

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 15, 1953

FIVE CENTS

## ISRAELI LAND GRAB:

Jewish Liberals Protest 'Robbery' of Arabs

... page 7

## Storm in the Spanish CP Politburo

The Revelations of Jesus Hernandez  
On the GPU's Role in the Spanish Civil War

... page 6

## The Political Kaleidoscope in N.Y.

II—What Happened to O'Dwyer?

... page 3

## The British Boot In Kenya Colony

On the heels of the suppression, by the British colonial government in Kenya, of the leading trade union of the country, the imperialist overlords have now banned the leading native organization, the Kenya Africa Union. Its assets were seized and membership was made a criminal offense.

While the Mau Mau in Kenya is a frankly terrorist movement, the Kenya Africa Union is the political representative of the African people. It is sufficient to quote the delicate manner in which the N. Y. Times dispatch gave the grounds for the ban (italics ours):

"Action has been taken because the government has satisfied itself that there is ample evidence to show that the Kenya Africa Union has often been used as a cover by the Mau Mau terrorist organization, and that both before and after the emergency there has been a connection between many members of the Kenya Africa Union and Mau Mau terrorists."

Outside of the colonies of the so very democratic countries of Western civilization, this can be paralleled only in the lands of Stalinist totalitarianism.

# Truce in Korea Will Intensify All of West's Inner Conflicts

By GORDON HASKELL

Both sides in the Korean war give every appearance of readiness to conclude an armistice in the immediate future. And despite the continued gestures of resistance by Syngman Rhee's government, it is quite unlikely that this will be permitted to stand in the way of an armistice, if the powers that control the situation are determined to have it.

As far as Korea is concerned, the willingness of both sides to conclude an armistice in no way indicates that they will be willing to conclude a peace which would democratically unify the country—the only kind of a peace which could give that country any hope for the future.

Under present circumstances the unification of Korea could take place only if both the United States and Stalinist Russia and China would receive concessions either in Korea itself or in other parts of the world which would justify their giving up Korea. For a unified Korea right now could only be either a capitalist-controlled or a Stalinist-controlled Korea. It is hardly likely that either side will feel that any concessions offered would justify giving up peacefully that which they had fought for over a period of three years.

The end of the fighting in Korea will be greeted with relief by all sections of the American people and the peoples of the world—all sections, that is, except those tiny minorities which actually want war now. Although the truce settles nothing, it makes it more difficult for the "war now" factions either in the United States or in Russia and China to use the pretext of Korea to precipitate a world war in the immediate future.

But the truce also makes much more acute a whole series of world problems which had been blanketed by the war in Korea. In a sense, it brings us back to the dangerous days which preceded Korea when the fate of Formosa, the admission of Stalinist China into the United Nations and the war in Indo-China were at the top of the Asian agenda, rather than one point below the fighting on the peninsula.

As long as China was actively fighting

American troops in Korea, and as long as the United Nations were formally on record as condemning Chinese aggression in Korea, Chiang Kai-shek's place in the United Nations was relatively secure. But even then Britain and all the countries of Southeast Asia made it perfectly plain that they consider the Stalinists the real government in China, and that they would seek its formal recognition and seating in the United Nations as soon as the fighting was over.

### PRESSURE UP

The conclusion of a truce in Korea will increase the pressure throughout the world for a general settlement of the cold war, with the seating of China in the UN as one of the major "deeds" asked of the American government as a contribution to such a settlement.

It is now clear that the Eisenhower administration would like to have its hands

(Turn to last page)

## HEADACHE FOR THE WEST



MAO TSE-TUNG

## SPOTLIGHT

### Opposite Ways

The decision of the Supreme Court on June 8, upholding the validity of an old District of Columbia law requiring racial equality in Washington restaurants, is a welcome break in the procession of news over the front pages. With regard to civil rights, that is, issues of racial democracy, the tendency of the judiciary has been pretty steadily toward breaking down institutionalized racism.

This is in sharp contrast with its tendency on civil liberties, that is, freedom of expression in its various forms. The picture is progress on the one and deepening reaction on the other. They have not gone hand in hand; on the contrary they have taken off in contrary directions. That picture is not new; it has been going on for some years, and it has been analyzed in our press from some basic points of view. It is well to point to it again.

### Mockery

On civil liberties, however, a recent decision of the Supreme Court received a good deal less publicity than the victory on Washington Jim Crow. This was on a deportation case involving an important issue.

The court refused to review the appeal of a Yugoslav alien in the U. S. who argued that his deportation to Yugoslavia would result in his physical persecution in that country. Nicholas Dolenz was once a member of the Yugoslav CP but now states that he is violently opposed to it. When ordered deported because of illegal entry into the U. S., he claimed the protection of the 1950 Internal Security Act which provides that

aliens cannot be deported if the attorney general finds that they would be subject to consequent physical persecution.

Dolenz introduced evidence, testimony by himself and two witnesses, that deportation meant such danger and possible death. The issue was not whether this was true, for the government made no attempt to bring forward contradictory evidence.

Yet, on the mere say-so of the government officials concerned, the Court of Appeals affirmed the deportation order by 2-1, and the Supreme Court refused review.

As the counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union stated, this "makes a mockery" of the act's provision: "no matter what evidence the alien presents showing that he would be subjected to physical persecution, he can nonetheless be deported, even though there is no evidence in the record to disprove his contention." The bad precedent set will affect other cases pending, and of course it is not just a matter of Yugoslavia. Involved also are deportations to Franco Spain.

### Moral Turpitude

We cannot, here in the columns of LABOR ACTION, keep up with all the new developments on the civil liberties front—both pro and con—although we would like to. (As a matter of fact, we once suggested to the ACLU that it would be doing a real service if it launched a periodical bulletin which did follow all developments on this front, and not merely ACLU activities as its present newsletter does, and more than ever we

(Turn to last page)

## Big Step Forward in Civil Defense: Parks to Be Used For Mass Burials

By JALK WALKER

OAKLAND, Calif., May 29—The following press release, grimmer than most of the flat stream of releases coming from this city's Civil Defense and Disaster Council, is an index to the meaning of the threatened third world war:

"Enemy forces may never scourge Oakland, but in case they should, or in case of other large-scale disaster, steps are being taken to assure prompt disposition of bodies.

"A request that Oakland's parks be used as temporary burial grounds during a disaster here was taken under consideration by the Board of Park Commissioners today. . . .

"Park Superintendent William Penn Mott Jr. has said that since many of Oakland's parks have been donated to the city for purely park purposes, a legal opinion would be necessary before the Board could take action.

"Board member G. R. Auguston told

Adams [chief deputy coroner] he didn't see why board opinion was important since 'in the event of a major disaster we would undoubtedly have martial law and the authorities could condemn or take over any property for the public weal or expediency.'

"Adams conceded that in the event of an atomic attack the authorities would have the power to commandeer property but pointed out that CD chiefs wanted to 'plan for such an emergency in an orderly fashion.'

"He said Alameda County cemeteries would not be able to handle large numbers of fatalities immediately and that a mass burial would be 'absolutely necessary.' . . .

"Bungarz [county coroner] and Shelabarger [assistant CD director] wrote the board that the California State CD has included advance arrangements for temporary mass burials as a part of its disaster planning."

## NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE LABOR FRONT

# Why the 'Soft' Line By the Big Three?

By BEN HALL

Starting with General Motors, then Ford, and finally Chrysler, all of the Big Three auto companies have granted in full the demands of the United Auto Workers for interim contract modifications.

The GM agreement, which became a model for the others, made the following concessions:

(1) 19 cents of the 24 cents per hour which had been added to the workers' rate per hour in accordance with the cost-of-living escalator clauses was added to their basic wage rate and hence made "permanent."

(2) The annual wage increase of 4 cents per hour, the "improvement factor," was increased to 5 cents.

(3) Skilled tradesmen received additional increases of 10 cents per hour.

(4) The method of computing the cost-of-living increases was modified to the slight advantage of the workers.

The Ford and Chrysler agreements went further, increasing the maximums payable under pension plans from \$125 to \$137.50 per month. GM quickly followed suit. Some skilled tradesmen at Ford got 20 cents per hour.

**The auto agreements, originally signed for a five-year period, had two more years to run and the companies were under no contractual obligation to give anything. Speculation began: What were their motives in adopting so conciliatory a policy?**

We have no collection of "inside" informational tidbits to shed astounding light on what "really" happened, but a hindsight summary of the facts that are known is in order.

The UAW hails the agreements as a token of an enlightened attitude by the employers, sees them as a sign that long-term contracts will be viewed as flexible "living documents," and predicts a period ahead of happy relations between management and labor.

But this optimism-for-public-consumption, apart from the fact that it does not necessarily reflect what union leaders on various levels are really thinking, conveniently omits consideration of some harsher facts of life.

## UNDER THREAT

(1) The agreements were not simply the product of a philosophic dream of enlightened bosses. In part, they were achieved by strikes and threats of strikes.

Strikes at the Ford plant in Canton, Ohio and Monroe, Michigan were beginning to shut down operations at the mammoth Rouge plant. An unauthorized strike closed the GM Detroit transmission plant and walkouts were authorized at two GM plants at Defiance, Ohio and Danville, Illinois over rate classifications.

The last UAW convention reflected a growing discontent among the local leaders with five-year contracts, and the Reuther regime adopted, with unanimous approval of the delegates, a resolution barring all long-term contracts in the future if the companies refused to make concessions to the union. Although the terms of the resolution mandated no specific action, it was a declaration of the UAW leadership that it would get nasty and more demanding in the future if the companies insisted upon the letter of the five-year agreements.

(2) Paradoxically, the very agreements which are anxiously sought and finally failed as the solution to industrial "warfare" become in an unexpected fashion the source of bitter struggles.

We saw that not long ago when the GM agreement was first adopted providing for annual-improvement increases and an escalator clause. Here was the beginning of "happy relations." Soon, this contract and the insistence of the UAW upon its maintenance was the goad and stimulus to the actions of the united labor movement in resigning from all war boards in protest against a coming wage freeze, which was effectively countered.

## Socialism and Democracy

A special pamphlet-issue  
of Labor Action

10 cents

If the "enlightened" sectors of the auto industry begin their period of happy relations, what happens in the not-so-enlightened areas? A special problem is already posed by the tough International Harvester Company which has flatly rejected the UAW demands and has instituted a 2-cent cut in hourly wage rates, using the old contract as its justification.

## GM'S ANGLES

(3) The decision of the auto companies to give in is based not upon some long-term principle but upon the calculation of immediate and temporary factors which might be wiped out tomorrow.

GM's statement in announcing the agreement said merely that it would contribute toward "stabilizing relations among our employees for the remaining two years of the contract." Special note should be taken of the two-year reference which puts GM's decision into a more realistic framework.

*Business Week* in its May 30 issue reports that "GM and Ford, with business booming, want a large-mindedness from the UAW in dealing with routine problems" instead of annoying shut-downs when production counts.

Another consideration, more from the daily account ledger than from the eternal moral codebook: "there is considerable talk in Detroit," reports the same *Business Week*, "about a record year for GM profits. The new agreement should effectively stop sniping from labor and liberal forces when profit figures must be made public. The corporation cannot be stigmatized as too big and too rich to be concerned about its employees' welfare."

(4) Momentary political estimates undoubtedly play a role.

The unions feared that the election of Eisenhower would mean the unleashing of a big push by the employers, who would see the first opportunity to deliver a big setback to unions. But for the moment these fears are not realized.

The companies were uncompromising and hostile to the unions in the last period of the Truman administration and seemed eager to provoke strikes in order to put Truman on the spot, embarrass the Democrats, and make the labor-Democratic alliance a little more uneasy. The last steel strike reflected these company aims. Now that their preferred candidate has moved in to the White House, they seem just as eager to give him a period of stability, free of the vexing difficulties of mass strikes.

These political factors may not have been weighty enough to determine GM tactics if powerful immediate economic motives led elsewhere. But in the present context, they were one more measure on the side of conciliation.

In any case, we have enough evidence to show that the predictions of a period of happy relations are somewhat premature.

## LONDON LETTER

# After the Coronation Ballyhoo

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, June 4—The ballyhoo is over at last. For the past week political life in this country has come to a standstill. All minds were turned to the enormous theatrical performance known as the coronation.

After every single newspaper had given the event high-power publicity, after 380 books had been published on the subject, after long discourses on the radio, the streets were packed. It was estimated that about 400,000 people had lain for over twenty-four hours on the foot-paths of London. This was so despite intermittent showers and the coldest June weather recorded for many years.

Outside of the pouring rain, the coronation seemed to have gone off quite well as a theatrical production. It has been estimated that \$84,000,000 were spent publicly and privately on the show. This, of course, is not the complete picture, as an enormous amount of building materials and labor was diverted from more important public works.

Two rather amusing incidents occurred during the week. They hinted that the apparently solid phalanx of public opinion in favor of the coronation was somewhat weakened.

## "SCANDALOUS INCIDENT"

At a dinner given by the Amalgamated Union of Foundry Workers, a loyalty toast was not drunk. When it came to the national anthem, someone stepped forward and told the orchestra to play *The Red Flag and the International*. The orchestra refused, so the delegates of this 80,000-strong union sang these songs without accompaniment. The caterer, who was a "loyal subject," called out all the waitresses and solemnly rendered the anthem, while most of the delegates walked around and smoked. "A scandalous incident," the *News Chronicle* called it.

Also amusing was the refusal of the Trade Union Congress to endorse the loyal address to the queen. Some delegates said it was too "flowery." Others maintained that it was silly and that

they would be ashamed to tell their mates that they had approved it.

The question legitimately arises whether the coronation represents a conscious attempt by the Right to divert people's attention from their economic troubles. In all fairness it must be admitted that the simple fact of its being beautifully executed commended it largely to the public.

I think the Tories honestly believe that it is part of the "British way of life." Some of them even feel the sentiments they so vociferously mouthe in relation to it. For most, however, the following motives may be ascribed:

(1) The coronation ballyhoo strengthens the class system by stressing all that is "permanent" under the present system. It perpetuates a tradition from which even such scions of Keir Hardie as Emrys Hughes feel loath to depart. It is no coincidence that many thousands of places on the route were reserved for school children. To this day I myself have a vivid memory of the 1937 coronation when I was at high school. I can well remember all the claptrap and jingoism associated with it. All this was executed in such a matter-of-fact way that one really did feel it part of one's education. It seemed to be a self-evident reality which no child would dream of questioning.

(2) The monarchy provides color and pageantry in capitalist countries in which the opiate of reactionary ideas has dulled the spontaneous pleasures of creation and imagination. The mechanical commercial attitudes of capitalist society have sterilized creative thought. They have had to create artificial excitements and fantasies for them.

(3) There is little doubt in my mind that the coronation has done a world of benefit for trade. A deflationary internal stagnation has been temporarily averted, and the value to the tourist trade need hardly be mentioned.

This should be the last piece that need be written about this well publicized event. But with political activity in suspension, this London Letter needed a theater critic.

## LOS ANGELES

# Hoffman Uses the Witchhunt to Defeat Mayor and Public Housing

By JULES SOREL

We have seen the congressional investigating committee used to hunt witches, burn books, and perform as a three-ring circus. Now the investigating committee has found a function which may prove as dangerous as any of these. It was used in Los Angeles by Congressman Clare Hoffman as a method of influencing political elections.

With the Los Angeles city elections only a week away and the public-housing question the main issue, Hoffman's Government Operations Committee set up shop in the local area and began to "investigate."

Announcing blandly that he didn't know an election was taking place, Hoffman called in the television cameras, proceeded to browbeat witnesses who support public housing, and graciously opened the floor to any and all anti-housing spokesmen. After the real-estate lobby had their careful and lengthy statements heard, the farce reached its climax with the calling of Mayor Fletcher Bowron to the stand.

Bowron has been a staunch supporter of public housing. When the Taft Public Housing Act was passed, Bowron and the city council signed a contract for federal public housing. At this point, the real-estate lobby launched a campaign to reverse the project of slum clearance. Under pressure, two councilmen changed their vote, but the mayor held that since money had been paid and slum clearance begun, the contract could not be abrogated. He was supported in this decision by the California Supreme Court.

The real-estate lobby put on more pressure, rammed through a referendum to drop the housing project, and put up their puppet, Congressman Norris Poulson, as a candidate against Bowron. Despite this, the City Council majority was threatened with jail for illegal contract-breaking and conspiracy.

With one sweep, the investigators put

the shoe on the other foot. Hoffman called Bowron to the stand and proceeded to badger him as he attempted to read his statement. Before he could finish, he was summarily dismissed. Not more than a week later, he was defeated in the city elections.

## NEW MONSTER

This is not the first time Hoffman has attempted such a coup. In March, he started subpoenaing witnesses in Detroit only a few days before local elections. The gimmick was to investigate the part the United Auto Workers had played in previous Michigan elections. Naturally, Hoffman calculated that this would prevent them from playing any part in forthcoming elections. But since members of labor unions have a right to participate in politics, Hoffman could not even persuade his supporters to back such a hearing.

In Los Angeles, however, Hoffman managed to twist some provisions of the Hatch Act in order to prevent employees of federal housing projects from participating in political activities.

If the sole effect of this were to convince people that public housing was "communist," it would merely represent a horrendous example of how far the reactionary atmosphere of our times can extend itself. But it represents more. It serves as a precedent for further attempts to influence elections by the use of America's newborn monster—the "investigating committee."

## WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!

# POLITICAL KALEIDOSCOPE IN NEW YORK — II

## What Happened to O'Dwyer?

By WALTER BARRON

The municipal election of 1949 in New York City, which saw the re-election of the O'Dwyer administration, seemed to presage an era of renewed success for the Democratic Party in the city.

Nationally Truman was having great difficulty in fulfilling his Fair Deal promises, but his great electoral victory assured his supporters that most of the population was behind him. The decisive victory of Herbert Lehman in the special New York senatorial election, with the support of the Liberal Party, at the same time that the O'Dwyer slate won without that support, gave the Democratic leaders renewed hope that Thomas Dewey or his handpicked substitute would be removed from the governorship the following year.

Of course, since then everything has worked out quite differently in city, state, and nation; although the reasons were somewhat different for the three spheres, they have combined to produce the era of Democratic disaster that dramatically came almost out of nowhere.

It started on the local level. In the previous article, some mention has been made of O'Dwyer's continued fight with the Democratic organization leaders in the boroughs of Manhattan and Brooklyn. He was generally unsuccessful in his attempt to get some of his own supporters elected to replace the various district leaders tied in with Borough President John Cashmore and Brooklyn leader Frank Sinnott. For these latter gentlemen, however, the battle was not over. It appears from many rumors—which unfortunately is all one can go by for much of this part of the account—they were out to assure that O'Dwyer constituted no threat, without, they hoped, seriously injuring the party in the process.

### The Racket Investigation

With the same reservations about the evidence, it also appears that this rivalry between O'Dwyer and the Brooklyn Democratic leadership was partly responsible for the inquiry into Brooklyn rackets by O'Dwyer's successor as district attorney of the borough, Miles MacDonald. Of course, it may be too facile a journalistic device to declare that this was primary. Let it be assumed that MacDonald and his staff were simply carrying out the duties of their office and honorably responding to some charges that Newbold Morris had made in the 1949 campaign.

Whatever the motives, the investigation into the tie-ups between bookmaking and the police in Brooklyn, best symbolized by the Harry Gross case, appeared to hurt O'Dwyer, who charged that it was a "witchhunt."

Why was O'Dwyer so thoroughly upset? Was it a sentimental attachment to old buddies on the part of an ex-cop? He could have maintained that tie with a few typical remarks about how "only a minority of cops" had been accused. The aforementioned rumors point to the contrary possibility that his political allies in the organization, never clearly identified, were most closely related to such rackets.

There is also the more likely possibility that he feared that investigations of that sort, once begun, might continue until someone close to him was hit. As it turned out, whether the MacDonald investigations were a spur to the process or not, ultimately inquiry did hit very close to home—to his two closest personal aides for many years, James Moran and Frank Bals. To the overwhelming majority of the citizens, none of this was in any way evident at the time.

In the early summer of 1950 the gossip columns began buzzing about big doings in city politics. With the Brooklyn investigation and the likelihood that the Senate Crime Investigating Committee (the Kefauver committee) would soon hit New York, the focus was on exposures.

The immediate development, instead, was the announcement that O'Dwyer was resigning to become ambassador to Mexico. All the various mysteries about recent city politics can be summarized inclusively under "Why?"

### Upset in 1950

The ambassadorship was more likely consequent to the resignation than the reverse. Did he voluntarily ask to be kicked upstairs, or did the pressure come from elsewhere? Both may be true. The Democratic Party leadership, both locally and nationally, may have feared coming exposures.

The liaison man between the two leaderships, Bronx Boss Ed Flynn, was presumably the person who made the arrangements. The wily former Democratic national chairman was supposedly largely inspired by the idea that a new mayoralty race would enhance the chances of the Democratic nominees in the state election that year. But how much of the motivation came from the desire to get rid of a great embarrassment, and a somewhat anti-organization one at that, is a matter of pertinent speculation.

When O'Dwyer resigned late that summer, he was, despite his blast at the Brooklyn investigation, still a popular hero. There was no evidence that his administration had "run the city poorly." On policy questions, he had aroused some wrath by raising the transit fare in his first administration, and some resentment from some groups for his interference with the selection of the president of Queens College. Personally, he was criticized for that most common of all maladies for New York mayors—frequent vacations. When he left for his new job south of the border, his administration and his party still seemed in fairly good shape.

A new election for mayor had to follow, in the same year as an election for governor, off-year congressional elections, and the election for the full senate term of the seat held by Lehman.

In the 1949 election, it will be remembered, the Liberal Party had supported Newbold Morris, the Republican-Fusion candidate for mayor, while it had supported Lehman, the Democratic candidate for senator. This arrangement was embarrassing to all sides, and, especially with state-wide and congressional elections coming up, it had to be avoided this time.

The deal worked out, probably at the suggestion of Liberal Party leaders, involved the nomination by both parties of Ferdinand Pecora for mayor. Pecora, with a long-time record as an "anti-Tammany" New York Democrat and the hero of the famed Senate investigation into the banking system early in the New Deal, had the support of both the Democratic organization and much of the "reform" element, receiving the official support of the municipal Fusion Party and the public endorsement of the anti-Tammany investigator of the '30s, Samuel Seabury. The Democratic and Liberal Parties would thus be able to present a solid combined ticket pretty much all the way down the line.

But one important snag developed: the incumbent acting mayor would not bow out. Vincent Impellitteri, the City Council president, was practically the unknown man of the city administration. Even when O'Dwyer's many trips out of town were followed by one of the frequent "municipal crises," few citizens realized that Impellitteri was temporarily in charge, he was so completely inconspicuous. Yet, for some inexplicable reason, in both victorious elections of the O'Dwyer slate, Impy had run ahead of his ticket.

### Impellitteri's Phalanx

Such occurrences may have given him delusions of grandeur. For it is to such typical "little men" that delusions often come strongest. By personality, ideas, influence, etc., he should have been more than satisfied with the fate the Democratic politicians had all cooked up for him—a comfortable, respectable, well-paying, long-lasting judgeship.

But he had had the taste of the chief executive's job, and someone put the bug into his ear that he could have it longer. Unlike the other symbolic little man in the White House, aspirations are all that ever developed—the man never grew in stature. But that was enough to produce the fantastic result of the special municipal election of 1950.

Three Manhattan Democratic district leaders' indorsement were about all the official and open support Impellitteri got from his party. One of these was Frank Sampson, who had been O'Dwyer's temporarily successful candidate to "clean up" the Tammany leadership. The second was the ambitious, "independent" and ever more important Robert Blaikie, about whom much more will later be said. The third was a man named Harry Brickman, since then publicly identified as one of the "Costello" men in the party.

But, the sub-rosa support to Impy from many Democratic politicians was obvious. Many an ambitious underling, particularly some of the "Young Democrats" who saw no chance to rise in the fairly firmly established district regimes, were actively for Impellitteri. The city AFL, pushed by its chairman, teamster leader Martin Lacey, actually officially indorsed him, but did little more than give some money during the campaign. The New York Daily News editorially urged its two million readers to vote for Impy.

There were rumors of religious influences during the campaign: although Impellitteri, Pecora and Republican candidate Corsi were all of Italian descent, Pecora was a Protestant. There is no evidence, however, that any official religious bodies intervened; one can only mention this scuttlebutt. But there was another rumor that probably had some validity: it said that the Republicans, under Dewey's leadership, sabotaged their own campaign for mayor and effectively supported Impellitteri.

### Clipped Claws

What sort of deal was concluded is not too clear. What the Republicans probably hoped was that the strength of the Impellitteri campaign would cut into straight voting for the Democratic-Liberal state ticket, just as Flynn had hoped that voting for the Democratic candidate for mayor would increase the strength of that ticket.

As part of the national turn against the Democratic Party (mostly prompted by the already serious frustrations about the Korean war), which has since shown itself to be more than a typical "off-year" election break, the Republican state ticket headed by Dewey was overwhelmingly elected. The decisive defeat for their forces was particularly bitter for the Democratic city leaders, for their candidate for governor was an innocuous but loyal Flynn man, former Representative Walter Lynch. However, Lehman was re-elected to the Senate, salvaging something for the party and, particularly, its New Deal wing.

But Impellitteri's election as mayor was the hardest blow. An upstart had licked them, one who, with control over city patronage and with ties to few of the existing leaders, might completely upset their control.

It still is not completely clear why Impy won. The symbol of the "little man" fighting the "bosses" undoubtedly had much appeal, and may have been decisive. Exposure of municipal scandals in the city, which were to grow much stronger in later months, had become more prominent since O'Dwyer's resignation. The waning of Fair Deal allegiance in elections for much of the population was more in evidence than many at the time realized, thereby hurting Pecora's chances. Ethnic and religious factors may have been involved in a manner not yet thoroughly analyzed.

But what stands out about Impy's election is this—the Democratic machine had no power automatically to deliver a victory vote. There had been many disputes about the cleanliness of the new Tammany tiger's claws. What 1950 showed was that the claws themselves were fairly dull.

So Impy was jubilantly elected; but—alas, poor Impy! he inherited more than he had bargained for. He had the misfortune to be around when the thus far hidden scores popped open, as we shall see in the next article of this series.

(Continued next week)

## Thomas Asks Inquiry Into New Reports On the Tresca Case

NEW YORK, June 4—Confirmation or refutation of two opposing charges in connection with the 1943 murder of Carlo Tresca, anti-totalitarian editor, was asked today in three different letters sent by Norman Thomas, head of the Tresca Memorial Committee, to District Attorney Frank S. Hogan, Police Commissioner George P. Monaghan, and William S. Paley, chairman of the Columbia Broadcasting System's directorate. Those charges are: (1) that Tresca was killed by the Mafia at Mussolini's order, and (2) that he was slain by "a Communist thug," who afterward also was murdered in Europe.

His committee's three moves were made, Thomas explained, because of a television show entitled *Death of an Editor*, lately presented by CBS, which, in a simulated news program, showed the Tresca killing to have been done at Mussolini's command, and a subsequent protest in the New York weekly *Enquirer* by its publisher, Generoso Pope Jr., who asserts that the supposed facts on which that broadcast was based are wholly untrue.

The CBS script, televised May 12 and presented as "history," as "truth," averred that \$300,000 was paid to the Mafia, an alleged terrorist organization, for the murder portrayed, easily recognized, Thomas states, as that of Tresca. Pope contends that this never happened, and cites J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as authority for his assertion that the Mafia is non-existent. *The Enquirer* editor also declares that the Tresca slaying was a Communist crime.

### CHALLENGE TO CBS

"Officially the murder of Carlo Tresca is carried as unsolved," Pope's protest said. "But the New York police do consider it solved. According to their secret files, Tresca was slain by a Communist thug who was himself murdered later in the Balkans."

In its three separate letters the Thomas committee made the following requests:

District Attorney Hogan was asked to call upon the CBS management for "any factual evidence on which your *Death of an Editor* TV script was based," and also to check with the Police Department "to see if by any possibility of circumstance it has evidence on the Tresca case that has not come to your attention."

To Police Commissioner Monaghan, Thomas wrote: "Is it true that your department's 'secret files' contain evidence that Tresca 'was slain by a Communist thug' who in turn was murdered in the Balkans? If so, we urge that you give that evidence to District Attorney Hogan and at the same time issue a public statement on the question. That would clear the air."

Writing to Paley of the CBS, Thomas urged that CBS "as a civic duty" turn over to the district attorney any evidence it may have to back up the May 12 "news program," which was narrated by Walter Cronkite of its staff.

### POPE'S ASSERTION

"Tresca relentlessly fought both the Fascists and the Communists," Norman Thomas pointed out today, "and he had numerous enemies in both camps. Ever since he was shot down, both Fascists and Communists repeatedly and alternately have been blamed for his death. Our committee has kept an open mind about the identity of the guilty."

"We feel that whenever any individual or organization makes a charge pointing in either direction the authorities should investigate fully, and should have the cooperation of all law-abiding citizens who are in a position to help clear the mystery of the Tresca crime."

"Mr. Pope's assertion that the killer was murdered in the Balkans is brand-new to us. If he has any more information on that score, or on the identity of those who instigated and committed Tresca's murder, it is likewise his duty to communicate it to the district attorney."

Tresca was shot down in the wartime dim-out on January 11, 1943, close to the office of his journal, *Il Martello* (The Hammer), at Fifth Avenue and 15th Street.

Read the  
NEW INTERNATIONAL  
America's leading Marxist review

# YOU and SCIENCE

## THE 'ENGINEERING' ATTITUDE ON SOCIAL ISSUES

By CARL DARTON

The pressure of technological and scientific developments continue to highlight the difficulties of an outworn and decadent system of "private enterprise." Unfortunately, rather than attempt to resolve the contradictions of their lives, most people remain within the comforts of outmoded, obscurantist, or religious ideologies. A few may rise to a partial understanding, to realize that society cannot continue with its present trend, but still lack the knowledge and insight of a well-rounded political and social solution.

Such a "half-way" ideology is characteristic of the Technocrats. Technocracy is not a particularly new movement but it is still with us, though of little mass significance. It should be understood, however, not only as an example of an ideology which fails to complete itself, but also as an incipient reactionary social philosophy.

Part of its analysis of our scientific age and the frustration of technology is correct but it fails to draw significant social conclusions. In its vagueness and often downright infantilism it could easily in a fateful social moment be used against the working class and socialism.

Technocracy is the result of what can be called an "engineering frame of mind." Since many of our best friends are engineers, we hasten to add that this approach is good within its specialized professional application but leads to horrible results when mechanically applied to social and political problems.

What do we mean by "engineering" thinking in this sense? The engineer, more than other technicians or scientists, is accustomed to dealing with "surface conditions." He is obligated in his professional manipulation of inanimate objects to assemble them according to a final plan or design and produce a machine which works. He must be entirely objective and stand above and outside his work. His main concern is that his finally conceived creation is efficient with no thought as to its ultimate purpose.

### MECHANICAL

This mechanical approach is all very well when the goals of the engineer's activities are recognized as in building a productive machine, a bridge, or equipment of any type. However, it is when this mode of thought is applied to social problems that trouble is encountered. The engineer, then, if he is not careful, will carry over the viewpoint of his specialization and overemphasize the superficial efficiency of a planned society to the neglect of its human aspects. This results in an overly managerial or bureaucratic system manipulated from above, rather than democratically self-controlled, as under workers' socialism.

It is the "engineering" approach which is so characteristic of Technocracy. This movement attempts to appeal to engineers, and Technocrats like to talk mostly in engineering terms. We quote from the editorial of the March 1953 issue of the *Technocrat*:

"Technocracy's survey of the economic situation in North America leads to the conclusion that there is in development a process of progressive social instability, that this process will continue until the instability exceeds the limits of social tolerance, and that there then will have to be installed on the Continent a social mechanism competent to meet the

needs of the people."

"Technocracy finds further that the day when social operations on this Continent can be based on a method of valuation has passed, and that it is now necessary that there be applied in the social field the quantitative methods of physical science."

More language like "self-contained functional unit under technological control," "a balanced-load system of production and distribution," and "use of extraneous energy, and resultant increase in potential production" illustrates the crude mechanical approach.

### QUASI-FASCIST

Technocracy, however, goes beyond misapplication of physical science to society. To quote further from the above editorial:

"Technocracy is not a political party. It has nothing in common with communism, socialism, fascism, democracy or any other social philosophy. It is the 'Technological Army of the New America,' an organization with a social objective, formulated, officered and staffed by North Americans as the only solution to the unique crisis facing the Continent."

Thus beyond its half-baked social philosophy Technocracy offers much which is downright reactionary and fascist. It speaks of being "100 per cent North American" and being tailor-made for this "Continent." It has a "Director in Chief" who occasionally receives a bright shiny motor car from his "Army" which is much admired by his followers. The members of the "Army," on payment of their dues, are entitled to "wear the chromium and vermilion insignia of Technocracy — the monad, an ancient generic symbol signifying balance." Each member is further identified by a number issued by CHQ (Continental Headquarters).

All of this would be quite amusing except that a social movement which befuddles people and carries even minor fascist overtones cannot be taken lightly.

As emphasized in the recent May 4 special issue of LABOR ACTION on Socialism and Democracy, only a movement which educates for a society which is both planned and democratically controlled by the people can solve the contradictions of our day. Such a society can intelligently make use of all our technical and cultural heritage. This will be socialism, not planned from above in mechanical fashion, not only efficient from an objective viewpoint but yielding a rich life of social and political participation for all working members of society.

## BOOKS and Ideas

## Namier: In the Nazi Era

### No Rose Water for Hitler's Generals

IN THE NAZI ERA, by Sir Lewis Namier.—New York, St. Martin's Press, 204 pp., \$2.50.

By GABRIEL GERSH

During the last few years, the German generals have been giving the Western nations their advice. They have had time to think things over in prison, but their repentance is not so dramatic as they would like the world to believe.

They know how a country should be run. If only the U. S. would remove the fetters on their activities in Western Germany, all would be well. It is the politicians, not the generals and their allies, who cause all the trouble.

This is the German generals' theme for the future. Furthermore, it is also their theme of the past.

In recent months, the generals have inundated Western Germany with their memoirs and autobiographies. They all tell the story of how the generals resisted Hitler, how they opposed the atrocities of the Nazi SS and how if it had not been for Hitler's disastrous military intervention Germany would have succeeded in conquering the world.

The U. S. diplomats and top military brass who are convinced of the German generals' change of heart should read *In the Nazi Era* by Sir Lewis Namier. It is the third volume which this eminent British historian has published on the diplomacy and statesmen of the late 1930s.

Like *Europe in Decay*, it is composed almost entirely of book reviews contributed to weekly or monthly British journals, and at his best Namier displays a power of insight which, added to his meticulous scholarship, easy style and keen wit, gives even his book reviews an unmistakable quality.

### ANTI-NAZI?

The first part of this volume, called the "Men Who Served Hitler," examines the memoirs of the German generals and diplomats who are now so anti-Hitler. Namier completely shatters their apologies.

Consider, for instance, the evidence which he quotes from General Von Blomberg in his affidavit at Nuremberg. "Before 1938-1939," he said, "the German generals were not opposed to Hitler. There was no reason to oppose Hitler, since he produced the results which they desired." That is the settled verdict of Namier after thoroughly examining all the documents. He concludes that there was little difference between Hitler and his generals in ultimate aim; the issue between them was technical rather than moral.

"Both sides," he says, "were out to rebuild Germany's armed forces, to re-establish her military preponderance and then, by intimidation or by wars, to realize her territorial ambitions."

As for the stories of the generals' readiness to revolt against Hitler, the

best comment is provided by one of their own kind, General Guderian: "Much is now talked and written about resistance to the Hitler regime. . . . But I refuse the description of resisters to men who merely whispered in corners that they were of a different opinion. . . ."

What were they whispering about? They were alarmed about Germany's weakness and about the readiness to fight. That was their concern in 1938 and 1939 during the pre-Munich months. Almost all of them were agreed that Germany could not muster the strength to risk a war then.

In the second part of the book, Namier turns to the leaders of the Western nations, particularly Great Britain, and examines their policy, or lack of it, during the Austrian and Czech crisis in 1938. Up until that time Hitler, it seems, was still impressed by his generals' opinion that Germany was not prepared to wage war. He calculated that a general challenge should not be risked until 1942 or 1943. He was ready to wait. But his plans were altered by Chamberlain's appeasement policies. The Allies' groveling attitude incited him to adjust his timetable, despite all the warnings of his generals.

### CHALLENGES MYTH

Namier reveals that the British were aware of Germany's military weakness and of the view the German generals took of it. In July 1938, a few months before Munich, the British military attaché in Berlin wrote that he was "continually coming across evidence that Germany as a whole is not ready for war this autumn," and that the army command was definitely opposed to war. Even Göring admitted that he did not "regard Germany's prospects in a general war too optimistically."

All this evidence was ignored by the British. Benes, the Czech leader, was forced into making one surrender after another, while Henlein, the Nazi stooge in Czechoslovakia, was acclaimed by the British Foreign Office as an "honest, unpretentious man." Chamberlain surrendered Czechoslovakia to Hitler without any misgivings. He "yawned without ceasing and with no show of embarrassment." Next morning he had what he himself described as "a very pleasant talk" with Hitler.

Namier's book has considerable interest, for it challenges the historical myths that are already growing up about the origins and causes of the Second World War. The unexpected turns of post-war politics, which have led to the restoration of Western Germany as an ally against Russia, have given rise to a rewriting of recent history.

The theme of more and more recent published books, in Germany and abroad is that the war on the Eastern front was not Germany's war alone, that the Germans fought it really for the whole of Europe and that they were beaten because "the others" did not understand in time or because the Nazi leaders, Hitler above all, would not let "the others" understand. The assault against the West was the same sort of lunatic excess as were the gas ovens. And so on.

With skill and imagination, Namier has critically examined these facile assumptions in the light of the records. His book should make the advocates of German rearmament pause before they accept the advice of the generals and diplomats who served Hitler's cause more diligently, if not more effectively, than Chamberlain and the British Tories themselves.

entirely irrelevant. Whether this is supposed to reflect badly upon Parsons, upon Howe, or upon both is unclear. This method of argument can only be called "guilt by association."

(3) We object to referring to Howe as the "late Irving Howe." The use of the adjective "late" is in bad taste and sectarian, to say the least. Leaving the ISL is not equivalent to dying; certainly not clinically, and not always politically. Howe, in leaving the ISL and renouncing its political ideas, has adopted other ideas, ideas worth discussion and refutation. This hardly merits designating him as "politically dead."

Max MARTIN  
Henry GALE

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### AFL Clubs

To the Editor:

The Alameda County Voters' League, AFL, affiliated with Labor's League for Political Education, recently took a step forward in political activity with attempts to set up neighborhood clubs for AFL members and their families. To date, four such clubs have had at least initial organizational meetings: two in Oakland, one in Berkeley and one in Hayward.

From the character of the announcements appearing in the *East Bay Labor Journal* and past activity of the local AFL, the limited character of these clubs, as auxiliary instruments to back up present political commitments to the Democratic Party and ADA, should be apparent. Nevertheless, such an experiment reflects the need of local AFL tops to secure greater participation from the ranks if even the limited program they espouse is to succeed. The debacle when Senator Knowland swept both party senatorial primaries last June, followed by Eisenhower's victory in November, together with an unfavorable referendum result on state issues, serve as adequate incentives to such a movement.

In spite of its limitations, particularly in excluding CIO participation, such a program deserves support since it can be a starting point for greater labor

participation in political life. Should such an organization independent of both capitalist parties grow and seek to include wider community elements (CIO, liberal) in a frankly labor-dominated movement, it might then be possible for it to function somewhat in the lines of the New York Liberal Party.

Jack WALKER

Berkeley

### Taking Exception

To the Editor:

We were deeply shocked to see James Fenwick's article "The Couch as a Secret Weapon" in LABOR ACTION for May 18. Its general tone is, in our opinion, unworthy of LABOR ACTION. We take particular exception to the paragraph on Talcott Parsons.

(1) Although it is permissible to treat ideas with ridicule, it is first necessary to present these ideas with some degree of fidelity. Fenwick does not even indicate what Parsons ideas are. Indeed, he admits he does not understand them; as far as he is concerned they are "written in Chinese." Flippant dismissal of ideas which are apparently not understood is contrary to the entire tradition of our movement.

(2) The fact that Irving Howe once said some kind words about Parsons is



LABOR ACTION

June 15, 1953  
Vol. 17, No. 24

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Asst. Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

Don't miss a single week of  
**LABOR ACTION**  
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!

# MARXISM for TODAY

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

Although it is true that Marxism has not played a dominant part in the evolution of British socialism, its impact has been deliberately underrated by the supporters of the right wing of the Labor Party.

The keynote of British socialism has always been all-inclusiveness. Within the broad framework of the Labor Party, views ranging from National-Laborism to revolutionary socialism, from guild-socialism to Social Credit, from Toryism to Stalinism, have been expressed and are still being expressed in wards, trade-union branches, regional conferences and right up to national conferences on the highest level.

And it is this feature which has been seized upon by the conservative wing of the British Labor Party to (1) dilute the principles of the movement, and (2) discredit attempts by Marxists to work out a theoretical set of premises for the policies of the party.

Clement Attlee's views on this subject are quite explicit. Writing of the sources of British socialist thought he says:

"It naturally follows . . . from the heterogeneity of the sources from which the movement drew its inspiration that the Labor Party has always comprised people of very various outlooks, and that its note has always been one of comprehensiveness. The natural British tendency to heresy and dissent has prevented the formation of a code of rigid socialist orthodoxy. Those who have sought to impose one have always failed to make real headway and have remained sects rather than political parties. As in religion, so in politics and economics, the Briton claims the right to think for himself." (*The Labor Party in Perspective*, 1939, p. 39.)

## MARX IN ENGLAND

These barbed comments on Continental social-democracy—which was Marxist in name at least—and on the Social-Democratic Federation (founded in 1885) are a fair reflection of the dominant views held by the right wing.

Now it is an unfortunate fact that Britain has experienced a variety of "Marxism" which has lent some substance to the charge made by right-wing Labor leaders that Marxists have tried to impose "a code of rigid socialist orthodoxy" on the Labor Party and trade unions. This was not the fault of Marx or Engels.

On the contrary, even a summary perusal of their writings during the heroic days of the Chartist movement, and many years later during the formative period of what was later to become the Labor Party, proves otherwise. Marx did not attempt in 1848 to form a Marxist sect either outside or inside the Chartist movement. Instead he made contact with the most advanced and farsighted leaders of the movement, learning as well as teaching from their own hard-won experience.

Both Julian Harney, the sailor, and Bronterre O'Brien, the Irish publicist, were strongly influenced by Marx. And they were the most promising of the set of leaders thrown up by the Chartist movement. The attitude of Marx and Engels to the Blanquists in the Paris Commune (1871) and above all their attitude to the party of Lassalle which was later to become a constituent of the German Social-Democratic Party at the Gotha conference in 1875 is equally well known.

The ideas of Marx and Engels were the very antithesis of sectarianism.

## THE SECTS

It is interesting to note how little interest Engels showed in the goings-on of the Social Democratic Federation, founded by Henry M. Hyndman. He was concerned not with "Marxist" or radical sects but with the growth and flourishing of a healthy working-class party. In *The Labor Standard* in 1881 he wrote:

"... no democratic party in England, as well as elsewhere, will be effectively successful unless it has a distinct working-class character. Abandon that, and you have nothing but sects and shams. And this is even truer in England than abroad. Of Radical shams there has been unfortunately enough since the break-up of the first workingmen's party which the world ever produced—the Chartist party." (*The British Labor Movement*, p. 35.)

It was the formation of the Independent Labor Party in 1893, the precursor of the Labor Party (1900), which encouraged

This sketch of the role of Marxism in the development of the British Labor movement is contributed by our London correspondent Allan Vaughan. The second half, next week, will discuss the role of Marxism in the Labor Party after 1917 and after the Second World War.—Ed.

Engels, and not the Social Democratic Federation, which went through a series of splits at various stages in its long, checkered, sectarian career (it dissolved in 1939).

Although affiliated to the Labor Party right from the start, and despite its undoubted services to the working class both in its street-corner propaganda and in its support for various strikes, the SDF remained a cantankerous and pontifical sect to the end of its days.

In 1904, in one of its early splits, it gave rise to the classic "Marxist" sect, the legendary Socialist Party of Great Britain (SPGB), which still exists today with a thousand members—a continuing monument to everything Engels had fought all his life. This party is not interested in the class struggle as such. It is concerned only with "socialism," narrowly conceived. "Housing has nothing to do with socialism"—this is one of its famous Hyde Park battlecries.

Its industrial counterpart, the Socialist Labor Party, was another product of the SDF. For this group reforms were worse than useless. It wanted an apocalyptic general strike. Today what is left of the SLP is content with reprinting pamphlets by Marx and Engels, which is, to be sure, the only useful thing it has done so far.

## ILP'S WORK

It was not until 1905 that, for the first time, the Independent Labor Party began to take a serious view of the absence of any comprehensive theoretical guide to socialist thought. In that year it began the publication of a series of volumes dealing with socialist theory. Ramsay MacDonald was the editor of this "Socialist Library," as it was called.

The prospectus, written in MacDonald's diffuse style, began as follows:

"For some time it has been felt that there is a deplorable lack in this country of a socialist literature more exhaustive and systematic than pamphlets or newspaper articles. In every other country where the socialist movement is vigorous,

such a literature exists, and owing to it socialism has taken a firmer hold upon the intellectual classes, and, amongst socialists themselves, its theories and aims are better understood than they are here.

"Comparing the output of socialist literature in Germany and France with Great Britain, one must be struck with the ephemeral nature of the great bulk of the matter which we publish, and the almost complete absence of any attempts to deal exhaustively with socialism in its many bearings in economics, history, sociology and ethics." (Italics mine—A.V.) The following volumes were published: Enrico Ferri's *Socialism and Positive Science* (which went through five editions); J. Ramsay MacDonald's *Socialism and Science* (six editions); Jean Jaurès' *Studies in Socialism* (two editions); Sidney Olivier's *White Labor and Colored Labor*; Emil Vandervelde's *Collectivism and Industrial Evolution*; Philip Snowden's *Socialism and the Drink Question* (!); Eduard Bernstein's *Evolutionary Socialism*; and an extra volume I on *The Revolution in the Baltic Provinces of Russia*, describing tsarist repressive measures in the Baltic provinces after the defeat of the 1905 revolution.

Undoubtedly these books had a great effect on the Labor Party and the ILP, and though they were far from Marxist, they popularized some of Marx's ideas for the first time on a broad basis.

## EYES ON RUSSIA

These books and the countless pamphlets produced by the ILP also assisted in bringing close together the events in Russia and the situation in Britain. Many refugees from tsarist tyranny, like Petroff and Rothstein, helped to acquaint the British labor movement with the great Russian revolutionary tradition, while they found in the Marxist sects, and groups like the SDF and the SPGB a more suitable political home than in the Labor Party or ILP.

Perhaps the most astonishing article written after the events of the first Russian revolution of 1905 was penned by Theodore Rothstein (author of that monumental work *From Chartism to Laborism*) in the *Socialist Annual*, a periodical published by the SDF. He wrote:

"The Russian bourgeoisie, as a late-comer, is far too weak to venture on a singlehanded combat with the autocracy; on the other hand, the Russian proletariat, also a late-comer, is far too conscious of its own class interests to be lured into revolution in the capacity of merely an auxiliary.

"The Russian bourgeoisie, therefore, finding itself between two millstones, has repudiated its historical mission, and the latter has fallen on the shoulders of the proletariat.

"And so it comes to pass that the Russian revolution, though political in its form, has acquired a deep social meaning. For the first time in history the proletariat itself is shaping its destiny, and

is winning political freedom as a condition of its own—not the bourgeois—ultimate emancipation. In other words, the revolution, which the Russian proletariat is now making is but part of the social revolution—of that revolution in which the proletariat will capture political power entirely to itself in order to effect a social reconstruction." ("The Revolution in Russia," 1906, p. 64.)

This analysis of the component forces driving forward to the Russian revolution is close to Trotsky's own theory of the permanent revolution elaborated at this time. I believe that this is the first time that Rothstein's article has seen the light of day, certainly since 1917. Whether Rothstein was aware of Trotsky's theory or not, it is difficult to say. But if he was not, and this seems the more likely of the two possibilities, he shares with Trotsky and Parvus in the "discovery" of the conception. With one proviso: his analysis does not even mention the Russian peasantry, which both Lenin and Trotsky saw as one of the two main class factors making for the revolution.

## WORKERS' EDUCATION

The third medium through which Marxism was to exert its influence was the Movement for Independent Working-Class Education.

This movement was founded to combat the influence of Ruskin College (Oxford), founded in 1899 by two philanthropists for educating workers, and also of the University Extension Movement which was formed for the same purpose. The object of the Movement for Independent Working-Class Education was to counter the type of workers' education which had as its aim the training of the top stratum of workers in the theories of capitalism. The Movement took definite form in 1906 with the foundation of the Plebs League. The viewpoint of this Plebs League was expressed in the second issue of its magazine *Plebs*:

"To the organized labor movement we appeal for support on a question that lies at the very bottom of working-class organization. We cannot trust our economic safety to the good intentions of the possessing class. We do not rely upon the politics of our employers for measures of progressive legislation. We establish our economic fortifications; we have our own political weapons; we control our own literary despatches. Why, then, should we not as independently manage our educational affairs? Even as we have a platform of our own, and a press of our own, let us have educational institutions of our own."

It was this body which became the Central Labor College and eventually the National Council of Labor Colleges, now the largest non-state-supported workers' educational body in the world.

These three media—the ILP, the Marxist groups, and the Plebs League—laid the basis for the unprecedented growth of the influence of Marxism in Britain shortly after the Russian Revolution in 1917.

(Continued next week)

# 'Human Intervention' in the SWP

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The first inkling that readers of the *Militant* have had of the faction fight which has raged in the Socialist Workers Party for the past year (unless they read about it in *LABOR ACTION*), was an announcement in the issue of June that a "peace" has been concluded between the warring factions.

This "peace" between the two factions was achieved not at a national convention at which the issues could be thrashed out by representatives of the membership who had been elected on the basis of political positions. It was concluded, rather, at a plenum of the SWP's national committee held on May 21-24.

Did the two factions find a common ground around which they could reach an agreement over party theory and policy? They do not claim that. "Peace" in the party was established only when it became clear that the Cannon majority on the national committee remained solid, that the minority had the choice of agreeing to submit to the majority or to split the party.

Or to put it in Cannon's own winged phrases:

"In my opinion, we have cemented here a real and genuine unity, which has two antagonistic and yet supplementary aspects. On the one hand, the plenum has seen the firm consolidation of a majority group, which can now lead the party with unchallenged authority. On the other hand, the plenum has shown a strong minority of qualified comrades, with many talents, who have not surrendered or been asked to surrender any of their opinions or any of their normal rights as a minority.

"Party unity and party peace have been secured and guaranteed at the plenum by an agreement of the majority and minority, after a hard year-long struggle, on the basis of a definite and clearly established relation of forces. For that reason, I think we have a right to confidence that the party unity and party peace are firmly based and secure. In my opinion we will now have a long peace in the party. And it will be a most beneficial peace for the party, in two respects. First, the party work will be developed unitedly, and with more spirit and energy than for a long time. Second, the party patriotism of the members of

both factions will be stronger than ever, and they will compete with each other in friendly rivalry to prove who are the best party builders and party doers."

In short, Cannon has his majority, and the minority will pitch in and do the party work, as no "friendly rivalry" among party talkers is included in the "peace" terms. This may be putting it a bit too sharply, as there is vague reference in the *Militant* article on the plenum to "objective discussion on all disputed matters, [which will] proceed in a regulated manner." (Was the previous discussion either non-objective or unregulated? We wonder.)

It will indeed be interesting to observe the two factions harnessed together in friendly rivalry pulling the cart of the majority down the road. It must be remembered that during the faction fight the minority had maintained that the party activity outlined by the majority was senseless and meaningless, and that the premises on which it is based are not only false but sectarian on the one hand and mystical on the other. Although the majority promises to "ensure" the minor-

(Turn to last page)

# The POUM Frameup Stirs a Storm

This is the third installment of a section from the recent sensational book, published in Mexico, by a former top leader of the Spanish Communist Party, Jesus Hernandez. The section we are publishing deals with the role of the Russian GPU and its foreign agents in organizing the frameup of the POUM and the murder of Andres Nin, POUM leader, during the Spanish Civil War. Translated from La Batalla, the POUM's organ.

In the previous two installments Hernandez recounted the preparations for the frameup by Slutzky, the head of the GPU in Western Europe, and his interview with Slutzky's chief aide in Spain, Alexander Orlov. Hernandez represents himself and José Diaz, the Spanish CP chief, as being opposed to the GPU's intervention in the country.—Ed.

"Now let's talk about the scheme of Orlov and Company," José Diaz said with a bitter grimace. "What can we do about it?"

"Little or nothing. I suppose they'll come to see you. It's strange they aren't here already. What intrigues me is why they are asking our help now when they've done and undone everything without consulting us on a thing," I pointed out.

"Because they expect a scandal—no other reason. Phone Ortega [head of the General Security Administration] and tell him that I am peremptorily opposed to any intervention in this affair without advance knowledge by the minister."

I went to the telephone. Ortega was not in. His secretary informed me that he was with the minister. After leaving a message that Ortega was to get in touch with Diaz at his private residence, I asked the secretary if the "friends" [the Russians] had been there.

"About an hour ago Ortega was urgently called to the Central Committee by them," he answered.

## Accomplished Fact

I hung up the receiver with a vague presentiment that we were faced with an accomplished fact. Orlov could more easily find support from the political delegation [from the Russians] and some other member of the Political Bureau than from José Diaz. I communicated my fears to Diaz. He shared them.

The telephone rang a few minutes later. It was Ortega. I told him of Diaz's order. Stammering, embarrassed, he told me he was immediately coming to see us.

"What happened?" asked Diaz.

"What we were afraid of. I think. Ortega is coming now."

Colonel Ortega showed up five minutes later—an honest man whom we had taken out of the front lines to take care of the General Security Administration, which was an extremely important and responsible post under war conditions. This man, who had never trembled before the face of death when he fought in the trenches in our struggle, entered José Diaz's house pale and uneasy. For those who did not know that we were Punch and Judy puppets, the authority of the Political Bureau was redoubtable. And now it was the head of the party who was questioning him with lightning darting from his eyes. Ortega felt crushed.

"A little while ago they called me to the Central Committee," he explained. "Togliatti, Codovila, Pasionaria and Checa were there with Orlov. They ordered me to teletype to Comrade Burillo" (Assault Guard commandant who for some weeks had been acting as the Public Order representative in Barcelona) "an order for the arrest of Nin, Gorkin, Andrade, Gironella, Arquer and all other POUM elements indicated by Antonov-Ovseyenko or Stazhevsky" (the first operated in Catalonia as consul and the second as commercial chargé of the USSR). "The police patrols they are to use were already in Barcelona."

## Codovila

A curse rang out explosively. Diaz, looking sick, jumped out of bed and began to dress.

There was a heavy silence. Ortega looked from one of us to the other without being able to understand what had happened. He tried to justify himself:

"I—I couldn't suppose . . . But they ordered

me . . . Besides, Togliatti, Pasionaria, Checa . . . I thought you agreed . . ."

Neither Diaz nor I said a word. Any explanation would have revealed more than he guessed, disagreement among the members of the Political Bureau themselves and our disagreement with the Soviet delegation.

Minutes afterward, we were on the street. We took leave of Ortega, jumped into my car and headed for the headquarters of the Central Committee.

We went up to the first floor. Diaz's personal secretary opened the door of the office for us. Inside, sitting before an enormous pitcher of orange drink, in his shirt sleeves, was Vittorio Codovila, an Italian by origin and Argentine by naturalization, calmly smoking a small pipe. His enormous corpulence filled the large work table—of the general secretary of the Communist Party of Spain.

## Pasionaria

Codovila threw us a glance over his small eyeglasses and told us, as if addressing subordinates:

"One moment, comrades, just a moment only—I'm finishing."

Ignoring him, Diaz went to the telephone and ordered the operator:

"Tell Comrades Pasionaria and Checa to come down to my office immediately."

Codovila looked up at Diaz for a moment. Perhaps he expected or sensed the storm. Our faces could scarcely be the faces of friends. He picked up his papers and, taking out an enormous handkerchief, he began to wipe off the stream of sweat that the day's heat had brought out on his mammoth neck.

Turning to Diaz, he sought to excuse himself:

"I asked for you a little while ago and they told me you were in bed. How hot it gets in my office—yours is cooler, isn't it?"

Pasionaria entered, followed by Pedro Checa, the party's organizational secretary. Pasionaria theatrically went over to Diaz:

"How good to see you here! You're better?"

I observed her. Her smile was forced and her question was official. Pasionaria hated Diaz. She could not forget that he had made some severe comments on her secret amorous relations with Francisco Anton, a lad 20 years younger than she and a prototype of the unscrupulous careerist. . . .

## Fencing

Without taking notice of the fuss that Pasionaria was making over him, Diaz answered dryly:

"I'm perfectly well."

The situation was awkward, tense. Diaz, making an effort to keep calm, asked:

"Would you like to tell me whether I have been disabled for doing work just because I'm ill?"

Pasionaria, with a hypocritical expression on her face:

"You're joking, Pepe?"

"I'm not in a joking mood. I ask and I want a plain answer."

"But what are you getting at?" Pasionaria asked again, with feigned ignorance.

"Who ordered Ortega to send orders for the arrest of the POUM men?" asked Diaz, going white with anger on top of his sickbed pallor.

"We did," said Pasionaria. "There couldn't be any question about bothering you for such an unimportant thing. What importance can there be in the arrest by the police of a handful of provocateurs and spies?" she asked, maliciously.

"The POUM arrests are not a police matter, they're a political matter," replied Diaz.

Codovila smiled with an air of almost sadistic evil. Squeezing the small pipe in both hands, without losing the arrogant expression on his face, he remarked:

"Pepe ought to take a vacation. Overwork and illness have got him excited. Reactions like this show an oversensitive state of mind. It's perfectly understandable that the comrades didn't want to bother you with foolishness, see-

## The Revelations of Jesus Hernandez - III

ing the state of your health. The exaggerated interpretation you give such a little business shows how touchy you've gotten because of your forced withdrawal from the work."

## "It Isn't Our Business"

Since I saw Pepe's chin trembling in agitation and irritation, I intervened lest he explode in a fit of anger and collapse in a heap.

"If the arrests of the POUM men are unimportant, it should have been done legally, that is, by authorization through ordinary channels—the government. If it can be proved that they are spies, then why be afraid that Zugazagoitia [the minister of public administration, Ortega's superior] would make himself an accomplice of Franco's agents? That's much too serious a matter for a political person to gamble his prestige on it. Zugazagoitia would neither have opposed nor denied arrest warrants if any of us had brought the evidence to him. The way you've gone about it, a scandal will immediately break out, and justifiably. That's what has gotten Diaz angry."

Pasionaria, looking bored, glanced around. Checa had been very much affected, and was biting his fingernails, as he always did when he was nervous.

Codovila answered curtly:

"Whatever reasons the comrades of the 'special agency' [the GPU] may have had to act as they did, it isn't our business. Their activity takes place outside the party."

"Very well!" cried Diaz. "Let them take public responsibility for their actions and then they will have a right to do what they please. But the burden of the scandal is going to fall on us. Their activity involves the party. And this POUM affair is very murky."

## "Are We Yes-Men?"

Codovila gave Diaz a vicious look. In a voice that sounded a bit strangled in his throat, he said:

"The comrades of the 'agency' are doing a big service for the republic and for the party by unmasking this counter-revolutionary rubbish. What are you complaining about?"

Defiantly and aggressively Diaz replied:

"It seems they're helping themselves more than us."

"That's the same opinion that Hernandez has and it reveals an intolerable hostility toward the comrades of the GPU," he replied irritably.

"It's not true that he has any preconceived hostility against any comrade from the 'House' [the Kremlin]," I explained. "Now then, if to express an opinion or disagreement on this or any other matter is to be considered hostility, then what are we doing in the Political Bureau? to say yes to everything? to keep quiet and obey?"

Codovila went on spitefully:

"We all maintain discipline and obedience. When you're a genuine Communist, without any petty-bourgeois airs or vanity, there are certain things that are not discussed and not brought up. Hernandez and Diaz's tone and words are offensive. We are advisers—advisers, and nothing more than advisers." He emphasized the word advisers as if he were hitting us with it. "You are the leaders. We have never made a decision without first consulting with one of you. What decisions have we made on our own? What decisions have we imposed on you which were not discussed and decided on by a majority of you? Tell me—which, when?"

His little eyes flashed behind his eyeglass lenses while he went on with his peroration:

"Why this insinuation that you only obey? The Political Bureau can't be in permanent session, and when a problem comes up we decide it by consulting the opinion of the comrades who are most available at hand. And it is decided by common agreement with them. The

# Inside the CP and in the Cabinet

**POUM affair was decided together with Pasionaria and Checa. At other times we made decisions in consultation with Hernandez or Diaz or some of the other comrades. So be careful about what you say, and about making reckless statements!" he wound up in a threatening tone.**

"In this case the comrades of the 'special agency' knew I wasn't in agreement. They promised to go see Comrade Diaz and didn't do it. Why didn't they inform the others of our opinion?"

"Yes, they informed us," Pasionaria asserted cynically. "But since it was urgent and we couldn't convene the full bureau to take up a simple matter, it seemed to us correct to decide it without waiting any further."

Codovila sweated and smoked. He had calmed down and a sardonic smile played over his mouth. Pasionaria was acting very well. When Codovila had talked a moment ago with such aplomb, he had made sure that the majority of the Political Bureau would support the delegation [the Russian delegation] against any argument that we could muster up in opposition to the conduct of the "tovarichi." They had us by the throat.

"I think," said Diaz, "that we ought to take up the question at the next meeting of the Bureau. This question is too serious to be decided among us."

Diaz, face livid as a corpse, rose and abruptly left the office. I said goodbye and went out, trying to overtake Diaz. He was waiting for me in the car. His face was somber. He asked me to take him home. We went along in silence. The certainty that the die was cast and that all the chances were against us made us speechless.

## Negrin

Forty-eight hours later, an urgent call from the presidency informed me that Negrin [president of the Loyalist government, Socialist Par-

ty leader collaborating with the Stalinists] was expecting me in his office. On entering, I found the president dictating into a machine, and without preamble he asked me:

"What have you people done with Nin?"

"With Nin? I don't know what's happened with Nin," I said, and it was the truth.

**With evident anger, Negrin explained to me that the government minister had informed him of a whole series of outrages committed in Barcelona by the Soviet police, who were acting as if they were in their own territory, without taking the trouble even out of politeness to let the Spanish authorities know about the arrest of Spanish citizens; that they were transferring these prisoners from one place to another without any authorization or court order and that they were locking them up in special prisons entirely outside the control of the legal authorities; that some of the prisoners had been brought to Valencia but that Andrés Nin had disappeared. The president of the [Catalonian] Generalitat [Companys] had phoned him, alarmed and indignant, considering that the activity of Orlov and the GPU in Catalonian territory was a violation of the people's rights.**

I did not know what to answer him. I could have told him that I thought as he did, as Zugazagoitia, as Companys, that I also wondered where Nin was, and that I abhorred Orlov and his police gang. But I decided not to. I saw a storm breaking over our party and I was ready to defend it even in case the defense of the party implicitly involved defense of a possible crime. For some time now I had been trying to convince myself that it was possible to establish a dividing line which would differentiate our organization as a party of Spaniards from the activities of the USSR as a state. My differences were with the procedures, not with the doctrines; my doubts rose around the men, not around the principles. The cracks in my loyalty were limited to the idols, not to the ideas. With

all my reservations about the policies of the Soviet leaders, I remained a convinced Communist, a "party man," a fervent believer in the historic necessity of the Communist movement and, concretely in Spain, of our party's mission. The ties which bound us to USSR's "reasons of state" and which so heavily influenced our political activity—we would have to go about breaking them one after the other till we had completely liberated ourselves from their tutelage and could go ahead on a national basis, shaping our conduct by the interests of the Spanish people and by the political, economic, social and historical realities of Spain. Correct or not, my understanding of these things then went no further than these propositions:

Negrin went on:

"Nin is an ex-councillor of the government of Catalonia. If any crime can be proved against him, it must be brought before the Court of Constitutional Guarantees."

"I suppose," I said, "that Nin's disappearance is due to an excess of zeal on the part of the 'tovarichi,' and that they will hold him in one of their jails, but I don't think that his life is in any danger. As for the rest, you are the indicated person to tell the Soviet ambassador that they should restrain their proceedings."

"And you people too."

"We too," I answered.

Negrin remained thoughtful for a moment. Then, as if talking to himself, he said:

**"In the Council this afternoon we'll have a wrangle. Prieto, Irujo and Zugazagoitia will raise a scandal. What can I tell them? that I don't know anything about it? And you people—what will you say? that you don't know anything either? The whole thing is stupid."**

Promising him to find out what I could about the kidnaping of Nin and inform him immediately, I said goodbye and at once went back to our party's headquarters.

(Continued next week)

# New Israeli Law to Grab Arab's Lands; Jewish Liberals Denounce It as 'Robbery'

By HAL DRAPER

For all who have at heart a democratic and socialist development for the state of Israel, the latest anti-Arab law passed by the Israeli Knesset (parliament) is another blow. Lacking as it is in virtually any possibility of justification even on official Zionist grounds, though indeed it stems from fundamental Zionist ideology, it aroused a wave of protest in Israel from liberal and enlightened Jewish elements as well as from spokesmen for the Israeli Arabs.

This "Land Acquisition Law" was passed by the Knesset on March 30 with all Arab deputies voting against and all Jewish deputies for it, but outside the Knesset the Jewish reaction included big elements of protest.

The law authorizes the government to expropriate land belonging to Arabs living in Israel, without their consent, if that land is needed for the expansion of adjacent collective settlements or private Jewish farmers. Compensation is provided for, but on the basis of the 1950 land value, with an additional 3 per cent for each year thereafter, to be paid in Israeli currency at the present exchange rate. The big injustice, however, lies in the fact that, though they would be given money, Arabs are not permitted to acquire new land in Israel and once deprived of present holdings they will remain landless, uprooted.

Besides the above information, further details of the issue are given by the *Jewish Newsletter* (May 25) as follows:

During the long debate in parliament, the law "was strongly criticized by many Jewish deputies of the liberal, socialist and left socialist parties and by the liberal Israeli press as an 'unjust law,' which 'legalizes robbery,' and as an 'act of discrimination against the Arab minority in Israel.' It was denounced by Arabs and Jews alike as a measure which will further impoverish the small Arab

minority still living in Israel and will force them out of their chief occupation, agriculture; this will push them into the ranks of the lowest proletariat, and eventually force them to leave Israel."

During the debate, the *Ichud* (liberal group founded by the late Judah Magnes) wrote to the speaker of the Knesset that the law "gives a stamp of legality to acts and deeds which he would consider a grave injustice if they were directed against himself, or against Jewish property. . . . As Jews and citizens of the state of Israel, we find it our duty to cry out against a proposed law which will add no honor to that which is Jewish." It was signed by Professors M. Buber and E. Simon and Dr. Shereshevsky, but was never acknowledged.

On April 25 a public protest meeting was held in Haifa by the Society for the Defense of Arab Minority Rights in Israel, addressed by speakers from various liberal, political and non-political groups, including the League for the Defense of Civil Rights and *Ichud*. The speakers stressed that the new law does not even pretend to be based on security grounds but is an act of undisguised expansionist greed.

Speeches at this rally also revealed why not a single Jewish member of the Knesset voted against the bill, although many members of the *Mapai* and *Mapam* (collective farms) of both these two parties benefited directly from the law by acquiring the land grabbed from the Arabs. Chief beneficiaries are the *Mapam* kibbutzim *Hamishmar* and *Kfar Masaryk*. They acquired so much of the requisitioned Arab land that they now rent out parcels of it to some of the Arabs who previously owned it.

## ON BEHALF OF THE JEWS

Sharp attacks on the law came from the liberal daily *Haaretz* and the *Letzte Naies*. The *Ichud's* organ *Ner* devoted its entire April issue to this protest. To

quote from one of the articles in it, an Open Letter by Dr. Shereshevsky to the Knesset sponsor of the law: the new law's "true meaning is robbery of land from people, inhabitants, of the state."

He goes on: "They are agricultural people, like you; they are citizens of Israel, like you. There exists only one difference between them and you: They are Arabs and you are a Jew. This difference seemed to you so great and decisive that you were ready to trespass for it all that is required by the Law of Israel and its tradition."

The name given the law, he continues, is "but a lie" to conceal the fact it means "an expropriation of lands that have been seized in an arbitrary and illegal way since 1948. This 'law' puts on a stamp of legality on criminal actions, 'the taking over of land by kibbutzim and settlements from Arab citizens only because these settlements wanted to enlarge their property' (*Haaretz*). One village of 7000 inhabitants, *Um-el-Fahm*, has thus lost 110,000 dunams and will remain with only 30,000 dunams. The village of *Jatt*, of 1450 inhabitants, remains with 1600 dunams. The village of *Tireh* (4000 inhabitants) is left with 9000 dunams. . . ."

Striking the note which is unfortunately alien to the thinking of the Israeli leaders, deeply sunk as they are in the chauvinist ideology of Zionist expansionism, Dr. Shereshevsky makes the basic point that the law is not only a crime against the Arabs but a crime against the real interests of the Jewish people:

"Do you know what you have done to the state of Israel? Do you know that henceforth the judges in Israel will have to judge according to a 'law' which both they and you as well as each of us know as 'robbery'!"

"It is not on behalf of the Arabs that I am writing this letter. They will know how to defend themselves and their

rights. For no law, not even 'the Land Acquisition Law,' can cancel and obliterate what is written in the Land Register about the legal ownership of their lands. It is not on their behalf that I am writing but on our behalf, for God's sake 'whose name you have profaned among the nations,' for the name of the people of Israel, on behalf of our sons and daughters 'who have not sinned'!"

"The Jewish people in the whole world will know about this 'law,' it will not put up with it, for our sake, and for its own sake, on our behalf and on its own behalf. It will not rest until this 'law' is abolished, for 'Zion shall be redeemed with judgment!'"

This is a key to the Israeli problem from a progressive Jewish point of view. Oppression of minorities in a state is an old story, and that the Zionist leaders of Israel have gone along this road too is disgraceful but not unexpected. What is somewhat different in the Israeli case is that this policy of anti-Arab oppression is suicidal from the point of view of the Jewish people, who live in an island within the Arab world and have to live with the Arab world too.

The most hopeful aspect of this last episode is the degree of protest which was aroused within the Jewish population itself.

## There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dimes and dollars of independent socialists. — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

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

# Truce in Korea Will — —

(Continued from page 1)

free to bargain over the question of seating the Chinese Stalinists in the UN. In the past couple of weeks a strong move was made by the "Senators from Formosa" in the U. S. Senate to get a law passed which would bar any future financial contributions from the United States to the UN if the Peiping government is admitted to that body. For once, on a question of foreign affairs, Eisenhower threw his weight around and forced the senators to back down.

Instead of a law which would have tied continued American support to the UN to continued exclusion of the actual government of China from that body, the China Lobby had to content itself with a Senate resolution which reaffirmed that body's opposition to the seating of China. As a resolution does not have the force of law, Eisenhower is still free to bargain with his allies over this point.

## TAFT'S NEW IDEA

Of course, this freedom may well be more nominal than real. Although Senator Taft seems to have gone along with Eisenhower in helping to block the proposed Senate law which would have made a serious break with the allies almost inevitable, he announced, almost at the same time, an Asiatic foreign policy of his own which would very probably have the same effect.

**Taft now proposes that American policy in Asia no longer be tied in with its alliances in Europe, but be based on a separate set of alliances with Asian powers. It appears that the purpose of this proposal is to end, or at least greatly limit, the influence Britain and other European countries have been able to exercise on American policy in the Far East.**

However, Taft's proposal has little possibility of success. The governments of most countries in Southeast Asia are inclined to regard the Mao government far more favorably than the government of Chiang Kai-shek, or at the very least to be much more concerned with having good relations with the former than with the latter.

At the same time, most of these governments would be very reluctant to form any kind of compact with the United States which would be directed against Stalinist China. The United States would have to offer very heavy inducements indeed to get the kind of treaty Taft seems to have in mind.

**As the present phase of the war in Korea comes to an end, the problems of the capitalist world remain as difficult as ever. The American government cannot devise a foreign policy either in Asia or in Europe which has any positive, progressive principle as its basis. Thus Stalinism retains the political initiative.**

The cleavage in the capitalist camp grows wider as Britain and the United States react differently to the Stalinist "peace offensive," and as this reaction finds its echo in the host of governments which make up the non-Stalinist world.

In actuality, the British government's attitude is no more positive than that of the United States. Britain has been exhausted by the two world wars and the loss of empire which followed the second. Her government and ruling class no longer feel that they can impose their will on the world. So they seek a policy of accommodation with the Stalinist powers, a policy which in the last analysis tends to turn into a policy of appeasement or of imperialist deals.

## ASIA TORN

Most of the governments of Southeast Asia are in a similar position. They fear Stalinism, not so much as an external military menace but rather as a social and political danger to their own regimes. As these governments have, in the main, put a stop to the agrarian revolution in their own countries, and have not found the strength to carry out in full even their own bourgeois-democratic program, the revolutionary pressure of the masses presents a continuing basis for the strength of Stalinism—so long as no genuine socialist movement is present to fight for the demands of the peasantry and the people in general.

The weak and unstable ruling classes in these countries are therefore torn in two directions. They fight domestic Stalinism with every governmental means at their command, and at the same time they see, or pretend to see, a vast progressive potential in Russian and Chinese Stalinism. This vision floats before their eyes because there are two powerful political reasons which make them want to see it that way: (1) they fear

Western imperialism and see in Russia and China a powerful force directed against it; (2) they hope that if they show a cooperative spirit, the Russian and Chinese governments will reciprocate by refraining from invading them and, more immediately, by keeping down the revolutionary activity of their Stalinist henchmen inside the Southeast Asian countries.

## U. S. ATTITUDE

The United States, on the other hand, is neither exhausted nor threatened by Stalinism internally. It stands at the height of its world power. Hence its attitude tends to be belligerent rather than propitiatory. Hence the American government feels that it can hold back the spread of Stalinism by a combination of subsidizing the capitalist world and arming it to contain and eventually overthrow Stalinism in its present citadels. The longer the struggle lasts, the more the military side of the policy tends to dominate over the economic.

The clash between these two attitudes, inside the capitalist alliance tends to hold the United States back from extreme military adventures. But neither appeasement nor war can answer the problem of Stalinism in the long run. The answer can only be found in terms of a positive principle, a social and political alternative to Stalinism which has a dynamism superior to its own. Such a principle can only emerge from a new world movement of militant struggle against both the evils of Stalinism and those of capitalism. Such a movement is embraced in the concept of "the Third Camp."

# 'Human Intervention' — —

(Continued from page 5)

ity's "integration in the work of the party on all levels," we wonder whether it will be able to forget, when the posts are being handed out, that the minority represents a tendency which is seeking the "liquidation of the party."

It is true that factions with views as divergent as those in the SWP (see the articles in LABOR ACTION during the past four weeks) have been able to live in the same organization for some time. But this has only been possible on two conditions: a really democratic regime in the party, and divergencies which are in the process of drawing closer together rather than widening.

The first condition is notoriously outside the realm of political possibility for the SWP. As to the second one, only time will tell.

## NOT AUTOMATIC

**Of course, things may be somewhat different for the SWP, as their destinies, it appears, are not altogether controlled by human beings. In his closing speech to the plenum, the new national chairman, James P. Cannon had this to say:**

"We know, of course, that it is not the party that creates the program. It is the program that creates the party, as well as its leading staff.

"But this does not happen automatically. It requires human intervention at the right time. If this intervention comes at the right time, historical periods are leaped over, and much time is gained."

There was the SWP, going its way calmly to glory, both the party and its leadership having been created by the well-known "finished program," untouched by human hands, as it were. But then, alas, human beings put rude hands on the machinery. Stalinism spread to Eastern Europe and China. Even the creatures of the "finished program" could not keep themselves from thinking about it. And thus, despite Cannon's "definite and clearly established relation of forces," they will continue to think and to react in both factions. And the trouble is, that once having started to think, it is the original creator, the program itself, which comes into question. And even though Cannon's own "human intervention" in lining up a solid majority in the national committee may have "come at the right time," the hard historical period with which all socialists, including the SWP, are confronted will not be "leaped over" by Cannon's methods. Not majorities but only theoretical clarity and a program which meets the real issues of the times will help.

# SPOTLIGHT

Continued from page 1

think this is an excellent project for the Union to consider, finances permitting. There is no such over-all coverage now, and it is needed. We note that the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee has just started a monthly organ named *Rights*, but the Stalinoid-liberal character of this organization is a count against its effectiveness and the first issue of *Rights* shows no sign that it is attempting this job. It's the ACLU that could really do it.)

That long parenthesis over, what we were getting to was a newly publicized case which requires startled notice. It introduces a really new development in the witchhunt. It is the case of Marcelle Henry, a Voice of America employee, disclosed in a series of articles by the *New York Post* last week.

Briefly, Miss Henry, a Frenchwoman, a naturalized American citizen and a former college professor, with a perfectly spotless record at VOA even from the point of view of the witchhunters, was dismissed after a new "security" investigation and interview on grounds of—moral turpitude.

Under the heading of "security," she was asked a question which the investigators deemed decisive: "Did you ever have sexual intercourse without being married?" As Miss Henry wrote to Justice Douglas, this line of question was accompanied by "repeated insults and name-calling." Some other questions were:

"When did you last buy contraceptives?"

"When did you last have sexual intercourse? with whom?"

"Do you know that you are just an alley-cat?"

Miss Henry's courage in publicizing the case is obvious, since no matter what she or her associates may say in her defense, even persons indignant at the witchhunters' course may snicker and cynically conclude that at the very least her reputation at VOA was provocative, irrelevant though it may be. As the totalitarians of the Big Lie found before our American witchhunters, a residue of mud sticks.

In Miss Henry's case, the question that takes the spotlight is: Is her case unique—or have the others merely been constrained to silence by even more powerful motives than the victims of political persecution?

## FBI News

The CIO-PAC's bulletin notes in brief: Dismissal notices being handed out by the thousands to federal employees are bitterly called "FBI slips"—Fired By Ike. . . . Secretary of State Dulles' book *War and Peace* is being withheld from circulation in Italy pending clearance from State Department officials. Also withheld are Italian editions of an AFL publication on forced labor in Russia. . . .

## 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!

## Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

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

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

## Socialist Youth League

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

- I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.
- I want to join the SYL.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE .....

STATE .....

SCHOOL IF ANY .....

## The Handy Way to Subscribe!

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:

- 1 year at \$2.  New
- 6 months at \$1.  Renewal
- Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....