosha's father is an official who occupies important positions in the economy and the party. While Brotashevitch, Seryosha's father, is at first presented sympathetically, he is exposed in the final section of the novel as a selfish careerist. And not only Seryosha's father but other grown-up responsible people are presented as self-seekers who perpetually betray their trust.

A whole series of party and state functionaries are shown in the act of aggrandizing or advancing their own fortunes. One has built himself a villa at the expense of the city administration. Another toadies before those who are more powerful than himself. A third gets rid of those subordinates who refuse to knuckle under to his slightest whim.

One example will suffice. Tschurkin, the mayor of the city in which the novel is laid, goes out of his way to build a house for a general who is writing his memoirs. The general complains he cannot write in peace at home because his daughter's family is growing—she has just had twins. The general needs another house and he gets it.

These descriptions of the seamy life of the ruling class is what *Pravda* means when it complains that Panova is too interested in describing the "shadowy side of Soviet reality." To describe ordinary people and ordinary things in glowing terms, and at the same time write critically of the commanding heights, to honestly present private virtues as against public vices, this is a serious crime against the official ideology.

The Danger of Relaxation

While it is impossible to generalize from only two literary works, it is interesting to note that implicit in the criticisms of both Sorin and Panova is a conflict of the generations. In Panova's novel the older people who run Russian society are seen through the disillusioned eyes of young people. Of course, Panova may not have intended this, or did not want to draw the line too sharply, since she also has as one of her symbols of corruption a young person who plays an important part in the novel. The parents of this Gennadyi are depicted as devoted and honest Communists.

In Sorin's play *Guests*, one of the chief critics of Kirpitschev, and by implication of the entire bureaucracy, is his father, the old Bolshevik-Stalinist. Because of his unimpeachable revolutionary past, Kirpitschev's father can denounce his son in the name of the old socialist ideals.

We might add, to borrow a phrase from Oscar Wilde, that life sometimes imitates art. The criticisms hurled against Kirpitschev by his father are very reminiscent of a scene from Gregory Klimov's autobiographical book *Berlin Kremlin*. At one point in his book, Klimov has a Russian general go on a visit to his peasant father in the countryside. A conflict similar to that presented by Sorin takes place.

Another critic of Russian society is described by Sorin, Kirpitschev's sister Barbara. She is described by *Literaturnaya Gazeta* as standing outside the mainstream of Russian society, adopting a completely negative attitude toward the ruling strata.

The sudden and spontaneous outburst of genuine, creative attempts to depict the grim Russian reality as it is, reveals how little we truly know about what goes on inside Russian society. Despite more than two decades of terror and material corruption, we can see that there exist writers of genuine integrity who are morally revolted by the arrogance and cruelty of the ruling class. All the regime has to do is to relax ever so slightly its severe control over the writer and it is immediately confronted by a sweeping indictment of its misrule.

In the words of Sorin's character, the source of corruption lies in one word "power," the power of the bureaucracy.

What would happen if the Malenkov regime were to relax its controls to an even greater degree? The question is superfluous since the regime has decided that the slightest degree of "freedom" is so graciously granted is much too dangerous.

And here we can say that literature reflects reality. For what the regime has been compelled to do in the literary sphere, it will have to do in other spheres of Russian life where it has relaxed the totalitarian terror and oppression.

Intellectuals, writers and poets do not invent their themes and the feelings they present. If this is how these more privileged members of Russian society feel, what must be the emotions of the masses, the feelings of those who are hidden from us by the blinding lights of the official literature?



The CERTIFICATION of HARRISON SALISBURY

By HAL DRAPER

Let's pick up the question of the meaning of Harrison Salisbury, as already excellently sketched by our contributor A. Stein (October 11: "Salisbury and Russian Slave Labor.")

It has been an interesting phenomenon, this series of articles on "Russia Re-Viewed" by the returned Moscow correspondent of the N. Y. Times. We propose here to look into Salisbury's third article of September 21, and then to look behind it.

This article presumed to be the true and untold story of how Beria seized Moscow right after Stalin's death and then let it go. The evidence for this story was Salisbury's own eyes; he saw it happen. It is either the biggest journalistic scoop of the century, or the biggest hoax, or—something else. We shall show that it is neither a scoop nor merely a hoax.

Salisbury started off his story with a pithy lead: "For about 78 hours in March of last year, Lavrenti Pavlovich Beria held Russia in the hollow of his pudgy hand. He was supreme. There was no one who could challenge him—not Malenkov, not Khrushchev, not Molotov, not the army.

"At any moment within those fateful hours, Beria might have proclaimed himself dictator, all-supreme ruler of Russia, heir of Stalin.

"He did not do so, and in that failure to act he sealed his own fate. . . ."

The scoop would seem to be clear. How does Salisbury know this happened? He explains that he "is in possession of an almost complete picture of what occurred in Moscow in the hours immediately after the official announcement of Stalin's death."

This "almost complete picture" he got from riding around the streets of Moscow in the Times staff car, he explains.

A Quirk in Red Square

He explains in detail that at 4 a.m. on March 6, when the Moscow radio announced Stalin's death, he was keeping vigil at the Central Telegraph Office. The night was quiet. His chauffeur got the flash on the car radio and told him. He and the other reporters filed bulletins but the wires were completely blocked for 3½ hours. During this hiatus Salisbury "made several tours of the city." Nothing in particular was happening.

But from 6 a.m. on, he describes how MVD troops took over the city. Truck convoys converged quietly on the city center, each with a detachment of MVD soldiers; gradually they accumulated in a pattern in the open squares. By 9 "there were thousands of troops in the central part of the city and great lines of trucks. Columns of tanks had also made their appearance on upper Gorky Street." They all bore the MVD insignia. There was a crowd in Red Square, collected to see Stalin's body brought out of the Kremlin; MVD police slowly cleared the square and adjacent spaces. All traffic was brought to a halt in the heart of the city. All the main streets and arteries of the city were lined, cordoned, barricaded by thousands of troops, plus trucks and tanks. "There was an iron collar around Moscow's heart" up to 4 p.m. on March 9. "During those hours not one person entered or left the center of Moscow without leave of the MVD command, Beria's command."

But "by one of those strange quirks of fate," Salisbury and his Times car was an exception. Since the Times office in the Hotel Metropole was "right in the heart of this dead area," since the car had been operating since the small hours of the morning and was within this area, then—

" . . . by one of those strange quirks of fate, it continued to operate within the closed ring during all those hours, molested and threatened repeatedly by the MVD but somehow continuing to pass through the seven police lines that barred the way. . . ."

At this point we must expect the scoop, for certainly up to now Salisbury has been describing a scene which, by its very terms, was known to all citizens and all correspondents. Apparently no one was surprised. As we shall see, not even Salisbury thought anything peculiar was happening, considering that the event was the death of Stalin. The dictator who topped the hierarchical structure lay dead; No. 1 was gone; anything might happen in this straightjacketed totalitarianism; the jittery heirs in the Kremlin had reason to fear vengeance and hatred; a network of MVD troops lay over the people of the city—what could be a more natural reaction on the part of the tyrants on top?

Smash Climax

But the scoop does not come. For Salisbury has absolutely nothing else to report, in spite of the "strange quirk of fate." On the contrary, his further account makes his lead paragraphs seem stranger and stranger.

For the reader has been led to believe he is reading about a coup d'etat, or attempted coup d'etat or near-coup d'etat. Yet we have already seen that the Times car and the not-unknown Salisbury circulated pretty freely within the very lines of the MVD pincer that held Moscow in its dread iron grasp. It was stopped "repeatedly" by MVD guards, but each time permitted to continue wandering about, presumably after the

MVD guards found out that it was only a harmless American reporter who was moseying around inside the "iron collar."

Salisbury's theory was that this was a "strange quirk of fate." He does not mention the alternative hypothesis that nothing particular was happening and that the MVD guards simply didn't care.

This strange scoop continues in the same way. The very next "exclusive" vignette we get is two days later, March 8: "Not long after dawn, I left the Metropole Hotel and made my way past sleepy sentry lines, past curbside campfires, where some troops were whiling away hours, playing accordions and stamping out tunes with their soft leather boots. . . ."

All this while Beria is holding Russia "in the hollow of his pudgy hand . . . supreme," etc., but his embattled troops in Moscow are dancing to keep boredom away. . . . Not only that, but Salisbury is on his way to the railway station to check on a rumor, and nobody is paying him a never-mind. It is a very disconcerting coup.

Moreover, at the railway station he finds that "All trains out of Moscow were running, but no trains into Moscow. . . ." From this, amazingly, he concludes that "Moscow was a city truly sealed off. . . ."

Right after this, comes a real adventure: "Later that day, by dint of simply walking past the sentry posts with a resolute air, I strolled right into Red Square."

It has the very flavor of E. Phillips Oppenheim, the derring-do of a spy picture by Hitchcock.

Salisbury is coming to the smash climax. He is in the heart of the heart, now. What secrets will elude his steely eye? He looks around him in Red Square. All is "deathly quiet." But is he fooled? No.

True, the square is deserted. There are guards at all the entrances to the Kremlin, so he can't get in there, even with a resolute air. But hark! something is happening—some workmen are busily chiseling the name of Stalin on the stone of the Mausoleum. Salisbury pulls out his resolute air, cocks it, and—

"A colonel of the MVD was supervising the work. Beria's colonel. I strolled over and watched idly. No one paid any attention. . . ."

Mitty-Type Scoop

AND THEN IT HAPPENED! Like a bolt from the blue—it took place—exclusively in Salisbury's presence—with no other reporters around—the event which is the basis for the whole article.

A thought struck him.

Or as he puts it with such seeming nonchalance, "It was then that the thought struck home so sharply."

This, in fact, is why no other correspondent in Moscow ever got the sensational story. Because the event took place within Salisbury's skull.

Reporters have prayed for natural scoops like this, but to few is it given.

The blinding thought that strikes him in the "deathly quiet" of Red Square is that the troops controlling the city belong to the MVD, only the MVD. This is a new thought for him? Not exactly. He starts imagining: Suppose army troops wanted in? Why, they could enter only with MVD permission or by fighting their way street by street through the barricades."

He imagines the air force challenging the MVD "grip": No, he shakes his head (standing there thunderstruck in the deathly quiet of Red Square while the MVD colonel watches workmen tapping on stone)—no, planes would be "perfectly useless." Suppose the planes bomb the city to "rubble"? No (he decides, as this terrific battle for Moscow is fought out while the MVD colonel yawns and lights another cigarette), even bombing the city to rubble wouldn't break the MVD's "grip."

The Beria revolution gets even more exciting. Suppose the men in the Kremlin wanted to leave right now? Could they get out? No (he thinks acutely to himself, as the MVD colonel scratches his bald head), no, they'd have to get Beria's permission, that's what.

There is a final crushing argument that sweeps away all doubt: If I can understand this (he thinks), then of course Malenkov & Co. are just as smart: "It was not likely that the men in the Kremlin had failed to note that they were, in effect, the prisoners of the MVD."

Alternative Fantasy

. . . Well, enough of this tomfoolery. We have seen Salisbury's scoop. It is at this point that insensibly the point of Salisbury's article begins to shift away from the conclusion so boldly announced, apparently, in the lead paragraphs. He veers away from expressions which might imply that Beria really had pulled a coup. He begins to imply that the events merely showed all of a sudden what he MIGHT have done if he had wanted to.

We get the suggestion of an alternative fantasy by Salisbury. For the first time Beria's colleagues realized—or must have realized—how powerful the MVD is. It is implied that somehow those naive colleagues had never quite grasped before how they were at Beria's mercy. And what was Beria himself doing? He himself hadn't realized what he represented, so "he overplayed his hand so badly at a moment when he was not prepared to strike for full mastery of Russia. Perhaps he did not fully realize the impression he would make on his colleagues."

These laughable remarks are presented seriously. The reader must have believed at the beginning of the article that he was reading an account of an MVD move made unbeknown to and behind the backs of Malenkov. Now it turns out (by suggestion, alternatively) that nothing of the sort happened. The MVD did only what it was supposed to do. Then how did Beria "overplay his hand"? It does not matter, because the whole thing is a fantasy.

As a matter of fact, Salisbury himself mentions that the mass deployment of the MVD troops on this occasion used "the basic movement plans that twice a year for many years had been employed on May Day and on Nov. 7. . . ." But somehow that old fox Stalin had never gotten the point of it all.

Furthermore, the thought apparently occurs to Salisbury: how about the argument that the party controls the MVD, and not the one man Beria? He gives himself away with the ignorant, crude, flat assertion: "the MVD was not just a group of initials. It was not just a department of the government. It was an individual." Few observers of the Russian reality are so vulgar.

Besides, hadn't it been speculated that Beria was no longer even top dog in the MVD any more? With the consistency of fantasy, Salisbury merely asserts that "it is also likely that he had only in the final hours of Stalin's life regained full and unchallenged control over the MVD." No evidence either way, but it doesn't matter. Two sentences later, this changes to the flat statement, "Beria got back his MVD."

Further evidence? At Stalin's bier, Salisbury detected in Beria's speech that "he sounded just a little condescending" toward the other top tyrants. It must have been in his tone or the tilt of his pince-nez, for there is no evidence adduced.

So, since Beria had shown himself too dangerous to his fellow dictators, his end had to come.

Certified by Moscow

The whole article from start to finish is a ridiculous farce, if taken at face value. That in itself would not be noteworthy. It merely points to what one had a right to suspect before, with regard to Salisbury. To put it brutally but with scientific precision, Salisbury is a political idiot.

In this respect Salisbury is not unique, but even on this field there is a unique distinction which he does enjoy. It is worth mentioning since it is a prerequisite for his more important role.

We remind readers how Salisbury got into his post as Moscow correspondent of the Times. The Times had been having some trouble keeping a correspondent in that capital. When it sent in correspondents who understood a bit about the ABC of politics, the Kremlin made it too hot for them, as it easily could. But when Salisbury came in, he stuck. He became the heir to the tradition of Walter Duranty, that other political idiot who had made a career out of a peculiar relationship to the Kremlin as correspondent.

The situation was analogous to the bouncing of Kennan as U. S. ambassador. It has often been argued that Kennan was *persona non grata* because he was simply too knowledgeable. We are ready to believe that. The Kremlin has followed the same pattern with the N. Y. Times' ambassadors.

What kind of Times correspondent does the Kremlin want? A pro-Stalinist? Such a theory would be downright silly. They have shown themselves willing to settle for something less, yet more useful in certain respects: a political idiot. Salisbury's tenure in Moscow shows that he was tested and classified. As we said, there are many political idiots around, but few who can accurately and provably be described as Certified Political Idiot. Moscow possesses this classifying service.

The Meaning of Salisbury

But this is only what makes Salisbury's role possible. And Salisbury's role has already been indicated by Comrade Stein. It would be a big mistake to believe or even suspect that Salisbury is a concealed Stalinoid, or crypto-Stalinist, as has been suggested on occasion by some New Leader writers and others.

Moscow has a whole stable of characters whose political function in various countries is to act as distribution agencies for pro-Stalinist propaganda (in addition to the open Stalinist propagandists). But Salisbury is not properly among these either.

Like Walter Duranty in his time, Salisbury can perform his function only as an anti-Stalinist. His function is to act as conveyor-belt for installing illusions about Stalinism in the minds of anti-Stalinists.

The impact of his series of articles as a whole is to implant, foster, nourish and strengthen illusions about the character of the new Malenkov regime in the opinions of staunch, immovable, ignorant ANTI-Stalinists—like the majority of American intellectuals, let alone the American people.

This function is directed to people who would not even read two lines of an article that seemed to be kind to the Russians, as well as people who might read it only to scoff; to people who would not believe a word of what they read on such a subject even (say) in the Nation.

This is no esoteric "conspiracy" theory. It is a very plain gambit, long known to manipulators of public opinion in every country. The Kremlin has a line, which, it is well known, it wishes to suggest to its enemies, an opinion to be held of the new Malenkov regime: the opinion that this post-Stalin regime is softer, susceptible to democratic ideas, more honorable, an important change from Stalin.

How does Salisbury's fantasy about Beria's 78 hours accomplish this? The answer is plain.

One of the biggest blows, perhaps the biggest single blow, to the illusion that the Malenkov regime is a regime of more democratically-minded gentlemen who were simply revolted by Stalin's crimes and who are yearning to bring a free air into Russia, was the fate of Beria.

The poor lambs, freed from Stalin's horrible dic-

(Turn to last page)

The German Pact — —

(Continued from page 1)

The agreement on the Saar, for instance, has a clause prohibiting agitation for a change in its status in either France or Germany. Once a plebiscite is held, Saarlanders themselves are prohibited from agitating against a change in the status of the territory.

This is, of course, an infringement of the civil liberties and political freedoms of Germans, Frenchmen and Saarlanders. But quite aside from that, the agreement has been worked out on the assumption that the plebiscite will approve of the "internationalization" of the Saar as an economic appendage of France. If the citizens of the territory should vote to reject this idea (and they presumably will have full political freedom during the election) the Adenauer-Mendès-France agreement has no provision as to what would be done.

The immediate uncertainties are of this order. Of course, the long-range uncertainties are far more grave. These revolve around the whole question of what kind of Germany will evolve in the event of rearmament under present circumstances, and the diplomatic course which would be pursued by Germany once she has been rearmed. (See LABOR ACTION for October 11.)

The most serious indictment of the Paris

treaty is that it introduces nothing new into the equation of a decaying Western Europe. No new social forces are aroused or liberated, and no institutional framework is created which could give the old continent a new lease on life. Europe continues under the domination of the United States as the chief prize and battleground of the cold war between the U. S. and Russia.

UNSTABLE DEAL

This was most clearly spelled out in the controversy between Dulles and Mendès-France over the latter's demand that the Western European Union be given control over the distribution of American military aid to its various members.

Mendès-France's motive in this was to give France a controlling voice, or at least a good measure of control and supervision over the flow of arms from the United States to Germany. But at least his proposal would have given some degree of reality, some powers, to the Western European Union. The United States rejected his demand out of hand, thus retaining in its own grasp the economic levers by which to exert the heaviest pressure on each of the members of the WEU.

It is true that there is some vague verbiage in the treaty about economic

and cultural collaboration among the nations which have signed it. And Mendès-France has talked about French-German economic collaboration and joint "economic effort" in the French colonies in North Africa. This is the revival of an idea suggested to the French by Hitler in 1940-41, which was rejected by them then. If anything ever comes of it, this will simply mean a European deal for the joint exploitation of Africans. In these times this can hardly be a firm foundation for peace and prosperity in Europe.

The Paris treaty is a fitting capstone for the efforts of the United States to "organize" Europe against Stalinism since the cold war broke out. It is a truly jerry-built structure which does not even incorporate any of the theoretical advantages of the European Defense Community scheme for the economic and political integration of that area.

There is nothing in it to arouse the hope of the workers for a better economic deal for them. It contains no formula for the creation of a really powerful military force; the morning after the treaty was proclaimed, the head of the NATO forces stated that even with Germany's military contribution, the "West" would have to use atomic weapons on a large scale to offset the "massed hordes" the "East" could throw at them. It makes no contribution to the unification of Germany.

STATION TO NOWHERE

Thus, the treaty of Paris is another station on a road which leads nowhere. It has come into being to fill the crying need for a real, democratic, independent Western Union. But such a union can be created only by peoples and governments which have rid themselves of the dead-hand control of the old ruling classes and of the United States which seeks to maintain a Europe which it can control and manipulate in its own world interests.

But it is clear that even when the working-class political and union movements in Britain and Germany, and in part in France, oppose the present structure, they do so often for the wrong reasons, or for individual considerations which are quite right in themselves, but which fail to add up to an alternative program which could fire the imagination and mobilize the masses of the common people behind a really progressive program for the integration of Europe.

Thus, they find in every case that they are dragged behind their governments, and in the end have to choose among alternatives none of which correspond to the real interests of peace and of the workers themselves. Or, if they refuse to choose among such alternatives, they tend to degenerate into a sterile and isolated opposition of carping critics rather than a mighty organizer of a new world.

The structure erected at Paris will hardly withstand the political and social pressures which will beat upon it in the months and years ahead. The task of organizing Europe on a democratic, independent basis remains as necessary and even as pressing as ever. The formation of such a truly Independent Western Union must become a central slogan among the consistently democratic and revolutionary groupings in the European labor movement.

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!

Lucky Luciano, Gov. Dewey, And the Tresca Murder Case

NEW YORK CITY—Answering a denial by Governor Dewey's counsel that Charles (Lucky) Luciano, racketeer, in prison in 1943, offered to give the governor the names of Carlo Tresca's slayers in exchange for freedom, Michael Stern, magazine writer, insisted this week that "such an offer was made to someone close to Mr. Dewey."

"Luciano himself told me voluntarily of his offer in an interview in Rome (I had not mentioned the Tresca case to him)," Stern says in his answer, "and his statement was subsequently confirmed by high-ranking law-enforcement officials who knew about the offer when it was made."

Commenting, Norman Thomas, head of the Tresca Memorial Committee, which released the Stern reply to the press, said:

"This controversy arose from a statement Michael Stern gave our committee about an offer of information concerning the 1943 killing of Tresca, Italian editor, that Luciano said he made. He was freed by Governor Dewey in 1946 without reference to such an offer. . . .

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply. As the Tresca committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the governor did not receive and reject that proposal, who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'"

When Governor Dewey freed Luciano, cutting 40 years from his maximum sentence of 50, he explained that upon this nation's entry into the war, "Luciano's aid was sought by the armed services in inducing others to provide information concerning possible enemy attack. It appears that he cooperated in such effort."

Objecting to Stern's assertion that both the army and navy had declared they knew of no usable information given by Luciano, Dewey's attorney's letter said: "The facts known to us demonstrate clearly that Luciano did participate in projects authorized by responsible navy officials and that considerable information was transmitted, much of which was of value."

"Here is my authority on that point," Stern's reply says. "Major General William J. Donovan, wartime chief of the Office of Strategic Services, said bluntly: 'The convicted panderer's alleged aid during the war was nothing but cheap talk from irresponsible persons and completely without foundation.' . . . Former Representative W. Kingsland Macy, in a speech July 17, 1951, cited testimony by Col. George H. White, the U. S. Treasury's supervising

narcotic agent, who told the U. S. Senate Crime Investigating Committee that all of the armed forces had categorically denied that Luciano had furnished any information to them or given them any service. . . . And the New York Times, on February 14, 1954, stated that 'The army, navy, and Office of Strategic Services have said that their records contain no evidence of assistance from Luciano.'"

On the day of the commutation, according to Stern, the racketeer's attorney, Moses Polakoff, stated publicly that Luciano had aided the invasion of Sicily by enabling the authorities to find many Sicilians who gave data of military value about conditions in Italy.

"Not only did Mr. Dewey not deny this," Stern avers, "but when Robert Ruark, Scripps-Howard Newspapers columnist, interviewed the governor's counsel (Charles Breitel), he was told in a monitored telephone conversation, that the precise aid furnished by the gangster was that he organized Sicilian fishermen into an anti-submarine patrol off Nova Scotia. This explanation was as phony as a three-dollar bill."

Stern recalls that in True Magazine for November 1952 he told of a letter which Charles R. Haffenden, "politician and former lieutenant-commander in Naval Intelligence, wrote at the request of Luciano's lawyer, to Charles Breitel, counsel to Governor Dewey, telling him of "the great value that Lucky's secret contribution to the war effort had been."

Harrison Salisbury — —

(Continued from page 7)

tates, constituted a collective leadership and, wham! before you could turn around, they again were wolves rending each other. One had his throat cut. It turned out to be Beria.

It looked like the old murderous pack, rather than the lately scrubbed and dressed-up Collective Leadership That Was Going to Lead Russia Back to Democracy just as fast as they could recondition their regrettably bestialized people. . . .

In the second place, there were even reports, and some evidence, that of the whole bloody pack Beria had even played the role of the more "liberal"—being victim of the anti-Semitic "doctors' plot," for example.

Salisbury provides a different story. Was Beria murdered by his collective friends in the familiar wolf-struggle for power among tyrants? No, you see, he was the one who overreached himself for power; he had stepped out of line; he was the greedy, grasping, power-hungry type; he had broken the Collective Leadership and of course had to be put in his place so that the New Course could flower. . . .

Is this just a hypothesis on our part? Not a bit. It is to this very conclusion that Salisbury devotes the whole last part of the article under discussion. Salisbury draws the moral himself.

He forthrightly attacks the "legend" that Beria was a great "liberal." He cites Beria's bloody record as MVD chief against this legend, as well as a specious but uninteresting argument of another sort. There is no formal connection between this whole section and the thrilling tale of the 78 hours—except the fact that the former caps the latter. But the connection is not mysterious.

Where did Salisbury get pumped up with this tale of the Beria coup, or would-be coup, or could-be coup, or whatever it was? We do not know, of course, and it doesn't matter. Does Salisbury himself know—and why should he? It is even reasonable to assume that he was actually convinced that he thought of the whole ridiculous thing his own very self. This is not an interesting field for speculation, except perhaps for Salisbury's friends and relatives.

What is politically demonstrable is the role which a Harrison Salisbury can play in spreading basic illusions about Stalinism. That is important.

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 _____