

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

DECEMBER 22, 1952

FIVE CENTS

**THE SLOGAN OF 'NEGOTIATIONS' —
A DEBATE ON WAR POLICY**

... page 6

Stalinist Trials Shake the Mapam

... page 2

Buck Rogers Goes to Washington

... page 5

Diego Rivera: Death As a Man

... page 4

High Court Kills Okla. Oath Law

A new decision of the Supreme Court, handed down on Monday, December 15, killed a state loyalty oath, but the grounds on which the verdict was reached narrowly restrict its positive meaning as any advance for civil liberties.

The oath which was knocked out was Oklahoma's sweeping statute requiring state employees to take such an oath as a condition of employment. It also required a pledge to bear arms in wars by the U. S. and the affirmation that the signer had not been a member, within the past five years, of any organization on the attorney general's notorious "subversive list."

Suit had been brought by seven Oklahoma teachers who had refused to sign and who had been dismissed. No question had been raised about any connection between any of the teachers and any "subversive"-labeled group; five of the teachers objected to bearing arms on religious grounds.

Limited Ground

The Supreme Court vote was unanimously for the decision as written by Tom Clark, though one justice particularly, Hugo L. Black, went much further in a concurring statement. But it was possible for the decision to be written by Clark—who, as a former attorney general, had been directly involved in creating the monstrous "subversive list"—because of the limited effect of the decision on the witch-hunt procedures being widely employed by government agencies.

The decisive ground on which court agreement was attained to dispose of Oklahoma's law was simply that it made no distinction between persons who knowingly associated themselves with a proscribed political organization and those who might have done so "innocently," that is, in unaware-

(Turn to last page)

Justice Black Says: No Compromise With Tools of Tyranny!

Concurring with the decision of the Supreme Court as a whole on the Oklahoma loyalty-oath law, Justice Hugo L. Black added the following as his basic ground for throwing the act out.

"The Oklahoma oath statute is but one manifestation of a national network of laws aimed at coercing and controlling the minds of men. Test oaths are notorious tools of tyranny. When used to shackle the mind they are, or at least they should be, unspeakably odious to a free people.

"Test oaths are made still more dangerous when combined with bills of attainder which, like this Oklahoma statute impose pains and penalties for past lawful associations and utterances.

Governments need and have ample power to punish treasonable acts. But it does not follow that they must have a further power to punish thought and speech as distinguished from acts. Our own free society should never forget that laws which stigmatize and penalize thought and speech of the unorthodox have a way of reaching, ensnaring and silencing many more people than at first intended.

"We must have freedom of speech for all or we will in the long run have it for none but the cringing and the craven. And I cannot too often repeat my belief that the right to speak on matters of public concern must be wholly free or eventually be wholly lost.

Individuals are guaranteed an undiluted and unequivocal right to express themselves on questions of current public interest. It means that Americans discuss such questions as of right and not on sufferance of legislatures, courts or any other governmental agencies. It means that courts are without power to praise and penalize utterances upon their notion that these utterances are dangerous.

"In my view this uncompromising interpretation of the Bill of Rights is the one that must prevail if its freedoms are to be saved. Tyrannical totalitarian governments cannot safely allow their people to speak with complete freedom. I believe with the framers [of the Constitution] that our free government can."

The ISL-SWP Debate in Berkeley

BERKELEY, Calif., Dec. 7.—For the first time in twelve years, a public debate was held between the Socialist Workers Party and the Independent Socialist League over the fundamental questions which caused the split in the Trotskyist movement in 1940.

The debate took place a few blocks from the University of California campus. Despite the fact that both socialist organizations are considered "subversive" by the authorities, and despite the atmosphere of fear and intimidation which permeates the university community, the meeting was surprisingly successful. There were about 175 present.

Through the long, heavy and involved debate, the audience stuck to their chairs. There was intense interest in the arguments of both speakers; the audience participated, interrupted, asked questions, for four full hours.

The question for the evening was: *Resolved: that the nationalized Soviet form of economy is progressive in relationship to capitalism.* The Socialist Workers Party speaker, Frank Barbaria, defended the affirmative view in

Company-Hoodlum Ties Revealed in N. Y. Dock Scandal

By GORDON HASKELL

The International Longshoremen's Association (ILA) is a labor organization. It is certified by the National Labor Relations Board as the collective-bargaining agent for longshoremen on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. Its officers have signed the "non-Communist" affidavits required for such certification. It has obtained wage increases for its members over the years, and its wage scales rank with those of workers in other industries. It also has the distinction of being the only labor organization in this country (and probably in any other) whose president, Joseph Patrick Ryan, has been officially and constitutionally given life tenure in office.

For many years it has been generally known that the ILA is distinguished for practices other than those which are normal to the labor movement. It has even been known that in these practices the ILA is exceptional, if not unique, among AFL unions.

Collusion

It has unfortunately been left to the New York State Crime Commission, however, to reveal to the general public in addition to being a labor organization, the ILA is a gangster empire of vast dimensions which enjoys the full support and backing of the stevedore and shipping

companies, and which, like every gangster empire, has political connections running high into the councils of government.

The Crime Commission has only held seven days of hearings as this is written, and there will no doubt be much more to come. If we are to judge by past experience, this particular commission is likely to lose interest in the political connections of the ILA gangsters the moment these seem to be leading high up, especially if they lead to Republicans.

Yet enough has been revealed about the ILA to make one fact so clear, that even the daily papers have not been able to ignore it: without the collusion and support of the employers, the ILA leadership would never have been able to turn this union into a den of thieves, murderers, extortioners, and racketeers of every description.

Bribery

What proof is there of employer collusion with the hoodlum leadership of the ILA? The crassest proof yet presented consists of a list of known payments by steamship, stevedoring and dock companies to officials of the ILA amounting to \$182,214 paid out during the five years 1947-51.

Forty-three companies participated in this bribery, three of them being responsible for nearly 50 per cent of the total. The Jaraka Corporation, largest stevedoring concern in the East, was re-

(Turn to last page)

(Continued on page 2)

Will There Be a Second Split?

Stalinist Trials Shake the Israeli Mapam

By AL FINDLEY

The anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish themes of the Stalinist purge trials in Prague have naturally focused attention on the reaction of Mapam, the pro-Stalinist party of Israel. Nobody was interested in the reaction of the Jewish Stalinists of the CP of Israel. Everybody expected them to swallow every word as gospel truth and hide the anti-Semitism behind the thin veil of anti-Zionism. They did exactly that, and blamed the Israelis for their troubles.

The Mapam, however, is a Zionist group and has different degrees of Stalinists and Stalinoids within it.

Up to the time of the trials the Mapam position was that the Czechs' arrest of its leader Mordecai Oren was a mistake, that he might have committed a minor infraction of some laws but never treason against the socialist fatherland and the People's Democracies. When Oren appeared as a witness in the trials and "confessed" that he was a spy, the issue was posed anew.

Moshe Sneh, head of the extreme pro-Stalinist wing of the party, demanded the acceptance of his guilt and (by implications) the guilt of all Zionists. He was voted down 3-2 in the editorial board of *Al Hamishmar*. The paper then came out with a statement announcing its faith in the innocence of Oren but including the ambiguous phrase that Oren did not "willfully engage in hostile acts against the republic of Czechoslovakia."

SWITCH?

The next day a special meeting of the executive of the Mapam was called at the insistence of Sneh and Rifkin, who declared that the editorial board had no right to make a decision. After a discussion the policy of the majority of the editorial board was upheld by a vote of 25 to 9, with the main group of the Hashomer Hatzair (led by Yaari and Chazan) joining the least Stalinist elements in opposition to the position of Sneh-Rifkin.

Press reports interpreted this as switch in Mapam's pro-Stalinist line and some went so far as to see a break with the extreme Sneh-Rifkin group.

This impression was heightened by an editorial in *Al Hamishmar* which attacked the anti-Zionist statements of *Rude Pravo*, official organ of the Czech CP, which declared Zionism to be the "greatest enemy of the working class."

Mapam had swallowed the liquidation of all Jewish writers and Organizations in Russia without any protest. No editorial criticizing Russia had appeared, though an occasional unofficial critical article by a member of the Achduth Avodah group was allowed before the "dissolution of fractions." The appearance of this editorial therefore attracted attention.

APOLOGIA

However, even this criticism of *Rude Pravo* was along Stalinoid lines. It was directed against a paper which is itself an unfortunate slave of its masters in Moscow, who control its tongue. No mention is made of the real authors of a line parroted by all the Stalinists the world over.

In addition, while attacking *Rude Pravo* the editorial sneaked in a defense of the previous purges of Jewish "cosmopolitans." Everybody knows that these purges set the stage for the Prague trials and further persecution of the Jews. In this statement Mapam implies that their purge was justified since they were real "cosmopolitans" and opponents of Zionism.

The general tenor of all the Mapam statements on the trials is saturated with praise for Stalinism and declarations of solidarity with Russia and the "People's Democracies." While there is a defense

the group seems to have asserted its dominant position in Mapam. The trials, instead of leading to a change in line, seem to have led to a polarization of the Mapam, with the vacillating group of the Hashomer Hatzair, led by Yaari and Chazan, being won over by Sneh. On the other hand, "Achduth Avodah" — the least Stalinist group in the party — became less willing to follow the line to its logical conclusion.

TWO LINES

In preparation for a party conference to be held this week two draft positions were advanced. The first was presented jointly by Yaari and Sneh. It proposed to say: (1) Mapam places the blame for the change in the attitude of Czechoslovakia toward Israel on the Israeli government; (2) Mapam should strengthen its campaign against Ben-Gurion's pro-American policy; (3) issue a statement about Oren. No details of the statement are as yet known but presumably it will take a new stand on the guilt or innocence of Oren.

The placing of the blame on Israeli leaders for the change in attitude of the Stalinists is of course not justified, but even if it were, it would not follow that the actions of the Stalinists are justified. In sum, what was adopted was the same as the line of the

Daily Worker, and one can see the extent to which these Mapam groups capitulated.

The members of the former Achduth Avodah proposed (1) the party solidarizes itself with Oren and does not accept his confession at the trial; (2) opposes the accusations made against the state of Israel; (3) declares Mapam an integral part of the Zionist movement; and (4) expresses dissatisfaction at the negative presentation of the Jewish angle at the trials.

TO SPLIT?

The language of even the most anti-Stalinist section of the Mapam shows a very extreme sensitivity for the position of the Stalinists and is not even clearcut on either anti-Semitism or other aspects of the trials. An anti-Stalinist tendency is, however, apparent.

The on-again off-again split of Mapam may take place at this conference. If it does not, the coming trial of Oren may break any patchwork unity the conference may establish. The split will be between the Hashomer Hatzair and the members of the Achduth Avodah tendency. There seems extremely small possibilities of a split within the Hashomer itself.

This will be the second split within the Mapam. Two deputies in the Knesset, Lifshits and Lam-

den, split last year but found few followers among the rank and file. Since they accepted all the basic premises that Russia is a socialist state and is leading the world revolution, they made little dent among the others. Their differences lay in the question of where to draw the line between Stalinism and Zionism.

There is still a danger of defections from the Achduth Avodah to the Hashomer. However, should a break occur they will this time take about 30 per cent of the party with them. Some 35 per cent of the Mapam live in settlements organized into the Kibutz Hameuchod. Since the outlawing of factions in Mapam this "non-political" organization of settlement has been transformed into de-facto organization of the Achduth Avodah faction to match the Kibutz Artzi, a similar organization of Hashomer. Both groups enforce "ideological collectivism," i.e., they do not permit different political party affiliation from that of the majority.

A split, if it occurs, will not result in the appearance of a party with an anti-Stalinist position but may start an evolution in their thinking. The actions of others beside the Stalinists will have an influence in deciding whether or not there will be a split. Should Ben-Gurion enter a coalition with the right-wing Zionists it will delay any such development.

The ISL-SWP Debate

(Continued from page 1)

ment be supported by socialists? Within ten days of the debate, the SWP suddenly called off the entire thing, for reasons which seemed to us preposterous.

But it is no secret that the ISL has been proposing to debate these intrepid thinkers on the "Russian question" ever since 1940. It is also no secret that the courageous "dialecticians" who run this party have refused point-blank up to now. Since the ISL was most eager to have the debate continue, it made many concessions. Finally under pressure from some of its contacts, the SWP agreed to debate the less acute question of "Soviet nationalized property."

"HIGHLY SIGNIFICANT"

To the dismay of the audience, Frank Barbara, Bay Area organizer for the SWP, spent fully half of his presentation on a long and dull analysis of the historical decline of the capitalist system, through the development of capitalist imperialism, the betrayal of the "yellow" Second International, and the Russian revolution of 1917. This entire section sounded like a May Day speech of the SLP of 1920 and was completely beside the point, since both organizations have fundamentally the same view about moribund capitalism. (Barbaria, plucking wildly at hairs, insisted in his rebuttal that it was *dynamically counter-revolutionary*, and uncovered a hidden "deviation" in the use of the word "moribund.")

Following the lead of countless Stalinist speakers on this question, he kept reiterating the "highly significant" fact that, as opposed to capitalism, there is "no unemployment in the Soviet Union." Stalin's slaves will be highly gratified to discover this "highly significant" fact.

In his defense of the "progressive" Russian economy, Barbaria then turned basically to a comparison of production figures between capitalism and Stalinism. While the capitalist economy stagnated during the depression on a world scale, Russia was rapidly industrializing. He explained that the Stalinist ruling group arose, and presumably continues in power, because of the failure to ex-

tend Russia's economy to the rest of the world; and left the impression that it is now merely a question of again extending the "revolution" to other countries, without fundamentally distinguishing between the Stalinist revolution and a socialist revolution. And this was all that he had to say.

ON SLAVE LABOR

Stalin builds factories; capitalism has unemployment and stagnates; ergo, nationalized economy is progressive—QED! There is no way to get around it, so long as Stalin continues to "nationalize" and to industrialize, and he will obviously continue to do so, this theory merely greases the skids for a fundamental capitulation to the new, totalitarian ruling class.

It is impossible, in this report, to deal with all the confusion the SWP speaker introduced. The most notable impression he gave was the obvious intellectual poverty of the SWP's theories and theoreticians. Although the speaker constantly came forward in defense of the colonial peoples, in favor of class struggle (shouted at the top of the lungs), against war, not many were impressed by this type of bluster.

The most shameful role played by the SWP representative was in connection with the slave-labor camps. The facts are leaking out since the end of the war and thus even the SWP is forced to deal with the matter.

Barbaria spent his time pooh-poohing the entire business. He pointed to the "slave camps" into which capitalist imperialism has transformed much of the colonial world. He tried, very unsuccessfully, to prove that the slave-labor camps which dot the Russian empire are "merely" a question of "super-exploitation." In his view the camps are not a "necessary" part of the "progressive planned economy of the Soviet Union." They are a political invention of the "bureaucracy" and are not part and parcel of the totalitarian collectivist economy.

It is possible to sum up his entire defense of the "only progressed aspect" which is left of the great October revolution, by saying that it was one long uncritical accolade for nationalized property *per se*. He can only oppose Stalinism, to the extent that it is dila-

tory ("capitulatory" in their language) in nationalizing this or that section of capitalist property. His main complaint against the Stalinists was: "You are afraid to nationalize! You are 'betraying' the revolution." You want to build "socialism in one country!" The lessons of ten years of world history, of the destruction of capitalism in all the countries under Stalinist rule, have passed them by. Their position is carrying them, willy-nilly, into the camp of Stalinist barbarism.

CLASS ANALYSIS

Another interesting aspect of Barbaria's speech was that not once did he refer to Stalinist Russia as a workers' state, degenerated or otherwise! Strange phenomenon! These people are willing to split the world revolutionary movement on this question, but they are unwilling today to come out and say that Russia is a "workers' state."

The reason this should be given special attention is that the SWP Cannonites have recently, especially in their local street meetings, been treating their "principled-position" on the character of the Russian state as if it were a sixth toe, something which just should not be mentioned in polite company. But the socialist movement can gain nothing from intellectual slovenliness, from evasive phrases and from dishonest political demagoguery. One wonders whom the SWP thinks it is fooling with this recent talk.

Since the readers of LABOR ACTION are likely to be already familiar with the general viewpoint of the ISL on the question of Stalinism, it is only necessary to sum up the main points made by Garber.

While Barbaria spent his time hailing the "great economic advances" made by the Soviet Union, Garber centered his attack on the social relations under Stalinism—the question of which class has power. He presented the facts about the living standards, the distribution of the national income, the criminal code, the conditions of the working class and peasants, and the wealth and social position of the new ruling class.

The image which his talk evoked for the audience was that Russia,

far from being any variety of "workers' state," was, on the contrary, a workers' prison. Not only does the working class not hold any political power, it is also prevented from forming any kind of organization to defend itself from the ruling class. The constant and deadly struggle between the collectivist bureaucracy and the workers is a class struggle no matter how primitive in form.

In his rebuttal Barbaria claimed that Garber had established nothing but the fact that a "bureaucracy" existed. "If this bureaucracy is a new class," he roared, "where did it have its existence before the October revolution?" "The only two classes in Russia," he said, "are the workers and peasants."

Then followed (today, in 1952!) those two old, shop-worn analogies upon which the SWP has built its solid, dialectical, "world historical" view of the class character of the Stalinist system. First the "trade-union analogy." (The trade unions "also" have a bureaucracy, you see.) Then came the analogy with the Bonapartist counter-revolution which followed the French revolution of 1789. (This is not the first time, you understand, that a revolution has been followed by a counter-revolution. But the counter-revolution is only a temporary setback. Society never returns to its starting point. The bureaucracy has not yet abolished the fundamental change in property relations introduced by the October revolution—the nationalized and planned economy. Therefore Stalin can be compared to Bonaparte.)

Finally, Barbaria tried to squeeze out something about the "petty-bourgeois opposition." These people know nothing about the ISL except that "somehow" it must be a "Menshevik" or "centrist" or secretly counter-revolutionary group. It must be admitted—Barbaria did his best on this point, but his best wasn't quite good enough.

NO ANALOGY

In his rebuttal, Garber took up the two analogies, which he carefully showed were built solidly out of sand. To compare the gigantic Stalinist state, with its prisons, MVD, its well-developed system of

(Continued on page 7)

LONDON LETTER

Politics Goes On in London's Fog

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Dec. 8 — This weekend's activities have been almost completely halted as the result of London's worst fog in this century. The Automobile Association reported that "it has never known worse conditions" and that "traffic has been completely dislocated." Visibility was down to zero in many parts of the city. And yet meetings were held in these unbelievably difficult conditions.

The Victory-for-Socialism Group, a small left-wing ginger group inside the Labor Party, for example, held a meeting on foreign and colonial policy at Westminster College, with no less than a hundred delegates from various Labor Party branches attending. Geoffrey Sing spoke on the Korean situation, Eric Messer on the "Third Force," Walter Wolfgang on the German problem, and toward the end of the meeting Fenner Brockway gave a detailed account of his visit to Kenya.

Although the speakers were scarcely visible in the room, the delegates took part in quite a lively discussion. When Geoffrey Bing, MP, was asked whether he was in favor of withdrawal of troops from Korea, he said no; in his opinion the admission of China into the UN and the repatriation of Chinese prisoners of war (unless they could be proved political deserters) would solve the Korean deadlock more effectively.

Bing represents the type of pro-Stalinist fellow traveler who is quite common in the Bevan group but whose pro-Stalinism always stops when the subject of the CP is raised.

Fenner Brockway made a damning indictment of Tory colonial policy in Kenya but admitted that the Labor Party's front bench was inhibited from taking drastic action in the House of Commons because it was largely responsible for the present state of affairs.

Unfortunately Fenner Brockway is far from clear himself. He suggests a "round table conference" between the European settlers and the African representatives to establish a basis for progressive economic and social amelioration of the lot of the Kikuyu peasantry. Such a policy is not constructive at all. The only way forward for the Kikuyu people and the African population as a whole is the way indicated by the Convention People's Party in the Gold Coast under the leadership of Kwame Nkrumah.

The European settlers are the most reactionary section of the British imperialists, and their interests are incompatible with even the most elementary demands (the right to land, the right to vote) of the African peasant. The African must take his own destiny into his own hands.

VOTES PUBLISHED

The current issue of the Bevanite *Tribune* contains a graphic article on the elections to the parliamentary committee of the Labor Party. It points out how the positions reached by the various members of the parliamentary committee vary very roughly in inverse proportion to the position (in terms of votes from the constituency branches) which they gained at the recent Morecambe conference of the party.

In the same article, entitled "It Was Morecambe in Reverse," another interesting set of figures are those for the votes received not only for the elected members of the National Executive Committee but also for those not elected (the latter figures, by the way, are not usually published). Here they are: Aneurin Bevan (Left).....965,000 Barbara Castle (Left).....868,000 Tom Driberg (Left).....744,000

James Griffiths (Center).....700,000 Harold Wilson (Left).....632,000 Ian Mikardo (Left).....630,000 Richard Crossman (Left).....620,000 The seven listed above were those elected. Following are the votes for those who were defeated for the NEC: Herbert Morrison (Right).....584,000 Hugh Dalton (Center).....437,000 Hugh Gaitskell (Extr. Right).....330,000 James Callaghan (Right).....196,000 Emanuel Shinwell (Center?).....146,000 Anthony Greenwood (Center).....141,000 Bessie Braddock (Right).....130,000

Another interesting article, entitled "Should Tito Come to London?" written by Michael Foot, vigorously counterattacks the agitation organized by the Catholic hierarchy in this country against Marshal Tito's visit. In this the Catholic hierarchy is at one with the Stalinists, who fear that Tito's visit will cement the ties between the left wing of the Labor Party MPs and the anti-Stalin version of "Marxism-Leninism" typified by the Yugoslav national-Stalinist state.

LEEWAY FOR BEVAN

Of course, the fact that Aneurin Bevan was called upon to wind up for the Opposition in last week's censure debate has caused considerable comment. The *Observer's* political correspondent, who is usually reliable, emphatically states that "the Labor Party [i.e., the Parliamentary Labor Party] has never been more united" as a result of Colonel Wigg's successful counting out of the House during the steel denationalization debate. Efforts were made all last week by some very powerful members of the parliamentary committee like Emanuel

Shinwell, Hugh Dalton, Alfred Robens and Sir Frank Soskice to soften the blow at the Bevan spokesman, Bevan himself, into the censure debate.

Clearly these MPs realize that unless Bevan is given some leeway inside the parliamentary committee, the constituency branches will deliver the right-wing MPs a rude and unpleasant shock—they will find that they will not be nominated during the next general election by their local parties.

Only the blind can fail to see that the right wing is compromising with Bevan, for they know that he is the unofficial leader of the party's rank and file.

The right wing has also learned from its past mistakes. It cannot sell out like the social-patriots who helped form Lloyd George's coalition government after the First World War (styling themselves Coalition Labor), or like the National Laborites of Ramsay MacDonald and Philip Snowden in 1931, because they know the party will remain solid.

And even the trade-union moguls like Arthur Deakin, Tom Williamson and Lincoln Evans know only too well that however much pressure they put on the Parliamentary Labor Party behind the scenes (they probably instigated the rigging of the Parliamentary Labor Party elections), they cannot exist or function outside the framework of their own trade unions, whose members are loyal to their Labor Party.

The trade-union leaders have also to reckon with the formidable array of secondary and tertiary unions which find their interests in conflict with the right wing. The National Union of Railwaymen, the Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers, the ETU, the Construction En-

gineering Union, and even the National Union of Mineworkers (they remember that it was the NUM's block vote which carried the resolution at the Scarborough Trade Union Congress for the extension of social ownership) are far from "reliable."

All the maneuvers, rigging and block votes in the world cannot prevent the emergence of Bevanism as the ideology of the new Labor Party. Churchill himself, by his most recent heavy cut in arms production, only reinforced and underlined the need for a Bevanite Labor Party.

The *Observer* editorial states without blinking an eyelid that "the heavy cuts in arms production announced by Mr. Churchill last Thursday mean that the three-year armament program initiated by the Labor government in the spring of 1951 is dead." Further, in the same editorial: "Now a Conservative government takes over a Bevanite position." With Churchill a "Bevanite," where does the right wing Labor and trade-union leadership stand?

ABROAD

Great interest is shown by the Labor Party in movements of a potentially friendly character the world over. The recent election of Walter Reuther as president of the CIO is a case in point.

The Republican victory in the U. S. caused great concern here. The emergence of strong politically and socially conscious trade-union leadership in the U. S. is a good omen for the future.

We are fully alive to the need for close ties between the British and American trade-union movement across the Atlantic. Without American labor taking its future into its own hands British Labor will find its job more than diffi-

Next Week —

We will print a complete index to LABOR ACTION for the past year in the last issue of the year. LABOR ACTION has been the only indexed socialist weekly since 1949.

While the index is especially useful in the bound volumes, where it is easily available at the end of the volume, it also provides the handiest way of assembling research material on a wide variety of current political questions for socialist speakers and writers, and for checking dates and important facts.

The business office is planning to have available bound volumes for both 1951 and 1952 soon after the turn of the year. The index makes these more valuable than ever as a contemporary history of current affairs. Look for the announcement.

Even when it is thrust back in power with an overwhelming electoral majority and a robust socialist program.

Again, we are not oblivious of the successes of our comrades in smaller countries. In Australia, for instance, the Labor Party has won an absolute majority in the Victoria state elections for the first time in history, capturing 36 out of 69 seats. Thus four out of the six states in the Dominion of Australia are now Labor.

And closer home (only relatively) the Iceland Social-Democratic Party has just ejected its right-wing leader, Johan Stefansson, and replaced him with the left-wing trade-union leader Hannibal Vladimirsson. The congress of the party carried a resolution suggesting direct contact between the Iceland trade-union movement and the British trade-union movement to settle the dispute between British and Icelandic trawlers over fishing rights.

In such ways also the links between international labor are forged.

Bolivia: Economic Breakers Ahead

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Dec. 8—The nationalization of the mines by the Bolivian government produced stagnation in the revolutionary movement of the country and, in consequence of that, a turn to the right in the policy of the MNR (Nationalist) regime. [See last week's issue—Ed.] The reconstruction of the cabinet would have been more to the right than it was, were it not for the resistance of the workers' movement, which kept the president from fully embracing the rightist elements who have been well known since the time of Villarreal.

The "workers' ministers" Lechin and Butron stayed in the cabinet despite the fact that Lechin had declared that he would not enter the government because he does not agree with the new composition of the cabinet. But after some "persuasion" by President Paz Estenssoro he not only went in but also defended his policy against criticism from the left. Such is Lechin, the "famous" leader of the mine workers of Bolivia.

BUTRON'S CLAWS

The turn to the right has also been expressed in the conflict between the ministers Barrenechea and Butron and the radio and telegraph workers, who went out on strike because the "revolutionary" cabinet would not respect its own decree about their wage raise. The "workers' minister" Butron declared their strike illegal and threatened the workers' jobs. The strike ended with a compromise but it displayed the rightist and anti-working-class tendency of the new government. The working class did not back this strike up with full

solidarity, in spite of the cabinet's rightward tendencies.

Agrarian reform also remains in a state of complete stagnation. The Indian peasants demand the distribution of the land and refuse to work any longer for the *patrones*, but the government is supporting the maintenance of private property in the country. The revolutionary actions of the peasants in the district of Cochabamba were suppressed by the police with armed force and some peasants were killed in the massacres.

COB IN BACKSEAT

The working class is incapable of clearly supporting the peasants with an organized action such as a sympathy strike or street demonstration. The government has promised agrarian reform but, according to the decision taken by President Paz, "property will be respected" and protected by the government—and it is the feudalists' property which is to be "respected," not the individual peasants' property.

Of course, from the standpoint of revolutionary changes in Bolivia, land reform is politically and socially more important than mine nationalization, because the former would completely change the social and political structure of the country while mine nationalization would only replace the capitalist owner with the state as owner of the mines.

The stagnation of the "national revolution" has also been manifested in the Central Obrera Boliviana, the central trade-union federation, which before nationalization had become of the greatest importance and was looked on as a dual government. Now, because of the yellow role played by Lechin and Butron on the issues of

compensation and workers' control, the Central Obrera has been subordinated to the eclectic and pro-capitalist policy of the cabinet and therefore has lost its former importance as the center of political and ideological power.

The cabinet's turn to the right has provoked much criticism of the "workers' ministers" within the Central; the POR fraction demanded their resignation from the cabinet. But Lechin, Butron and Chavez (the peasant minister) have consolidated support for their policy as against the POR's attack, and with the support of the Stalinists of the PIR and the CP have conquered a majority of 23 against 4 in favor of their participation in the government.

DANGER AHEAD

With this vote, the victory of the rightist-Nationalist-Stalinist tendency in the Central has given the organization a right-wing coloration.

The majority of the workers are backing the Nationalist government because they think that a government which has nationalized the mines must be a revolutionary government. They do not understand that this government is transforming itself, through the statification of the mines, and given the fact that the state is a bourgeois state, into a new oppressor and exploiter of the workers.

But the economic crisis in the country is becoming greater every day, since the government cannot sell its tin to the United States. If the government continues to be unable to sell the tin for another six months, nothing can save it from a new coup d'etat, perhaps from the right; for the government must provide food to eat not only for the mine workers but also

for the whole country, and without the sale of its tin it cannot buy food from the U. S.

The economic crisis and the onset of hunger in Bolivia could also be a new stimulus to workers' opposition against the Nationalists and perhaps to a new stage in the workers' revolution, backed up by peasant rebellions in the villages and spontaneous land-reform measures.

It is to be thought likely that the businessmen and bourgeois politicians of the United States understand this danger also, and that they will grant support to the Nationalist regime: that is, buy the tin, contribute to avert a new workers' revolution, and at the same time turn a good piece of business by getting lower prices, in return for compensation to American investors. In this case the Nationalist regime could find a basis for stabilization, temporarily of course, and could transform itself into a totalitarian state-capitalist and anti-working-class dictatorship, supported by the U. S.'s "democratic" pro-capitalist policy.

The workers' yellow Nationalist leaders bear full responsibility for the dangers of a new totalitarian enslavement which has been prepared by their traitorous and reactionary policy.

WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

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!

INTERESTED?

Get Acquainted

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

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

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY ZONE

STATE TEL.

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
- Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 - One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

- NEW
- RENEWAL
- Bill me.
- Payment enclosed.

NAME

ADDRESS

APT.

CITY

ZONE STATE

DEATH AS A MAN

Diego Rivera Grovels Before the Kremlin

By HAL DRAPER

Having just returned from a month in Mexico, I am—like many another Yanqui turista—sufficiently saturated with viewing Diego Rivera productions to last quite a while. By coincidence, however, I return to find that LABOR ACTION has just received another one—not a mural. It is a translation, sent here, of Rivera's latest application for admission into the Mexican Communist Party, his third attempt to crawl back into the embrace of Stalinism.

The contrast between the Rivera which is recorded on many a Mexico City government-building wall and the Rivera which reeks out of this statement is quite sharp enough to conform with the slogan of Mexico's tourist bureau, "See Mexico, the Land of Contrasts."

No one can fail to be impressed as he looks at the great Rivera mural which covers the vast wall over the stairway of the National Palace in Mexico City, depicting in a compelling montage the history of the country from the Spanish conquest to the years of industrialization. There is courage, dignity, violence and passion for justice rioting in the color. Not only in this mural but elsewhere in Mexico a central figure is the man who would not crawl, would not bend the neck to despots, would not sell himself. He is the Aztec hero of the Mexican people, We Americans are likely to know of the Aztec emperor Montezuma, but it is a fact to be recorded with some astonishment that I had never heard of the real hero of Indian Mexico until I came to live a stone's throw away from his statue: he is Cuauhtemoc, the son of Montezuma, who refused to bow to a tyrant. The only thing named after Montezuma that I saw in Mexico City was a beer.

But the Rivera who sent his third whine to the bosses of the Mexican CP does not have the right to shape a portrait of Cuauhtemoc. This Rivera is a quivering mass of slime falling on his belly before a potentate, filling his mouth with equal parts of licked dust and lickspittle flattery. What he has written is as good a job as he can manage, not being an artist with the pen, to give as close an imitation as possible of a broken Stalinist functionary in the dock of a Moscow trial.

Portrait of Indian Abased Before Cortés

I confess all my political errors, he bleats, especially the error of having belonged to the "Trotskyite gang" till expelled therefrom in 1938. "Nevertheless," he adds, "on being expelled from this organization, I lacked both the political orientation necessary for a re-examination of my position, and the political courage to make public the points of disagreement." And so he proceeds to convince the Masters that he can degrade himself as humbly as any other Stalinist zombie:

"If I am readmitted to the party, I will fight without mercy the ever-deepening degeneration of capitalism, as well as the abject treason of the Trotskyists and Titoists. The Trotskyists have now converted themselves, objectively and subjectively, into the worst enemies of the fatherland of the workers, the Soviet Union, and into the most efficient counter-revolutionary police agents now in the service of American and British imperialism. In the struggle against the worst enemies of the laboring masses, they must be counted in the vanguard of these enemies as the worst of the worst, the most hypocritical, the most abject, the most degenerate traitors, who objectively are no more than neo-fascists, thrice traitors to communism, to peace, and to the cause of humanity."

And more such abject and degenerate mouthings to the men he knows as murderers and assassins.

To be sure, Rivera never had a political head, and it is not even his present pro-Stalinist political opinions that should be highlighted here. An artist has a right to be a political muckhead without being less great. Something else is involved with Rivera: not his confession of pro-Stalinism, but his death as a man. For a man can be a nincompoop in politics as in any other field without imperiling his gift, but can he force himself to become a brutalized swine, liar and cringing jackanapes and still maintain integrity as an artist?

Get ALL your books from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

We specialize in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement and Marxism.

Write for our free book list: all the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky; labor history; socialist fundamentals; economics of capitalism; Stalinism and Stalinist Russia, etc.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 51 December 22, 1952

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address: Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

THE CAMPAIGN NEWS THE PEOPLE GOT.—The Reporter, Nov. 25.

Under the above title, five articles are assembled in the Reporter on the behavior of the national press during the presidential campaign. The most general and most interesting is the one by Robert Lasch. Naturally it is not news—because it was not new—that the overwhelming majority of the press was for Eisenhower; it had been true in previous campaigns too that the bulk of the lords of the press were for the GOP. But he stresses that there was something relatively new in 1952.

This was the fact that, on the biggest scale yet, the pro-Republican bias of the newspapers was flaunted not only or mainly on their editorial pages but in their news stories. He helps to document the charge "that in a good many pro-Eisenhower papers it was for a time virtually impossible to tell the news columns from the editorial pages."

This had been pointed out by independent newspapermen during the campaign itself. Roscoe Drummond, correspondent for the pro-Eisenhower Christian Science Monitor, had written that Stevenson was getting "considerably less than an even break in news columns of daily newspapers across the country" and that the press showed "marked one-sidedness." Eric Sevareid of CBS had stated over his network that "Nearly all the great weekly publications such as Time and Life are not only for Eisenhower in their editorials, but some are unabashedly using their news and picture space as well to help his cause, by giving him the predominant play week after week. But they are fairness itself compared to some big Midwestern and Western dailies where Stevenson is reported as if he were a candidate for county clerk."

In New York, the Herald Tribune and the Hearst papers, plus the Scripps-Howard World-Telegram come in for special denunciation. In another article, M. R. Werner gives the New York City press a detailed going-over. In all fairness, it must be mentioned that the New York Post, which alone supported Stevenson, was guilty of similar news practices.

Lasch and others give numberless examples of the devices used by the press to distort the campaign in their news columns. Lasch points out that the Associated Press's whitewash was a fraud. The AP purported to make a survey as a

result of the claims of bias and presented figures on the amount of news coverage for both sides. It is pointed, however, that they chose, for the purpose, the period of Truman's whistle-stop campaign only, which threw the real balance off.

An interesting sidelight article by Gordon Cotler gave the story of how advertising man Rosser Reeves worked up the Eisenhower saturation-program of spot commercials on "Eisenhower Answers America." It reads like a caricature of huckster-politics.

In an accompanying editorial, publisher-editor Max Ascoli allows himself to get indignant about the way in which business prostitutes the press. (Since a reading of the Reporter's editorial page has not convinced us that Ascoli even a liberal, we may mention that for Ascoli this luxury is made possible by the family money which allows him to publish the Reporter without ads.) But, of course, what he says is still true:

"The fact is that the larger the number of readers a publication has, the smaller is the fraction of its total revenue that it receives from them. The difference, of course, is made up by advertising. . . . So the system goes. . . . It concentrates enormous power in the hands of advertising agencies. . . ."

"Never has the huckster's arrogance gone so far as during the 1952 presidential election. . . . And never as during this election have the major mass publications taken so many liberties with their readers. Why shouldn't they? Their major source of revenue comes not from their readers but from advertising. . . ."

It is true, but strangely enough, Ascoli does exactly what he sneers about in an aside—he gives the soap-box generalization of "Communist maniacs of left-wingers-at-large." No informed Marxist thinks the class prejudice of the press stems basically from the direct pressure of "advertising agencies" and other personal capitalist devils, though this is often a factor and a channel. More basically, the lords of the press tend to be literate and class-conscious big capitalists themselves, and that is much more important.

But as so often happens in the case of the philistine who drags out his ritual sneer at socialist critics, he neither understands the socialist criticism nor can he himself steer clear of the vulgar forms that it sometimes takes in its more ignorant manifestations.

British Stalinist Intellectuals Balk at Jumping thru the Hoop

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Dec. 9.—It has too often been stated that Stalinism is in "crisis." History has shown, however, that international Stalinism, faced though it is by a complex of internal and external political, social and economic contradictions, is far more stable and flexible than had been supposed. But British Stalinism is in a particularly anomalous position in this connection. For where, as in France and Italy, Stalinism has taken root in the mass workers' organizations, in Britain Stalinism has always found itself isolated from the broad stream of the Labor movement.

True, during the Popular Front days and toward the end of the Second World War, Stalinism exerted great ideological influence on the Labor Party and the trade unions, but organizationally it has always been very weak. Today Bevan's powerful figure stands guard over the left wing, and Stalinism finds itself even more cut off than before.

WHIP-CRACKER

In this sense, and in the above context, it can be said that British Stalinism is faced with the prospect of a long, painful internal crisis. And it is not only the recent Slansky trial that has hit the CP where it hurts most.

This is all too clear from a careful reading of Modern Quarterly, the "super-theoretical" organ of the CP, edited by Dr. John Lewis. Some months ago, Maurice Cornforth, the leading CP authority on philosophy (particularly in its relations to biology, chemistry and physics) made a violent at-

tack on Christopher Caudwell, the brilliant writer who was killed in Spain in 1938. To the discerning the controversy that raged in the pages of the Modern Quarterly brought to light a most revealing fact. The majority of the leading Stalinist intellectuals vigorously dissociated themselves from Maurice Cornforth's violent assault.

Here a word about Caudwell is appropriate. Caudwell's works, such as *Illusion and Reality*, *The Crisis in Physics and Studies in a Dying Culture*, were published posthumously. They were very much in vogue in CP intellectual circles after the war. These remarkable books were a gallant attempt on the part of Caudwell to show how the Marxist worldview (as he saw it colored by Stalinism, of course) incorporated and interpreted, as it were, the great discoveries made by bourgeois scientists—biologists, physicists and psychologists.

Significantly, with the autumn issue the whole controversy was ended with a contribution by Maurice Cornforth. It can be stated without fear of contradiction that this is the first time that British Stalinists have gone on record against the official line.

The well-known private reservations which Professor Hyman Levy and Dr. John Lewis himself have in regard to CP policy makes it highly likely that the CP intellectuals are being faced with some insuperable problems. Already Professor J. B. S. Haldane has left the CP. The Caudwell controversy left no doubt that many others will be following in his footsteps.

THEY DON'T GET IT

Today, of course, "Freudianism," "Einsteinism," and "Morgan-Mendelism" cannot possibly fit into the new Stalinist philosophy, especially since the official coronation of Russian Lysenkoism. The dialectic which was "discovered" by R. Osborn in the Oedipus complex (see his *Marx and Freud*) and in the theory of relativity and genetics by Professor J. B. S. Haldane and Christopher Caudwell himself no longer suits the latest Stalinist "discoveries." The dialectic must now be served up to prove that Lysenko is the true Marxist, the true scientist.

In the autumn 1951 issue of the *Modern Quarterly*, contributions from such well-known figures as Margot Heinemann, Edward York,

J. D. Bernal, Alick West and Alan Bush were published. What is astonishing is this: the majority of the contributors, including Professor Thomson, a member of the Executive Committee of the CP, seem to be unaware of the fact that Cornforth is transmitting the new Lysenko line to British Stalinist intellectuals.

Significantly, with the autumn issue the whole controversy was ended with a contribution by Maurice Cornforth. It can be stated without fear of contradiction that this is the first time that British Stalinists have gone on record against the official line.

The well-known private reservations which Professor Hyman Levy and Dr. John Lewis himself have in regard to CP policy makes it highly likely that the CP intellectuals are being faced with some insuperable problems. Already Professor J. B. S. Haldane has left the CP. The Caudwell controversy left no doubt that many others will be following in his footsteps.

The BEST recent book on the labor movement—
"The UAW and Walter Reuther"
by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick \$3.00 Random House

Order from:
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Youth and Student Corner

The SYL's Debate with the Young Socialists on 'Coexistence'

By ARTHUR HART

At a recent meeting of its National Executive Committee, the Young Socialists, youth affiliate of the Socialist Party, adopted a "Resolution on Coexistence" which declared its support in favor of "Big Power Negotiations." It indicates that the YS has taken a step away from the Third Camp position which it holds.

Because of the importance of the question, therefore, the New York Socialist Youth League unit challenged the local YS organization to debate the question: "Resolved, that Socialists Should Support Big Power Negotiations in the Interests of Peace."

After a series of preliminary maneuvers which did them no credit, YS agreed to the terms of a debate, which then took place last Friday, December 12. Before forty-five members and sympathizers of both organizations the position of the YS was debated by two speakers from each side.

The main argument presented in support of the idea of "Big Power Negotiations" is discussed in the article on page 6, which is based on an analysis of the YS resolution proper. More interesting, however, and most significant as to the ideological source from which the resolution was derived, were the remarks of the YS speakers with regard to the "nature of Stalinism," and the "progressive transformations" which it effected in the territories under its control. Next week's column will be devoted to an analysis of the implications of this part of the debate.

Both in the presentation and rebuttal, the SYL speakers pointed out the contradictions between a policy of calling for negotiations—which "would be, in effect, imperialist agreement at the expense of immediate interests of the people," to put it in the words of the YS itself—and the

struggle against imperialist aims by the forces of the Third Camp, the working classes and colonial peoples of the world.

To this demonstration, however, the YS speakers made no answer until the final surrebuttal, although part of their answer had been implied in earlier remarks. It became clear that the main concern for YS was how to find a way to the "Stalinoids and fellow travelers" who are now presumably being "left in the lurch" by the latest evolution of the Stalinist Party proper. How to attract such elements has become the dominant concern for YS. In contrast to their own policy of pointing out the degree of agreement (advocacy of Big-Power Negotiations between Russia and America), the SYL was absurdly described as "approaching such elements by shouting that war is inevitable."

And as a further indication of YS's orientation (though it is undoubtedly not true of the YS as a whole) the audience was told that the YS speaker had "given up trying to recruit liberals." And as the climax to this kind of "argument" the speaker concluded by saying that "proof" of the correctness of the YS position would be forthcoming in terms of the high level of growth that the YS was about to attain!

It was quite apparent to SYLers and others present that the position of the YS had been compounded of a mixture of ignorance with a large dose of opportunism, as one of the SYL speakers put it. What was not so obvious was the results of the "successes" which YS had secured with its "new line," namely that as it bent its "tactics" and slogans in the direction of attracting Stalinoids, its political theory and political analyses were revised along parallel lines.

How this was brought out by the debate will be discussed in a second article in next week's Youth and Student Column.

Buck Rogers Goes to Washington

By JACK STUART

There has been a recent rash of popular scientific articles on the subject of man's conquest of space via the rocket ship and a few words of comment might be of interest to LABOR ACTION readers.

The present barrage was initiated by the popular weekly, *Collier's*, in its March 22 issue, which devoted some 15 pages to the general topic "Man Will Conquer Space Soon." The editors no doubt were looking for a circulation prop and rockets were obviously much safer than World War III, a topic on which they had seriously burned their fingers some months earlier. Having gotten hold of a sure thing (the series was expanded and released as a book later under the title *Across the Space Frontier*) they devoted considerable space this fall (October 18 and 25) to the trip to the moon.

On November 16 the sedate *New York Times* had a long article on current plans for a space station. Finally the height of recognition was granted the subject when *Time* devoted its (pseudo) science page to a very long article on these same matters.

These articles are all presented in a very serious manner (except *Time* which always injects a flippancy into everything but a Republican political victory) and the most arresting single fact is that the name of an ex-Nazi, brains of the German V-2 rocket program, appears either as author or leading character in each of these articles.

This man—engineer, scientist, call him what you will—is really a striking example of the irresponsible scientist—a man who has played the fortunes of war both ways and won each time. Von Braun is an interesting study. His goal in life since youth has been to stand on the moon and he has made each step a studied one toward that goal.

Von Braun got into this rocket racket in the early '30s as a member of the German rocket society.

When the German army took it over most of the other members left for the United States but Von Braun became the chief scientist on the German rocket projects. He above all others is responsible for the V-2. He was very close to Hitler, who made him an honorary colonel in the SS, and it was he who prevailed upon Adolf to keep pouring money into the V-2 project during Germany's darkest hours of the war. He, of course, supervised the tests of this weapon, one of which had a typical diabolic Nazi touch.

In March 1943 the town of Sarnaki, Poland, with its 1000 inhabitants, served as a target for test firings of over one hundred V-2s. The outcome was more fortunate than expected for the smallness of the town provided too small a target area and the result was several houses damaged and but two casualties—one dead, one injured.

It is now well known that because Von Braun had a pipeline to Hitler his rocket project was favored over the atomic-energy project of Germany's then leading physicist and Nobel prize-winner Professor Heisenberg.

The drain of this project on the much bombed and blasted German war economy can probably never be fully assessed. Some have claimed that Von Braun lost the war for Hitler, for the V-2s had very little military effect and the drain on the country's natural and technical resources immobilized the German air force. The director of the underground V-2 factory at Nordhausen said at the end of the war, "For each V-2 we could have built at least one jet fighter." These hundreds of un-built jet-fighters might have significantly altered the war.

Von Braun was brought to this country after the war as a prize of war. He is now one of the chief engineers at the Army Ordnance guided-missile center at the Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala. He had proposed to the government that the U. S. spend a minimum of 4 billions on a rocket space-station (in much the same manner that Einstein proposed

the A-bomb project to Roosevelt in 1939). But Von Braun sells this idea not as a free trip to the moon for himself but as "a daring, inspiring program that has a real chance of controlling the world." No doubt Hitler was told the V-2s represented a daring program with a real chance to win World War II.

We have no position on rocket-shiping to the moon but we oppose this country's or any country's "controlling the world" and we oppose any scientific opportunism who must use the cold war as a stepping-stone for his own projects.

Von Braun's singlemindedness is really appalling. During the war in Germany he had a rocket fired just after sundown when the ground was in darkness. He

watched with joy as his rocket climbed out of sight only to reappear as a shining star overhead when it burst into the sun's rays. Pretty, but it cost a quarter of a million bucks for the show and proved nothing.

Von Braun is no doubt having trouble selling the military his favorite idea and these popular articles, all sugar-coated with color drawings and appealing to engineering know-how, are no doubt an attempt to put pressure on the government. He has never discussed what the Russians would do if the U. S. had a space station to look down behind the Iron Curtain. But that is unimportant. The moon's the thing and one irresponsible scientist cares not the cost in dollars, resources, or human lives.

New York SYL Forum

Friday, December 26, at 8:30 p.m.

The Theory of 'Countervailing Forces'
—A New Capitalist Ideology
An Analysis of Galbraith and His Critics

Speaker:
SAM FELIX

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street
New York City

Get acquainted with
THE SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

For information on SYL program and activities, write to:

SYL, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

The Slogan of 'Negotiations'

By SAM FELIKS

The new position in favor of raising the slogan of "Big Power Negotiations," which has been adopted by the left-wing leadership of the Young Socialists, the Socialist Party's youth group (the YPSL), is conceived by them as compatible with and auxiliary to their basic Third Camp position on the war. It is this which was discussed in the December 12 debate between the YS and the Socialist Youth League, reported elsewhere in this issue [see Youth and Student Corner, page 5].

Now it is true, of course, that socialist supporters of the Third Camp view have to find all necessary ways to appeal to and win over the so-called "neutralists" who lean toward a Third Camp policy but who still look to the panacea of big-power negotiations as their instrument of bringing peace. It is clear that the Young Socialists are motivated by this consideration in attempting to make the "negotiations" slogan, as they raise it, square with their basic policy. They want to give the Third Camp idea a more concrete, more "flexible," less "sectarian," content and think that they can do so with the slogan of "big-power negotiations."

They argue essentially: If big-power negotiations (presumably between the U. S. and Russia) were concluded, even on the basis of an imperialist deal, a breathing-spell would ensue during which socialists could build a Third Camp movement, etc.

But, as is the case with other anti-war advocates of "big-power negotiations," they find very little to say about the "negotiations" themselves. Attention is fixed on the claim which is made for the objective consequences of the negotiations. Just what kind of deal can the American and Russian imperialists sign down to negotiate, thereby making their "coexistence" possible? The YS does not add much to our enlightenment on this point.

Some Relevant Queries

This, of course, does not deal with the question of whether such an imperialist deal, assuming for the moment that it is possible, will be of a kind that we should support. But without dwelling on any consideration of what kind of a deal it would be, the YS steels us for the outcome by assuring one and all that "any kind of negotiations would be, in effect, an imperialist agreement at the expense of the immediate interests of the people," albeit with "immensely progressive consequences."

If the slogan of big-power negotiations is being used only as a trick tactic in order to win new adherents by convincing the "neutralists," who already have it as their slogan, that Third Campers do not believe in the inevitability of a third world war, then the YS is under no obligation to answer the relevant questions: What kind of negotiations do you propose? Are negotiations possible given the nature of the imperialist rivalry? Are you ready to support the resulting "imperialist agreement" which will be "at the expense of the immediate interests of the people"? Why have all previous attempts at U. S.-Russian deals failed?

However, the YS is not merely proposing this as a trick tactic for what they call its "obvious organizational advantages" [wreaking havoc among the "neutralists" and Stalinoids, we presume] but as a program or at least a slogan toward the achievement of a breathing-spell. Therefore they are under some obligation to discuss in more detail this "imperialist agreement." But the *sine qua non* for all talk of "peaceful coexistence" is—little attention to how it is achieved, plus plenty of talk about its "immensely progressive consequences."

The Cost of Breathing-Spells

The reason for this is obvious. When anyone sits down and begins to consider seriously the proposed or wished-for "imperialist agreement," the problem he faces is how to convince Stalinist totalitarianism not to be imperialist and how to convince United States capitalism not to be imperialist, or at least how to remain imperialist without coming into conflict. This was in effect the purpose of the Henry Wallace foreign policy:

divide the world into two spheres of influence dominated by the respective powers and leave whatever is left over to the United Nations. The only consideration that the YS resolution gives this by-no-means-insignificant stumbling-block is the assurance that it will be a dirty deal whatever the outcome; but over the outcries of those whose "immediate interests" have been sacrificed, they will be looking for the hoped-for "immensely progressive consequences."

The inference is clear: the YS line would seem to lead to the support of a reactionary deal as long as it seems to provide some kind of breathing spell—a new Yalta agreement, the Wallace foreign policy, or something even worse. There can be no dispute about the idea that a breathing-spell is better than no breathing-spell. But the question is: what more basic considerations are to be sacrificed? Whose interests are to be sold out? And will it weaken and disorient the struggle for the Third Camp? SOCIALISTS SHOULD CONDEMN any possible big-power deal which would mean, for example, abandoning East Europe to Russian domination, or strengthening the Franco dictatorship in Spain, and not be the ones who call for such deals.

It's Their Contradiction

Now we need not be indignantly reminded by the YS that it has not the slightest idea of actually supporting the reactionary imperialist deal which will be the "obvious" result of the negotiations which it advocates. That is just the point: the YS does not want to support the reactionary consequences which it admits are inevitable as a result of the line it proposes; it wants to support only the "immensely progressive consequences" which it looks forward to. This is what is curious about its approach. For a political group cannot decide merely by writing a resolution that it accepts responsibility only for some of the consequences which its line demands.

We may comment in passing, at this point, that it seems strange that anyone would be seriously proposing "Big Power Negotiations" at this time. A casual glance at the newspaper headlines will inform anyone that negotiations have been going on for almost a year and a half in Korea, with no settlement yet in sight to that blind-alley conflict. And if the Russian Stalinists do not sit in Korean tents, they sit in the UN halls, and there is still no end to Korea. The last attempt at a Big Four meeting was about two years ago. At that time the deputy foreign ministers of the Big Four sat through something over 30 meetings and disbanded with failure to agree on what to discuss.

The fact that it is extremely unlikely (at least there is nothing to indicate the possibility) that a Big Two, Three, Four, or Five conference can settle or mediate the conflicts between the rival imperialist blocs does not mean that World War Three is going to break out tomorrow or the next day. Neither Russia nor the United States wants the third world war. What they do want is the fruits of such a war without a war. Each wants to exploit the other's weaknesses, embarrass the other politically, seek to strengthen its own military and political power, and extend its own influence by bringing new areas of the world within its sphere of influence, and push back the other's areas of influence.

The Cause of Breathing-Spells

All of these aims risk the dangers of war, just as the Stalinist invasion of South Korea was a calculated risk. But now that the risk has been exposed, both sides have been fighting a limited war, just as they are trying to wrangle out the most favorable political advantages from a truce. The United States does not bomb Manchuria, and the Stalinists do not bomb U. S. bases in Japan.

Whatever settlement comes out of Korea will be an indication of the strength of the opposing sides and, in general, of the relationship of forces. There is no such thing as a "reasonable" settlement of a power conflict. The same thought must be borne in mind in discussing a negotiated deal. It is not the negotiated deal which postpones war or provides the breathing-spell. It is the other way around; it is the need of the United

States and Russia to postpone a major conflict that makes a negotiated deal possible.

This remains a major deterrent to war today. Both sides are feverishly trying to win as much support as possible (India, for example), and to neutralize the other's strength. The people all over the world, where they still have an opportunity to express their wishes and sentiments, have nowhere indicated readiness to support adventurist policies by their government which increase the possibility of the third world war. Such was the reaction in Western Europe and Southeast Asia over the first proposal by the United States for the bombing of Manchuria. It is this suspicion and distrust toward adventurist policies by both the United States and Stalinist governments which makes the Third Camp the political myth one of the YS calls it but a real potentiality—and a major roadblock against the third world war.

Reinforcing Illusions

The breathing-spell is achieved, but not because of "Big Power Negotiations," which at best are the diplomatic forms through which the war blocs jockey for position. The point of conflict breaks off at one point only to sharpen again at another. Temporary truces may be reached, sometimes by tacit agreement, as a reflection of existing power relationships. In the meantime both the United States and Russia continue the military build-up, probing for the next point of weakness—Indo-China, Iran, Germany, North Africa. But the struggle continues primarily on the political level. Even if a "Big Power Negotiation" were held, the same results would follow. The minute the existing power relationship is changed the deal is off—whether the deal is tacit or explicit. Unless the YS resolution conceals illusions about a disarmament program, whatever breathing-spell we have will take place with or without an explicit "imperialist agreement."

The YS resolution refers to advantages accruing from this "imperialist agreement" which they propose, and which takes place without them: a "neutralized Europe [presumably Western Europe] . . . without U. S. intervention would be a socialist Europe," "national independence movements would find it easier to become independent of Moscow influence," "it could undermine the popular support for the permanent war economy at home."

What is common to all of these "immensely progressive consequences" of the proposed "imperialist agreement" is that they are predicated upon the notion that the deal actually means the subsiding of the imperialist conflict. No doubt, if there were a deal, there will be some people who will be fooled into believing that both sides really are calling off the cold war. But it is certain that neither Washington nor Moscow will have any such illusions. They will continue to try to move the balance of power in their favor—all the while denouncing the corresponding acts by the other.

As a tactic to gain influence among "neutralists" and Stalinoids and potential Third Campers, the slogan of "Big Power Negotiations" is at best a curious one. It is assumed that it is being directed at those who are breaking with their illusions over the peaceful and progressive intentions of the rival imperialist camps. Many of these people say "Count me out of the cold war"; they want a way out of the cold war and hope for the future. The duty of anti-war socialists is to break these potential Third Campers from the illusion that the United States and Russia can make a deal that will leave them alone so that they can develop their socialist Europe.

Implementing the Third Camp

The duty of every Third-Camp socialist is to tell these people that the imperialists will still try to dominate them, if for no other reason than that one rival believes, and with good reason, that the other will step into the area if just vacated. Instead the YS has come up with a slogan that can do nothing else but further these illusions. YS wants to win over the "neutralists" by adopting the neutralist slogan, or give the members of the YS the same illusions as the "neutralists" labor under. Historically this kind of tactic has been called opportunism.

One thing need not be disputed: the mere slogan of the Third Camp is not itself a program on how to fight the looming world war. It is a term which sums up a political position on the imperialist war line-ups of today, and it goes without saying that Third-Camp socialists continually seek to give this position concrete content and operative tactics at every point. The trouble with the new YS line is not that it too tries to do this but that it tends to surrender to the confused politics and thinking of the so-called "neutralist" elements to whom it wants to appeal.

The implementation of the Third Camp policy is not a matter of drawing up a finished program of auxiliary policies. It must and will go on all the time as anti-war socialists deal with the problems of the war and propose lines of struggle against it. Thus, we of the SYL and the Independent Socialist League have indeed contributed to implementing and concretizing the general Third Camp position when we proposed the slogans of an Independent Western Europe, an Asian federation, a program for a truly democratic foreign policy for the United States, in the way in which we have directed and explained these proposals and others. The YS proposal in favor of big-power negotiations is, to be sure, another attempt to add to this arsenal of implementations, but it is one which at best misfires and at worst backfires.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor . . .

A Yipsel Asks About Our Attitude on Left Unity

To the Editor:

I am a left-wing Yipsel [member of the Young People's Socialist League (Young Socialists), youth group of the Socialist Party—Ed.] who reads the LABOR ACTION quite regularly and in general find that papers in the U. S. However, there are several questions that come to my mind whenever I read your articles about the need for socialist unity, etc.:

(a) What is the attitude of the ISL and SYL to unity with the SP?

(b) What is the attitude of the ISL and SYL toward the Third-Camp socialists in the SP and YS?

(c) On what basis do you think that unity of Third-Camp forces can be arranged.

Of course, these questions are meaningless without considering the view, quite current in the YS, that the ISL and SYL are sterile most particularly in view of their continued lip service to a "Trotskyism" that never was and a Bolshevism "as it should have been."

For that reason I hope that you can make clear your attitude on:

(a) The suppression of the Workers Opposition in Russia.

(b) The failure of Trotsky to make a decisive break with the CP before he did. Finally:

(c) The whole relevance of the question of the ISL-SYL's "Bolshevism" to unity among anti-war socialists.

Fraternally,
A YIPSEL

REPLY

I think myself that the first set of questions which are asked above by "A Yipsel" have been answered adequately taken up in LABOR ACTION on a couple of occasions; the most recent was in February 25 of this year when we discussed "Why Can't All Socialists Unite?"—also in answer to a letter from a reader.

The other may be of more immediate interest to our correspondent. In 1945 the Independent Socialist League (then known as the Workers Party) addressed an open letter to the YPSL convention meeting at the time, proposing unity to the young socialists of that group. Since that was seven years ago, and the April 2, 1945, issue of LA is scarce, it may be worthwhile to use this occasion to cite some sections of that open letter, since our general views on the subject have not changed. We

are sure that there are many members of the YPSL who will find it interesting today.

1945 PROPOSAL

"The question of the future relationship between the YPSL and the Socialist Party is now uppermost in the minds of the Young Socialists of this country. In one way or another, the discussions and decisions of your convention will deal with this question. It is a decisive one.

"The Socialist Party in the past few years, and particularly in the crucial period of the Second World War, has steadily deteriorated, both from the standpoint of its influence in the working class and the standpoint of its socialist character. In general, the members, and especially the militant left-wingers, in the YPSL have sought to resist this deterioration to the maximum of their ability. It is a fact that they have not been successful.

"During the war, and in all the vital problems raised by the war, the clear-cut, consistent socialist and internationalist position that a party like the SP had the elementary duty to assume, was not in evidence. The consolidation of the party that was mandatory upon it in the crucial period we have been living through, did not take place. The firm discipline—not bureaucratic sterility, but democratically organized and democratically maintained discipline, without which no socialist party can hope to be effective—disappeared entirely. . . .

"A socialist party is tested decisively in wartime. The SP has failed to pass the test. The party, as an organized, clear-voiced political force, has virtually ceased to exist. . . .

"Up to now, the YPSL militants have resisted and combated this disintegration. They have collaborated with some of the left-wing elements inside the SP itself. They have set themselves the goal of winning the party to a left-wing program, a left-wing leadership, and to their conception of what a truly revolutionary socialist party should be. . . .

"The question arises: What to do now? Shall the YPSL militants devote themselves indefinitely to the work of winning what remains of the Socialist Party?

"The most obvious danger in such a view is this: The left-wingers can exhaust themselves, to no practical end, by substituting

ing a purely internal struggle against hardened right-wingers and deadweight dues-payers for effective independent participation in the class struggle. This means: no realistic perspective, disorientation, a waste of valuable energies. It can only end in the gradual breaking up of the YPSL itself. . . .

"To continue any longer with the work of 'reforming' the Socialist Party, and therefore affiliating with it, is a waste of precious time.

"We therefore place before you an alternative. We ask that you give it the most earnest consideration.

"Our Workers Party is a revolutionary socialist organization. It has come into being along a different road from yours. In many ways its traditions and its methods differ from yours. These facts need not be ignored.

"But between the Workers Party and the militants of the YPSL there is a fundamental bond which, in our view, is decisive. We do not have important differences on basic program and aim. And it is program and aim that should unite revolutionary socialists into one movement.

"There is an additional bond between us, and it is of great importance. Like ourselves, every thinking member of the YPSL has noted with abhorrence the ravages wrought in the labor and socialist movements by bureaucratism. Everyone of us lays greater store by workers' democracy than ever before. Our Party is proud of the fact that bureaucratism is not tolerated within its ranks in any form or for a single instant. Our party is proud of the fact that it looks upon the free discussion of party problems, party principles and policies, not as an 'occasional' affair, or as a 'luxury,' but as an integral part of its daily life, as an indispensable element in its development. The unity in action which we have achieved is based in large part upon the most jealous maintenance of party democracy.

"We propose to you: 'Join ranks with the Workers Party. Let us be more concrete. We propose to you: 'That the YPSL shall fuse with the Workers Party and operate as its youth organization. The terms of this relationship are of course fully subject to discussion between us. We ourselves hold to the principle of complete organizational autonomy for the youth

concerning this systematic spoliation of the satellites.

"This, perhaps, is also not part and parcel of the 'progressive planned economy.' After reading everything out of Stalinism except the metaphysical essence of 'nationalization' it is really very simple to defend it. Unfortunately, the peoples of the satellites understand very well that it is not a metaphysical essence which rides on their backs but a real totalitarian Great-Russian imperialism.

It is obvious that a single debate cannot solve this question for those who are hesitating between the two organizations and for those who are merely interested in coming to some conclusion about the important question of Stalinism. What is required is systematic study and close attention to the new developments in the Russian empire. Since the more recent people of the SWP seemed eager to discuss the ideas of the ISL, it is to be hoped that this debate will be followed by others on both a national and a local scale.

organization which is linked with the party politically.

"We know that many of you have significant differences with the Workers Party, particularly on questions relating to historical estimations, more particularly on the question of historic Bolshevism or Trotskyism and of aspects of the Russian Revolution. To us, this is the least disturbing aspect of the problem of our relations. In our party it is possible to discuss these historical questions, and even their topical political implications, in a free, comradely and scientific manner, free of bigotry, heresy-hunting and threats of excommunication. For our part, we welcome such discussions, not only between organizations but inside our own movement. We ask only that those with whom we discuss likewise refrain from intolerance and bigotry, and confine themselves to the methods which are in the best tradition of revolutionary Marxism.

"Both of us have the same problems to solve, the same task to perform. There must be built up in this country—and, with our aid, also internationally—a strong, effective, serious revolutionary socialist movement, its roots deep in the working class; its activity constant, disciplined, consistent; its inner life a model of the democratic social order to which we socialists aspire.

"We propose to you that we solve this problem by performing the task jointly, in one movement. We are not concerned with petty 'maneuvers,' with 'clever tricks' in regard to the militants of the YPSL. Our proposal is made to you openly, with candid recognition not only of what unites us but what still divides us, with the sincerest wish for the closest union of the best revolutionary socialist forces in the country.

"The fusion of the YPSL and the Workers Party would not mean that our job is accomplished—far from it. But it would mark a real leap forward in the building of the movement to which we are both devoted, with the most fruitful results in the immediate future."

Certainly, also, we cannot imagine that anyone can seriously think of predicating a meaningful political unity today on previous agreement about a myriad of historical events. If some Yipsels still consider "Kronstadt" a matter of burning interest, it would be entirely necessary for such discussion to go on, on an educational plane, within a movement which takes its political ideas seriously, and we should be no less anxious to speak for an informed and Marxist valuation of such questions as we see them; but we can only deplore as sterile any thought of letting such matters stand in the way of uniting elements who ought to be fighting together in the same movement.

Our desire to join forces with the left-wing elements in the SP and YS is clear. The real question is whether there is a similar desire on their part. If at some time such a desire should become an actuality, that is, if the question of the unity of all left-socialist elements should become a practical one, the problem of the organizational form of such unity would be worth discussing, and for our part, we would approach them with an open mind. In the meantime we think we have been as clear as possible in explaining our "attitude," as A Yipsel requested.—H. D.

ABOUT ATTITUDES

The fact that this proposal was made at all is, in a way, as important a part of the answer to "A Yipsel" as anything contained in it. Of course, there is one important difference in the situation now and then: in 1945 our youth group, the Socialist Youth League, had not yet come into being; obviously this would change the form of any proposed fusion; but "A Yipsel" asked about our attitude and the 1945 proposal illustrates it. That is the only reason we quote it now.

Other aspects of our attitude were discussed in the article of this year to which we have referred on "Why Can't All Socialists Unite?" This also took up the specific question of unity of the socialist left, and of historical-theoretical differences on "Bolshevism." Only a couple of other comments need be added here.

We do not quite see, precisely from the point of view which is held by our Yipsel correspondent, why it is even meaningful to raise the question of our unity with the SP—the SP as a whole, as it is now, we assume he means in his first question. We assume that there is no dispute that a meaningful socialist unity can only be based upon sufficient agreement on program, aims and policies, and while this obtains with regard to Third-Camp left-wing elements in the YPSL and SP, we do not know that anyone believes it to obtain in the case of the SP as a whole. At any rate, this aspect was discussed as completely as possible in our February 25 issue.

Finally, we do not believe that "A Yipsel" really expects us to review the history of the post-revolutionary Bolshevik party in this space, nor would it be relevant to the nub of his questions. On that subject we could refer him to Max Shachtman's articles in the *New Internationalist* on

"Four Portraits of Stalinism," and other places, but that would not bear upon what significance we assign to disagreements of this sort, dealing with historical estimations.

We can state very categorically and without any reservations whatsoever that, to our mind, the decisive question is not any disagreement which might exist about an evaluation of "Bolshevism" (even assuming that we are talking about the same thing when we use that term) or about when Trotsky should or should not have broken with the CP, or any questions of that order; but the decisive question is political program.

That means that, as we see it, such questions as the above are entirely subject to discussion within a party which is united on the basis of political program.

We need scarcely add that, in saying this, we are entirely aware that there is indubitably an important relationship between one's estimation of the historical past of the socialist movement and one's present-day political ideas.

It would be breaking in an open door to emphasize this as strongly as one may please. As we wrote in February, "Certainly, 'theoretical' and 'historical' differences may be indicators of vital political differences, or lead to them, but one finds that out not in theory but in practice."

Certainly, also, we cannot imagine that anyone can seriously think of predicating a meaningful political unity today on previous agreement about a myriad of historical events. If some Yipsels still consider "Kronstadt" a matter of burning interest, it would be entirely necessary for such discussion to go on, on an educational plane, within a movement which takes its political ideas seriously, and we should be no less anxious to speak for an informed and Marxist valuation of such questions as we see them; but we can only deplore as sterile any thought of letting such matters stand in the way of uniting elements who ought to be fighting together in the same movement.

Our desire to join forces with the left-wing elements in the SP and YS is clear. The real question is whether there is a similar desire on their part. If at some time such a desire should become an actuality, that is, if the question of the unity of all left-socialist elements should become a practical one, the problem of the organizational form of such unity would be worth discussing, and for our part, we would approach them with an open mind. In the meantime we think we have been as clear as possible in explaining our "attitude," as A Yipsel requested.—H. D.

Our desire to join forces with the left-wing elements in the SP and YS is clear. The real question is whether there is a similar desire on their part. If at some time such a desire should become an actuality, that is, if the question of the unity of all left-socialist elements should become a practical one, the problem of the organizational form of such unity would be worth discussing, and for our part, we would approach them with an open mind. In the meantime we think we have been as clear as possible in explaining our "attitude," as A Yipsel requested.—H. D.

Marxism in the United States

By LEON TROTSKY

35 Cents Order from

Independent Socialist Press

114 West 14 Street

New York 11, N. Y.

N.Y. Dock Scandal Reveals —

(Continued from page 1)
 sponsible for \$58,585 of these payments, and this fact gains added interest when it is pointed out that Frank W. Nolan, Jarka's president, is the principal negotiator of union contracts for the owners' association.

And who were the principal recipients among the ILA leaders? We must regretfully record that proper union precedence and protocol was ignored in the company handouts to union leaders.

The lifer president, Ryan, got only \$9,850. In contrast, Michael (Mike) Clemente, boss of the East River piers, took in \$21,231; James J. O'Connor, business agent of Local 791, got \$16,049; and Edward Florio, a mere organizer, took in a neat \$10,900.

Others who did handsomely for themselves were: Constantino (Gus) Scannavino, another organizer, \$8,520; John (Meatball) Moody, delegate of Local 306, \$8,465; Joseph (Joe the Gent) Giantomasi, business agent, Local 1235, \$3,400; and thus on down the line to the small fry such as Anthony (Slim Lucy) Lucz, secretary of Local 1274, who is recorded as having received a grand total of \$50 over the years.

Not exempted from company generosity was John J. (Gene) Sampson, business agent of Local 791, who led the strike against Ryan's leadership two years ago. He received \$3,350.

GREASED HANDS

What did these union leaders do for the companies in exchange for these gifts? Did they perhaps settle wage negotiations for somewhat less than could have been gotten by leaders who had benefited less from employer largesse?

Of course, no proof has been presented of this, and it is quite likely that none will be forthcoming. But, as the New York Times for December 16 puts it: "The average dockman, observers say, is especially bitter over the fact that many members of the union's negotiating, or wage-scale committee, were recipients of Jarka's generosity."

The Crime Commission hearings revealed that a considerable number of longshore officials were men with long and distinguished criminal records. Anthony Tisch, a member of the ILA, told the commission that he got his job through friends he made while at

Sing Sing prison. Asked what kind of job they got him on the pier, he replied, "Nothing. I didn't do nothing. I just got a job."

Under the leadership of graduates of Sing Sing and other similar institutions, all kinds of rackets flourished on the waterfront. Large-scale stealing from shipments was so common that hundreds of thousands of dollars are lost annually by this means, and the insurance rate on cargoes via New York are by far the highest in the country. One company official referred to the "disappearance" of ten tons of steel from a single shipment. Obviously the lifting of materials on such a scale is not the work of small-time individual pilferers but of well organized gangs.

PATRIOTS, THEY

In the ILA, extortion takes second place only to stealing. In 1950 a group of American furriers represented by one Gregory Butman imported about \$3,000,000 worth of furs from Russia. When the two ships carrying the furs docked in New York, the ILA announced that its patriotic members had decided to strike a blow for freedom by refusing to unload the furs coming from Russia. Butman testified before the commission that during the "patriotic boycott" he was approached by Joe the Gent Giantomasi (mentioned above as a recipient of \$3,400 in "gifts" from the companies) and Pasquale Ferrone. These union brothers suggested that \$50,000 would just about succeed in softening their feelings toward Stalin enough to make the unloading of one ship possible. After some haggling, they agreed on \$70,000 as the right sum for both ships, and the furs were promptly unloaded.

Why do the employers cooperate with the gangster leadership of the ILA? Their defense before the commission is that this is the only way in which they can get continuous production out of the men, as a refusal to cooperate leads to all kinds of obstruction and job actions enforced by the leadership of the union. But one official, Harold J. Beardell, head of a stevedoring company, gave the same away when he said: "You want good, tough men on this waterfront, because you're bossing tough men."

Whether the leaders of the ILA are "good" men is a matter of one's standards, and obviously those of LABOR ACTION are somewhat different from those of the employers. But no one can question the fact that the leaders of the ILA are "tough."

The murders of rivals or dissidents in one local are so commonplace that it is known as the "pistol" local of the ILA. The

Crime Commission has had paraded before it story after story of the shooting, stabbing or severe beating of one man after another who refused to play ball with the hoodlums controlling this or that section of the criminal empire.

THE ONLY VICTIM

The chief prey of the leadership of the ILA are the working members of the organization who are terrorized into docility by their masters. Repeated testimony has been given of pier bosses working "short gangs," in which 17 or as few as 12 men are required to do the work of a normal gang of 22. While the men sweat blood to get the work done, the employers and the gang bosses fix up the difference in their pockets.

Further, men are compelled to borrow money from loan-sharks who are part of the syndicate. As security they hand over their claim-checks so that the loan-shark collects their pay and gives them what is left after deducting principle and illegal interest. Added to this is the open and direct kickback, the simple payment by the worker to the man directly in charge of hiring him for the privilege of working.

Even if we did not have the evidence of company bribes to the union officers, it would be clear that this whole setup could not possibly exist without the collusion of the employers, the political machines, or both. Employers have pleaded that they could not resist the gangsters because these were in collusion with the police, while the New York City police department has insisted that the employers never asked for protection.

BOSSES' ANGLE

So far, Mayor Kenny of Jersey City, New Jersey, and Mayor Fred M. DeSapio of Hoboken in the same state have been directly implicated in the struggles among rival gangs for control of different sections of the waterfront. There is only testimony to that effect, and not proof of guilt. It remains to be seen whether any attempt will be made to gather and present such proof before the courts.

Why should employers prefer to deal with hoodlums who rob them of cargoes, extort money from them, and to whom they have to give large bribes, than with honest union leaders? The answer is quite plain. Such men can also be counted on to keep the union in an iron grip, which means: to intimidate and terrorize any sign of militancy in the membership.

That, at least, is the usual origin of the employer's willingness to deal with gangsters: to keep

real unionism out of the picture. It is similar narrow and corrupt motives which have led businessmen to work with and support corrupt political machines of all kinds in American society.

Eventually, of course, the tribute which has to be paid to the gangsters may even exceed the amounts in wages and other benefits which the employers would have to pay the workers under an honest and militant leadership. But by that time gangsterdom has fastened itself on the union and the industry, and it is extremely difficult to root it out. A section of the membership itself becomes corrupted, as the big crooks need small crooks to work with and for them. A housecleaning job under such circumstances can only originate in some force outside the union, which has repercussions within.

Whether these hearings will prove to be that force remains to be seen. The AFL itself has proved completely incapable of handling this kind of a situation. This is true not only because of its loose structure, but because there are too many other unions in the AFL which could not stand a real airing of the same kind, and some of them are exceptionally powerful.

BAD PRECEDENT

If a government agency as housecleaner has been the only possibility in this situation, that fact is nonetheless a dangerous thing for the labor movement and a bad development by itself, apart from the beneficent change which may or may not ensue for the rank-and-file longshoremen as a result of the Crime Commission's intervention.

All experience should teach labor to be vigilant whenever the government intervenes in union affairs, even in the affairs of an Augean stable like the ILA, lest it use the powers and precedents thus achieved as the basis for other and less legitimate interventions.

That the situation has come to this pass, in spite of the fact that its existence and general nature is not its details were no great secret, is of course most immediately due to the Ryan-gangster-company-police-government combine, but it is necessary to add another to the pillory, and that is the leadership of the AFL.

Formally, the Green leadership of the AFL could not intervene; actually it never sought to use any levers which were in its hands to rid its house of the Ryan stench; it went along. There are likely a couple of other sewers of corruption still in the AFL that could provide the new president Meany with an opportunity to justify his new perquisites of office.

Figures on Socialist Vote

As was generally expected, the socialist vote in the presidential election dropped sharply as compared with previous national election years. Only part of this decrease was due to the fact that, because of the difficulties created by state electoral laws, fewer socialist candidates were able to get on the ballot in many states.

Following is a table listing the national figures as reported in the New York Times for last Sunday. The number of votes is accompanied by the number of states in which the listed groups were on the ballot.

	1952		1948	
	Vote	States	Vote	States
Socialist Party	20,189	17	139,009	31
Socialist Workers Party	10,306	7	13,613	12
Socialist Labor Party	30,154	23	29,061	21

In addition, the press reports that the Progressive Party, the Stalinists' stalking-horse in the election, sank to 140,296 votes (in 28 states) as against the 1,156,103 which Henry Wallace, then the titular leader of the PP, got in 1948 in 44 states.

The SLP, which alone managed to get on more state ballots than it had 4 years ago, seems to have at least held its own, raising its total somewhat probably as a result of its additional two states. The biggest decline was registered by the SP, which no longer had Norman Thomas's drawing power as an individual.



GALA

New Year's Eve Party

for Frolic

Fun

Food (free)

for Prancing

Dancing

Romancing

for Ringing out the old

for Ringing in the new

PLACE: Women's Trade Union League
 (247 Lexington Ave., near 34th St.)

DATE: Wednesday, December 31

TIME: From 8:30 p.m. on

CONTRIBUTION: \$1.50



Sponsored by the New York ISL

Kills Okla. Oath Law —

(Continued from page 1)
 ness of the organization's nature.

In writing the majority opinion—which, in effect, was simply a minimum basis for agreement that the Oklahoma statute was a disgrace from anyone's point of view—Clark emphasized the difference between the Oklahoma act and other state loyalty-oath cases where the majority of the court (including himself) had upheld the witchhunt, because in the latter cases it was possible for the high court to interpret the language of the acts as requiring knowledge and afirethought.

Although Clark included a smattering of noble generalizations about the democratic rights of individuals, etc., there was no evidence in his document of concern with the more fundamental dangers inherent in the system of proscribing political ideas.

The concurrence by Justice Black, however, represented a basically different approach, which Black has consistently put forward in the series of civil-liberty cases

which the Supreme Court has heard. While also agreeing with the majority's reason for condemning the Oklahoma statute, he went on to explain why "The Oklahoma oath statute is but one manifestation of a national network of laws aimed at coercing and controlling the minds of men." His document is of such fundamental value that we print it separately here.

Another separate concurring statement was delivered by Justice Felix Frankfurter and signed also by Justice William O. Douglas. It distinguished itself from Tom Clark's pedestrian and oath-bound decision mainly in the broader generalizations added about the necessity for free inquiry, especially for teachers, but fell far short of Black's "uncompromising" stand. The question may be raised as to why Douglas chose to associate himself with Frankfurter's rather vague declaration instead of with Black's forthright words.

Finally, it is of interest that the Clark document for the court as a whole specifically pointed up two questions which, it said, were not being taken up in the present

case and which presumably have not yet been adjudicated by the high court.

This section read: "... we do not pass on the serious questions raised as to whether the act, in proscribing those 'Communist front or subversive organizations' designated as such on lists of the attorney general of the United States, gave fair notice to those affected, in view of the fact that those listings have never included a designation of 'Communist fronts,' and have in some cases designated organizations without classifying them.

"Nor need we consider the significance of the differing standards employed in the preparations of those lists and their limited evidentiary use under the federal loyalty program."

The first points to possible grounds for invalidating many government uses of the attorney general's blacklist, and the second shows awareness of the pretense that the list is "merely" an administrative guide for the information of government departments.