

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**ON THE ROAD BACK:  
MIKOYAN AND THE 'HARDS'**

... page 6

**The Djilas Case Is Not Over!**

... page 7

**Old Script: 'Dawn Over Reuther'**

... page 2

**G. D. H. Cole's Socialism of Despair**

... page 3

JANUARY 31, 1955

FIVE CENTS

**No War to Defend Chiang's Police State on Formosa!**

## EISENHOWER LIGHTS A MATCH NEAR THE POWDERKEG OF WORLD WAR III

By HAL DRAPER

President Eisenhower has asked for, and undoubtedly will get from a docile Congress, a "predated declaration of war" against China. That is what former Vice-President Barkley is reported to have called it, accurately.

But only a minute fraction of the American people would be ready to support any declaration of war whose sole purpose is to keep Chiang Kai-shek in power. Hence the assiduous repetition by Eisenhower, and by the parrakeet press of the country, that this "calculated risk" is really the only way to ensure peace.

But U. S. belligerency and armed blustering on behalf of the Formosa war-lord is no road to peace. To be sure, there may be small probability that it may lead to war immediately. But in tendency and in longer-term effect, the new U. S. war threat is part and parcel of the drive toward a catastrophic Third World War for which U. S. imperialism will be just as responsible as the Stalinist totalitarians of Peiping or Moscow.

Eisenhower is acting out the ancient role of the warmonger threatening war in the interests of "peace" and other good things. And in this crisis, truly the U. S. stands before the world as a warmonger, just as clearly as do the Stalinist regimes.

It is true that neither Washington nor Peiping *wants* war. (Few governments in the history have ever *wanted* war. They merely want the dominant power, and the fruits of dominant power, that are impossible to win without war, in the long run.) But viewed from the standpoint of their common international morals, it is Washington that is brandishing the gun.

We say "viewed from the standpoint of their common morals" because we socialists do not share the very first assumption that is common to both the Chinese Stalinists and the

American H-bomb brandishments and all of their hangers-on: the assumption that the fate of Formosa and disposal of the island is something to be decided by Americans, or by Chinese, or even by the UN.

It is almost impossible for a reader to gather from an American newspaper that there are such people in the world as FORMOSANS. Chiang Kai-shek, his government, his army and his retinue, are not Formosans; they are Chinese conquerors of Formosa, a foreign occupation over the native population of the island, which has traditionally feared, hated or been suspicious of the mainlanders of all persuasions. The Formosans are a national people in their own right.

The best testimonial to the absence of the smallest admixture of democratic thought in the foreign policy of the imperialists is the fact that none of them propose the only democratic solution to the problem of, what to do with Formosa:

*Let the people of Formosa decide.*

The Chinese Stalinists, who declaim against "imperialism" (meaning, as usual, any imperialism other than their own and their friends' in Moscow), are against this as much as are their Western enemies.

(Continued on page 2)

### This Is Preventive War!

said Senators Flanders and Morse of Eisenhower's message (reported as we go to press). But their amendments do not change the heart of the proposal presented by the majority.

## Rearmament Is the Issue In the German Class Struggle

By GORDON HASKELL

Resistance to the Paris agreements and the rearmament of Germany continues to mount in West Germany. Even more important, the character of the resistance has begun to change. It has broadened out from the realm of pure parliamentary debate to assume the character of a general social struggle. In doing so, it is bringing into active participation in German political life a broad stratum of the population, primarily industrial workers, who in recent times have tended to assume a passive role.

The most dramatic event in this struggle to date has been the day-long strike of some 800,000 miners and metal workers which took place on Saturday, January 22. (It should be noted that in Germany factory workers now average 50 hours of work a week, which means that for them Saturday is like any other working day.)

Although the ostensible reason for this strike was to protest a statement by Hermann Reusch, general manager of the Gutehoff-

nungs steel combine, that labor had received co-management rights in industry as a result of blackmailing the owners and the government, everyone in Germany knew that the strike was really a demonstration of the strength and solidarity of the labor movement against the government, and particularly against its drive for the ratification of the Paris agreements

The miners' and metal workers' strike was only one part of a wide campaign on the rearmament is-

sue. Parades and demonstrations by students and young workers affiliated with the Social-Democratic Party have been held in many regions [see last week's *Challenge* article].

### IMPORTANT REFERENDUM

In addition, the Bavarian Federation of Labor has decided to hold a referendum among its 900,000 members on the Paris agreements, and also recommended to the German Trade Union Federation (DGB) that it hold a similar referendum among all the 6,000,000 organized workers in West Germany. It is quite plain that the effect of such an unofficial plebiscite, taken among such a significant section of the population by the unions rather than by the government, would be an open and extremely serious challenge to the power and prestige of the Adenauer regime.

If the trade union referendum renders an overwhelming vote against ratification of the Paris agreements and rearmament, it could be a powerful opening

(Turn to last page)

### MacArthur Vindicated

The cowardice and capitulation of the Democrats and liberals, as they fall in line with Eisenhower's war threats, can be measured by a single fact: By underwriting the president's message they are vindicating General MacArthur's defiance of Truman in the Korean war.

All MacArthur wanted to do was what Eisenhower promises in advance now. In fact, MacArthur's proposal to bomb military concentrations in China was substantially more modest.

For MacArthur made this proposal in the midst of actual fighting against Chinese troops. Eisenhower proposes it as preventive bombing, BEFORE the start of hostilities.

MacArthur made this proposal in the midst of a war in which U. S. forces were directly fighting Chinese troops. Eisenhower proposes it to defend Chiang Kai-shek.

Yet the Democrats and liberals, and even many Republicans; greeted MacArthur's proposal with horror and denunciation, as warmongering, adventurist and provocative. The yellow liberals who applaud Eisenhower now stamp themselves as warmongers and provocateurs of World War III, by their own words against MacArthur.

## AN OLD SCRIPT

# 'At Last, the Answer!' — or: 'Dawn Over Walter Reuther'

By BEN HALL

"To begin with," said Walter Reuther at the CIO convention in Los Angeles in reply to Mike Quill, "everyone who knows anything about the elementary facts of political history in America knows that building third parties will get no one anywhere."

He still favored a "new political realignment." But when this phrase was first put forward by him some years ago, he strongly suggested that it meant the formation of a new political party to represent the common people. Now, however, he insists, "Basically what we are trying to do is work within the two-party system, [for] a fundamental political realignment within the two-party system, [for] a fundamental realignment of the basic political forces so that political parties can become responsible."

Although Reuther's speech was featured by the press as a repudiation of a labor party, and he did specifically renounce any such proposal, his renunciation went much further. In the name of the two-party system he rules out the formation of any new party, call it what you may—labor, liberal, progressive or peoples party.

**We offer, for the record, some other recent opinions, views which are not quite opposed to Reuther's but which emphasize things a little differently.**

In mid-December Louis Hollander, president of the New York State CIO, demanded that the newly elected Governor Harriman take action in support of labor legislation. Like Reuther, Hollander cautioned that he did not favor the formation of a third party representing labor, but how different his emphasis! "I refuse to isolate myself from the masses and join in a political ghetto by moving toward a third party now." (Hollander's statement is undoubtedly in part a repudiation of the Liberal Party, which the CIO does not support.)

But note the "now." And later? "When labor is ripe for independent political action," he said, "it will not be a third party. It will be the first party." This man rejects a labor "third" party in the name of a "first" party. Surely a noble vision. But the question is: Do we get our labor "first" party from our labor "no" party?

We remember that AFL Paper Makers President Paul L. Phillips told the British Trade Union Congress that a real labor movement needs its own party. Elwood Swisher, president of the CIO Chemical Workers Union, was one of the few labor leaders to comment on this speech. Reporting the talk in detail in his newspaper, the *United Chemical Worker*, Swisher is non-committal but sympathetic. "Brother Phillips is entirely too close to the truth for our comfort," he writes.

**More bluntly, Matthew Burns, listed as former president of the AFL Paper Makers, writes in the *International Paper Maker* under the heading: "Time Has Come For Labor Party." "It is clear," he says, "that there must be a new political realignment, a labor party which can rise above the 'marketplace' of labor, represent the mass of people and preserve our liberties and freedom." Then, criticizing the two old parties, "Doesn't this prove that we should start building a new political party?"**

## Reply to the Perplexed

Reuther told the CIO delegates that "our brothers across the sea" are always asking "How come you don't have a labor party in America?" At last! At last! A reply to this perpetually perplexing question:

"In Europe where you have society developed along very classic economic lines, where you have rigid class groupings, there labor parties are a natural political expression because there you have a highly fixed and class society. A labor party would commit the American political system to the same narrow class structure upon which the political parties of Europe are built."

Emil Mazey seems to have fought his way through to a similarly novel conclusion.

**Reuther's philosophic bombshell missed being sensational by a little more than half a century; the**

**argument has been around about that long; he merely overlooked it during the many decades of his birth, rearing and rise to power. Still it is worth reviving, if only for comic effect.**

Here is a man who has fought for pensions for workers, for millions of workers, tied to industry for a lifetime. They must have pensions after working all their adult life to the age of 65 lest they be thrown on the human scrap pile. (Already there are more than 10,000 getting pensions from Ford alone.) Their only hope of rising is the hope of being able to rise from their warm beds at 6 a.m. to reach the factory time clock by 7. The union must fight for maternity benefits for wives, for sickness benefits, for death benefits. From cradle to grave under the protection of the union! And the man who recognizes such needs refuses to recognize "rigid class groupings" in America. Perhaps if we don't look they will go away. And least of all, will he "commit" political life to such a narrow view.

Perhaps General Motors, in the light of forthcoming struggles in the auto industry, can be persuaded of the logic of his view. Perhaps it will finance a scholarship for some struggling young sociologist to do research on some such topic as "the evils of committing the American economic system to the classic European class structure." Alternative title: "Why Labor Unions Are Un-American."

## Reuther Comes Out Foursquare Against Biting Fingernails

One thing though—Reuther insists that "The CIO is not the tail to the Democratic kite." In fact, he says, "I have never participated in a single Democratic Party function as such." And, if the Democrats let labor down?

"We are independent because, if the Democratic Congress on January 1 begins to do things that we think are wrong, does anybody think that the CIO will sit back and bite its fingernails and say, 'Too bad we can't criticize them because we are the tail to the Democratic kite'?"

**Luckily, 1955 will give the CIO plenty of opportunity to demonstrate its independence. In fact, it already has had such a chance. . . . Apparently it was overlooked.**

The *United Mine Workers Journal*, official organ of John L. Lewis' union, editorializes: "All signs point to the same coalition of conservative Southern Democrats and Republicans running things on Capitol Hill, despite the November 2 balloting that gave control of both Houses to the Democrats." As a case in point, "Rep. Graham Barden who will be chairman of the House Labor Committee has made it clear that he won't permit any labor legislation to come out of his committee." And the *Journal* concludes, "it is best not to engage in too much wishful thinking about the new Congress."

Since then, Congress committees have been put into the hands of conservative Southerners. The CIO missed a chance to make an independent protest.

The Democratic Party, and its liberals, decided to forsake the struggle against filibuster, key parliamentary weapon of reaction in Congress. The CIO forgot to register its independent objections.

But opportunity but knocks again and again.

"It can generally be expected," we read in the *Michigan CIO News*, "that 1955, particularly with a more liberal Congress in the saddle . . . will see a fighting labor movement determined to make up for past setbacks." Soon contracts expire in the auto industry. If there is a fight, the CIO will see its political friends in action or inaction.

And in the *CIO News* we learn, "There is no indication that a return to full employment is in sight, the CIO said last week. . . . The forecast is in the current issue of *Economic Outlook*, publication of the CIO Research and Education Department." Unemployment benefits will expire; workers will need extended and increased protection. How hard will the Democrats fight?

1955 will be a great year to show independence.

## Eisenhower Lights A Match to —

(Continued from page 1)

But within the framework of this joint imperialist assumption, it must be frankly and honestly admitted that it is the Chinese Stalinists who are in the "right" as against the U. S., and that it is the U. S. which is the aggressor before the world. Implicit in the U. S. position is the idea that Formosa belongs to China. In fact, the Democrats and the ADA have been criticizing the proposed U. S.-Chiang treaty on the ground that one of its provisions makes this admission more or less explicit. They have said: this concedes Peiping's claim that the shooting around Formosa is part of a "civil war," a domestic ruction, which is not properly the concern of the U. S., the UN, or anybody else.

No one, absolutely no one, has even undertaken to refute this rigorously logical conclusion both from the treaty and from the content of U. S. policy.

**All this reflects no credit on Peiping, in our eyes. It is an internal contradiction in U. S. policy which it cannot escape. It reflects on the doubledyed hypocrisy of the honeyed "peace" talk from the lips of Eisenhower and the journalistic clique.**

As juridical ground for its intervention, Washington argues that Formosa was taken over by the U. S. from Japan when Japan surrendered. And of course everyone knows how Japan got it. It is ironic, but startlingly true, that the legal basis for Eisenhower's message is the "right" of a hi-jacker to his loot.

Eisenhower justifies intervention in Chinese waters on one ground: the needs of U. S. security. (He didn't even charge Peiping with "aggression" in his speech if you read it carefully.) Such are imperialist morals, however, that the same people get blue in the face with swollen indignation when the brutal despots in the Kremlin justify their grabs of satellites and spheres of power on identical grounds, with identical realism.

But the content of this U. S. war-mongering is not exhausted by discussing the juridical rights of the two war blocs. The U. S. is intervening and predated a declaration of war on China not on behalf of a democratic opposition to the Stalinist rulers of China but on behalf of the tyrant who preceded Mao Tse-tung as the butcher of Chinese freedom.

In going to the length of alarming the world with a declaration of war, the U. S. is going all-out in support of precisely that type of regime which is the symbol of capitalist failure in the world.

**In the name of "peace," Eisenhower has gone the length of threatening to bomb the mainland of China—a threat which led to MacArthur's dismissal in the Korean war, to the cheers of the Democrats. Today, the craven Democrats applaud Eisenhower along with the rest, with only a few mutterings in the corridors from Humphrey and a couple of others, and a few pious hopes that the UN will put through a cease-fire.**

But the U. S. proposal for a cease-fire is mainly a fake. Like most others, we're for a cease-fire, a ban on shooting, in the Chinese waters; no mistake about that. But what the U. S. proposes is not quite what a real cease-fire implies.

Washington columnist Doris Fleeson writes, for example, that "What a cease-fire would not mean is that the Nationalists would have to give up any of their present activities short of war; to the extent that they were able they could continue their campaign against the Communist government of the mainland."

That is, Chiang can continue to harass and sink Peiping shipping, etc. But the cease-fire would stop Chiang from invading the mainland? This is a very comical concession, in view of the fact that these would-be invaders cannot even defend a couple of nearby islands without the U. S. fleet. Big deal!

Moreover, there cannot be a cease-fire in this situation in the ordinary sense. It is not a case of involving two countries. On Chiang's side, you have not a "country" but a regime (riding Formosa) which exists solely for the purpose of warring or threatening war against the mainland.

The cowardice of the Democrats goes right through to the liberal press, up to and including the *N. Y. Post*, which in an editorial hails the Eisenhower speech, adding only (ah, how liberal!) that the UN had better hurry up and take the situation over before the world gets blown up. The "liberal" touch in the editorial was a dig at Ike about his "unleashing" of Chiang. Not a word from these realistic, practical, unvisionary, hard-headed liberals about the political or moral meaning of defending the discredited regime of Chiang's war lords.

# A Glimpse of G. D. H. Cole: 'Lonely and Near Despair'

By BERNARD DIX

LONDON, Jan. 18—Three years ago the monthly journal *Fact*, published by the British Labor Party, carried on its cover a photograph of Professor G. D. H. Cole with the caption, "Lonely and near despair." This caption was a quotation from the Webb Memorial lecture delivered by Cole five days after the defeat of the Labor government at the polls in 1951 which was reviewed in its printed form in that issue of *Fact*.

The reviewer, calling himself "Factotum," expressed his disappointment with Cole's lecture; in particular he objected to what he called the "lamentation" with which Cole ended his lecture and which read as follows:

"The fire and fervor, I feel, are dying out fast from the socialism of the West, which has a good case against Communism only if it stands fast to the idealism that went into its making. In fact, the problem confronting western socialism today is simply this—can it meet the challenge of Communism without accepting the philosophy of Americanism as a substitute for its lost ideas? I do not know the answer; I only know that I feel lonely and near despair in a world in which socialist values as I understand them are being remorselessly crushed out between the two immense grinding-stones of Communist autocratic centralism and hysterical American worship of wealth and hugeness for their own sake and not as means to that fellowship which lies at the very foundation of the socialist faith."

The reviewer commented that this was sad, especially as Cole's pessimism was shared by "many other democratic Socialists." "But," continued the reviewer, "it is no use mourning the decay of socialist values 'as you understand them' unless you explain what they are, in what manner they are endangered and in what manner they may be preserved."

Now, three years later, it appears that Cole intends to do just this in a series of articles entitled "The Future of Socialism" which are being published in the current issues of the weekly journal *New Statesman and Nation*.

## BLEAK ACCOUNT

The professor begins his first article by posing a very important question: "Is socialism, as it exists today, a nationalistic or an internationalist movement?" This, judging from Cole's previous statement quoted earlier, would appear to be the basis of his despair, and the reader therefore is led to expect a clear and positive statement of principles by the professor. Alas, such expectations remain unfulfilled.

In the main the article consists of a short but lucid historical essay on the international socialist movement since the war of 1914-18. It records the collapse of the Second International, due to this war, and the birth, after the Russian Revolution, of the Third International which "stood clearly for internationalism." It records also the transformation of the Third International into "an agency for the promotion of Russian interests," after "Stalin became the apostle of 'Socialism in One Country.'"

During this historical survey Professor Cole displays his scholarship and mastery of the technicalities of the written word—and as such it is pleasant reading. It is when he begins to review the present situation, as a development of the collapse of the Second and Third Internationals, that the loneliness and despair become once more apparent in the professor.

## MISSING LINK

"How much," he asks, "of socialism survives in Western Europe?" He then proceeds to answer this by listing the failures of social-democracy on the continent of Europe. France, Belgium and Holland are rapidly written off; Western Germany is but a little better; the situation in Scandinavia is a little brighter

but the social-democratic parties there show little desire to use the power they hold to establish socialism.

Finally the professor turns to Britain and states that: "the contents of recent Labor programs furnish enough evidence that the Labor Party has very little notion of what it wants to do next and is basing its hopes of electoral victory much more on its opponents' mistakes, or on the mere swing of the pendulum, than on any constructive projects of its own."

Cole thus comes to the conclusion that due to thinking in terms of national parliamentary victories the socialist movement has lost its international character. Furthermore the programs of the various socialist parties, due to being framed in such a fashion, have lost their socialist character—they have allowed themselves to become limited to the extent that capitalism will permit them to move.

One would now expect, following this outline of the present day "socialist" movement as represented by the leadership of the various social-democratic parties, that Professor Cole would review the developing forces which are seeking

to bring a change in this situation, that having revealed the negative side of the problem he would do likewise for the positive side. But no, Professor Cole refrains from doing this.

One is led to believe that the only result of the collapse of the Second and Third International is, on one hand, the Stalinists and on the other hand the right-wing social-democrats—two forces which are utterly incapable of overthrowing capitalism. One can now understand the reasons for the feelings of loneliness and despair which Professor Cole often displays!

## THE REAL PICTURE

It is fortunate that such feelings of despair, contrary to the opinions expressed in the Labor periodical *Fact*, do not exist on a widespread scale in Britain. They do not exist because the rank and file of the Labor Party are rapidly becoming aware of their own strength and their abilities to solve the problems which Professor Cole so often sees, yet is apparently incapable of solving. They do not exist because the Labor left wing in Britain is busily engaged in a practical solution of the problems posed before it.

The fringes of the British Labor movement are scattered with solitary individuals who, seeing the enormity of the tasks ahead, have lost all confidence in the ability of the working class to fulfill its historical function. They, along with small sectarian groups of twentieth-century Blanquists, either seek academic solitude far removed from the daily class struggle, or, alternatively, constitute themselves an elite who will lead the working class when the conditions are ripe for their emergence as self-appointed leaders.

But the future of the British Labor movement—and that of the world—does not, thank goodness, depend upon them.

## LONDON LETTER

# Church and State in Britain

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 20—Last year the U. S. religious industry sent over to us its biggest-ever consignment of evangelism. Its main salesman issued a challenging statement, "What Nazism and two world wars have failed to do to England, socialism has accomplished in seven years." This immediately prejudiced his chances with 14,000,000 angry Labor voters, so he apologized. What he had meant, he lied, was "Secularism had accomplished in seven years."

Not long ago, Clement Attlee reiterated in private that the Labor Party was a Christian, not a Marxist, party; that Keir Hardie, its first MP, and most of its leaders—with the notable exception of its first premier, Ramsay Macdonald—have all been believers.

The recent controversy over the broadcast of agnostic views over the radio has once again brought up the important question of the relation between the church and the state in England.

As we reported last week, an assistant lecturer on psychology at Aberdeen University has been permitted to give a series of talks on "Morals Without Religion" over the BBC. Mrs. Knight frankly described herself as an "unbeliever" and something of a public storm has resulted.

## THE HOLD OF RELIGION

The first point I would like to make is that from a religious point of view, Britain is a comparatively homogeneous country. Of its 50,000,000 inhabitants 45,000,000 are Protestants (Episcopalians) and Non-Conformists, 3,000,000 are Catholics, 500,000 are Jews, and the rest a variety of lesser known persuasions. I think it is true to say that only among the Catholics are religious views related to political ones.

The Labor Party was originally founded to give social justice to the proletariat, and religious groups particularly in South Wales and in Lancashire were very much in evidence at that time. Many ministers had associated themselves with the "combinations" which had preceded the foundation of trade unions, and there was a nonconformist religious tradition among many Labor pioneers.

At the same time, such movements as the Oxford Movement and the Quakers had shown how one could be aware of social injustice and at the same time religious. They had tried to bridge the gap between capitalism and fundamentalism on the one hand, and socialism and evolution on the other.

The religious approach to social justice was one which appealed to capitalist consciences. Here you could go on exploiting

the masses, while if you paid evangelists enough, they would preach that the people should ignore their worries in this world as they would be repaid in the next.

The development of media of mass communication in this century at first threatened the monopoly of moral thinking by the church. But its powerful ally capitalism did not fail it. Every important newspaper daily and weekly became an organ of religious education. Likewise the all-powerful British Broadcasting Corporation had the responsibility for seeing that no programs which would offend the susceptibilities of listeners were to be broadcast—a very creditable aim.

Last week, after 27 years, an agnostic as an agnostic broadcast non-religious views.

## SACRED COWS

We know that capitalism has a big stake in religion. What stake has religion in capitalism? To be exact, \$590,000,000 worth of property. Until two years ago, all the churches' money was invested in real estate or government bonds. However, a wily managing director of a big bank and an ex-civil servant decided that the churches could make more money by investing in industry rather than government bonds, especially as they were not doing too well with a Labor government.

Ever since then the church commissioners have reported that their financial investments have shown continuing progress. The steadily rising level of rents has also benefited them grossly. As a result, though not without difficulty they have managed to put up the minimum clerical living from \$1,120 per year to \$1,680. Nevertheless, many genuinely poverty-stricken vicars have to put up students in their large vicarages to make both ends meet.

Because Britain is religiously homogeneous, and because both parties are agreed on the necessity of religion, the church can still claim to be "above politics," and it has certainly managed to keep out of the Labor-Conservative political arena. The myth that it can be "above politics" is strengthened by a further powerful force in the United Kingdom, the monarchy.

Reactionaries in this country have managed to equate, in the minds of the masses, the idea that whatever happens, the monarchy and the church are sacred. You can change your political party as long as you leave these two powerful reactionary forces. The Conservatives and the monarchy frequently engage in mutual back-scratching, as in the New Year Honors, when the government recommends, knighthoods, baronetcies, and vis-

# NYCLU Takes Up Case of ISL Against 'List'

The Independent Socialist League is going to court to challenge the New York State Civil Service Commission for listing the ISL on its own "subversive list." Through the interest of the New York Civil Liberties Union, the ISL has obtained the services of NYCLU counsel Osmond K. Frankel, who has a long record of service in behalf of civil liberties.

This is the second court case involving the ISL's attack on the subversive list, the first (in the federal courts) being the Shachtman passport case.

Several weeks ago, as reported in *LABOR ACTION*, the ISL learned that it had been placed on a State "subversive list" through the columns of the NYCLU paper. This was the first notice that the ISL had of such a listing, since the State Civil Service Commission never informed the ISL of its action.

The ISL and the NYCLU communicated with the State CSC requesting information on the grounds of the commission's action. The ISL merely received a form letter advising that its letter of inquiry had been forwarded to the "proper" body which would communicate with it shortly!

At the same time, however, George Rundquist, executive director of the NYCLU, received a reply from the State CSC advising him that the ground for the commission's action was a state law permitting the CSC to draw up its own list on the basis of the attorney general's list.

The reply of the CSC intimated that organizations placed on the state list were those which already had received hearings from the attorney general under Presidential Order 10450. This is a pure assumption, since no organization on the list has as yet had a hearing from the Department of Justice under Attorney General Brownell. Quoting the law under which it acted, the commission quotes from the Presidential Order stating that upon protest of any organization, charges and interrogatories would be presented to it, and upon reply to such interrogatories, a hearing would be granted to a protesting organization.

After more than a year since these procedures have been complied with by the ISL, the only response from the attorney general has been a reiterated promise that a hearing will be granted and the ISL will be advised in sufficient time to prepare for it.

The State CSC never bothered to find out whether or not such a hearing had been held. In typical bureaucratic fashion it assumed that the president's directive meant that it had been carried out. Thus, it has no need to grant any hearings of its own.

Mr. Frankel will challenge this listing on several grounds: unconstitutionality of the list, lists per se, failure of the State CSC to notify the ISL of the intended listing, and failure to grant the ISL a hearing before placing it on a list.

The complaint being drawn by counsel is expected to be filed in court within a couple of weeks, in the hope that quick action can be obtained in this legal test of the state's "subversive list."

counties to the queen. By this method three aims can be achieved: the monarchy rewards its supporters; the government looks after its pensioners; and they both buy off militant popular figures with the prestige which these awards bring.

At the Coronation, on Commonwealth Day and nowadays on Christmas, the happy alliance between the monarchy and the masses is demonstrated to be flourishing. The queen in her quiet country home at Sandringham talks to all the hard-working housewives like herself, and reminds them of the Christian message. The BBC waxes eloquent on this theme, while the people are encouraged to forget politics and their real problems.

Religion, the monarchy and the BBC unite both Labor and Conservative, and Labor has been stupid enough to take into its fold these three most powerful enemies, each of them dedicated to maintaining the status quo. Certainly one can believe in a theology and be a revolutionary. But religious revolutionaries must realize that organized religion is another industry in a capitalist society.

That is why we were happy when a quietly spoken lecturer at Aberdeen University broadcast on the BBC her talks on "Morals Without Religion."

**There's No Angel Around to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dime and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.**

**A sub is only \$2 a year—Subscribe now!**

# YOU and SCIENCE

## WHY THE TO-DO ABOUT H-BOMB WEATHER?

By PHILIP COBEN

There is something ironic about the present to-do over the possible impact of H-bomb explosions on the freakish weather of 1954. Both the U. S. and British government authorities have been insisting that there can be no possible connection, that even the H-bomb is too ant-like a force to affect the gigantic structure of forces which control the weather; whereas critics of these governments' foreign policies have been glad to seize on this questions as another reason for demanding outlawry of the bomb.

Official word handed down in Washington from meteorological sources has scoffed at the possibility that H-bomb tests might have had something to do with the over 600 tornadoes, hurricanes or typhoons globally reported (an all-time record), with the pattern of excessive floods and drought in unlikely places, and this in a year of minimum sunspot activity. In London Churchill himself, who is better known as a painter than as a meteorologist, advised the jittery public that the amount of radioactive ash thrown up by bomb experiments could not be sufficient to interfere with the sun's rays to the extent needed to explain the peculiarities of 1954 weather.

Weather experts have kept referring to the 1883 eruption of Krakatoa, when a volcanic island in the South Seas blew up, spread dust through the atmosphere all over the world, cut down reception of solar energy by something like 10 per cent, and yet did not produce the freaks of 1954 storms and disturbances; they have demonstrated that an H-bomb explosion is small compared with this gigantic eruption, and so what could it do? It is like "a thumb thrust in a mattress," they have explained, that's all.

Now, one reason why these energetic denials have deservedly aroused suspicion and wrath, rather than diminished concern, is that they are patently the "Hush-a-bye, baby" type. These denials were clearly, from the beginning, just as "political" as some of the expressed fears. There simply was not enough knowledge about the effects of the H-bomb bursts to justify either such positive denials or any contrary claims.

It was one thing when some scientists carefully limited themselves to saying that they knew of no possible way in which an H-bomb-size explosion could "cause" tornadoes; this wasn't saying too much. It was another thing when others flouted the fear as if it was the result merely of weak-minded superstition, to be jeered at by men of knowledge. This was not only unjust but unscientific, for it is to the highest degree antagonistic to the method of science to make positive statements of fact with so little basis in knowledge.

Such denials deservedly aroused wrath because they are of a piece with the general policy of the government with regard to the hazards of the atomic age—namely, the official substitution of soothing syrup for facts. The public are treated as infants to be rocked to sleep, rather than made aware of what is going on. The same process is going on right now, continuously, with regard to the genetic dangers of nuclear radiation and (as we once detailed in *Labor Action*) the dangers of atomic reactor plants.

And so it became something of an issue

to expose this hush-a-bye policy wherever possible, and one cannot fail to sympathize with these efforts. One step was taken when the special UN agency, the World Meteorological Organization, took sufficient serious interest in the question of H-bomb weather to launch a world survey and inquiry.

It never was satisfactory when the official voices poohpooed any possibility of H-bomb impact on weather by using the argument that the force of the bomb was so small as compared with the meteorological forces involved. That clearly begged the question, or at least said nothing about precisely that possibility which was the most likely. A very small force can trigger a larger one. Our "rain-makers" do not, of course, "make" rain, but they "cause" weather by using a very small amount of energy compared with the energy of the weather which is unleashed. The question was obviously whether the H-bomb explosions in any way could have acted to trigger forces more massive than themselves. An honest scientist had to say "We don't know" even if he wished to minimize the possibility.

### SYMBOL OF FEAR

The British "dean" of science writers, Ritchie Calder (whose *Science in Our Lives* has just been published here), has pointed one reason why the "thumb in the mattress" analogy is hardly conclusive:

"There is, however, another possibility, apart from the 'jolt' [of the bomb] or the radioactive dust. The 'funnel' of hot air and vapor thrusts up almost to the ceiling of our atmosphere. Consider it, not as a thumb thrust into a mattress, but as a pole thrust vertically into a stream—the east-west currents of the atmosphere. This pole might have the effect of causing divergent currents, eddies which would cause disturbances over a wide area. As an eminent physicist pointed out to me, this disturbance might be sufficient to vary the tracks of typhoons. Usually these swirlers follow a predictable track, but this year these tracks disgraced from the normal."

As Calder says, this suggestion is purely speculative, and other speculative explanations are possible; perhaps it and all the others are quite wrong, but the point is that such speculation by scientists is quite in order. That means investigation is in order, rather than official hushing.

Now, if it is indeed true that H-bomb explosions can affect the weather to the extent surmised, the reaction of humanity should hardly be one of unmitigated dismay. There is a quite different side to this phenomenon, if it turns out to be a real one. We point this out quite apart from the immediate political considerations about H-bomb tests, which are not the concern of the present column. If verified, it will mean the opening of another avenue to weather control, a very important field in the full conquest of nature by man.

If ever man succeeds in separating the uses of nuclear power from the uses of war, so that only the positive aspects of the atomic age need be considered, this would be no small field of inquiry that would be opened up. In hindsight, then, it would indeed be ironic if the only force man has developed to do this job came into being in the face of heated denials by scientists that they ever did any such thing.

But pending that pleasant time, the fears of the man in the street that H-bomb tests have had something to do with the unexpected tornadoes and floods will remain; and they will remain fears rather than hopes; and this will be so not only because of suspicion of the political motives behind the bomb tests but also because the H-bomb weather is a symbol. It is a symbol of the uncontrolled, unfettered nature of the atomic power which mankind has acquired; it is a symbol of the atom out of control, running wild in nature as it is running wild in the jungles of capitalist and Stalinist politics.

## Among Our Police-State Allies

Among the police states on "our side"—that is, police states run in the interests of the capitalist class rather than Stalinist bureaucrats—is Greece. The Greek government recently refused to permit a socialist group even to publish a paper.

The Socialist International has announced that the Greek Socialist League applied to the Athens government for permission to publish a weekly bulletin to be called *Socialistika Nea*. It is interesting to note that such permission is required. In a curt communication from the Bureau of the Prime Minister, the application was rejected.

No reason was given in the communication, but appended to it was the information that Police Headquarters in Athens had also been notified.

The Greek socialists have appealed this decision to the State Council (High Court of Administration). In the municipal elections held last November 21, socialist candidates were elected in nine cities, including Athens, Salonika, Piraeus and Patras.

Franco's police state in Spain also has had trouble with revolutionary papers—most recently with that soapbox publication the *New York Times*. During the last month (December), five issues of the *Times* were banned in Spain. In the course of 1954, twenty issues were banned.

On January 11, Franco's ambassador to Washington, José Areilza, appeared as guest on the radio program run by Tex McCrary and Jinx Falkenburg. Questions were phoned in by listeners, and some of these were put to the ambassador by Jinx.

Areilza was asked about the banning of the *Times*. It was banned, he explained, "because statements made by the N. Y.

*Times* correspondent in Madrid were not near to the truth. . . . Those untruthful statements are not helpful to the mutual relations of our countries. *The N. Y. Times* should put a better picture to the situation."

The last words slipped out of the ambassador's mouth, giving his answer the authentic totalitarian touch.

A reporter for the anti-Franco magazine *Iberica* phoned in a question: "Will the ambassador tell us why Federico Garcia Lorca was shot, and what is the position of the present regime toward the great Spanish poet?" The telephone receptionist replied, "The ambassador is not answering any questions about Garcia Lorca."—"Why not?"—"Because he is dead."

The explanation seemed definitive.

In another item, *Iberica* points out that Franco has been harboring the well-known Belgian traitor Leon Degrelle, who was Hitler's quisling in his native land. In 1945, when Germany fell, Degrelle fled to Spain, where he has been living since, although the Madrid regime has consistently lied about it. Franco has claimed that Degrelle was not in Spain, in answer to Belgian demands for his extradition.

On December 15, Degrelle was publicly seen at a ceremony in the Madrid Town Hall honoring the Blue Division, the Franco-fascist division fighting with the Nazi armies in the war; he was in the company of the air force minister and the Falange general secretary. Three days later, the Falangist *El Español* published an interview with him in which he referred to his trips through Andalusia.

As a result of this proof of Spanish lies in defense of the pro-Nazi traitor, Belgian foreign minister Spaak protested and withdrew the Belgian ambassador from Madrid. The Franco government is supposed to answer Belgium in a note one of these days.

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### More Puerto Ricans Being Put on Trial

To the Editor:

Attorney General Brownell's statement escaped my scrutiny in the daily press; therefore I don't know whether to attribute to him or to Mr. Cramer the error appearing on page one of your January 24 edition. Whatever its source, however, I am certain that LABOR ACTION does not wish to leave uncorrected the statement that the Puerto Ricans who "shot up Congress" last March 1 could be and were given only six years. To date Lolita Lebron, who was declared innocent of "intent to kill," has received only 31 years, two of her companions 81 years each, and the third 84 years.

It is the conspiracy charge of which 9 others were also convicted that carries a six-year maximum sentence, to the dismay of our Department of Justice. Yet one can comb through the thousands of pages of "evidence" presented against these 9 without discovering any real grounds for believing that a conspiracy existed. Two erstwhile defendants, having chosen the alternative role of professional witness, confessed their own part in the purchase of some of the guns used in Washington. Yet the majority of the 9 were not linked by the government even with this admittedly unlawful, albeit dubiously conspiratorial, activity. They were simply Puerto Rican Nationalists, dedicated to the return of Puerto Rico to the Puerto Ricans, and therefore, according to Mr. Brownell, deserving of a twenty-year sentence.

I have just returned from Puerto Rico, where I was able to converse, before they are sentenced, with several persons who were present in the Nationalist Party headquarters almost constantly during the five months preceding the congressional shooting. They confirm my earlier suppositions, that Lolita Lebron's action came as a complete surprise even to the top leadership of the party, which is nonetheless jailed because of that action. Evidence presented against Nationalists in Puerto Rican courts includes even Christmas cards sent by the president of the party in 1953 (Sh-h-h! I got one myself), and copies of speeches made by Nationalist leaders in 1941! On the basis of such evidence Puerto Ricans can be sentenced to ten years, since the "insular" sedition law is more satisfactory, to Mr. Brownell, than the "federal" one, although it is only half as good as he would like it.

Next month 12 more Puerto Ricans go on trial in Foley Square. Their real offense, to the best of my knowledge, is that of trying to raise money for the defense of their predecessors. However, the ignorance of the American jury, the free scope allowed the prosecution, and the restraints applied against the defense, all combine to virtually insure conviction of these 12. They will receive "only" six years, instead of the twenty advocated by Mr. Brownell, for allegedly conspiring to bring about the political independence of Puerto Rico from the United States of America by means of force and violence. And in the middle of the trial, without any sense of unseemliness, the court will adjourn for a day so that judge, prosecutors, jurors—and even defendants—may each in his own way honor the birth of George Washington, the Father of our Country!

Caramba!

Ruth M. REYNOLDS

Thanks very much to Miss Reynolds for the correction. The *Times* news item which misled our writer was in turn undoubtedly a reflection of Brownell's dishonest effort to minimize the existing penalties.—Ed.

## 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.

### 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.

18-52

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

RENEW NOW!



# LABOR ACTION

January 31, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 5

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

**PRO AND CON: DISCUSSION**

## The Appeal and the Dangers Of the 'Coexistence' Mood

The following article by Michael Harrington is a discussion of the problems posed for the socialist movement by the slogan of "coexistence." Challenge invites further discussion contributions on this question from its readers.—Ed.

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Within the context of the present imperialist conflict, the Young Socialist League, true to its traditions, is absolutely committed to the struggle for peace. In Korea, for instance, we did not support the imperialist armies of either side; rather, we took our stand with the Korean people who suffered through two bitter years of war to find themselves in a still divided and occupied country.

Moreover, we have consistently pointed out that peace is threatened today by the existence of two gigantic imperialist blocs, both of which are driven toward war by the dynamics of exploitation. We have opposed both of these blocs; we have taken an intransigent stand against the militarism of the United States and of Stalinism.

Within the past year, a gradual shift has become visible in international politics. It has concentrated itself around the slogan of "coexistence"; the "peaceful coexistence" of the Stalinists, the "competitive coexistence" of Eisenhower Republicans, etc.

There is no doubt that this slogan has rallied masses to its banner. Especially in Europe, it has made itself felt as a powerful force in the working-class movement. Precisely because this slogan is the focus of so much political discussion today, we must define our attitude toward it. In doing so, our criteria will be those we have always used: does such a policy, a policy of coexistence, lead toward peace, toward democracy, toward socialism?

### THREE FALLACIES

The most common form of the coexistence argument is in the slogan: "coexistence or no existence." Does this represent a politically meaningful slogan? Or is it merely a semantic play on words?

(a) To begin with, this slogan presupposes the continued existence of the status quo as a necessity for, and guarantee of peace. It assumes that you must be either for one or the other alternative; there is no third way. As a consequence, all of the people within the two blocs are sacrificed to continued exploitation; the struggle against the exploitative ruling classes of both blocs is abandoned. The world is conceived of as divided between two imperialisms.

Secondly, such a slogan assumes that an exploitive division of spoils between the United States and Russia can serve as the basis for real peace. It assumes that such a division can, and should, achieve permanence. We are opposed to both assumptions.

These consequences are not abstract logical conclusions. Already, Tito and Nehru have used the occasion of their mutual pledge to the politics of coexistence in order to denounce any idea of a Third Camp.

(b) Underlying such a view is an incredibly naive version of historical process. It holds that war is the result of "bad will" and peace of "good will," that conflict can be avoided by "sensible talk." On the contrary, we insist that the roots of war lie in exploitation, and that an exploitive division will lead to war.

(c) The fallacy of this entire line of argument is summarized in its conclusion that "coexistence" is a guarantee against "non existence." This can be assumed only if international politics is analogized to a chess game where issues are settled by a rational set of rules and stalemate ends the game.

Moreover, it tends to identify peace and coexistence. Yet is there any one

who regards our present state, the absence of armed conflict, as being peace? Rather, we see it as a breathing-spell agreed upon because of the internal needs of the two imperialist social systems, as a postponement of war rather than an achievement of peace.

### ii

#### BEHIND THE ILLUSIONS

Yet sharp as we are in our criticisms of these illusions that a real and lasting peace can be brought about through imperialist peace, we must realize one legitimate aspect of this point of view. It is this aspect which constitutes its mass appeal.

Along with the majority of the peoples of the world, we prefer imperialist peace to imperialist war. This preference should not lead us to the illusory belief that imperialist peace can stop the drive toward imperialist war. It should make us realize that imperialist peace can serve as a breathing-spell in which the creation of a genuine anti-imperialist, anti-war movement can take place.

(a) Within this context, we must recognize the role already played by the people of the world in gaining a breathing-spell. It was this pressure, in Europe, in Asia, which was one of the factors forcing a detente. For example, the extremist faction of the American ruling class was inhibited, even defeated, by the knowledge that their plans would lead to "going it alone."

(b) Characterizing much of the coexistence sentiment in this fashion, our criticisms take on a special character. We are in profound sympathy with the very real and legitimate roots of the coexistence movement: opposition to imperialist war. At the same time, we must be sharply critical of the illusions which have attached themselves to the aspirations for peace. It is this dual character of our attitude which defines the role we must play in the coming period.

In Europe, we have long felt that socialists should act within the left wing of social-democracy, e.g., like the Bevanite movement. Today, these movements are coming more and more under the influence of "coexistence" thinking. Our special task here will be to combat the illusions which arise from such thinking. At the same time, we must make it very clear that we are in sympathy with the peace sentiment which is the motive force of these movements. We must dissociate ourselves totally from any notion of "preventive war," "wars of liberation," etc. We must constantly focus on the positive slogan of: Peace, real peace, not coexistence.

In practical terms, this will mean, within the left-wing, that our criticisms of and opposition to Stalinism will take on a great importance. In this regard, we must be ceaseless in our struggle against Stalinist opportunism. For the coexistence movement often takes on the aspect of the "Popular Front" of the thirties which crippled the struggle against fascism. It involves unity "across class lines" for something even less concrete than the struggle against fascism.

(Continued on page 7)

## Socialist Youth Internat'l Expanding Outside Europe

By FRED S. MOORHOUSE

The fourth congress of the International Union of Socialist Youth was held at the beginning of November in Copenhagen and attended by well over a hundred young socialists from all over the world. It was a significant gathering in that it threw what can be viewed as a hopeful light on the future of international socialism.

To date, it would not be true to describe the international socialist movement as a world movement. The adult movement is divided in two parts: the Socialist International, primarily a European organization, and the Asian Socialist Conference. Before Copenhagen the IUSY was also best described as a European body, and with the increasing suppression of the social-democratic movements in Eastern Europe as Stalinism dug in its heels, it actually contracted its sphere before 1950 to Western Europe.

During the last four years, however, the Union has progressed far along the path which leads to the realization of a universal youth international. Amongst its affiliated bodies are organizations in Japan, India, Burma and Indonesia. There is contact with the Gold Coast and East Africa, Lebanon and Uruguay, and affiliated bodies in Nepal and Israel.

This new world character of the IUSY was reflected in its delegates to the Copenhagen Congress, the presence of our Asian comrades making very real to all of us the changing nature of the Union we are called to serve.

### AGAINST WAR

Inevitably in such a gathering the accent was on those problems which are truly universal. There was little room for parochialism. In a long statement on peace the congress affirmed its stand for total disarmament under international control, an international development fund for the underdeveloped areas, and named poverty as the cause of war. The statement ended by declaring:

"Whoever wants peace is for simultaneous total disarmament under international control.

"Whoever wants peace is always ready for the settlement of disputes by negotiations.

"Whoever wants peace opposes totalitarianism and colonialism.

"Whoever wants peace works to bring an end to poverty in the world.

"Whoever wants peace fights together with IUSY for a world where freedom, prosperity and peace are indivisible. For international socialism."

The congress reaffirmed its belief in the role of the United Nations Organization in the effort to assure peace, and called on the democratic socialist parties to work for a revision of the UN Charter to enable the UN to develop into a form of world government. It strongly protested "against the failure of the Security Council to take effective action to oppose open aggression against the recognized government of Guatemala." It further demanded the admission of the People's Republic of China to the UN and the right of self-determination for the people of Formosa.

In a long section on colonial affairs the congress condemned the Apartheid policy of Malan, the British rule in Kenya, Portuguese reign of terror against the people of Goa, and urged "the governments of all colonial powers immediately to confer with representatives of national movements in the remaining colonies in order to fix target dates for independence." It affirmed its solidarity with the Tunisian people in its "peaceful fight for independence," and appealed for a new policy in Morocco. It passed a long resolution on Latin America in the following terms:

"that a policy negative to democracy continues to develop in Latin America which is characterized by the abolition of democratic governments and their substitution by dictatorships or semi-dictatorships, that the root of this policy can

This report on the recently held congress of the International Union of Socialist Youth was written for Challenge by Comrade Fred S. Moorhouse, chairman of the National Association of Labor Students (Britain), a member of the Bureau and Student Secretary of the IUSY. Thanks are due to Ron Keating, chairman of the British Labor Party's League of Youth, for obtaining the article for Challenge.

While the Young Socialist League and Challenge are sharply critical of much in the political positions of the IUSY—its failure to mention capitalism as a cause of war, and its illusions about the UN, to mention two points referred to but not discussed in detail in this article—we are nevertheless certain that this report will be of interest to our readers.—Ed.

be found in the action exercised by the U. S. pressure growing stronger every day in the political life of this part of the world, and by direct use of Spanish influence under cover of the so-called "Hispanism" in order to introduce phalangist theories and specialists in repression.

"IUSY fights side by side with the oppressed peoples and will develop action so that the Latin American countries can progress on the way of economic prosperity and social development.

"It condemns the violent action of the Peron police against the Argentine students. IUSY will support them in the defense of their rights.

"It extends fraternal greetings to the young socialists of the various Latin American countries—especially to those in Uruguay—expressing its desire of sincere and close collaboration for our common ideal."

### BROTHERHOOD IN ACTION

The congress also greeted its comrades who are struggling against bestial oppression in Franco Spain; and expressed its solidarity with the socialist youth in the Soviet-dominated countries. It specifically urged the Hungarian government to release our comrade Anna Kethly, and it is with joy that we have since heard that this doughy fighter for social-democracy has been set free.

Much more could be said of the resolutions passed by the congress, but over all the deepest impression one carried away was a sense of deep comradeship. For a brief time we had glimpsed the vision that inspired William Morris, Jack London, Jean Jaurès and all the pioneers of socialism, a vision of one world in which men were brothers.

Much more than that, we had not merely seen the vision, we had experienced the reality. For there, in a city in Northern Europe, the Brotherhood of Man had become in some small measure a reality. The Austrian who had been imprisoned for his socialism by the Nazis, the French Jew who had fought in the resistance, the Indian Socialists who had been in jail for civil disobedience, the Burmese student who was a citizen in Asia's first socialist land, the Spaniard who fought in exile to rid his homeland of a pernicious regime, all found themselves raceless, nationless and classless in a new brotherhood.

In its closing session the congress paid tribute to those who had made possible this new creation. It paid homage to Peter Strasser, its out-going president, an Austrian with a record of a life de-

(Continued on page 7)

# ON THE ROAD BACK

## Is Mikoyan Through? The 'Hard' Faction In the Kremlin Exploits the War Danger

By A. STEIN

The question all the world has been asking since the French National Assembly voted in favor of West German rearmament—What will the Kremlin do?—has now been answered. The sudden dismissal of Anastas Mikoyan as minister of trade on January 24, and the vicious propaganda onslaught by *Pravda* Editor Shepilov against those who would raise living standards by limiting the further growth of heavy industry, point the road the Kremlin intends to take.

*That road leads in the direction of an armaments race.*

The dominant faction in the Kremlin collective leadership apparently intends to maintain Russia's position in Eastern Germany. At the same time Russia will increase her own armed forces and those of her satellites to match the contribution which the twelve or more German divisions will make to the military strength of the Anglo-American bloc.

That the change in line applies to the entire satellite empire is clear from events in Hungary. The day after Mikoyan was dismissed and Shepilov hurled his vitriolic blast, Matyas Rakosi, the Hungarian Stalinist leader, echoed Shepilov's words in a speech to a coal miners' meeting. The *New York Times* correspondent in Vienna, John MacCormac, quotes the following excerpt from a Budapest radio broadcast of Rakosi's speech:

"Because of a war threat from the West and the rearmament of Germany, it is necessary to tie in Hungary's economic production tightly with the military needs of the whole peace camp. Considerations of defense policy compel us powerfully to develop heavy industry and to force its development."

### Mikoyan's Role

Mikoyan's dismissal from his ministerial post—he still holds his positions as a deputy prime minister and as a member of the Politburo—is only the first flash of lightning that announces the gathering storm in the not-so-harmonious ranks of the collective leadership in the Kremlin. It is difficult to believe Mikoyan will be allowed to remain suspended in mid-air without either being returned to his former powers or else kicked unceremoniously further down the ladder of the hierarchy. Whatever Mikoyan's fate may be, it is important only insofar as it reflects the struggle of more powerful figures inside the Kremlin.

Anastas Mikoyan has always played a secondary role in the inner circles of the Stalinist clique. Although a faithful supporter of Stalin from the early days of the civil war, he did not achieve prominence until the early thirties when he was chosen by Stalin first to head the food industry and later in 1938 to head the Commissariat for Foreign Trade. Mikoyan's advancement in these fields was not due to any special training, but rather was his reward for catching Stalin's fancy with his wit.

He became Stalin's court jester and in return was favored with the above-mentioned posts. Perhaps this was Stalin's idea of a joke at the expense of his court jester. For in the thirties, with their grim years of starvation and permanent hunger, there was not much for Mikoyan to do in the field of internal trade.

Mikoyan's precarious position was revealed in the reshuffle of posts that accompanied the struggle for power in the weeks that followed Stalin's death. Although he retained his position in the Politburo or Presidium, and was named head of the combined ministries of domestic and foreign trade, he was ignored in

the make-up of the Council of Ministers announced on March 6, 1953.

In the second reshuffle that followed two weeks later when Malenkov surrendered the post of party secretary to Khrushchev and assumed the position of premier, Mikoyan achieved a unique and interesting position in the Council of Ministers. While Beria, Molotov, Bulganin and Kaganovich were all named First Deputy Ministers, Mikoyan was only designated as a Deputy Minister.

In this comedy of titles and place, some more powerful figure had succeeded in improving Mikoyan's status by bringing him into the Council of Ministers with the other members of the Old Stalinist Guard. However, his secondary role in the distribution of power was indicated by the fact that he was not a First Deputy Minister. The only question that remained to be answered was: Who had undertaken to act as Mikoyan's patron?

That question still remains to be answered. But one thing is clear. Mikoyan has been identified with the general line of concessions to the consumers and the further development of the consumer industries. To be sure, nine-tenths of the "new line" that has now been cut short consisted of propaganda promises; nevertheless the question of the general direction was unmistakable.

If we assume that Party Boss Khrushchev represents the old Stalinist line, then it is safe to say that Mikoyan's protector and patron was none other than Malenkov.

One other very important personality in the Kremlin demotion foreshadows the dangers that await Malenkov, hierarchy enters the equation—Molotov. If Mikoyan's

### How About Molotov?

One other very important personality in the Kremlin hierarchy enters the equation—Molotov. If Mikoyan's demotion foreshadows the dangers that await Malenkov, what will Molotov's fate be? The entire domestic shift back to emphasis on heavy industry and armaments finds its justification in the sphere of foreign policy. The French ratification of the Paris Treaty meant that Molotov's policy of trying to split away Washington's European allies has ended in dismal failure. Should the German parliament ratify the treaty, then the debacle will be complete and Molotov altogether discredited.

Furthermore, the struggle over domestic policy is tied up with foreign policy—and both of these disputed issues in turn are inextricably bound up with the struggle for succession to Stalin's place and power. If the hard-line faction—represented, let us assume, by Khrushchev—conquers, the settlement that will follow will be of like character. The consequences for both Malenkov and Molotov are not hard to foresee.

In a rather disingenuous editorial entitled "Mr. Khrushchev Wins," the *New York Times* of January 26 notes that a primary reason for the change in line and Khrushchev's apparent victory lies in the fact that "the Soviet leaders now view the international scene as having taken a turn for the worse."

The delicacy of the *N. Y. Times* is understandable if not forgivable. French approval of German rearmament was the weapon seized upon by the "hard" faction to impose its point of view in the collective Kremlin leadership. But what happens then to the argument advanced by Washington and London that 12 German divisions would give the Anglo-American bloc just the additional strength needed to compel the Russians to retreat on the issue of German unification?

However, it would be an oversimplification to believe that German rearmament is responsible for the re-emergence of the "hard" Stalinist faction as some "neutralists" and pro-Stalinoids argue. They insist that if Washington and London had agreed to a "neutralized" Germany, this would have favored the "liberal" Kremlin faction. It is important to note that till now the entire Kremlin leadership has been united on one issue: the maintenance of the Russian empire in Eastern Europe, including Eastern Germany.

To withdraw from Eastern Germany would not only mean the reappearance of a united and industrially powerful Germany, completely free from Russian control or interference. The rollback of the Russian occupation armies would immediately raise the question of Russian domination in Czechoslovakia and Poland. Any disturbances in the satellite countries would have se-



rious repercussions in Russia itself so long as the economic difficulties—particularly in agriculture—and the succession crisis remain unresolved.

Molotov's policy of temporizing and trying to maintain the status quo in Germany has been dictated by the needs and interests of a crisis-ridden ruling class. The one thing wrong with the Russian policy is the fact that time does not stand still and Germany has returned to the European scene as a power to be reckoned with—divided though she is.

### Using the "War Danger"

The Khrushchev grouping has transformed the possibility of German rearmament into an immediate "war danger." Behind the exploitation of this issue lies the desire on the part of sections of the party bureaucracy, supported by the secret police and the army, to resolve what they consider an intolerable threat to their social power.

The domestic policy of "more consumption goods" has its political implications. To produce consumption goods on a mass basis means to produce economically and efficiently; it calls for decentralization of administrative authority, and it means laying the bureaucracy open to criticism from below. All of this runs contrary to the experience and interests of a decisive section of the bureaucracy which is accustomed to hiding its parasitism and waste behind the screen of terror and absolute authority.

While the conflict within the ranks of the Russian bureaucracy has been successfully hidden from the eyes of the outside world, the struggle by the "hard" old-line Stalinists against the "liberal" policy has been quite evident in the satellite countries.

In Hungary, for example, all during 1954, the "liberal" faction headed by Premier Nagy, which attempted faithfully to carry out the then "new line," charged that the old-line Stalinists were sabotaging its efforts. A resolution adopted by the Hungarian Communist Party's Central Committee on October 31, 1954 declared, for example, that though the decision to slow down the tempo of heavy industry in favor of consumer goods and food was correct, this decision was not implemented and "even met with open resistance in certain party circles." The same resolution further states that the party's plans for reorganization of the economy met with opposition, particularly on the part of the State Planning Office of the Ministries for Heavy and Light Industry, Heavy Machine Construction and for the Iron and Steel Industry.

On January 4 of this year, the Hungarian newspaper *Szbed Nep* carried an article urging a renewed emphasis on heavy industry as the foundation of the country's economy, as advocated by Stalin. Other articles along this line maintained that, by opening the mass political organizations like the Patriotic Peoples' Front to non-Communists, the ground was being prepared for the creation of opposition within the Communist Party itself.

### First Stage

There can be no doubt that with Mikoyan's ouster from the Ministry of Trade, the first stage in a new struggle for power has been entered. More clearly than in the case of Beria, the conflict is concentrated around specific issues of domestic and foreign policy, and the lines between the "liberalizing" and old-line Stalinists are being drawn accordingly.

It would be premature to assume that the victory for the "hard" faction is assured in advance. For example, if the German working class supported by large sections of the middle class should succeed in preventing German ratification of the Paris Treaty, the Khrushchev faction would lose the powerful weapon of the "German danger" it is now wielding so tellingly.

This does not mean, by the way, that the German question would be resolved in favor of Stalinist imperialism. A victory for the working class in Western Germany would raise the hopes and fighting spirit of the East Germans and create dangers of another order for Stalinism.

The new turn back to the emphasis on heavy industry and armaments in Russia raises a number of interesting problems. What effect, for example, will the new line have on the policy of sending technical specialists and skilled workers into the countryside? Will the present trend toward a looser and more decentralized planning be reversed? We hope to deal with these and other problems in future issues of *LABOR ACTION*.

# The Djilas Case Is Not Over

By HAL DRAPER

In a hurried secret trial, the Yugoslav regime has convicted Djilas and Dedijer as criminally pro-democratic, and then suspended sentence in order to avoid enflaming world opinion at this time, while still holding the ax over the head of the two men in case they dare to speak out again instead of waiting quietly to be liquidated at Tito's convenience.

With a cynicism which has doubtlessly not failed to surprise all the dupes who had high hopes for Tito's democratic reformation, the "public trial" of the oppositionists was made into a farce. The foreign press was kept out first, because they could not be trusted to give the proper reports. But in addition the domestic kept press was excluded too, as well as the public generally. The N. Y. Times dispatch concludes:

"When the correspondents entered the office of the president of the court for clarification of his statement [on barring the foreign press], the court president angrily declared, 'I have nothing for the foreign press and I have no time to talk to you'

"Is this a secret trial?' he was asked

"No, it is public,' he asserted."

**It is to be seen whether, at least, any kind of complete report on the proceedings, especially the defense, is published by the controlled press**

According to the release of the official Titoist news-stuffing agency Yugopress, as reported in the Times, the prosecution's emphasis was not on the fact that Djilas's and Dedijer's actions constituted "hostile propaganda" (criticism) against the state, as demanded by the law under which they were tried, but on their connections with foreign powers, that is, foreign newspapers. It was pretty much inevitable that this should be the main smokescreen put up by the government.

The prosecution's case rested on quotations from the press to show that the two lent themselves to a "foreign campaign" against Yugoslavia, against "socialism," for capitalist restoration, for intervention by foreigners, etc.

The slanderous case worked out by the Titoists can already be seen in the first pronouncements of the regime after the Djilas bombshell, the text of which is now available to us, although already referred to in the U. S. press. Some details not previously reported deserve the light of day.

## BORBA'S MUD-BOMB

The first blast by *Borba* (central Titoist organ), which quoted the "incriminating" passages from Djilas's interview with the N. Y. Times, wound up with a typical rash of Stalinist slander. Since this didn't make the U. S. press summaries, let us present it here so that readers can get the taste of it on their tongues. Translating from Belgrade's French-language bulletin, *Nouvelles Yougoslaves*, we find *Borba* accounting for Djilas's heresy in the following way:

"In reality, Djilas cannot resign himself

to the fact that he no longer wields that bureaucratic power which he once wielded in his sector. He would like to get it back now with the help of his two-party system. And that is why he declares that we have a system of political monopoly, that we lack a democratic policy, and that our regime is the government of the most reactionary elements.

"Djilas often repeats the words discussion, democracy, liberty! But he had a chance to discuss at the Third Plenum of the Central Committee [the purge plenum of last January]. His words were then broadcast by radio and every word he uttered was published by the press. He had an opportunity then to formulate his convictions and struggle for them. Why didn't he do it? And now that he remains alone with his friend Dedijer—free and with his ministerial pension—he declares that all that is an inquisition. . . .

"Events have demonstrated that Milovan Djilas and his friend Dedijer no longer represent anything in our socialist country. That is why they tried to strengthen themselves abroad, seeking a point of support among those who are not friends of our country, who cannot resign themselves to accepting the independence and socialist character of Yugoslavia. In other words, they would like to get their lost positions back with the help of the foreigner. They did not even have as much national consciousness as certain bourgeois politicians, like Grol, who, after the Liberation, never (at least not openly) asked foreign aid to restore the old regime in Yugoslavia."

## IN THE GROOVE

This is the pure, unadulterated, blown-in-the-bottle method of Stalinism, which hasn't changed by a hair since the days when Tito was a mangy agent of the GPU instead of the darling of so many socialist confusionists. In the first place "The Political Platform of Milovan Djilas" (which, as we forgot to state is the title of this piece) is explained as being the man's personal careerism and ambition, dirty personal greed, not political ideas.

It does not matter to this Stalinist method that everybody knows that Djilas lost his precious bureaucratic privileges not before but after opening up a struggle for democratic reforms. That happened a year ago, and the Stalinist mind (in Belgrade as in Moscow) figures that such scruples don't count if you have the secret police on your side. Besides if one in ten can be led to forget, that's a good beginning in falsification.

Next I wish to draw the reader's attention particularly to the second paragraph above. The Titoist hacks ask: Why didn't Djilas discuss when he was before the Central Committee purge plenum a year ago?

They are "proving," you see, that he is an unprincipled character, and that therefore even if you, dear comrade, happen to agree with his mistaken ideas, that is no reason to defend him because ideas mean nothing to him. . . . This is Stalinist Procedure No. 23a for separating the purgee from his potential support.

That it is a foul lie is no drawback as far as they are concerned. The Central Committee was not convened to "discuss" with Djilas, or hear him discuss his ideas. Mosa Piyade, the oiliest hypocrite in the Tito entourage, said so in so many plain Serbo-Croat words at the plenum itself. These words of his were then published in the press transcripts of the plenum and broadcast over the radio. The plenum was called, he said, to take action against Djilas's disciplinary infractions, only.

Mistakenly of course, but understandably in view of the past he was coming out of and the present pressure upon him, Djilas made no attempt to turn the plenum into a forum for his ideas but meekly accepted the framework devised by his enemies. (His own thinking, for that matter, was still trailing gobs of Stalinism behind it.)

Now, after Djilas HAS spoken up, and after this has been answered by the heavy hand of the police state—now they sneeringly demand to know why he was silent then. . . .

## SMEARS

About the same time as this *Borba* blast, the press spokesman of the Foreign Ministry gave a statement to foreign newsmen on the case. As summarized by *Nouvelles Yougoslaves*, this statement "points out that this [Djilas] affair involves Yugoslav internal politics strictly and has very little significance. . . ."

It is amusing, if one can be amused, to note that in the very next column of the same page, there is also a summary of the speech delivered by Edvard Kardelj; and in this particular carload of mud which is to be heaped on Djilas, Kardelj explains that Djilas and Dedijer did what they did because they "told themselves that perhaps there were in the world some people and some circles who were not sympathetic to Yugoslav foreign policy and even more so to President Tito's trip to India and they servilely offered their services to whomever wanted them, to whoever desired to undercut this policy."

A slight contradiction, but what matter?

For Kardelj, as per pattern, it was the N. Y. Times which was sufficient evidence against Djilas: "They [Djilas and Dedijer] hoped in vain that the New York Times and the [London] Times could help them to become a political factor in Yugoslavia. . . . Not only among us, but in any country of the world whatsoever, every honest man would spit in the face of politicians of this sort, politicians who so generously offer their services to foreigners, even when the foreigners don't ask them. . . ."

## 'Coexistence' Mood — —

(Continued from page 5)

was in the thirties—for "coexistence." At the same time, we must point out that the illusions about coexistence also involve attitudes toward the United States. The assumption here is that the war drive of the United States is a subjective aberration of "extremist" elements. We must constantly point out the relation between the very nature of the American social system and its drive toward war.

One last phenomenon must be noted in Europe: that of the bourgeois coexistence movement. The roots of this movement lie mainly in the fact that the European bourgeoisie needs to have trade with the Stalinist bloc. The insecurities of this ruling class have been exacerbated by the economic polarization of the cold war and the domination of the Western bloc by the United States. The mere statement of the motives of this movement is sufficient to indicate our opposition to it.

In the United States, mass coexistence movements do not exist. It is not likely that they will come into existence. However, in the youth field, within the restricted area of political activity, Stalinoid illusions may be expected. The very healthy reaction against the American ruling class, coupled with the desire for peace, too often tends in the direction of illusions about Stalinism. It is our special task to fight against these illusions. We must do so, not in the name of an "anti-Stalinism," but in the name of the fight for peace. We must do so by pointing out how illusions about either imperialist bloc actually damages the struggle for peace.

In doing this, two particular points must be emphasized. First, the opportunistic entry of the Communist Party into bourgeois politics. The nature of Stalinist parties has been documented time and time again. The youth are often not aware of the facts. But here, today, we have an opportunity to demonstrate the truth in a concrete fashion. Secondly, we must continue our criticism of American liberalism. In this regard, we should point out that the liberal wing is increasingly becoming the most militaristic element in American politics.

## III

### TO CONCRETIZE THE 3rd CAMP

Our task today, then, is to concretize the Third Camp within the context of the present political reality.

That reality in Europe embraces a "mood" of coexistence, expressing itself in many organized movements. The mood

Kardelj winds up: "And if, in spite of that, they want to represent someone, they can represent only the odds-and-ends of the various remnants of reaction, beginning with those of the old Yugoslavia and ending with the handful of bureaucratic elements who regret that their power has passed to the people."

Here (Lesson No. 3) we have another standard Stalinist gambit, in which Djilas is smeared as the representative of precisely the bureaucratic elements he attacked.

## KEEP IT ALIVE!

Obviously the case of Djilas and Dedijer is not over. In effect, the regime has moved to postpone the reckoning to the dark of night.

The move to put them in the dock on criminal charges was a bad mistake to begin with. It succeeded in focusing international publicity on the affair. Like others, we even speculated that (on the initiative of the absent Tito, perhaps, or on second thought in Belgrade) the criminal charges might be withdrawn or allowed to lapse. Instead, apparently, the form of the suspended sentence has been used as the way out of the embarrassment, plus a quick jamming through of a secret trial to get the whole thing over with as quickly as possible.

**Who will know if, or when, Djilas or Dedijer disappears from public view, at some future time when the regime feels that the step is possible without annoying repercussions?**

The international socialist movement can exercise some influence over this eventuality by keeping the case alive, by not helping Belgrade bury the memory of the two men in preparation for a more literal interment.

engenders illusions about the struggle for peace. In the name of that struggle, we feel that socialists must participate in, and identify with, the sentiment for peace, pointing out that coexistence is not peace, that it cannot lead to peace.

In the United States, it is not a question of mass movements. Here, we may expect a resurgence of illusions about Stalinism among a small, but significant, section of the youth. To this, we must counterpose an insistence upon criticism of these illusions through the presentation of a positive program for peace.

**We live under the shadow of the hydrogen bomb. To be meaningful, any political approach must clearly define its attitude toward this terrible reality: against the bomb, against imperialist war, for peace. In so far as "coexistence" means a breathing spell, even at the price of imperialist peace, during which a genuine anti-war movement can be formed, we must identify with its legitimate aspect of opposition to war and desire for peace.**

Above all, to the illusions of "coexistence" we must counterpose the fight for peace—which is the fight for democracy, for socialism, for the Third Camp.

## Youth Int'l — —

(Continued from page 5)

voted to socialism. It paid homage to Per Haekkerup, its Danish general secretary, and to Donald Chesworth, its English student and overseas secretary, who can claim much credit for the extension of IUSY work to Asia and Africa.

Finally, in its elections it reflected its world character, by electing a Swedish general secretary in Kurt Kristiansson, and an Indian president in Nath Pai. The other comrades elected for the next three years were Betto Bolt (Holland) as vice president, Menahem Bargil (Israel) as joint secretary, Fred Moorhouse (Great Britain) as student secretary; and—as Bureau members—Carl Hamilton (Canada), Antti Hietanen (Finland), Bernt Lund (Norway), Josef Jonas (exile—Czechoslovakia), Leopold Gratz (Austria), Heinz Westphal (Germany), Eeichi Nagasue (Japan), Garcea Duarte (exile—Spain), Kyi Nyunt (Burma), Pierre Duthilleul (France); and—as Control Commission members—Bertil Löfberg (Sweden), Wernerbuchstaller (Germany), and Nicola Caracciolo (Italy).

## THE BENDING CROSS

A BIOGRAPHY OF  
EUGENE V. DEBS

by

Ray Ginger

Now, while they last  
only \$1.00

Order from:

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

# Rearmament Is the Issue — —

(Continued from page 1)

wedge in a demand for a national vote on the question.

The campaign against rearmament reveals a development in the German labor movement which will bear the closest watching. It is clear that the initiative in the struggle has been assumed by the new elements in the leadership of the DGB (most heavily centered in the metal workers' union) and by some sections of the youth movement. The SPD itself is lagging far behind in the fight.

[On the rise of the new trade union leadership see A. Stein's article in LABOR ACTION, November 1, 1954. In this article, incidentally, Comrade Stein also raised the question of the demand for a national referendum on rearmament as a possible tactic for the new left wing in the German labor movement.—Ed.]

No wonder! As the struggle against rearmament and the complete integration of Western Germany into the American bloc has been rising to a feverish pitch, a deep split on the question has been revealed inside the established leadership of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany (SPD).

## RIFT IN SPD

While the party was officially engaged in one of the major campaigns of its post-war history, prominent party leaders have publicly informed the Adenauer forces and the country in general that they do not support the party stand on the matter.

In Bremen, Wilhelm Kaisen, Social-Democratic president of the Bremen Senate, stated publicly that the SPD's placard campaign against the Paris agreements "should not be taken too seriously." In Stuttgart, Dr. Herman Knorr, SPD deputy in the Baden-Württemberg state legislature, announced that "we here in Southern Germany will not go along with the stubborn Ollenhauer course." And Dr. Carlo Schmidt, SPD vice-president of the West German Parliament, stated recently that the party would recognize the Paris agreements once they had been ratified by the Bonn parliament.

This division in the ranks of the SPD is nothing new. Carlo Schmidt has been an ideological leader of the wing of the party which want to transform the SPD

from a socialist party based on the labor movement into a "people's party," that is, a broad non-class party of reform which in actuality would base itself on the petty-bourgeois strata of German society.

He and his co-thinkers have been the strongest advocates of "responsible" opposition, of confining all political struggles to the realm of parliamentary speeches alone. Since the party lost the strong hand of Kurt Schumacher which kept Schmidt and his co-thinkers in check, they have been getting stronger, more vociferous, and have been developing rapidly to the right.

Although the Stalinists in West Germany have had no influence in the radical mass campaign against rearmament, the Russian government's diplomatic moves have been calculated in recent weeks to give it all the encouragement possible.

## U. S. ON THE SPOT

For instance, the Russians appear to have dropped their previous adamant stand against international supervision of all-German elections. They have offered to recognize the Bonn government pending the unification of the country.

In short, they have yielded, in appearance at least, to most of the demands set forth by the German Social-Democrats and accepted by the government last year as preconditions for the unification of the country. They continue to demand only that in exchange for these concessions the Bonn government refuse to ratify the Paris agreements, and pledge itself to a position of neutrality between the Russian and American blocs.

The more the Russians appear to yield, the harder it is for Adenauer and the Americans to refuse to enter into negotiations with them. The SPD and trade-union federation in Germany have demanded that the government and the Allied occupying powers accept the new Russian proposals as a basis for negotiations. Adenauer and the Americans are now placed in the untenable position of refusing to resume negotiations even though the Russians have appeared to yield on many of the questions over which previous negotiations broke up.

Such refusal simply tends to demonstrate the contention of the German so-

cialists that the United States and Adenauer are not really interested in the unification of Germany, but would be willing to forfeit the possibility of such unification to the inclusion of West Germany into the NATO alliance.

The Russian proposals are no doubt a bluff. But the only way to call it is to accept them at face value and start negotiating from there.

The difficulty which the Americans face is that they really do not want the unification of Germany, which would obviously require the removal of American troops from German territory.

## STRUGGLE SPILLING OVER

As long as the Russians made demands which were clearly tantamount to guaranteeing the position of their puppets, and hence of their own control over a united Germany, the Americans had a basis of opposition to that kind of unification which could find some response in the German people.

But now the Russians are in a position to make the issue appear as one of a reasonable offer for the unification of most of the country (they have never offered to include the territories formally annexed to Poland) as against an adamant demand for the rearmament of West Germany as part of the American bloc. Popular support for the Paris agreements is likely to wane to the vanishing point.

The diplomatic conflict between the Russian and American blocs on the rearmament issue has set the stage for the struggle inside West Germany. But the struggle itself has now leaped over the bounds of parliamentary window-dressing and is beginning to involve masses of people in action.

It is true that neither the SPD nor the new militant section of the leadership in the DGB have come out with a clear program for Germany as well as Europe as an alternative to the "solutions" offered by either the Americans or the Russians. But now that the struggle has assumed such a sharp form, and is being carried on in such an encouragingly mass, popular form, it can be hoped that the urgency of the situation will press upon the movement the clarification and extension of its goals beyond the tactical objectives of "no rearmament" and "four-power negotiations."

## 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!

# German Rearmament and the Jews

From the JEWISH NEWSLETTER (Jan. 24), published by William Zukerman

The rearming of Germany is one of the gravest and perhaps also one of the most poignant questions confronting the free and democratic world at the present moment. It is more than a military or political question. It is a psychological and moral problem which has stirred humanity to its depths and has split the civilized world into two almost equal parts. One part, the one which has seen German militarism in action and has suffered most from its brutality, cannot make peace with the rearming of the Germans, although it realizes what seems to be the practical necessity for it. France is pathetically struggling against it. The most progressive part of England—the one represented by the Labor Party—is opposed to it. The people of Belgium, Holland who still remember the occupation of their countries, instinctively revolt against the idea. Even in Germany itself that part of the population which experienced the horrors of Nazism, fear and oppose rearmament, and openly voice

their opposition to it despite the obvious immediate benefits to Germany.

Only one people, the one which has admittedly suffered most tragically and pitifully from German militarism and has lost six million civilians in one of the most terrible outbursts of inhumanity in history—organized Jewry in its political form, as the State of Israel, and in its non-political form, as the Jewish communities of the world, including America—has remained peculiarly indifferent and "neutral" on the entire question. The press of Israel and the Jewish press in this country which raised such shrill cries against the contemplated arming of the Arab states, have been practically silent on the entire issue. A people which remembers Amalek of three thousand years ago, seems to have forgotten the slaughter of one third of its members of only a decade ago.

## ISRAELI SATELLITE?

How is one to account for this almost unbelievable psychological fact? The Jewish Bulletin, one of the few truly independent publications in this country, which has the courage to face unpopular problems, has raised this particular question in its January issue and has also provided a plausible and what seems to be a true, answer to it. According to the editors of the Bulletin (Dr. I. N. Steinberg, Ch. S. Kazdan and Louis Nelson, three of the most respected moral personalities in the American Jewish Labor movement) there is a simple and very crude explanation for this riddle of the age. Israel and West Germany have recently reached a reparations agreement under which the Bonn government has agreed to pay Israel 820 million dollars in reparations for the damage done by the Nazis to the Jews, and this goodly sum of money has sealed the lips of Israel. The Israeli government cannot protest against the rearmament of Germany because it benefits greatly from the German reparations and a protest might jeopardize the payments. This is how the Bulletin puts it:

"All nations are restless, disturbed, shocked. . . . Everywhere there is uneasi-

ness, excitement. The only people which is calm and does not protest is . . . the Jewish people—the most pitiful victim of German militarism is quiet and calm and does not raise its voice in bitter protest. . . . It would, however, be false to conclude that the Jewish PEOPLE is calm. The heart of every Jew bleeds at the sight of what is going on in and about Germany, the country which exterminated one-third of the Jewish people. The Jews are more than the French and English opposed to placing arms in the hands of the murderers again. If there are no protests and demonstrations on the part of the Jews, the fault lies in the first place with the Zionists and with the State of Israel.

Israel cannot protest. Its hands are tied and its mouth is shut with the unholy money which it is receiving from the murderers. The politicians of Israel are afraid that if the people protest against the German rearmament, Adenauer's government will stop the reparations. . . . It was to be expected that German reparations money would bring tragic results, but that it will lead us to this, shame—this even the Devil himself could not foresee."

One may or may not agree with the position of the editors of the Bulletin on the rearming of Germany, but there can be no disagreement with them on one other point which they bring out in the same article. This is that Israel has by its "neutrality" on this question not only degraded itself morally, but has degraded also Jews all over the world, particularly in the United States. Anyone who knows the temper and emotionalism of American Jews during the last generation and the readiness with which they rushed into protests against every real or imaginary injustice affecting Jews anywhere in the world, cannot have any doubt that the rearming of Germany would not have passed without the loudest protests in New York, Washington and elsewhere. But now there is a strange calm in the press and on the platforms. The entire issue of the rearming of Germany is ignored by organized Jews in this country as it is in Israel. Nothing illustrates

## 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

more graphically than this incident the intellectual and ideological domination of American Jews by Israel and its interests. American Jews do not voice any protest independently of Israel, just as Poland or Czechoslovakia and other satellites never voice any opinion or protest independently of Moscow. Conformity with the ideological headquarters is the surest sign of all satellitism, be it political, ideological or spiritual.

[With regard to the silence of the American Jewish organizations, it is likely that another aspect should be added to the motivation which is suggested above: namely, their line of slavish adherence and conformity to Washington's foreign policy except where pressure is to be applied for a more pro-Israeli or more anti-Arab policy. In fact, their tendency is to support U. S. foreign policy all the more religiously in all other fields insofar as they have to become more critical of U. S. policy with respect to Israel. This is to demonstrate that, though often critical of U. S. policy in that one area, they are otherwise thoroughly respectable, conformist, docile and pro-imperialist.—Ed., LA.]

## Anti-Conscription Fund

The War Resisters League announces a concert to aid its Anti-Conscription Fund, to take place on Friday evening, February 18. Under the title "Comments on Our Time in Song," the performers will be Francis Barnard, baritone, and Margaret Davison, pianist. The concert will take place at Carnegie Center, 46th Street at UN Plaza. Admission is by donation.

Read and subscribe to  
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

The Marxist review for serious  
students of social issues

35 cents

\$2 a year