

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**Chrysler Turns the Clock Back**

... page 2

**The Class Nature of Peronism**

... page 6

**British CP and the Labor Party**

... page 3

**Liberal Tradition in America**

... page 7

AUGUST 22, 1955

FIVE CENTS

## SPOTLIGHT

# Steel Workers Push GAW to New Levels

By BEN HALL

Labor's campaign for a Guaranteed Annual Wage got a big push forward; this time from the United Steel Workers Union. In a two-year contract with two leading can manufacturers, American and Continental, covering 35,000 workers, the union won a 13-cent hourly wage increase and at the same time gained a 52-week guaranteed wage, the first in any major manufacturing industry.

According to first reports, the wage guarantee will be financed by company contributions of 5 cents per hour; it will apply to all workers with at least three years seniority; it provides for supplementing unemployment insurance up to 65 per cent of the workers' normal take-home pay. And these payments will continue if necessary up to 52 weeks.

### INFINITELY SUPERIOR

David MacDonald, president of the Steel Union, told reporters that the plan was infinitely superior to the UAW agreement with the auto companies which provides for payments for a maximum of 26 weeks up to 60 per cent of takehome pay. The reported agreement was announced suddenly; the preliminary negotiations were not in the news; and no details of the plan's actual operations are available. But MacDonald said: "If I may be so bold as to brag, nothing like this has ever been achieved in American labor-management negotiations. This is out by itself."

Most significant is the contract's impact on the basic steel industry where the union represents 650,000 workers. Up to now, the steel industry has rejected even the demand to "study" the

question of GAW. But now, the union announces that "without question" it will make the same demand of "Big Steel" when negotiations begin next year. At the same time, the UAW, which initiated the fight for GAW and broke through in auto, will have to set its sights higher. It has not yet completed signing up the major companies and already has to think of the next stages in the fight.

Resistance to UAW demands loomed as a distinct possibility in the agricultural implement field where the companies have repeatedly fought against extending gains won in auto into their industry. On August 7, the UAW announced that both the Caterpillar Tractor Co. and the John Deere Co. had met the full GM-Ford pattern. But negotiations are still in progress with Allis-Chalmers and International Harvester, two companies that have never reconciled themselves to unionism. In both companies, the UAW is armed with overwhelming strike votes. The agreement in the can industry puts new pressures on the two hold-outs.

But in the electrical industry, the International Union of Electrical Workers-CIO is stalled. It has just signed a five-year contract with the General Electric Company which omits the GAW in any form. Although the union won important wage concessions, the final settlement is a set-back that puts off GAW in the whole industry. Among the union's top demands was the GAW. In fact, James Carey announced that he was insisting on going further than the Ford-GM plan.

### GE HANGS TOUGH

General Electric, however, rejected the demand in toto. It was clear that the union would have to strike to win it; locals in the General Electric chain had voted by big majorities for a no-contract, no-work policy. But when it came to a showdown, the union gave up its demand. The IUE was unable or unwilling to fight for the CIO's major objective; despite its size and the importance of its industry, the union has not yet emerged as a decisive section of the labor movement.

Other unions are getting ready, including the Amalgamated Lithographers Union (CIO). Ivan T. Brandenburg, International Councillor of the union, writes in the Lithographers Journal:

"Although the United Automobile Workers were successful in securing through negotiations the basic idea and plan for a GAW, I personally think that our organization must go much further in securing a better guarantee for our members—at least 80 per cent of their wages during periods of shortened weeks or total unemployment.

"In my opinion the UAW did not go far enough. Their plan is a fine beginning for an industry with widespread, mass layoffs. In our industry, however, we also must guarantee the 80 per cent to the member who faces a partial work week."

Despite a temporary setback to the IUE, the victory in the can industry indicates that the campaign for GAW will extend to all industry and, as time goes on, the unions will win far more comprehensive GAW plans than the UAW got at the beginning.

### A Rude Reminder

Last week, LABOR ACTION reported the difficulties staff members on the Voice of America are experiencing in adjusting themselves to "the new tone of conciliation" which that agency of State Department propaganda has adopted since the Geneva Conference. We quoted the New York Times to the effect that "the paramount foreign language staff have to be United States citizens, but many have left Communist-ruled countries sufficiently recently to have vivid memories of suffering."

A later dispatch to the Times (August 15) indicates that if there are any among the Voice staff who, in the relatively cozy atmosphere which has been established between the Russians and American governments, have tended to let their memories of the true nature of Stalinism grow dim, they have now been served with a stiff reminder.

"In spite of the 'Geneva spirit,'" writes the Times, "some aspects of the 'cold war' still go on. Word reaching here is that at Munich, Germany, refugees employed by Radio Free Europe and Voice of America have been getting frantic letters from relatives in Hungary imploring them to quit their jobs. Apparently under pressure from Communist officials, these relatives say they will be forced from their homes unless the refugees stop their propaganda activities. Some of the letters beg Radio Free Europe employees at least to refrain from sending food packages, for nothing points the finger of political suspicion like a gift from the West. . . ."

"A disturbing aspect of the letter campaign from Hungary is that some of the refugees who received them had kept their names and voices off the air and thought they had dropped out of sight so far as the Communists are concerned."

Threats by the Stalinists against the relatives of refugee political opponents are nothing new, and certainly need not

have anything to do with the "cold war." It is part and parcel of the political regime of Stalinism, or any other totalitarian system, for that matter. It is not altogether without significance that the Times copy-editors describe normal Stalinist political behavior as if it were some thoughtless throw-back to procedures peculiar to the long-gone "cold war."

The report that some of the refugee employees of the Voice who have received these letters from Hungary "thought they had dropped out of sight so far as the Communists are concerned," gives rise to the thought that despite their "vivid memories of suffering," these State Department propagandists apparently have a lot to learn about the "vivid memory" and the long arm of the Stalinist secret police where political opponents are concerned.

### Another "Landy" Case?

Another "Landy" case broke in New York last week. Alfred Aresco was refused appointment to the police department of New York City, although he had graduated from the police academy. The basis of this refusal to appoint him: 16 years ago Alfred's father, then a street-cleaner for the city, signed a petition to nominate a Stalinist for city councilman.

According to the father, this is how it happened: "It was 16 years ago. I was working for the city Department of Sanitation. A man from City Hall came in and said, 'we need 500 signatures for one of our councilmen.' There were 10 or 12 of us in the room. The foreman said, 'let's sign.' So we all signed. I didn't even read it."

In view of growing public impatience with this kind of thing, the police department has sought to deny that their refusal to appoint Aresco was based on the petition signed by his father. On a TV program, Deputy Police Commissioner Vincent L. Broderick claimed that Ares-

*(Turn to last page)*

## Freedom From Socialism

It was 1959, and the American Way had been almost entirely cleansed of Socialism, following the report of the third Hoover Commission. This commission had been made up by simply naming the presidents of all American corporations with assets of \$1 billion or more. Their vice-presidents and public-relations men made up the task force.

All Socialistic enclaves of public power like TVA and the Grand Coulee had been sold to the Power Trust for token payments of \$1. All federal-state and other conflicts over federal mineral resources on land or undersea, had been resolved simply but effectively by quit-claiming all such resources, "now known, or ever to be discovered" to a new private corporation created for the purpose.

A similar corporation organized by the lumber companies now owned the national forests, plus all worthwhile timberlands in the national parks. This corporation had been praised for its generosity when as "public relations," it left several hundred acres, even of the best

marketable timber, for future generations to look at.

It had cost the government little to cleanse itself of Socialism in these respects, but the Post Office Department was different. Universal Express Co. had had to be paid \$500 millions to take it over, because it was such a money-loser.

By putting home deliveries on a twice-weekly basis, abolishing RFD, cutting carriers' wages and requiring them to carry up to 100 pounds of mail, and other such reforms, Universal was able to pay 100 per cent profit yearly. Even then some stockholders complained that other corporations that had helped rescue America from Socialism were being much better rewarded.

A mammoth new corporation had taken over the 42,000 miles of federal highway. There were tollgates every 10 miles, but any motorist could drive straight through by buying (from the corporation, of course) for only \$1,000 an electronic gadget that automatically flashed a "free" signal.

The Defense Department had become a division of General Motors.

This company had gotten for \$1 all the weapons and other property of the Defense Department. Even at that it had difficulty making enough money to satisfy stockholders off its contract to defend the nation, until it put most defense equipment into mothballs, closed all foreign airbases and Polar warning installations as inefficient and too scattered, fired 90 per cent of personnel, and put most of the rest on standby at half pay.

This worried the Secretary of Defense (Congress had retained the office for sentimental reasons) and when the world situation grew tense he used to call up and ask, please, could not the defense installations be at least partially reactivated?

At first the corporation executives were polite, and told him that their private-enterprise espionage system was much more efficient than the old Socialistic, CIA, and would give them at least six

*(Turn to last page)*

# Auto Workers Negotiations Snag Over Working Conditions as Chrysler Tries to Set the Clock Back

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Aug. 13—Many of the problems left unsolved by the General Motors and Ford agreements are coming up in sharper form in current negotiations between the United Autoworkers Union (CIO) and Chrysler, and also American Motors Corp. (Hudson-Nash).

In the case of Chrysler, the crucial area of disagreement between the corporation and the union centers around working conditions, work standards, and bargaining procedure. Essentially, what the corporation keeps asking, or offering, is the GM package to the UAW. To accept a GM package would mean a major step backward for the Chrysler workers in the vital area of bargaining structure and work standards. And here the union leadership faces a delicate as well as difficult problem.

It may be recalled that Chrysler bought out the Briggs plants which produce most Plymouth bodies as well as much other material for Chrysler. The purpose of this purchase was to lower labor costs and put the company in a better competitive position in relation to Ford and General Motors.

As a first step, Chrysler offered the Briggs workers, notably those represented by Local 212, the same contract which is in operation at the rest of the Chrysler plants. In spite of some pressure for acceptance of this deal, the Briggs workers under the leadership of Ken Morris, president of Local 212 at that time, stuck to their position and forced Chrysler to retain the Briggs contract intact. Incidentally, at that time, the official story in the UAW was that the Briggs contract was better in a few respects than Chrysler contract, but in others the Chrysler contract was superior.

As a matter of fact, it turns out, and this has been revealed to everyone in the course of current negotiations, the Briggs contract is superior in most key respects, from union shop, to bargaining structure and procedure, and to wage rates, not to speak of the best functioning shop steward system in the UAW.

And this is precisely what Chrysler wants to change, in return for a modified GAW, and the other fringe benefits won at GM and Ford. In two of the Chrysler locals, Local 7 and Dodge Local 3, where local tradition and militant history have served to stretch bargaining rights into something close to the Briggs set-up, especially the use of full-time chief stewards, the company has two further obstacles, from its viewpoint, to get its labor costs down, and its plants functioning in what its plant labor relations men call "the GM manner."

## STRIKE SET

The UAW negotiators turned down the Chrysler offer this past week, although it had all the other benefits of the GM and Ford package, because the company insisted on having its way on these shop problems. Thus a strike vote is now being taken and a deadline for strike action set, the 31st of August when the contract expires.

Adding to the difficulties in the situation are the skilled trades problems, for dissatisfaction in those ranks over the 14 cent raise are a major headache for the entire UAW; the fact that Briggs workers

have their own contract, while the Chrysler workers want a single corporation-wide contract which would place them on an equal status with the Automotive Body Division, as the ex-Briggs plants are now called; also a strong demand for a retroactive wage increase to June 1st, for Chrysler workers did not receive an annual improvement factor boost at that time, much to their surprise.

Other questions that remain unanswered include a sensitive one for the power-relations inside the UAW leadership: why should there be two sets of negotiators in the Chrysler talks when GM, which is three times as big had only one set, and Ford which is a little larger than Chrysler also just had one team. In the case of Chrysler, the union has had Norman Mathews, UAW Chrysler director, as head of the talks for the non-Automotive Body division, while Emil Mazy has been negotiating for the ex-Briggs locals. The International Union Executive Board has recommended one contract, and one director, and it remains to be seen how this works out.

## AMERICAN MOTORS

In dealing with American Motors the UAW, through Leonard Woodcock, is negotiating with Ed Cushman, formerly on the UAW advisory committee for the GAW. He is now director of industrial relations at American Motors. What he is trying to force on the UAW is a continuation of the policy that was allowed at Studebaker, namely "helping a company out." Cushman is not asking for wage cuts, as Studebaker did, but for a

lower price on the package than at GM, whose \$621,000,000 net profit for six months is somewhat in contrast to the earnings of the smaller corporations. Likewise the company wants to break down the good working conditions that Hudson has had, especially on relief time for assembly line workers. Negotiations here are in the crucial stage too.

As a matter of fact, most of the auto industry is trying hard to get a GM system in operation. GM committeemen, for example, finally got 3 hours bargaining time per day under the new contract, an improvement over the 2 hours allowed before. At Briggs, the two big Chrysler plants, and also at Hudson-Nash, the union representatives have full time, and thus maintain a far more vigilant attitude toward company attempts to violate seniority, increase work loads, speed-up, and other plant problems.

In current negotiations, the corporations are also trying to break down some of the seniority standards that have been won through many hard years of struggle, and also to change promotion procedure to give greater weight to "merit and ability," that is, foremen's pets.

Since the GAW is out of the way as an argument in these negotiations, both companies conceding to the package in principle, the focal point of the struggle is working conditions, and bargaining structure. It is here that the question will be answered on the frequently heard charge that the UAW leaders too often give up on shop issues to get so-called principles established. Chrysler and American Motors settlements will provide the answer for all to see.

## FERMENT IN AFRICA

# WHAT IS THE MAU MAU?

By PRISCILLA CADY

A recent article in the London *Times*, based on "an analysis of field reports," gives us an interesting description of the nature of the Mau Mau. It is run (we are told) by the Parliament of Kenya, which holds regular meetings of a Shadow Cabinet and whose Prime Minister is "Field Marshall Sir" Dedan Kimathi. The fighting forces, calling themselves The Kenya People's Land Liberation Army, are divided into four divisions, one of which is led by Kimathi. The returned Kikuyu veterans of World War II have managed to manufacture complicated modern rifles from the most unpromising materials.

This report is so different from the usual characterizations of "a bunch of savages running amok" that one is inclined to place at least a certain amount of credence in it. It does correspond to what we are told of Mau Mau guerilla warfare, new being carried on almost solely in the Aberdare Mountains by the hard core. Mbiyu Koinange, in *The People of Kenya Speak for Themselves*, refers to Dedan Kimathi as "General", the Chief of the African Fighting Forces.

Whether or not one accepts this report as gospel (always remembering that the ways of the London *Times* are devious and their paths to Whitehall many), questions still remain. What was the inception, whose the leadership, what the activities?

## SOME THEORIES

We have, of course, the common garden, or L. S. B. Leakey variety of theory that says in general that the unspoiled, primitive Kikuyu was fine and dandy but some of them just couldn't handle all this civilization and were spoiling for trouble when taken over by the Machievellian hand of Jomo Kenyatta. (Rurk adds the notion that an unnamed Russian and Indian were in on the control of the Mau Mau, to which Walter Allen in the *New Statesman and Nation* retorts that he doesn't know one way or the other but can only suggest that the "uprising" would have been more successful if they had been.) It is doubtful that the British Government ever intended that Kenyatta should bear the full responsibility for the Mau Mau in the way that many have placed it on him. He was tried with a number of other men, and the government's aim was obviously to discredit the whole Kenya African Union and have an excuse to ban it. If he was the leader, and the Mau Mau a

subsidiary of the KAU, we won't know unless or until he tells us; the evidence the British adduced at the trial was only capable of indicating sympathy for the Mau Mau by Kenyatta and the others. The British may have been right or wrong—we don't know.

Nobody else knows either, but a lot of people have theories. J. D. Rawcliffe, in *The Struggle for Kenya*, suggests that the Mau Mau arose from one of the religious cults, common to people whose way of life has been invaded by Christianity and colonialism, which combine the old and new religions and frequently produce Messianic prophets who exhort the people to drive out the invaders. The level of political understanding of such men as Kimathi certainly seems to preclude this although it is possible that under the name of "Mau Mau" various ideas and groupings may have operated.

The idea that the Mau Mau is made up of the members of the old Kenya Central Association, predecessor to the Kenya African Union which was banned for political activity some time ago, is purely speculative. Quite a bit of time has elapsed since its suspension, and one would rather assume that the old members would have been working in and with the new KAU.

Another theory which is of interest is based on Kikuyu law. To celebrate an age-old revolution against monarchy, the Kikuyu people periodically underwent a ritual revolution—ritual in form but not in content. The elders who were the top governing body (there were no chiefs—they are, in the Kikuyu tribe, an invention of the British)—were displaced by the younger generation. Thus the theory goes, the "Forties", that is, the age-group initiated in 1940, consisting to a large extent of veterans, were due to take their place as leaders and, finding resistance among their people sought to impose their tribal rights by violence. This would help to account for the fact that only a small proportion of English to Kikuyu have been killed, in spite of obvious opportunities. Although interesting, this is also speculative.

## AFRICAN RESISTANCE

It has also been said that there was no such thing as Mau Mau and that it only arose as resistance to the "Emergency" of the British, who were anxious to break the ever-growing political strength of the people of Kenya. Koinange writes: "The Emergency was to smash this movement of the people who had made no secret of their needs nor of

how they thought they should be met . . . it had been long prepared for by the amassing of civil police, police reserves . . . all these forces began to make their presence felt by beating up and arresting Africans."

Certainly the only activity attributed to the Mau Mau of which one can be certain is the actual warfare carried on in the forests and mountains, and this is obviously of a defensive nature. Killings are freely attributed to the Mau Mau, but one is at a loss to discover how the authorities can look at a body of men who was responsible for the murder. When the slums on the outskirts of Nairobi were razed (as a "precautionary and disciplinary measure"—driving people from the worst possible kind of housing into no housing at all) and bodies were found, the authorities shook their heads wisely—they'd known it had been a hotbed of Mau Mau-ism. Hotbed it may have been, but how did they know? We have no figures on the number of ordinary murders committed before the Emergency for purposes of comparison—these crimes may have been those of passion and greed which slums generate.

E. Cary Francis, in *African Affairs*, July '55, tells of two incidents at schools where there was vandalism, and warnings were left that if the teachers continued to teach they would be killed "by order of Dedan Kimathi." He praises the bravery of the teachers who did carry on, and adds that nothing happened to them. Mau Mau? Or a juvenile prank?

It has been said that the presence of a disemboweled animal at the scene of a murder is the sign of a premeditated Mau Mau attack, but one can only wonder at the small number of whites killed and the random selection—is this controlled activity, or only individual acts? To quote Koinange again: "the Africans have resisted in such a way as to spare lives" (here he mentions non-violent methods, such as boycotts) ". . . talk of Mau Mau atrocities is designed to obscure the issue of the liquidation of Africans and win sympathy for the settlers as representatives of civilization. . . to the extent that some Africans have reverted to outmoded tribal customs, the responsibility belongs to those who have denied them the opportunities of progress . . ."

We do not know, we cannot know at this point, the specific details of the Mau Mau. The vital facts about Kenya cannot be disputed, however—Africans are fighting for their land and freedom against their colonial overlords.

Have you read . . .

## "NEXT— A LABOR PARTY!"

by

Jack Ranger

A discussion for trade-unionists of American labor's greatest lack and greatest need.

25 cents

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

At last available!

## The SECOND volume of Leon Trotsky's THE FIRST FIVE YEARS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

384 pages.....Paper covers

Only \$2.50

All orders must be accompanied  
by payment.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

NOTE: The first volume is still  
available too, of course . . . also  
for \$2.50.

LONDON LETTER Stalinists See Chance to Woo Bevanites

# British CP and the Labor Party Left

By OWEN ROBERTS

LONDON, Aug. 10—A few weeks ago the British Communist Party celebrated its thirty-fifth birthday. It was at a convention held in the Cannon Street Hotel in London over the week-end July 31-August 1, 1920 that about 150 delegates from the British Socialist Party, a faction of the Socialist Labor Party and the South Wales Communist Council held discussions which resulted in the formation of the Communist Party in this country. Since that time it has led a chequered life—its ups and downs, twists and turns, being more or less a faithful mirror of the world pattern. Now—in its thirty-fifth year—the British Communist Party seems to be in the middle of a new upset.

This new crisis in the internal affairs of the British CP can be traced directly back to one source—the growing left wing of the Labor Party. For years the Stalinists have sought to cultivate and create a left force within the Labor Party—but a "left" that is firmly anchored to the ship of international Stalinism in general and the rowboat of British Stalinism in particular. When signs of a developing left expression became apparent in the Labor Party a few years after the 1945 election which swept the Labor Party into power, the Stalinists viewed it with mixed feelings. On the one hand they welcomed it as an ally in a fight against the Labor Party leadership and yet, on the other, they were afraid that it would develop outside of the control of the Communist Party. Hence great efforts were made to seduce those who expressed discontent with any particular aspect of the Labor Party policy.

## TOE STALINIST LINE!

In 1947 Harry Pollitt, the secretary of the British Stalinists, wrote a book entitled *Looking Ahead* in which he gave much space to consideration of this point. After welcoming the appearance of a left wing opinion he uttered many complaints about its conduct. He complained, for instance, that when he had offered advice to members of the Labor Party left on policy and tactics prior to a Labor Party Conference he was rudely told by these left wingers that they didn't want "you fellows slung around our necks" and that they were quite capable of putting their own case and organizing the tactics to put the case over. Said Pollitt: "The answer to this demands a straight approach and plain

speaking. There can be no real Left movement inside the Labor Party that excludes the Communist Party from participation in it." In other words Pollitt was waving the big stick at the Labor Party left and saying: either you toe the Stalinist line or else. . . .

For some time the British Communist Party was partly successful in its endeavors to influence and provide the political leadership of the Labor Party left wing, but with the resignation of Bevan, Wilson and Freeman from their government posts in 1951 the situation changed and the Labor left began to shake off some of the shackles imposed upon it by the Stalinists. The fact that it was Bevan who emerged as the focal point of the Labor left caused no joy in the King Street headquarters of the British Communist Party for Bevan had long been the target for Stalinist propagandists due to his refusal to play ball with them. An indication of the depth of these attacks can be judged from an article written by William Gallacher, who was then a Communist member of Parliament, in *Labour Monthly* of February 1950. (Incidentally, readers should not be put off by the title of *Labour Monthly*, for the magazine is in fact a Stalinist sheet and has as its editor R. Palme Dutt, leading theoretician of the British Communist Party and one generally tipped as the Moscow contact man.)

## ATTACK ON BEVAN

Gallacher in his article made a slashing attack upon Bevan whom he asserted was "linked up with every Fascist and near-Fascist supporter of capitalism in piling up armaments far and away beyond the capacity of our economic resources." He said that Bevan was as wordy and confusing as Ramsay MacDonald ever was but that Bevan "sought to give his demagoguery a working class content" by going for the "big fellows" such as Winston Churchill. But, said Gallacher, Churchill in reality was Bevan's friend because no matter what

Bevan said about Churchill in the House of Commons it could always "be sorted out in the smoke-room" afterwards. "Here in this country," said Gallacher, "we will fight against your war policy, Mr. Bevan, and you can pass that information on to Mr. A. V. Alexander and to the pious Sir Stafford Cripps."

## "FAITHFUL SERVANTS"

Such attacks did not cause Bevan to lose any sleep and he chose mainly to ignore them, but he did not ignore the Communist Party. In 1951—the year of his break with the Labor official policy—he showed just what he thought of the Stalinists when he wrote a foreword to *The Curtain Falls*, a book which recorded the fate of the Socialist and Social Democratic parties of Eastern Europe after they had been "liberated" by the so-called Red Army. Said Bevan: "The Communist Party is the sworn inveterate enemy of the Socialist and Democratic Parties. When it associates with them, it does so as a preliminary to destroying them. . . . It is necessary for Socialists to understand that they are not now talking the same language as those who have come under the influence of Stalinist doctrines. The Communist does not look upon a Socialist as an ally in a common cause. He looks upon him as a dupe, as a temporary convenience, and as something to be thrust ruthlessly to one side when he has served his purpose." Small wonder that the British Communist Party did not welcome the idea of Bevan leading a Labor left wing and that *Pravda* described Bevan, Wilson and Freeman as "faithful servants of Imperialism."

In the four years which have now passed since the emergence of Bevan as an expression of the Labor left the Stalinist fortunes have declined considerably. It is true, of course, that on many issues Bevan pursues a line which—if not exactly similar to that of the Stalinists—shows illusions concerning the role of Russia in world politics. But nevertheless his fundamental distrust of Stalinism and utter contempt for the British Communist Party remains, and as a consequence the direct influence of the Stalinists upon the British Labor Party left wing has declined. With this decline has come a decline in the strength of the CP itself because many left wing workers who might have been attracted to the CP in the absence of a Labor left are instead now inside the Labor Party. Recent happenings inside the Communist Party show this quite clearly.

Faced with a falling numerical strength, coupled with the knowledge that even much of the alleged strength exists only on paper, the Executive Committee of the Communist Party has recently been making an attempt to rectify the position. This takes on three distinct forms; first a checking and tightening up on the membership of the CP itself, secondly in increased efforts to win over recruits to the CP from the Labor Party left wing, and thirdly by endeavoring to widen the area of contact and influence of the CP upon the Labor Party left.

## CP CENSUS

As part of the internal check upon the CP membership the executive committee decided to hold a national check of membership cards. The result for them was not very pleasing. Out of a membership of 33,000, some 18,000 cards were checked. The remainder are either still in the process of being checked or else are not able to be checked due to lack of active workers and bad organization. But the figures leave no doubt as to the situation. One third of the members who have so far had their cards checked are in arrears in membership dues, and 3,000 of these are over four weeks in arrears. These can reasonably be expected to be the cards of members who are in the best position—in the best organized areas. The situation in so far as the other 15,000 members are concerned can easily be imagined. This, of course, means a loss of finance for the CP but, even more important, it shows the unstable character of the membership. At a meeting held at the beginning of July the Executive Committee of the CP adopted a resolution which said: "Bad dues payment in the Party and excessive fluctuation in membership go hand in hand. The fight for clear cards is part of the battle to establish that pride of Party membership which is the guarantee that our ranks not only remain strong but are rapidly extended."

This evidence of internal weakness in the CP organization accounts, in part, for the fresh attempts which are now being made to win over recruits from the Labor Party left. What the CP badly needs at this moment is an injection of fresh blood to revive its failing energies—and it seeks this fresh blood from amongst the politically immature, but physically extremely active, members of the Labor left.

On August 2nd, R. Palme Dutt, the vice-chairman of the CP, wrote an article in the *Daily Worker* designed to convince members of the Labor left that they should be inside the Communist Party. Said Dutt: "We are sure you are doing a good job in the Labor Party. But you can do a better job in the Communist Party." The reasons, according to Dutt, are that the leadership of the left, and he mentions Bevan, Crossman and the *Tribune* in particular, are handicapped by threats of expulsion by the right wing and that the ultimate victory of the left can only come about through a party based on Socialism. And that party, says Dutt, is the Communist Party. Other articles of a similar character have appeared in the *Daily Worker* of late and today Emile Burns, another of the back-room theoreticians of the CP, launches an attack against the Labor Party leadership and asserts that "no Social Democratic or Labor Government has ever changed the class basis of capitalism or the Capitalist State." From this Burns draws the conclusion that all who want Socialism—whether they are in the trade unions, the cooperative movement or the Labor Party—should join the Communist Party.

## TWO CAMPAIGNS

Alongside these endeavors to tighten up the CP machine and to gain recruits for it from the Labor Party a parallel campaign is developing which is directed toward increasing the influence of the CP within the local Labor Party organizations. The editor of the *Daily Worker*, J. R. Campbell, emphasized this point in a recent report he made to a meeting of the CP Executive Committee. After stating that the CP should "multiply its contacts" Campbell urged that the strength of the trade union movement be used to bring about "a different type of Labor Party." In other words Campbell, and the Stalinists, want the aid of the fellow travellers and Kremlin camp followers in the Labor Party to enlist the Left Wing generally in peddling the Stalinist line. This means that ultimately they hope to break down the rules which prevent members of the CP from being members of the Labor Party or attending Labor Party conferences as delegates from trade unions.

In order that their campaign should be successful the Stalinists are doing their utmost to convince members of the Labor Party left that it is useless to struggle against the right wing without the support of the Communist Party. The National Organizer of the CP, John Gollan, played this line strongly when he wrote an article in the Stalinist weekly *World News* of July 23. He wrote that since 1945 there had "been the effort to build the Left in the Labor Party without the Communist Party, with some of the Left leaders playing the anti-Soviet game, arguing that the Communist Party is unnecessary, that the Left in the Labor Party is enough and so on." In a way typical of the Stalinists, he implies that the members of the Labor left who attack the CP only do so in order to protect themselves from the wrath of the right wing; that they hide behind "anti-Soviet" slogans not because they really mean them but because they think this will protect them from the right wing. One would never think—by reading Gollan's article—that many of the active leaders of the Labor left, both national and local, had fundamental political differences with the Stalinists. This much is evidenced when he bleats again the old, old, story: "For Left policies to triumph in the Labor Party, all obstacles to unity in the working class must be overcome; there must be cooperation, joint campaigning and work of all the Left forces and the Communist Party."

This situation in which the CP finds itself is an excellent signal for the left forces of the Labor Party if they but recognize the fact. The CP realizes that at this moment of time the Labor Left has developed into a force which must be acknowledged and either seduced into Stalinist conformity or wrecked lest it hamper the political influence of the CP.

(Continued on page 7)

# IUE Strikes Westinghouse

By JOE SENTNER

EAST PITTSBURGH, Aug. 16—With the grievances which caused a strike last month still unsettled, Local 601 of the IUE-CIO at the main Westinghouse plant in East Pittsburgh is again on strike as this is written. The last strike was to force the company to give more consideration to grievances. The strike was ended by setting up a union-company committee to investigate the grievance system. The committee has not yet reported.

The present strike began when dayworkers walked off their jobs on August 1st in protest against company attempts to make time studies of their job. (Dayworkers are non-incentive workers, such as cranesmen, hookers, material handlers, and the like.) The time study was obviously the first step to laying more dayworkers off. This would have eventually hurt production workers as well, because unless they are serviced by a sufficient number of dayworkers, incentive workers cannot make out.

There are 3000 dayworkers in a total of 9500 workers. At a union meeting called to consider the walk-out, it was moved to let the dayworkers themselves vote on whether to strike or not. This motion passed easily. (If the whole membership had voted, a strike might possibly have been voted down.) The strike is legal and is authorized by the international. Bob Nellis, chairman of the Westinghouse Conference Board of the IUE, spoke at the meeting.

The company claims that the efficiency of the plant (and, therefore, the time-study) is none of the union's business. The daily press has viciously attacked the union for "opposing efficiency and interfering with the way the company conducts its business." Actually, the com-

pany could cut the union to pieces under the pretext of "efficiency" and "managing the plant."

The union claims that since the time-study affects working conditions, rates of pay, and hours, that the company must first bargain with the union over the time study. The workers know that behind the time study is pure and simple speed-up, with lay-offs as a result.

By now, the entire plant is shut down, and federal and state mediators are at work on the case.

This time-study is just one more step in the introduction of automation. Jobs are at stake. In order to really fight seriously to save jobs, a big push is in order for a thirty-hour week with forty hours pay. After all, the electrical industry has been making record profits for years, and could afford it.

The present strike also affords an opportunity to win the salaried employees to the IUE. At present, salaried employees are in an independent union. This division of the workers hurts both salaried and hourly workers. The salaried workers are in as great a danger from the time study as the hourly workers, and they know it. The IUE should approach the salaried workers union for united action on this matter.

The union has bent over backwards to try to settle disputes in recent weeks, but with the company's arrogant attitude, the union must soon realize that conciliatory moves do not take the place of constant and thorough education of its membership.

At a general membership meeting following the dayworkers meeting, the local approved the "no-settlement, no-work" stand of the Westinghouse Conference Board with regards to wage negotiations now in progress for the chain as a whole. October 15 is the deadline.

# U.S. — LAND OF FREEDOM

## Puerto Ricans' Rights Limited to UN Sanctuary?

By RUTH M. REYNOLDS

During periods of political persecution, the behavior of most Puerto Ricans can be understood only in relation to their behavior during a hurricane. When "the look of the sky" (not the Weather Bureau report) announces an approaching storm, they board up everything they possibly can, lock themselves with their children, pigs, and poultry inside their houses, and settle down for a long siege. They do not emerge with the first lull in wind velocity—for it may be only the calm center of the storm, with another gale to come as bad as the preceding one. They wait until they are certain that the storm has passed; then they survey the damage done, quietly set to work to salvage what they can, and resume their normal life.

If one were to take a census of the Puerto Rican population by counting noses out-of-doors during a hundred-mile-an-hour windstorm, he would conclude that Puerto Rico was an uninhabited island, on which little houses grew mysteriously instead of trees. No statistician would be so silly. Yet our liberal sociologists are quite as foolish, for they choose to judge the strength of non-cooperation sentiment in Puerto Rico by counting open supporters of the Nationalist Party at times when such support brings certain persecution, from loss of job to long imprisonment on perjured testimony.

The present hurricane of political persecution is already five years old, and restless patriots, impatient with long restraint, are wondering whether the current lull (ten months without new arrests, and no new prosecutions pending in the courts) means that the storm is over, or only that the half-way mark has just been passed. A tentative feeler was put forth in New York last week, and this is what transpired.

### "NOT ALLOWED TO"

There were two of them, a man and a woman, and, carrying leaflets entitled "Puerto Rico's Freedom Victim of the United States Democracy, 25 of July in the Year 1898" they stationed themselves at the Visitors' Entrance to the United Nations at 11 a.m. on August 8th, and began passing out their leaflets to the passersby. They had been there not five minutes when a uniformed United Nations guard approached and told them to desist, that they could not pass out leaflets there.

"Why not?" they asked.  
"You're not allowed to," he replied.  
They told him that they understood they were allowed to, and that if he thought otherwise that he should telephone their lawyer. He said he didn't want to talk to any lawyer, but that he did want them to move across the street. They answered that, until they were convinced that what they were doing was illegal, they would stay where they were to pass out their leaflets.

By this time two burly fellows dressed in civilian clothes had joined the United Nations guard.

"You can't stay here," they stated.  
"Our lawyer says we can."  
"If you insist, we'll have to arrest you for disturbing the peace."  
"You can't arrest us here," the Puerto Rican, with a smile, told the plainclothesman, "for this is international territory."  
Although these "civilians" at no time

identified themselves as F.B.I. men, or as anything else, they did not deny that United Nations ground was outside their jurisdiction. Instead, they turned to the young lady:

"You're Miss Collazo, aren't you?"  
"My name has nothing to do with my rights here," she countered. "So far as you're concerned I have no name. The only name I'll give you is this one." And she handed him the calling card of Attorney Conrad J. Lynn.

With that, the plainclothesmen, who by this time had multiplied to six, forced her bodily outside the fence that now surrounds the United Nations buildings, and locked the gate. They told her never to come back there, and threatened her that if she did they would be prepared for her.

Meanwhile, her companion was engaged in conversation with the occupants of two squad cars, which had just pulled up. They asked him why he and his companion would not move across the street, as the United Nations guard had requested.

"What for?" he asked. "So you can then arrest us?"

The six plainclothesmen, four uniformed policemen, and one United Nations guard then went into a huddle.

"You'll have to arrest them," the guard told the uniformed police.

"We can't. This is your headache," replied the cop.

Taking advantage of this opening, the lady exclaimed: "Why, officer, he won't even go inside to find out what the regulations really are. He won't even talk to our attorney."

"Well, I will. What's his number?" asked the cop.

By that time Mr. Lynn was out to lunch, and it was half an hour before he could be reached. The policeman asked him whether he would please advise his clients to be reasonable, and move across the street.

"I can't do that," said Mr. Lynn. "Why, in August, 1953, I defended that young lady when she picketed the United Nations with a group of Puerto Rican women. They complied with your request that time, and moved across the street, and were immediately arrested. That's just why I've told her now she need not budge."

"But we guarantee we won't arrest them."

"How can they trust you?" asked Lawyer Lynn. "It's going to be a long time before any Puerto Rican patriot believes your word again."

### UN SANCTUARY

Redfaced, the officer emerged from the telephone booth and advised the United Nations guard to take the Puerto Ricans inside and determine with the Security Office just what the regulations are. This process required another hour-and-a-half, during which time United Nations legal personnel conversed by telephone with Conrad Lynn and, it may be supposed, with divers other persons. The conclusion reached was that the leafleteers could be arrested only if the United Nations should waive jurisdiction over them, and allow the city police to act. Dubious about the advisability, from a public relations standpoint, of issuing such a waiver to permit the arrest of members of a colony for passing out a perfectly legitimate leaflet, the Security Officer finally assured the Puerto Ricans that they were within their rights, and that these rights would be respected. He requested them, however, to move across the street to continue their distribution. "We'll stay over here, thank you, where we have some protection," they replied.

Their beachhead thus established, the two Puerto Ricans returned the next day to the same spot, and were unmolested. In order to punish them for their impertinence in expressing long-silenced non-cooperation sentiment, it seems that our government will have to wait for some pretext for another conspiracy charge against the innocent. Until then, there seems to be one spot, contiguous to land over which the American flag flies, where Puerto Ricans, without fear of reprisal, can exercise their universally recognized but unrespected right to freedom of expression.

But one small city block is not enough. Puerto Rican patriots can not be expected to remain much longer under the "hurricane psychology" that has predominated during the past five years. They must and they will express themselves. Traditionally, they have done this through educational and diplomatic means so long as these were open to

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### Choose Sides!

To the Editor:

I received in the mail the other day a copy of your weekly paper LABOR ACTION. It seems to be a militant and courageous publication.

However, in commenting on your "Program in Brief" of the ISL, I must say that I find it quite opportunistic, decidedly un-Marxian and, from an historical point of view, absurd. It dismisses the greatest political, economic and social upheavals in recent history as mere "Stalinism" and, laughably, as a "new form of exploitation."

Even an organ of the Trotskyites, the *American Socialist* magazine, does not take this futile, hopeless outlook, and, while calling "Stalinism" (so-called) a "despotism," correctly calls it an historical event without equal. And Trotskyists are usually the most feverish in the rabid anti-Soviet phobia that characterizes the various "socialist" sects, flea groups and grouplets.

If this is your viewpoint I cannot understand for the life of me why the ISL is on the attorney general's blacklist. To be on that list, for a truly revolutionary socialist organization, is an honor and should be pointed to with pride.

But your program agrees fully with Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy (R., Wis.) that in "every country, the Communist Parties" are the "agents" of the Kremlin.

Then why should the reactionaries persecute such stalwart allies of theirs as this? After all, the ISL occupies a position close to the American Left and thus serves capitalism via its strategic position from which it throws sand in the eyes of the workers. Lenin's description of Trotsky in 1917 fits the role of the ISL today: "Left phrases and a bloc with the Right against the aims of the Left!"

Most unappreciative, these capitalists. I therefore wish you hearty success in your efforts to have the ISL extracted from the attorney general's damning list. The ISL deserves its rightful, respectable place amid the ranks of the defenders of capitalism, and should not be an outcast to be cruelly identified with the "agents" of the Kremlin hobgoblins.

Irrefutable proof that groups such as the ISL are faithful props of the bourgeoisie lies in the fact that they can only flourish in a hate-filled atmosphere such as is generated by today's cold war and its accompanying witchhunt hysteria of McCarthyism. Groups like the ISL, such as the French Socialist Party, in the end expose themselves with such actions as voting for West German Nazi rearmament.

For further evidence, let us compare the record of the ISL to that of the American "Stalinists"—the comparison answers itself. The ISL being "persecuted" by the bourgeoisie stands as nothing, absolutely nothing, compared to the vicious persecution being visited upon the fanged "Stalinists."

But let's not be that cruel. Let us compare the record of just one Tyrannosaurus Rex Stalinist to the whole ISL—the record of Steve Nelson, author of *The Thirteenth Juror*. Again the comparison answers itself.

But the final bankruptcy of the ISL program is shown in that it equalizes the camp of Socialism (which it has created into its own monster like any ordinary Wall Street banker) with the receiving camp of capitalism, when any cool-headed socialist thinker knows that without the influence upon history of the USSR and the other new labor republics, we would probably still be fighting in World War II and would perchance be under a reign of total fascism instead of its kid brother, McCarthyism, if the camp of Socialism did not exist and there was merely a brutal totalitarian imperialism in its place, for that would mean that

them. But when our government has closed these avenues of expression to them, some of them have used other methods, more costly both to them and us, to demonstrate their legitimate determination to be free. As one of the Puerto Rican leafleteers told the plainclothesmen the other day, when they ushered his companion by force and violence outside the United Nations gate, "So long as there are people like you in the United States government, some of our people will be tempted to get too patriotic, and go again to Washington."

It is up to consistent democrats and socialists in this country to fight for the right of Puerto Rican nationalists to press their case for independence without hindrance or restriction by the American government.

there would be no great organized mass movement for peace and democracy in the world.

The ISL crusade for a "Third Force" is also exposed as a weapon of the bourgeois in that it fulfills the role of the old capitalist trick of "divide and rule" against the international proletariat.

The "Third Force" idea falls into final, total bankruptcy when it is shown that there is no hope for its success since it has little or no basis in objective historical necessity.

True, the program does reveal a certain sympathy for socialism.

But no socialist movement can be successful by ignoring the vast treasury of experience contained in the camp of "Stalinism." Socialists should extract from it what is good, reject what is bad, take warning or take inspiration from whatever the lessons studied show. It is absurd to either totally reject or totally accept everything "Stalinist."

Hence I leave you with these words: Choose sides.

"A YOUNG WORKER"  
Massachusetts, July 10.

### Reply

We print the above letter as a petrifed, if not classical, example of the Stalinist mind at work. The only thing which prevents it from being a classic is that the writer is apparently unaware of the total arsenal of Stalinist lies and slanders against revolutionary socialists. This may be accounted for by the fact that he is a "young worker," and hence can be excused for omitting the charges that "Trotskyites" worked for the Nazi, British and French secret services (all at once), signalled to Japanese bombers in China, etc. etc.

The only really puzzling thing about the letter is its ending. After submitting "irrefutable proof that groups such as the ISL are faithful props of the bourgeoisie," (the "proof," of course, being as factually far from the mark as everything else he writes) he ends up by adjuring us to "choose sides." Is it possible that after all he has written he feels there is some chance that we really don't know what we are doing; that we are "subjective" socialists who just happen "objectively" to be bourgeois agents in everything we say or do? If so, his Stalinist mentors will soon straighten him out on this.

There is, perhaps, only one point worth making on the substance of "Young Worker's" letter. It is his statement that "if the camp of Socialism [by which he means the Stalinist governments—G.K. H.] did not exist and there was merely a brutal totalitarian imperialism in its place, for that would mean that there would be no great organized mass movement for peace and democracy in the world."

This is the line of reasoning which attracts to Stalinism many people who have become disillusioned with capitalism. Without the power of the Stalinist governments, what chance would there be for socialism?

Before the Russian Revolution, there were no socialist governments in the world. That did not prevent Debs, Lenin, Marx, Rosa Luxemburg and millions of rank and file workers from being socialists, from having full confidence in the capacity of the working class and oppressed masses generally to overthrow capitalism and establish socialism through their own, independent revolutionary action.

Since the degeneration of the Russian Revolution, the Stalinist bureaucracy has corrupted the whole idea of socialism by insisting that without the leadership and support of Russia, no socialism is possible. And all over the world, people whose confidence in the revolutionary capacity of the working class has been undermined by the defeats and failures of the last three decades, have gone for this line with a vengeance. "There is no hope" for the success of the Third Camp, writes our young Stalinist, "since it has little or no basis in objective historical necessity."

The independent struggle of the workers and oppressed for democracy and socialism, you see, is hopeless. The only thing which gives hope is to attach oneself to the gun-carriages of the Stalinist armies.

He is welcome to that kind of "hope."  
G. K. H.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION —  
\$2 a year does it!



# LABOR ACTION

August 22, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 34

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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

# Young Socialist CHALLENGE

August 22, 1955

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

FIVE CENTS

## Discussion of Tactics at the SDA Convention

To the Editor:

Permit us to compliment Mr. Eli Fishman for his able, long-awaited presentation of your point of view on the month-old SDA convention in the July 18 *Challenge*. However, his article contained errors of fact and, we believe, of judgment, which deserve comment. In the first place, his title was factually wrong. SDA did not take a Middle Road on ADA Relations: it gave in completely to ADA's demand that it not defend the civil liberties of Stalinist teachers.

In the second place, Mr. Fishman wrongly states the position of what he calls "the left wing" at the convention.

Mr. Fishman's left wing did not oppose SDA's capitulation to ADA. They did not offer a motion to substitute for the "right-wing" motion that finally passed. They did not even vote against it: they abstained.

What they offered instead was a petition humbly addressed to ADA. Was the petition even as little as "an attempt to negotiate the question with ADA"? It was not: incredible as it seemed at the time, the petition differed in no essential way from the "right-wing" motion, except for an occasional whimper that ADA had not played fair. It did not even imply that SDA would make a fight to it.

The YSL has condemned Bevan and the British Labor Party for abstaining on such issues as the rearmament of Germany and the building of an English Hydrogen Bomb. It has condemned (in retrospect) Roosevelt for his "neutrality" during the Spanish Civil War. Is it not inconsistent to urge a policy of abstention at the SDA convention?

Mr. Fishman seems to have confused his "left wing" with what he calls the convention's "ultra-left" wing. For it was these "ultra-lefts" who proposed what Mr. Fishman undoubtedly believes: that SDA must be able at least to publicize its position in defense of the civil liberties of Stalinists if it is to be an effective liberal organization, and that it should fight for its rights without hesitation. But both his right and his left rejected their motion. What they rejected, we might add, is also the official position of the Columbia University chapter of SDA.

If Mr. Fishman *does* believe this, it's a shame that he does not follow his own argument out to its logical conclusion. If at least this much autonomy is absolutely necessary for SDA, if without it SDA will shrivel and die like so many of its predecessors, then no threats—not even the threat of disaffiliation—should make SDA give up what amounts to a struggle for its very survival.

Ralph Brown  
Linda Greenberg  
Gaya Feinerman  
Robert Ilson  
Arthur Mitzman  
Tony Ramirez  
Gerald Schames  
Arthur Steier  
concluded in by:  
Michael Shute  
August 4, 1955

**Reply**

As far as I know, the SDAers who signed the above letter all take a position in defense of the civil liberties of Stalinists, and in particular reject the notion that Communist Party membership is automatic grounds for a teacher's dismissal. We are, therefore, in general agreement—indeed our dispute is one among friends. Where we differ is on a tactical question: how can an effective presentation of this position be made within the liberal movement?

Note that this is a question of a liberal organization. Ideally, I may want

all liberals to cease being so and to become socialists. Concretely, I am faced with a specific problem of the liberal movement as it now exists. Given the actual state of that movement, I begin with an empirical judgment: that there is no possibility today of an independent liberal youth organization, i.e., that the choice is between a liberal youth organization affiliated to ADA and no liberal youth organization at all. If the writers of the letter are to object to my position they must contest the factual accuracy of this proposition.

As I understand it, it had been made absolutely clear that if SDA took a "hard" line on their autonomy, disaffiliation would follow. I object to this on all kinds of grounds, in terms of opposition to bureaucratic maneuvering on the part of ADA, of a bad policy imposed upon the youth, etc. I want to change this situation. But given my initial judgment, this change can only come from within the liberal movement, that is from an SDA affiliated to ADA. It could hardly come from the non-existent liberal youth organization which (I think) would be the inevitable result of disaffiliation.

I believe that the British Labor Party could take a position on German rearmament or the Hydrogen Bomb without destroying itself. Therefore, such a policy is realistically within their power. I am disappointed when they do not exercise their choice. But SDA, in this situation, had no choice.

This analysis leads to a further point. The way to actually gain a victory for

(Turn to last page)

## YSL CAMP SHAPES UP

Plans for the Young Socialist League camp at Genoa City, Wis., are rapidly shaping up in final form. From all appearances, this camp, to be held from September 6-11 will be even better than the one held last year in New Jersey.

On the educational side, the camp will feature a series of lecture-discussions by Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION, on "Critics of Marxism" (Dewey, Schumpeter and Aaron), and by Gerry McDermott, well known socialist lecturer, on a series of topics which are to be announced in the near future. In addition there will be a series of panel discussions led by Detroit and Chicago trade unionists on such topics as "The Labor Movement Today," "Labor and Politics," "Labor and Civil Liberties," and "Socialists in the Labor Movement."

It is clear from the above that the educational side of the camp will be a valuable experience for all young socialists and young liberals interested in socialism. But as in last year's camp, elevation of the mind is not its sole purpose. Ample time is provided in the six-day program for elevation of the spirit also. Square dancing, a campfire, party, and time for all kinds of sports (including one listed as "loafing") are on the program.

The Recreation Camp at Genoa City is 60 miles north of Chicago. The camp starts at 10 a.m. Tuesday, September 6, and ends after supper on Sunday, the 11th. Prices are really a bargain for these days. \$28.00 for the full camp; \$5.50 per day for week days, and \$6.00 a day over the weekend.

Every reader of *Challenge*, and all their friends are urged to attend. To register, or for further information, fill out the blank below.

## What Price Truth on Television?

By LEO MEL

The social significance of the television industry has been a topic of much discussion in many circles for the last eight years or so, and socialist circles have been no exception. I have heard views expounded on the subject all the way from TV being the greatest contribution to the raising of the popular educational level since the invention of the alphabet, to it being just a new competitor with religion and baseball for the title of "opiate of the American masses."

To be fair it must be admitted that some worthwhile material does manage to get on the TV screen. Just recently I had the pleasure of seeing a presentation of John Galsworthy's "The Mob," about

an anti-imperialist British MP who gave up his life for his ideals, a story with about as much social significance, or rather much more social significance, than you might expect to see on a commercial television program.

On the other hand, no one who has ever had to sit before a television screen for more than fifteen minutes can deny that a great deal of painful trash is turned out. And this quite apart from the commercials, many of which, as any TV viewer can testify, are of such a nature that one wonders why capitalism was not overthrown by irate television fans about ten minutes after the first one was broadcast.

Some of the factors which drag TV down from the level of "educational benefactor" to that of "opiate" and militate against a higher level of material being used on TV are discussed by television drama writer, Rod Sterling in a recent article in a well-known writers' magazine ("TV's Sacred Cows," *Writer's Digest*, July, 1955).

Mr. Sterling suggests that if a would-be television writer writes about a politician, he can just drop the script in the nearest wastebasket rather than the mail box. If you're the brave sort and choose politicians as a subject, just be sure "to find an issue which really isn't an issue at all." And "a conflict which must never have been a conflict—at least not in the past 100 years." And what ever you do, *don't* have your character say, do or think anything that might link him with any real existing political party. This restriction gets troublesome when even smiling at the words "labor" or "tariff" may be considered partisan activity, or so attests Mr. Sterling.

Now politicians aren't the only people who are always "nice guys" as far as the television industry is concerned. No indeed. Television politicians, on the national level anyway, are all one hundred per cent trustworthy, loyal, helpful, etc. But they're not the only ones. TV lawyers are honest. Doctors are honorable. Ministers are holy. Army officers from major up are noble and fair.

Certain professions are only some of the things that you have to watch out for in TV drama. Certain ideas are even more strenuously banned than crooked

lawyers and drunken doctors. Mercy killing, fratricide, and segregation are some of these. One television show once did a story dealing with prejudice. This produced a pile of vehement letters on the theme of "You guys mean to tell us that this goes on in the U. S. A.?"

The above is only part of the story of restriction and censorship discussed in Sterling's article. Some other examples are even more ridiculous—Westinghouse insisted that the name of Kipling's "The Light that Failed" be changed to something "not so suggestive of bad bulbs" before an adaptation of the story could be presented on its TV theater.

It is an interesting sidelight to notice what purpose the *Writer's Digest* article is intended to serve. To arouse the indignation of writers or viewers over these cases? Not at all. After all, writing television scripts, just like almost anything under capitalism, is a business, intended to make money. If originality or depth in your writing is likely to keep you from selling your stuff—originality and depth have to go. The "blurbs" at the head of the article promises "... you can learn to live with TV's taboos." Indeed, Rod Sterling hastens to assure us that he cites these cases "... as an indication of the subtle problems the writer needs to explore before putting keys to paper ... to what vast depths of care he must go for fear of treading on a sensitive toe or plucking too enthusiastically on the teat of a sacred cow."

### ATTEND THE YSL SUMMER CAMP—SEPT. 6-11 Socialist Education—Recreation—Comradeship

At Genoa City, Wisc.

Fill out and send in the blank below.

YSL—c/o Meier  
5426 S. Maryland  
Chicago 15, Ill.

I would like to register now for the YSL camp.

- \$5 deposit enclosed.  Please bill me for \$5 deposit.  
 I may attend the camp; please send me brochure.

(Make checks payable to D. Meier or Young Socialist League.)

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

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

Registration for one  for couple

### YSL CLASS • NEW YORK

THE NEXT SESSION  
IN THE CLASS  
Perspective on  
History & Revolution

TUESDAYS at 8 p.m.

IS

Aug. 23—GORDON HASKELL  
Revolution in Asia—II  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

# PRO & CON: DISCUSSION

## Class Character of the Peron Regime; Tactics for Socialists in Its Crisis

I must take issue with Juan Rey's interpretation of the Argentine events (July 25). I believe his analysis of the Peron regime and of its opponents is very superficial, and his conclusion is incorrect.

First of all, what is the Peron regime? That it is a dictatorship which must be overthrown is, of course, absolutely true. But there are dictatorships and dictatorships; and only a concrete analysis can yield a realistic perspective in regard to a particular regime. Rey characterizes the regime sometimes as "totalitarian" and sometimes as "semi-totalitarian," without any attempt to support his characterization or to reconcile the obvious contradictions in his article. This is a vital question, not at all to be taken for granted, since it involves the relation of forces in the class struggle; and what is involved in Argentina is the class struggle and not, as Rey believes, an all-class, "national" struggle for democracy against an over-riding, classless tyrant.

### NOT "TOTALITARIAN"

A totalitarian regime is one which has succeeded in destroying all independent political and social organizations, and especially the parties and trade unions of the working class. Totalitarianism represents a definitive and long-term victory of the capitalists and landlords over the working class and peasantry. This is not the situation in Argentina. Trade unions exist, and carry on strikes which bring them into conflict with the government which they support. Furthermore, as Rey reports, "In Argentina, the Radical Party, the Democrats, and the Socialists [are] practically outlawed." (My emphasis). "Practically,"

though unsatisfyingly imprecise, means, at least, not completely. The error of characterizing the Peron regime as "semi-totalitarian" is just as real, though somewhat more difficult to demonstrate, because of the inherent ambiguity of the term. The Castillo Armas regime in Guatemala is, in my opinion, semi-totalitarian. It has administered a severe defeat to the working class and peasantry, but has not succeeded in completely destroying all independent manifestations. Peron did not come to power as the result of the defeat of the working class. The perspective of Peron is not the destruction of the trade unions. There is a vital distinction between Castillo Armas and Peron; to subsume them both under the term "semi-totalitarian" is to obscure this distinction, and prevent the presentation of a clear picture of the actual course of events.

The characterization of Peron made by Hal Draper (June 27) is much more meaningful. Peron, says Draper, is a military dictator with a mass labor base loyal to himself. In 1945, Draper points out, "Peron used his mass labor support as a weapon against his partners inside the military junta in order to make himself supreme as against them. In his ensuing period, he had to balance off the army against his labor support." This is the picture of a typical Bonapartist regime. I deem it curious that Draper does not use this term to describe Peronism.

Peron, then, holds power by balancing off two fundamentally antagonistic social forces: the armed forces, plus the church, against the trade unions. Here another question is raised by Draper's article: why he puts quotation marks

around the term "trade unions"; they actually are organizations of workers, they actually do carry on the class struggle (of course, in a halting and distorted manner). Their reactionary political ideas and their reactionary leadership are not sufficient to rob them of their working-class character. This hesitancy in assigning a class character to the Peronist trade unions is matched by Draper's complete failure to assign a class character to the armed forces and the church. His term for them is—"reactionary", and he uses the term not in relation to their class character, but only in relation to their attitude toward democracy.

"It must be said," says Draper, "that what we have pictured here is the dynamics of a reactionary regime whose reactionary component forces have been cracking up. That does not make these reactionary components 'progressive.' The army cliques are profoundly reactionary, as we have said. The hierarchy (with the exception of a number of courageous and principled clerics like Andrea who deserve all respect but who have been powerless to move the policy of the church) has been happy in its alliance with the dictatorship, from which they have benefited greatly. These people and their political role . . . do not become any more progressive or respectable in democratic eyes when they break with Peron in order to preserve their own interests."

### OFFICER CAST & HIERARCHY

The officer caste and the hierarchy are indeed reactionary, and their break with Peron does indeed fail to make them progressive (about respectable, I don't know); but their reactionary character is rooted not in their opposition to bourgeois democracy (which is a by-product, and not a necessary one at that) but in their class character, which, as I have said, Draper does not mention. The officer caste and the hierarchy represent the landowners, capitalists, and foreign imperialist interests. As long as the favorable economic situation permitted they could, through Peron, though unwillingly, grant concessions to the working class sufficient to retain its support. With the worsening of the economic situation and the withdrawal of the concessions, mainly through inflation, the support of the working class is gradually dissipated. At the same time the need on the part of the landlords and capitalists to take still more from the workers and peasants and to destroy their organizations increases.

The bonapartist dictator, capable of muting the class struggle in good times by threats and concessions, mixed with repressions directed mainly but not entirely against the working class, finds himself, as the class struggle sharpens under economic pressures, astride a developing civil war. The revolt against Peron was the opening act in the class war of the landlords and capitalists against the workers and peasants. Peron, still trying to keep the class struggle in check—the necessary condition of his rule—called for a limited (very limited) mass mobilization; but his main reliance was on his generals and on negotiations.

### CLASS INSTINCT

Juan Rey, consistent with his failure to see the class components of the struggle, looks with favor upon the revolt against Peron. "The Argentine civil war," he says, "is a very significant form of the spontaneous political and anti-totalitarian revolution against a dictatorship." This line, with its tactical implications, would be suicidal for the socialist movement in the concrete situation as it has unfolded. For it would mean isolation from the working class and aid to its enemies. The workers who came out to fight the navy revolt were impelled by class instinct.

Draper is well aware of the reactionary nature of the revolt. "It is to be expected," he writes, "that there will be an attempt to replace the shaken Peron structure with a military-clerical authoritarian substitute. It may even be successful." The possibility of such a military-clerical authoritarian regime is a deadly danger to the working class, which must not be underestimated. Such a regime would be one of civil war, which could remain securely in power only over the shattered bones of the working-class organizations and the corpses of their leaders. Such a regime would differ from Peronism in this—that it rejects the left base of Peron's power, the trade unions, and sets out to destroy them.

Against the establishment of such a

military-clerical authoritarian regime the workers must fight. They will fight. Socialists must participate in this fight, and lead it in so far as possible. This fight has already begun, in the form of the mobilization of the Peronist trade unions against the navy revolt.

I anticipate that my position will be attacked as being pro-Peronist. But such an appreciation would be entirely false. A victory of the organized workers over the military forces would upset the balance which allows Peron to rule as the supreme arbiter. It would probably result in his overthrow; and this probability would vary in direct proportion to the active participation of socialists in the struggle. For the economic situation will continue to worsen, making imperative radical measures for its solution, such measures as a capitalist regime would find very difficult, if not impossible, to carry out. S. R.

### Reply

Comrade S.R.'s very interesting letter finds me packing up for vacation; it deserves a more careful discussion than the following hurried notes:

(1) I too quite disagreed with many things in Juan Rey's discussion article, but I let my own article imply my criticisms of Comrade Rey's.

(2) I would be very suspicious, to say the least, of the trend which S.R.'s argument takes. He anticipates that it may be attacked as pro-Peronist. It may be, indeed. It sounds to me very like the beginnings of a position (I would say, not yet thought through) of critical support to the Peron regime along the lines which have in fact been taken by some Trotskyists in Latin America. To say this is not yet to "attack" it; it is worth discussing; but I wonder whether S.R. has quite faced up to the full policy which may flow from his trend of thought, as the aforesaid Trotskyists have done.

### CRITICAL SUPPORT

Thus S.R. denies that he is "pro-Peronist" because, he argues, a victory (within the pro-Peronist coalition, he means), against the army, by the "organized workers" (organized, I take it, in the Peronist "trade unions") would upset Peron's balance and "probably result in his overthrow." But what he is thereby describing is precisely a position of critical support—support not of Peron the man, whom he wants to overthrow, but of the Peronist regime and the Peronist movement, within which the working-class sector is to conquer.

The "pro-Peronism" which S.R. implies is very analogous indeed to the pro-Stalinism of the Trotskyists who have come out in favor of giving critical support to the Stalinist movements and regimes while still vowing hostility to the Stalinist leaders.

Now if S.R. recognizes that this is the type of position he is moving toward, well and good, he is in a position to discuss it intelligibly; but if he does not, as his disclaimers lead me to suspect, then the first thing is to think the position out to its end.

(3) S.R.'s discussion of "totalitarianism" rather reflects this, I think. To be sure, I stressed in my article that the Peron regime remained essentially "a military dictatorship, but I carefully added twice: "though with totalitarian trappings and tendencies." S.R. does not comment on this not unimportant qualification. He is mainly interested in simply discarding the "totalitarian" label on Peronism; perhaps because it is disconcerting to start thinking in terms of giving critical support to a "totalitarian" regime?

### PERON AND ARMAS

I would not comment on this, perhaps, were it not for S.R.'s rather astounding contrast between Peron and Castillo Armas. The Guatemalan regime's military, dictatorial and authoritarian character does not begin to have (yet) the "totalitarian trappings and tendencies" that Peronism has seen for many years! Yet S.R. insists that the Castillo Armas regime is at least "semi-totalitarian" while he emphatically denies even that ambiguous term to Peronism. This begins to come perilously close to whitewashing Peronism, though S.R. does not wish to do that.

(4) Hence also, I think, S.R.'s one-sided view of the Peronist "trade unions." If anyone thinks these "trade unions" are as fully totalitarianized and

(Turn to last page)

## New Members Join WDL Committee To Support Case Against "List"

The Rev. Donald Harrington of the Community Church of New York and Dwight Macdonald, an editor of the *New Yorker* magazine and former publisher of the magazine *Politics* have joined the Workers Defense League Committee in support of the ISL case against the Attorney General, Rowland Watts, Secretary of the WDL, announced this week.

This Committee is preparing a financial and publicity campaign on behalf of the case, for which preliminary steps have already been taken. At the time of this writing, ten people have joined the committee initiated by Norman Thomas and Watts.

In addition to Thomas, Watts, Harrington and Macdonald, James T. Farrell, noted author, and Waldo Frank, veteran of the liberal movement, have become members. They are joined by Meyer Schapiro, Columbia University, noted historian and critic of art, and Prof. Kermit Eby of Chicago University.

Other members of the Committee include Lewis Coser and Irving Howe, editors of *Dissent*, and Nancy Macdonald, head of the Spanish Refugee Aid Committee, and Frances R. Grant, a well known figure in Spanish-speaking liberal movements.

The hearing of the ISL before a Hearing Examiner of the Department of Justice has been temporarily adjourned to await a decision of Mr. Brownell on the motion of Attorneys Rauh and Groner to dismiss Mr. Edward Morrissey as hearing examiner on the ground of bias (see Rauh's and Groner's affidavit in LABOR ACTION, August 8).

This decision should be forthcoming within a few days and the hearing will reconvene thereafter, whether with a new hearing examiner or with Mr. Morrissey, depending on the decision of Mr. Brownell.

The Workers Defense League and Attorneys Rauh and Groner are, it goes without saying, confident of the outcome of the ISL case, considering the case as of the utmost importance in the fight for civil liberties. The ISL is the first organization to have received a hearing from the Attorney General in almost eight years that the "list" has been in existence.

The case is a test, not only of the false listing of the ISL, but as much of the procedures, techniques and the purposes of the "subversive list" itself. It therefore transcends in importance the immediate hearing itself, for the ISL fight is a broad one. In the same way that the Shachtman passport case has set a precedent for other cases, so, too, the ISL case against the Attorney General's listing, will have far larger implications.

It deserves the widest public support, both moral and financial. Right now, the committee is seeking financial support which is indispensable to carry on the legal fight. The old axiom that litigation costs money, is particularly true in this case. Without financial support, the case can bog down at its most crucial points.

We therefore call upon our readers to give their support to the ISL case by sending a financial contribution to the Workers Defense League, using the contribution box below for that purpose.

Workers Defense League  
112 East 19th Street  
New York, N. Y.

Enclosed please find \$.....as my contribution to the  
WDL's fight against the "subversive list."

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... STATE .....

(Make checks payable to the Workers Defense League)

## BOOKS AND IDEAS

# A Sterilized History of American Liberalism

By HERMAN BENSON

Louis Hartz's book on liberalism comes highly recommended but it is a big disappointment. Richard Hofstadter, author of *The American Political Tradition*, called it "a brilliant book that will have to be reckoned with by all informed students of American society" and he was impressed by it as "the latest and in some respects the best" recent effort to portray American tradition as something "new and different."

Hartz lays claim, too, to a deep understanding of the weakness of socialism in America. A book by a serious critic could indeed be a worthwhile contribution to political clarification; but this one turns out to be ponderous and superficial, though not without sweeping pretensions to learning.

## LIBERALLY BESPRINKLED

His pages are liberally besprinkled with passing references to the names of famous and not-so-famous men of history and politics, references which often add little to his own line of thought but which apparently serve as his credentials to scholarship and deep thought. He brightens up one point by brushing lightly over the name "Friedrich Lassalle." The fact that the founder of German socialism was *Ferdinand Lassalle* changes little; even use of the correct name would have added nothing; consequently the error can detract just as little.

Why was Hofstadter so impressed? An answer to this question is instructive: it gives the key to what Hartz's book appears to be but is not.

In his own book, which appeared in 1948, Hofstadter commented as follows: "[These] studies . . . have convinced me of the need for a reinterpretation of our political traditions which emphasizes the common climate of American opinion. The existence of such a climate of opinion has been much obscured by the tendency to place political conflict in the foreground of history. It is generally recognized that American politics . . . has not shown, at least until recently, many signs of a struggle between the propertied and unpropertied classes. What has

**THE LIBERAL TRADITION IN AMERICA, an Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution, by Louis Hartz.—Harcourt, Brace and Co., 328 pp., \$4.75.**

not been sufficiently recognized is the consequences for political thought . . . the range of vision embraced by the primary contestants . . . has always been bounded by the horizons of property and enterprise. . . . Even when some property right has been challenged—as it was by followers of Jefferson and Jackson—in the name of the rights of man or the rights of the community, the challenge when translated into practical policy has actually been urged on behalf of some other kind of property." (To be strictly accurate, Hofstadter should refer not to property in general but to bourgeois private property.)

## NO CLASS STRUGGLES

We quote this at length because Hartz's thesis bears a certain superficial similarity to it. Basic to American tradition, he avers, is the lack of a feudal tradition; there never have been classes in America of the "European type;" consequently, no class struggles and no class-consciousness. And in the absence of classes and class struggles, the American working class never became class-conscious.

" . . . where the aristocracies, peasantry, and proletariat of Europe are missing, where virtually everyone, including the nascent industrial worker, has the mentality of an independent entrepreneur, two national impulses are

bound to make themselves felt:—the impulse toward democracy and the impulse toward capitalism. The mass of people, in other words, are bound to be capitalistic and capitalism with its spirit disseminated widely is bound to be democratic."

From such similar beginnings, the two authors diverge sharply. Hofstadter analyzes the limitations of America's early conflicts but recognizes at the same time that these were real struggles arising out of the material world between "two kinds of property." Hartz is preoccupied with the task of prettifying American history and making it respectable. If there were conflicts, it was all a mistake.

Of Federalists and Whigs, he writes, "Their crime was not villainy but stupidity." The fight between Whigs and Democrats was an idiocy: "Thus what Whiggery should have done, instead of opposing the American democrat, was to ally itself with him. . . . It should have made a big issue out of the unity of American life, the fact that all Americans were bitten with the capitalist ethos, which it was trying to foster. It should, in other words, have developed some sort of theory of democratic capitalism which fit the Tocquevillian facts of American life."

## SOCIAL ANTAGONISM

— Even on the basis of bourgeois property, manufacturers, speculators, and merchants were engaged in a bitter struggle with small farmers. This social antagonism Hartz would wipe out in retrospect.

The chief fact about the American Civil War would appear to be that it was indeed a civil war. But Hartz is busy with other matters.

He finds that the South could never create a firm ideological platform of self-justification; its thinkers, he maintains, were torn between two irreconcilable tendencies. They were for Jefferson, democracy, and liberalism; and yet, they were for human slavery.

Let us grant it; let us forget that the same dilemma faced all American statesmen. This would remain: without a consist-

ent ideology, the South was able to fight in the bloodiest war in American history, with the exception of World War II. Material interests triumph over ideology.

But Hartz has a fondness for such materialism only when it bolsters class harmony. When materialism threatens to bring class struggle he takes refuge in a liberal mystique.

## MATERIAL INTERESTS

Notice, in the long quotation above from Hofstadter, that "the common climate of American opinion" is linked clearly and firmly to common material interests, a widespread diffusion of property. And, if he finds few signs of a struggle between propertied and unpropertied classes, he quickly adds the necessary qualification "at least until recently."

"Recently," in American history, a massive wage-working class has emerged; it is now organized into powerful unions; it is intensely union-conscious. This class is a non-propertied class. If the "common climate" was based upon ownership of property, the rise of this non-propertied class is a fact of overwhelming significance. It is decisive to the fate of socialism as it is to the ideology of capitalism.

But if author Hartz is busy cleaning up all American history, it is not for the purpose of allowing the dusty old class struggle to sneak in at the last minute. In fact, his chief aim seems to be the literary liquidation of socialism yesterday, now, and forever.

"Actually," he writes on page 6, "socialism is largely an ideological phenomenon, arising out of the principles of class and the revolutionary liberal revolt against them which the old European order inspired. It is not accidental that America which has uniquely lacked a feudal tradition has uniquely lacked also a socialist tradition. The hidden origin of socialist thought everywhere in the West is to be found in the feudal ethos."

If socialism is simply an ideology arising out of feudalism, it would belong in America only in a museum. But socialism is more than "ideology." Wherever capitalism exists, except in the United States, socialism appears as a movement of millions of workers. It is a material class force as well as an "ideology."

The same class that creates the socialist movement exists in the United States, where it has been growing, evolving, changing. And this class, in the United States, carries on its struggle against its employers.

Where is it going? If Hartz did not answer this question, we could not complain. But he does not even deal with it. He does not deign to mention the real class, here and now.

No mention of the CIO. No mention of labor's role in politics. No reference to

(Turn to last page)

## Alois Neurath — Socialist

In April of this year Alois Neurath, the former Sudeten-German labor leader, died in Stockholm (Sweden). Thus another of the revolutionary socialist leaders of the generation of Lenin, Trotsky, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, with whose names the history of the labor movement of Europe for the first four decades of this century is inseparably associated has gone to his grave. The Sudeten-German workers have every reason to grieve deeply over Alois Neurath for in him they have lost not only their wisest socialist head but also one of the clearest and most upright leaders of their political movement.

Before and during the first world war, Neurath stood at the most leftward wing of the Austrian Social Democracy. When the triumph of the October Revolution heralded the onset of a new historical epoch and when right afterward the German Revolution threateningly raised its head, Neurath was one of the first labor leaders of the Sudetenland to summon the working class fearlessly and passionately, "Hic Rhodus, hic salta!"

The first assault of the German Revolution was smashed by the reaction thanks to social-democratic assistance; the revolution in the countries of old Austria suffocated in the chauvinistic delirium of the national uprisings; and the Sudetenland, without recourse to a popular referendum and by virtue of the peace-dictate of Versailles, was incorporated into Czechoslovakia.

The problem of the revolutionary socialists of the time was now, under changed conditions, to assemble and to prepare the forces for a new assault. With enthusiasm and dogged courage, Alois Neurath plunged into this task. He was one of the organizers and founders of the first Communist Party in Czechoslovakia and was soon elected to the Executive Committee of the Communist International. For him there followed years of the most intensive agitational work, as a Communist deputy in the Parliament at Prague, as the publisher of the *Vorwaerts* (Forward) of Reichenberg and in the International.

Meanwhile the revolution in Central Europe, after several isolated assaults and waves, had ebbed, and after Lenin's death the signs of the approaching counterrevolution appeared in Russia itself. In the Communist International the period of the great factional struggles, the embittered battle of the tendencies for a way out of the inexorably advancing crisis now began. Neurath of course was in the thick of this ideological struggle, and when the victory of the Stalinist counterrevolution in Russia spread to the parties of the Communist International, he was expelled from the CP of Czechoslovakia for his uncompromising position and resolute rejection of Stalinism.

After a short period of feeling his way, Alois Neurath joined Trotsky's movement in 1928, and up to the time of the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Hitler in March, 1939,

he was at the very center of the Trotskyist movement in the country. In 1939 he succeeded in fleeing to Norway but when, a year later, the armies of Hitler occupied this country, too, he was arrested and brought back to Prague. Only by an accident and a trick was he able to save himself from Hitler's hangmen and to escape to Sweden.

After the war Neurath remained in Sweden and was active as a journalist in the social-democratic papers of the country. At the same time he kept working among the circles of his former friends and comrades in struggle, sharply decimated by the war and scattered to every corner of the globe, to create a new, revolutionary socialist grouping, and to inspire the despairing and the discouraged among them with a new fighting spirit.

In the period from 1939 to 1946, Alois Neurath had no possibility of taking part in the great and fundamental discussions within the Trotskyist movement, or even of getting information about the basic questions that were at stake. It is therefore all the more remarkable that, out of his own political and theoretical analyses, he arrived at similar conclusions to those of the Independent Socialist League in the United States. A few years ago, he published a brochure in Germany under the pseudonym of Josef Schmidt called "Vom Roten Oktober zur Diktatur der Buerokratie" (From the Red October to the Dictatorship of the Bureaucracy) which, in simple language and terminology, understandable by any worker, ripped to shreds every possible form of socialist illusion about the progressive nature, the class character and the possibilities of development of Stalinism, and which showed the workers the only possible road, even today, of revolutionary, democratic, independent socialism. It is indeed the only work in the German language that goes to the heart of the burning problem of socialism: the dispute with Stalinism, from a Marxist point of view, in an absolutely clear, unambiguous way and without the slightest opportunistic concession to hysterical anti-Bolshevism or to modern revisions of Marx.

The framers of the Prague witchcraft trial of 1953 found it necessary to drag in the name of Alois Neurath as one of the superiors and wirepullers behind the "conspirators." Neurath who, in earlier years, had been teacher, counsellor and model of many of the accused, utilized this opportunity in order once again to fling his contempt, over Radio Free Europe, into the faces of the wretched Quislings in Prague.

The life of Alois Neurath, which was dedicated to the full and with all intensity to the struggle of the working class, has been extinguished. The spirit that animated him gleams today but weakly among the workers of his people who once were swept along with enthusiasm by the glow of his speeches at thousands of mass meetings. But another day is coming again, and then many streets and squares of the cities of the Sudetenland will bear the name of Alois Neurath.

## British CP — —

(Continued from page 3)

itself. The Stalinists can see that the Labor Left is now hesitating following the electoral defeat and the recent change of climate in international relations. Thus if the CP is to gain any measure of control over the Labor Left now as the time to do it. Tomorrow or the day after will be too late.

It would be unrealistic to say that there are not a number of left-wingers who may fall for the latest Stalinist line, particularly if the Bevanite leadership fails to respond in a most positive fashion to the situation now existing inside the Labor Party. But the political infants who will be sucked in by the Stalinists are far and away outnumbered by Labor left wingers who—while seeking a new road for the feet of the Labor Party—know that this cannot be provided by the Stalinists.

The answer was provided in the August issue of the *Socialist Review*, a Labor left wing monthly journal, which said that the extent to which the latest attempts of the CP to influence and infiltrate into the Labor left succeeded "depends upon those of the Labor Party Left who stand in clear opposition to both Stalinism and capitalism and consistently advance the Third Camp position. By exposing the fundamental reactionary character of Stalinism they will frustrate the attempts of the CP to influence those members of the Labor Party who, while dissatisfied with the present policies, are not yet able to see that Stalinism offers no socialist alternative."

# Nature of Peronism — —

(Continued from page 6)

bureaucratized as the Hitler Labor Front, then of course S.R.'s reminders would be useful. They are "organizations of workers" and (as I pointed out in my

## 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!

## SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

co's rejection was based on his "whole record." The only other "damaging" material in Aresco's record appears to have been truancy while he was a school boy, and two courts martial for minor infractions while he was in the navy during the Korean war.

Alfred Aresco continues to insist that when he was questioned by police officials about his past "only about three minutes were devoted to questions about the courts martial. The next 22 or 23 minutes were devoted to questions about the Communist issue. Bringing up the courts martial now is definitely an afterthought by the police department."

Aresco has hired an attorney who will

article at the heart of my argument) the irrepressible class struggle has broken out through them.

But S.R.'s description of them would also apply to (say) the bona-fide but right-wing trade unions of the AFL. Is there no difference, in his opinion? He makes none, and indeed he is discussing the subject because I indicated a qualitative difference by using quote-marks. For me the bona-fide trade unions of Argentina are organized in the illegal COASI.

The Peronist "trade unions" are controlled by the state and agents of the state. This does not prevent working within them or prevent class struggle from breaking out through them. (It doesn't in the Stalinist "trade unions," either; it didn't in the police-organized "trade unions" of tsarism, which could be won over too; and it didn't even in American company unions, many of which in the '30s were won over and transformed into CIO locals.) This one-sidedness of S.R.'s characterization of the Peronist "trade unions" would also be astonishing, were it not for the suspicion I have voiced in point 2.

(5) I termed the army officer caste and the hierarchy reactionary not simply because of their attitude on democracy but because of their social program and record. But S.R. wants to know: why didn't my article go further and label their class character? A legitimate question; so legitimate that S.R. should have been sensitive to the fact that when he begins his letter by asking "First of all,

## A Sterilized History — —

(Continued from page 7)

organized labor. No discussion of modern strikes. He refutes De Leon shatteringly: "the people who are supposed to make the revolution are inveterate capitalists." Are the modern wage-workers "inveterate capitalists"? He implies it without saying so.

He scorns Granville Hicks because "he missed completely the historic implications of a middle-class America because of his concern with the decline of individual property holdings and the rise of an 'objective' proletariat." America then will remain eternally middle class; perish small holdings; rise working class... yet the tradition of capitalist liberalism will remain forever.

It is clear that Hartz is soaring aloft; his ties with the real world which seemed so firm at the beginning have been broken. The liberal tradition is transformed into an eternal mystique.

Thus he writes: "If the Great Depression of the thirties suggested anything,

what is the Peron regime?" he never says a word about the class character of the Peronist movement and regime! For one who is so insistent on class-characterization, this is thought-provoking.

More than that: S.R., who is very anxious to class-characterize the anti-Peron rebels, says these "represent the landowners, capitalists, and foreign imperialist interests." Suppose this were true: *it leaves very few classes for Peronism to represent, doesn't it?* Is S.R. willing to face the conclusion that Peronism must be... a workers' and peasants' government?

I submit that this is politically absurd, and I don't think S.R. believes it, but he has boxed himself in.

Now I might as well say very quickly at this point that (1) I think that the nearest approximation that I can make with regards to labelling the class roots of Peronism is that it primarily represented, at least in its heyday, the interests and perspective of the relatively new industrial capitalist elements in the country; but (2) I have long been very conscious of what I think is a much more complicated social character and role of the Peronist phenomenon as a whole, one which I think can be discussed adequately only within the context of world trends toward a statified bureaucratization of capitalism. Simply raising this question is enough to show how much work the question needs. But I do not think much work is needed to discard S.R.'s proposals for class-labels.

As for a class characterization of the

rebels, there is a great deal more I would like to know about them, though perhaps S. R. is satisfied with his own stock of information.

Up to now at least (leaving aside naturally the anti-Peronist sectors of the labor and socialist movement) the main bastion of anti-Peronism has been in the landowning class; and there apparently have been important anti-Peronist sectors in the urban petty-bourgeoisie. But it does not follow automatically that therefore the class lines in the recent revolt were clear-cut. Why should they be? My feeling is, that there is a great heterogeneity and flux in this period in the social forces that have backed Peronism. Even as far as industrial-bourgeois elements are concerned, one cannot assume that the regime still is the best instrument to express their present needs. Peron's relatively recent turn toward capitulation to U. S. imperialist pressure in order to attract capital investment shows that there has been a great squeeze behind it. Would not a different type of authoritarian regime, cleansed of Peron's demagoguery and past, be better adapted to get the best results for the bourgeoisie? Some may indeed think so.

And so my best guess would be that behind both Peron and the anti-Peron cabal right now are *split* class forces. The whole unstable atmosphere of Argentine politics at this moment, and the very tactics of the revolt, would seem to me to cry this conclusion, too.

HAL DRAPER

it was that the failure of socialism in America stemmed from the ideologic power of the national irrational liberalism rather than from economic circumstance." And later: "one can easily wonder whether any purely domestic crisis could shake the national faith, whether innovations even larger than those the New Deal dreamed of could not be made on the basis of the mechanism it used."

The liberal faith is now immune to "economic circumstances" and "domestic crisis." It lives on in a sterilized world of its own.

Hartz wastes no time on Stalinism, expressing only contempt for those who have tried to grapple with its significance: "The American Marxist learns nothing and forgets nothing, and if evidence of this were ever needed, the New Deal era provides it aplenty... the Marxists fought out with a fine integrity every one of the battles which split apart their brethren abroad. Trotskyites blasted Stalinists, cherishing an American branch of the Fourth International and insisting on a puristic version of ancient texts."

Stalinism may have disoriented and finally destroyed American socialism; world politics may be dominated by the problem of Stalinism, what it is, how to fight it. But our author is not to be

coaxed out of a determined grasp on utter ignorance.

And that is what makes his last chapter an impressive achievement, a noteworthy tour de force. For 25 pages, entitled "America and the World," he clambers over the terrain of world politics guided by mysterious compass quiverings of a thesis on liberal tradition. If he knows nothing about Stalinism, he proves it to the hilt.

The crisis of modern liberalism is inseparably linked to the rise of world Stalinism. The democrat wants to fight off Stalinist totalitarianism but at the same time extols capitalism which provokes pro-Stalinism the world over; he is eager to defend democratic rights but at the same time is ready to suppress the democratic rights of Communists. And so, liberalism today is in a state of intellectual disintegration.

Hartz, too, finds his liberal world in a quandary; he notices a tendency toward conformity; in his view, the trend toward a submissive uniformity flows directly out of the American tradition; it is simply the tendency toward "tyranny of the majority" implicit in liberalism and democracy.

We have here a theory of the liberal tradition which does everything except stimulate the fight for democracy.

## SDA Convention — —

(Continued from page 5)

the civil libertarian position is not to pass a resolution whose objective consequences would be to disrupt, and perhaps decimate, the liberal youth movement. It is to carry the fight on into ADA so that both the adult and the youth organizations will have a civil libertarian position. This is what I would call the program of a responsible left-wing. It is this attitude which I would recommend to the writers of the letter.

To recapitulate: (1) I am for a liberal youth organization in America; (2) I believe that this organization can only exist *today* as an affiliate of ADA; (3) I am for winning adherents and organizations to a civil libertarian position; (4) the only practical way of doing this today in the liberal movement is to have SDA stay in ADA and militantly fight to change that organization's attitude.

ELI FISHMAN

## Freedom From Socialism — —

(Continued from page 1)

months' notice of any enemy plan to attack.

He bothered them so much though, that at last they got tough with him, and asked him if he remembered the old fable of the boy and the wolves. He was a sensitive soul, and finally got the hint and quit calling up.

It seemed by the end of 1959 that even the most ardent foe of Socialism should be satisfied with the new American way.

But one day his aides found him sitting in his Washington office gloomily gazing at the Stars and Stripes flying over the Capitol.

"Gentlemen," he said, turning to them a man of mingled determination and high resolve, "our work is not yet done, as long as our very Capitol building itself remains a bastion of Socialism, and is not leased to the government by free private American enterprise. We must have a fourth Hoover Commission!"

—From Union News

### READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM!

In four special pamphlet-issues of LABOR ACTION, the basic ideas of Independent Socialism are vividly and simply explained.

- No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism
- No. 2—Independent Socialism and the Third World War
- No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis
- No. 4—Socialism and Democracy
- No. 5—What is Stalinism?