

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 13, 1950

FIVE CENTS

Why Were the Fair Deal Liberals Silent in the Election Campaign?

... page 8

Philippine Independence Wears Thin

... page 7

Where's the Schuman Plan Today?

... page 3

UAW Wins at Harvester

... page 2

U. S. Opens UN Door To Fascist Dictator Franco

By MARY BELL

What is it that captivates the minds of so many of the people of the world with Stalinism? What makes them turn to it—monstrous totalitarianism though it is—instead of to the vaunted capitalist democracies of the West?

The United Nations General Assembly, by voting for the resolution of the Philippines and several of the Latin American representatives, has made that silent partner of the late Axis, Spanish dictator Francisco Franco, the butcher of the Spanish people, a silent partner in the UN.

In the wake of World War II, a resolution had been passed by the assembly which, amid severe condemnations of the Franco regime, barred Spain from membership in the UN and its international agencies and recommended that all UN members recall their ambassadors and ministers from Spain.

This 1946 action has now been reversed by a vote of 28-10 with 13 abstentions. Aside from most of the South American "republics"—really dictatorships—the important spokesman and prime mover for the change in the status of Franco Spain was the U. S.

The U. S. delegate, John Sparkman, had this to say: "From the start the U. S. has had serious doubts about the wisdom and efficiency of the 1946 resolution. . . . It is now clear that the withdrawal of ambassadors from

Spain as a means of political pressure was both . . . unsound and impractical . . . I wish to make equally clear that our support of this specific action in regard to Spain emphatically does not constitute any approval of the policies or practices of the Spanish government."

While Sparkman or President Truman may reserve approval of the policies of the Franco government, the U. S. Congress has already indicated its desire to bail

(Continued on page 4)

Labor's Bloc with Dems Gets It Nowhere as GOP Makes Hay on 'Red' Issue

By CARL DAVIS

On the basis of substantial but incomplete returns at the time of this writing, it is certain that the Republican Party won the decision over its Democratic Party opponent in this off-year election. The off-year (non-presidential) election was nevertheless of the highest importance in indicating the political temper of the country and increasing the existing Congressional chaos.

There was a great deal of independent, selective, and bullet voting across party lines, as the New York Times political writer, Arthur Krook, was quick to point out. But in most cases, with the exception of the election of Herbert H. Lehman as senator from New York and Brian McMahon from Connecticut, important victories went to the GOP.

The Democrats conceded the defeat of their Senate majority leader, Scott Lucas from Illinois, who was beaten by the candidate of the Chicago Tribune, Everett Dirksen. They lost in California, Wisconsin, Iowa, Colorado, Utah, Maryland and very likely in Pennsylvania. In this Republican upsurge, they also lost one of their oldest wheel-horse senators, Millard Tydings of Maryland.

Although the Republicans do not appear to have captured a majority in either the Senate or the House because of the Democratic victories in the Solid South, these latter victories can hardly be called favorable to the administration since the Solid South as often as not blocs up with the GOP against the administration. But the closer the vote in both houses, the greater the difficulties of the administration and the less likelihood is there that the president can carry out his Fair Deal program, even if we assume that he intended to carry out every one of its important measures.

"ANTI-RED" BOOMERANG

The early analyses in the newspapers about the significance of the cross-ballooting, independent and selective voting are all of them true, since a great deal of the votes were cast irrespective of party label. And mixed up with it, too, was a considerable traditional vote in both Republican and Democratic strongholds, where votes are cast irrespective of candidate or program but solely for the party label.

MORE on the elections next week

The above has importance, of course, particularly in the startling victory of Vincent Impellitteri for mayor of New York City, where he triumphed over Ferdinand Pecora, candidate of the Democratic-Liberal Party coalition. Even if a deal had been made between "Impy" and the Republican Party (their official candidate, Edward Corsi, made a weak campaign, and the GOP was practically silent about him throughout), the important point to bear in mind is that he won out over Tammany and against the official labor movement which backed Pecora as "labor's candidate."

Of even greater significance, no doubt, the most important in the country was the victory of Robert A. Taft in Ohio. Despite its official and active support to the Democratic candidate, Joe

(Turn to last page)

Ukraine Partisans Fight Under New UPA Commander

The new commander of the Ukrainian underground resistance army (UPA) is Colonel Wassil Kowal, succeeding General Taras Chuprinka, whose death in battle with Russian police troops was announced in last week's LABOR ACTION.

Latest advices from Yperend, the organ of the Ukrainian partisans' emigre center in West Germany, indicate that the struggle against Stalin behind the Iron Curtain continues and lives under the new leadership, despite the loss of the man who organized the movement.

Island's Freedom Still the Real Issue, Not Senseless Attempt on Truman by Terrorists—

Puerto Rican People Are the Victims!

By HAL DRAPER

The senseless attempt on President Truman's life by two fanatical followers of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party, the movement led by Pedro Albizu Campos, has put the spotlight on that unhappy island colony of the United States in its own way—but it is a way which can only harm, and has already harmed, the genuine aspirations of the Puerto Rican people immeasurably.

Everything applies to this case which the socialist movement has always said in condemning and fighting against the policy of individual terrorism and political assassination, even in the case of the groups which in czarist Russia directed their fire against the despotic and autocratic czars. But few cases have so clearly shown the reactionary results which such methods entail for the cause they purport to further.

And that is true even aside from the fact that Campos' Nationalists can scarcely be considered in the same category with the Russian terrorists who mistakenly looked to bomb-throwing as a road to freedom. The Nationalists boast of no program or ideology other than a near-chauvinist nationalism, and started as a black-shirted "Army of Liberation" whose ranks were shot through with admiration for the fascist dictatorships in the '30s and sympathy for Japan during the Second World War.

Albizu Campos himself is a mooted figure and we do

not presume, in the midst of contradictory estimates of his role, to characterize him. There is no doubt that especially in the 1930s he was a near-legendary hero for the Puerto Rican people, who felt that he alone stood for the freedom of the masses of jíbaros, the back-country peasants. There is little doubt that sympathy for his name is today still strong among these masses. But Campos, in contemporary Puerto Rico, chose the road of conspiratorial clique action instead of mass political organization and struggle; his party does not represent the masses of Puerto Ricans who want some form of independence from the U. S.

The assassination attempt in Washington, and in Puerto Rico itself the adventurist putsch engineered by a handful of Nationalists, has served only to put the case for Puerto Rico on the defensive among the American people, and to give Governor Luis Muñoz Marín a handle to institute sweeping arrests of opponents on the eve of election registration. They may have hoped to awaken the American people to the plight of their island people under American imperialism, but they have served to strengthen reaction instead.

All the more reason, at this time, to make clear the real plight of Puerto Rico, the real grievances of Puerto Rico against its mainland master, and the real roads to national freedom which are before them, which have only been obscured by the recent dramatic events.

The Nationalists' putsch and assassination attempt, while senseless indeed, arises out of a situation in Puerto Rico which can understandably lead to blind frustration and desperate extremism among some and to the deepest bitterness among all the people. On this little island, 35 miles by 100, where over 2 million people are crowded in, more than 600 to a square mile, "after 50 years of U. S. rule the poverty of the islanders is appalling," as Commonwealth magazine noted only last June. The average family income (1942-43) was only \$341 a year. For comparison, in the same year, the relief standard for Puerto Rico was \$642 and the Insular Minimum Wage Board standard was \$1237.

The diet of the mass consists of little more than rice and beans; their clothing is rags; their per-capita milk consumption only 31 quarts; they are young on the average, those who are to be met, because ravaging diseases make the life span short. El Fanguito, the marsh-built slums of the capital San Juan, compare in filth and squalor with those in any land on earth. As a result of the policy of the U. S. which till recently required school instruction in English, the people are largely illiterate in two languages, even those who have gone to school; and there are no schools for a large proportion of the children. This only sketches the picture.

This is Puerto Rico, U. S. A.—a part of the richest nation.

(Continued on page 6)

UAW Signs Up Harvester; Big Gains in New Contract

CHICAGO, Nov. 7.—Agreement between the United Auto Workers (CIO) and the International Harvester Company was reached at noon, Saturday, November 4, bringing to an end the ten-week strike of more than 23,000 UAW Harvester workers.

The settlement was the first lengthy strike in the agricultural implement industry in which the union won a clear-cut victory. The past years of defeats and partial victories of J. I. Case, Allis Chalmers, and International Harvester make this settlement a significant event for the UAW.

Right at this moment the John Deere workers of the UAW are at the end of their second month of strike, and each month when they reconvene the company breaks off negotiations after a one-day session.

The new agreement is for five years, with a reopener in two and a half years. In the process a substitute system for pieceworkers is to be negotiated, and that question and general wages will be open.

BIG GAINS

The General Motors modified union shop, escalator clause, improvement factor, and right to strike on production standards were obtained. The union won victories in this field because Harvester has always stated that it never would yield to any form of union shop or to any right to strike on piecework prices.

The contract is a master contract and represents great strides forward. Just two years previously a strike for a master contract was defeated when the company's arrogant bluff made some members of the union council capitulate. This year the company tried every sort of stunt to bring about a similar situation but the council held together.

The pieceworkers in Harvester have always earned money over average wages paid in the auto industry. Harvester thought that this year they would be able to bring the pieceworkers down. The company consistently wrote letters to its employees urging that they refuse to water their piecework system down any further than it is. They tried to eliminate contract protections covering cancellations of prices which were in the Melrose Park and Memphis contracts. They were not successful.

WAGE RISE WON

The master contract, while not as good for all locals as for others is a much better contract than exists in the biggest units of the CIO. Considerable gains were made on seniority, grievance procedure, holiday-pay restrictions, vacation eligibility, apprenticeship program, equalization of overtime and representation.

Substantial wage increases were granted to day workers. The important elimination of the Southern differential was made clear. The increase in wages resulting from this for the Memphis plant brought out by the fact that overall day-work raises were 22 cents per hour. In other plants the average wage increase was around 19 cents per hour.

A flat across-the-board wage increase of 10 cents an hour was won for all workers.

In addition, hourly-rated employees received the following total wage increases: 2,500 skilled workers received increases averaging 24 cents an hour with some

increases as high as 54 cents; 8,000 semi-skilled workers received increases averaging 17 cents an hour with some increases as high as 32 cents an hour; 2,000 other hourly-rated workers received increases averaging 13 cents an hour with some increases as high as 18 cents an hour.

FE PUT IN SHADE

The strike was interesting because it showed that the power of a combined office workers local and a tool room local could shut down the production of the F.E. McCormick Works plant. These two locals supported the council with no prospects of ultimate victory. They too came out on top.

The Farm Equipment section of the Stalinist-run United Electrical Workers, which had raved about the five cents it obtained in July for about 19 classifications, and which on June 5 had continued its old contract for two more years, has now lost the initiative in Harvester to the UAW. We will probably now see a wave of "militancy" by FE in order to obtain the vacation pay, holiday restrictions, day-work wages, etc., that the UAW has won by its 75-day effort.

The Harvester UAW Council struck together through thick and thin, fought issues out, utilized all the talent of the International as this was continually poured in, and (remembering 1948) came out with a good package for all Harvester workers.

Harvester, which had been arguing for eight weeks of the strike, finally had to come through. The letters from the company consistently cried that they were being bargained out. The union, its negotiators, and its striking workers changed this around to read: Harvester has simply been out-bargained.

Guild Strikers Publish Own Paper in Pittsburgh

By GERRY McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, Nov. 3.—Newspapermen in Pittsburgh the past several weeks have been demonstrating that the labor movement can publish its own daily paper. The newspaper unions of Pittsburgh are putting out their own daily, The Reporter. The regular newspapers of Pittsburgh are shut down by a strike of the AFL Mailers union. The publishers had refused the mailers pay-raise demands and also refused continuation of the existing contract.

The publishers immediately raised a howl about the public being denied news—by the unions, of course. However, the strike-aided newspaper workers—members of the CIO Newspaper Guild and the various AFL printing trades unions—decided to put out a paper of their own and give the public news. At the same time, the sale of the new paper would support the newspaper workers throughout the strike.

This plan quickly caused the publishers to lose interest in "giving the public news." Neither the Associated Press, United Press or International News Service would provide wire service. None of the struck dailies would release any of the newsprint piling up in their warehouses. Paper mills were strangely reluctant to sell paper to the unions. National syndicates would not sell their columns, features, or comics.

However, the union men located and rented offices, furnished them, set up telephone switchboards and located printing facilities. They got the services of a radio news service for wire news. Newsprint was scraped together. And the paper appeared, and is still appearing, despite an attempt by unknown persons to sabotage the presses.

The Reporter has been greatly aided by union employees of Pittsburgh's famous Negro weekly, the

Pittsburgh Courier. Members of the Newspaper Guild on the Courier are contributing part of their pay each week to the strikers. In addition, both editorial and technical employees of the Courier contribute their aid in their spare time to help get the Reporter out.

COURIER EXPANDS

In the meantime, the Courier itself has expanded its press run and is much in demand throughout the city. Since the Courier has expanded its coverage during the strike, one situation has been reversed—the people of Pittsburgh can read about murders and crimes by WHITE people in a Negro newspaper. The Courier, however, unlike many of the big dailies, never mentions the race of the criminal.

The Reporter, given its temporary nature, and the opposition of the publishing industry, is not all that could be hoped for in a paper. Beside other handicaps, it can only get newsprint enough for six-page editions. The paper has its good features, however. The news is really unbiased—which is quite a change from the Hearst and Scripps press that Pittsburghers are used to. There has been no socialist trash and no reactionary editorials or campaigns. Incidentally, the paper has been welcomed by the people of the Pittsburgh area.

LABOR ACTION, along with many militants throughout the labor movement, has long felt that American labor, like labor almost everywhere else in the non-Stalinist world, should have at least one daily newspaper of its own. The Pittsburgh Reporter, like other temporary Guild papers before it, is proving again that this can be done.

There is one other instructive aspect of the strike. Without labor, newspaper management in Pittsburgh is completely useless. Without management, newspaper workers in Pittsburgh are doing quite as well as ever.

Where's the Schuman Plan Today? German Question Muddies the Deal

By SAM FELIX

The dispute within the North Atlantic Pact Council over the rearming of Western Germany has brought into clearer view the meaning of the Schuman Plan for the pooling of the coal and steel resources of France and Germany.

The Schuman Plan was proposed last May during the course of a Big 3 meeting preceding a conference of the foreign ministers of the Atlantic Pact countries. Already at that time, the issue of the rearming of Western Germany was posing as a stumbling block in the remilitarization of all of Western Europe.

Within the Western war camp there has been a jockeying for position among the second-rate powers: England, France and Germany. To the extent that any of these is in the leadership of a bloc of nations their power is enhanced in such matters as tempo of rearmament and how the cost will be distributed.

The French government is in the unfavorable position of not being at the head of a sub-bloc (of course under the domination of American capitalism). England carries extra weight in the North Atlantic Pact Council by virtue of its leadership of the sterling bloc. For Germany the problem has been to rise out of the complete subservience and domination by the other two second-rate powers and take her position on the second line.

The now admitted deliberate actions of the French government to exclude England from the Schuman Plan—not that England would have been interested in joining anyway—is best understood by this French aspiration to build up their own sub-grouping on the continent of Europe.

There were two main problems that the Schuman Plan attempted to solve. One was the fear of an increase of German industrial production in a world market that was barely large enough to accommodate the victorious powers of the last world war. The other problem was brought on by the pressure of the cold war. It was the insistence by the U. S. that Western Europe begin to rearm, and that meant the rearming of Western Germany.

The first problem has been "solved" by the second. The rearming of Western Europe has raised the necessity of finding enough productive capacity to maintain the meager standards of living. In the eyes of the French government, it becomes a question of preventing the defeated and truncated Germany from rising to the leading Continental power of the Western bloc.

In this struggle against the very logic of the politics which it integrally supports, the French government is fighting a losing battle. From their own point of view they are fighting against "the inevitable." Germany is to be rearmed; the United States has laid down the line; it is the necessity of the cold war. It is

onto this road that all the pro-war socialists and liberals are forced, with all their misgivings and regrets.

OUTDATED

The Schuman Plan fits into this series of developments as the means by which the French hope to be able to control and dominate the rearming of Western Germany. But like many of the other plans of Western capitalism, it too has fallen as a casualty of the cold war.

When the Schuman Plan was proposed last May, the French insisted that it be accepted immediately, and that the details for operation be worked out at a later time. This pressure for speed was in response to the realization that if the plan for the control of German industry was ever to succeed, it would have to be done immediately. For if there were a delay, the American insistence upon rearmament would strengthen the bargaining power of the Adenauer regime and there might even be an outright rejection of the plan. The Korean War has quickened the tempo of remilitarization, and the Schuman Plan now stands outdated.

It was this insistence on quick acceptance that brought forth the British Labor Party statement on "European Unity." The discussion that centered about this pamphlet was concerned with the industry-integrating and cartel aspects of the plan.

During the summer months, discussions went on among the would-be participants in the plan: France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg. There is no indication that decisions were reached toward the actual implementation of the Schuman Plan. Time after time snags were hit in the negotiations that broke off the meetings.

Typical of the difficulties encountered were the price and wage differentials in the coal and steel industries of various countries, and the problem of how to equalize costs so that coal and steel could be sold in this proposed single large market without discrimination. Also: how was the power of the proposed "high authority" that is to regulate the plan to be distributed and where would the final decisions reside?

PARIS vs. WASHINGTON

It is on this point that the smaller nations raised the same objections as did the British: that they would not and could not permit the final decisions to rest in a body that was not subject to their ultimate control.

At the meetings of the North Atlantic Pact foreign ministers in late September, it was more or less formally decided that Western Germany would be brought into the Atlantic Pact and that some degree of remilitarization would have to begin. The last five weeks have seen the frantic attempts by the René Plevege cabinet in France to gain acceptance of some plan that would give it the control over German industry

which the Schuman Plan attempted to get.

The American point of view, as stated by the N. Y. Times, was: "Without Germans, the North Atlantic powers simply lack the manpower to build an adequate defense of Western Europe. West Germany cannot indefinitely remain a power vacuum. In fact, it must be allowed to organize and train military units as soon as possible in order to deter aggression—even though the placing of armed force in the Bonn Government's hands means giving it considerably more sovereignty.

To this the French countered with the plan that German remilitarization should be preceded by the merger of basic industries, to be under the control of an all-Western European cabinet. This unified Western European army would be under the control of a minister of defense, and the Germans would have no voice in this European cabinet.

BONN STIFFENS

This virtually proposes a federation of Western Europe. In the five years since the end of the world war, it was difficult enough to set up custom unions or even a modified and weak payments union. The European Marshall Plan Council is still a body without anything but advisory power.

Right now the American press is heaping the abuse on the French government that was formerly reserved for the British when they ran counter to American policy, as in the earlier period of the development of the Schuman Plan.

The Bonn government in response to this development has been stiffening its resistance to the Schuman Plan. The Ruhr steel barons, who at first hesitatingly accepted the Schuman Plan when there was no better offer to be had, are now openly hostile to the plan. The American insistence on remilitarization has strengthened their power. Recently, in a cabinet dispute over remilitarization, Adenauer appointed Robert Lehr, an outspoken critic of the Schuman Plan and representative of the Ruhr steel and coal magnates, as minister of interior.

There is no doubt that the U. S. is playing the decisive role in the fate of the Schuman Plan, for if the plan was to be implemented it would have to be with the use of Marshall Plan funds. Right now the Schuman Plan stands as a barrier to the U. S. timetable for rearming Western Europe, and the plan must go. Whether it is to be scrapped outright or modified unrecognizably depends on the need to placate French resistance to the remilitarization of Western Germany.

ACEWR Ends Relief Work, Group Dissolves

The American Committee for European Workers Relief has announced that the relief organization, which for many years has been doing a valuable job of aiding needy workers abroad, is dissolving. Its statement explains:

"The ACEWR was organized immediately after the war at a time when many countries had been hard hit by the war, and the population and especially the working people were suffering from extreme starvation, lack of medical supplies, clothing, etc. Since then the situation in one country after another has progressively improved in these respects. Although needy cases of the type we have been helping exist in several countries, especially in Germany and Greece, it nonetheless does not warrant the maintenance of a national organization with the inevitable administration expense involved. The committee has been faced with a declining income and increased expenses over the past year. For these reasons, the officers decided to dissolve the committee as of October 31, 1950.

"We wish to express gratitude to all those who have contributed their energy and their financial support to our relief work. Many individuals have been helped and the thanks they have given us for the service we have rendered to the best fighters among the working people are sufficient reward and justification for the work of the committee."

Break Widens In Stalinist-Run UAW-CIO Local

By JOE HAUSER

CLEVELAND—The Stalinist-dominated leadership of Fisher Body Local 45, UAW-CIO, is now faced with the first break in the solid clique of union officers in recent years. As reported previously in LABOR ACTION, Bert Foster, financial secretary, fell out with the administration over the issue of freedom of the press. Leo Fenster, editor of the local paper, the Eye Opener, had refused to print an article written by Foster supporting the UN action in Korea. After considerable commotion, Foster succeeded in having the article printed. Next he went after Fenster's scalp as editor, and the September membership meeting removed Fenster from this post.

The Stalinists, as is their custom, then unleashed a campaign of personal vilification and character assassination against Foster. Soon the plant was full of the usual epithets, company man, FBI stooge, union wrecker, etc. This only served to further alienate Foster from his former buddies, and he wrote a letter resigning his office, in order, as he said, to fight the slanderous charges without hiding behind his position as financial secretary, and to campaign in the next elections for officers willing to serve the membership.

Aside from the maneuvering, the important thing is that Foster appears to be thinking in terms of an avowed opposition. Such a group could fill a real need in the local, and might lead to the downfall of the present leadership.

Sentner Case: FBI Made Arrests, But They Won't Even Tell Why

By JAMES JAIRUS

ST. LOUIS, Oct. 28.—This week the McCarran Police State Law met its first test in the St. Louis federal courts. On Monday, October 23, Mrs. William Sentner was arrested by federal agents on orders of Attorney General J. Howard McGrath. Mrs. Sentner had been out on \$2,000 bond since last October awaiting a trial to deport her to Yugoslavia where she was born and which she left at the age of eight to come to this country.

Mrs. Sentner is a former member of the Communist Party and her husband is an avowed CP'er and an active leader of the Stalinist-controlled United Electrical Workers Union (UE) which was recently thrown out of the CIO.

In arresting her the government refused to tell her the reason for which she was being arrested and also refused to allow her release on bond. On Tuesday the St. Louis chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union filed a petition for her release on a writ of habeas corpus.

Federal Judge Hulen (who early last summer ordered the city to admit Negroes to the city-owned swimming pools) stated: "It looks to me like the whole thing is pretty indefinite. Certainly a person who is arrested has a right to know why he has been taken into custody."

HELD INCOMMUNICADO

The United States attorney, when asked, was unable to tell Judge Hulen whether Mrs. Sentner had been arrested on the old charge or whether she was being

held under the McCarran Police State Law.

The monstrous nature of these actions is attested to by statements from several well-known liberal organizations.

The executive board of the St. Louis ACLU stated Tuesday night that the Sentner case was a "terrifying example of totalitarian procedure" permitted by the McCarran Act.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch said in an editorial two days later (after stating that they were against Stalinism but for the rights of the Stalinists): "If she (Mrs. Sentner) can be held behind bars without bail, part of the time at least virtually incommunicado, then anyone else can be held without bail under the same frightening circumstances. . . . As it stands now the Sentner case is typical of what might happen in Romania or Bulgaria or some other dictator-rue satellite behind the Iron Curtain."

That Mrs. Sentner was held incommunicado is established by the fact that none of her friends could see her at the federal jail nor was she allowed reading matter of any kind except that which could be bought within the jail! A friend was not even allowed to send her a few recent books of fiction.

RELEASED BY JUDGE

Yesterday the case came before Judge Hulen for a final hearing at which time the government had to show cause why she could not be released on bail. The government could not satisfy the judge and he ordered her re-

leased but not until after the federal attorney requested that she be released on such another bond. (During both of these hearings Mrs. Sentner was at no time allowed in the court but waited in a guarded room next to the courtroom.)

Hulen's reply was explosive and to the point: "You're in the best possible position—you not only have the prisoner's \$2,000 but also her body." With this he ordered Mrs. Sentner released on her old \$2,000 bond and further ordered a final hearing for November 6.

It may very well be that the McCarran Police State Law will be first defeated by the courts in the City of St. Louis.

It is of interest to note that Judge Hulen does not have a reputation for being the most progressive of federal judges; he quite often has put property rights before the rights of the individual and only recently has his court taken a stand in support of the rights of Negroes in this city.

But apparently the judge remembers that the Constitution still has a Bill of Rights and this in itself is encouraging in this border city where only last week the leading university started a witchhunt for "subversive" students.

You're Invited

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

Ben Gurion Cabinet Back, Municipal Vote Will Decide

By AL FINDLEY

The first cabinet crisis in Israel has been solved in two weeks with the re-establishment of the old coalition. No new national elections will be held.

The new cabinet is organized along the lines of the proposals made by Prime Minister David Ben Gurion which were rejected by the religious bloc. The economic policy of the government continues to be what it was before. The cabinet was enlarged from 12 to 13 ministers. The Ministry of Trade and Supply is under a non-party "expert" and businessman. A number of personnel shifts have taken place, the most important of which is the entry of the Histadruth's secretary, P. Lubianker, as a member of the government.

The religious bloc had caused the crisis by demanding a rightward shift in economic policy and by refusing to agree to Ben Gurion's proposals, but it was forced to re-enter the government without any significant gains primarily as a result of division in its own ranks. The rank and file of the religious labor organizations are in favor of cooperation with the Mapai, the labor party led by Ben Gurion which controls the bourgeois religious groups and the present leaders of the Hapoel Hamizrachi to accede to re-establishment of the coalition.

During the two weeks of the cabinet crisis, the leaders of the religious bloc tried to shift the emphasis from the unpopular economic policy to religious demands. They asked greater legal recognition of religion, control of education and prohibition of the importation of non-kosher meat. All they won was a limitation on non-kosher meat imports, the status quo on all other religious questions, and a joint ministerial committee to study education.

NEW TEST COMING

While the coalition was re-established, the former spirit of collaboration between the partners is not there. The outcome of the struggle between the two forces of the coalition can be described as a stalemate. The struggle will continue and is likely to erupt again in the near future.

The immediate future of politics in Israel will be determined by the outcome of the municipal elections to be held on November 14. The campaign issues are not local ones but almost exclusively national. In addition, this will be the first time that hundreds of thousands of new immigrants who entered in the last two years will be eligible to vote and indicate their party loyalties.

The last convention of the Histadruth decided to put forward a unified labor or Histadruth list such as was customary before the split into Mapai and Mapam. The Mapam, the pro-Stalinist wing, has defied the decision and is putting up its own ticket. The result is that the "Histadruth list" will in fact be only the Mapai list.

The religious bloc is divided in the municipal elections. In only a few cases is it presenting a united ticket, as in Jerusalem. In other localities, the religious labor groups are running their own ticket and the religious bourgeoisie is doing likewise.

The other important party in this election is the conservative General Zionists, who stand for lifting controls and introducing a free-trade economy. Most commentators expect the General Zionists to make the greatest gains, the Mapai to lose slightly, and the religious bourgeois candidates to lose considerably.

MAPAM TRIES TO GROW

The Mapai leadership, however, is confident of gaining a large proportion of the votes of the new immigrants and they believe that the recent spectacular struggle against the black market has re-established their support among the workers. The gains for the General Zionists, they say, will

come from the losses of the other bourgeois groups. There are indications that this analysis is substantially correct; it can be expected that Mapai will at least hold its own.

Mapam hopes to broaden its base in this election. Until now its strength lay almost entirely in the collective farms of Hashomer Hatzair and Kibbutz Hamehuchad. Moshe Sneh, the able but unscrupulous Mapam politician, has been organizing among the city workers and the immigrants from East Europe. Sneh represents the extreme pro-Stalinist wing of Mapam.

There seems no doubt that the religious labor groups and especially Hapoel Hamizrachi will make sizable gains. The elections will decide whether their vote will so overwhelmingly swamp that of the religious bourgeois groups as to give them control over the religious bloc.

It is these municipal elections which will also determine the life of the present coalition and the possibility of new national elections in the near future.

Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Next — A Labor Party!

by Jack Ranger

A Hard-Hitting, Meaty Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party

25 cents Order from: Labor Action Book Service 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

MURDER IN MEXICO The Assassination of Leon Trotsky

by General Sanchez Salazar in collaboration with Julian Gorkin

The story of the assassination of Trotsky written by the ex-Chief of the Secret Service of the Mexican police who was in charge of the investigation.

235 pages \$2.50

Order from: LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y. (Orders must be accompanied by payment)

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 world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name Address City Zone State Tel.

Youth Student Corner

Vanguard Issue Still Hot at Brooklyn

By EUGENE MARTEL

NEW YORK, Nov. 7.—The movement to reinstate the official Brooklyn College student newspaper Vanguard has continued unabated this past week. Events were highlighted by a series of campus meetings, a Stalinist-sponsored "sitdown strike" and resultant student suspensions, and the impeachment of the president of the Student Government Association.

On Wednesday, November 1, about 50 Stalinist students staged something which was a cross between a sitdown strike, a demonstration and a hootenay outside the office of President Gideonse. Preparatory to this protest, the Stalinists had handed out leaflets for four days calling for "mass action" as the only way to reinstate Vanguard. Their leaflets also red-baited the Campus Coalition to Reinstate Vanguard, referring to it as "Trotskyite" and "Trotskyite-led."

The response to their call was inconsequential. Fifty students showed up, every one of them a hack with the exception of a few bewildered dupes. They sat down in the hallway outside Gideonse's office chanting slogans and singing songs (accompanied, naturally, by a guitar).

As a result of the demonstration three leading Stalinists were suspended for the remainder of the term and three others were officially reprimanded. This irresponsibly sectarian and completely futile act would have had its comical aspects, were it not for the fact that it will probably harm the more serious struggle to reinstate Vanguard by associating that struggle with the tactics of the Stalinists. The former Vanguard staff has already dissociated itself from the Stalinist fiasco and condemned it. It remains for the Campus Coalition to do likewise.

The action of the Stalinists, born out of isolation and desperation, had absolutely nothing to do with the Vanguard issue. On the contrary, the Vanguard issue was the pretext through which the Stalinists hoped to create another issue concerning students' rights and, as a result of the suspensions, be in a position to pose as the martyred defenders of student rights.

Gideonse Stogge Impeached

Harry Taubenfeld, president of the Student Government Association and the administration stogge who introduced the original motion revoking the Vanguard's charter, was impeached by the Student Governing Council last Monday by an 18-9 vote. This is significant in view of the fact that a similar motion was voted down several weeks ago. Since that time an investigating committee was formed which presented its findings to the Student Council. The vote to impeach followed the committee's report.

The impeachment will get the necessary three-quarters vote of the Faculty-Student Committee on Student Activities, however, is very unlikely. The committee is divided equally between students and faculty members.

Two campus meetings, both endorsed by the Campus Coalition, were held. Professor Arthur Cole, History Department chairman, spoke on "Academic Freedom and Student Rights" under the auspices of Students for Democratic Action; and Harold Lenz, dean of students at Queens College, spoke at the meeting of the Eugene V. Debs Society on "The Function of a College Newspaper." Both speeches quickly left the realm of abstraction when most, if not all, of the questions and discussion which followed centered around the Vanguard issue and the role of the Campus Coalition.

Press Policy Has to Be Settled

A meeting of the Campus Coalition was held yesterday at which the whole question of the relationship between the coalition and its paper Campus News was reopened. Up to this time the policy of the coalition was to allow complete freedom to the editorial board of the paper, thereby making possible conflicts between its editorial policy and the policy of the coalition as a whole.

This led to considerable confusion last Friday when the third issue of Campus News editorially called for two student newspapers. The coalition's central demand has been for the reinstatement of Vanguard. To eliminate such confusion and to strengthen the Vanguard fight, we believe it will be necessary to coordinate policy in Campus News and policy of the coalition more closely in all issues relating to the future status of the college press.

A subcommittee of the Faculty-Student Committee on Publications is now reviewing four alternate plans submitted by students concerning the future disposition of the college press on campus. One of the suggestions calls for the maintenance of two college papers. No plan for reinstating Vanguard has been introduced. The Campus Coalition must decide whether or not to incorporate the two-paper demand into its own program to reinstate Vanguard. Whatever it decides to do, it will be necessary for it to submit immediately some plan representing its views to the subcommittee.

Thomas Puts N. Y. Candidates On the Spot on Tresca Case

NEW YORK, Nov. 1 — Norman Thomas, as chairman of the Tresca Memorial Committee, renewed today a demand upon the three Italian candidates for mayor for a public statement from each giving his position with regard to the unsolved 1943 murder of Carlo Tresca, editor of the anti-fascist Italian journal Il Martello (The Hammer).

Thomas had asked Judge Ferdinand Pecora, Edward Corsi, and Acting Mayor Vincent Impellitteri on Monday, October 23, each to pledge himself—if he should be elected mayor—to "reopen the Tresca case—and through the facilities of the Police Department, bring about a new and searching investigation of that crime, with a reweighing of all the evidence bearing upon it." No answer came from any of the three.

Thomas made public today, therefore, the text of the October 23 letter, re-emphasizing what he had urged upon them: "There can be no question that the voting public is entitled to know where each of the three Italian mayoralty candidates stands on this issue. It is a matter of vital concern not only to the Italian populace of Greater New York, but to all citizens who believe in human justice. If they would be fair to the public, Messrs. Pecora, Corsi, and Impellitteri cannot remain silent about their intentions concerning the Tresca situation."

In his appeal to the mayoralty aspirants, Thomas voiced the "strong belief" of his committee that Tresca was slain "because of his opposition to one of the totalitarian governments or to one or more of its supporters in this country."

Thomas recalled also that his committee had had "cause to assail the prosecutor's office for lack of thoroughness and for lack of good faith in the Tresca inquiry." He said that the names of four of Tresca's intimates, "in a position to know about his political enemies," were given to District Attorney Frank S. Hogan in 1944 and 1945, but that "it took months and great pressure from us," before they were questioned by Hogan's aides.

"While we know," Thomas declared, "that several conscientious members of the Police Department worked zealously to crack the Tresca case, it is evident that the district attorney's office dominated the inquiry from the start. In our judgment, the failure of the state and city alike to bring Tresca's slayers to justice is a black disgrace to both."

Tresca was shot down in the wartime dimout on January 11, 1943, at Fifth Avenue and 15th Street, in the shadow of his editorial offices. The memorial committee includes: Dr. Angelica Balabanoff, William Henry Chamberlin, Frank Crosswaith, John Dewey, Varian Fry, Aron S. Gilmartin, America Gonzalez, Sidney Hertzberg, John Haynes Holmes, Sidney Hook, Harry Kelly, Liston M. Oak, A. Philip Randolph, Sheba Strunsky, M. R. Werner, Edmund Wilson, and Bertram D. Wolfe.

UN and Franco --

(Continued from page 1) out the hard-pressed Franco dictatorship by extending it a loan. Truman preferred the use of the International Bank through the UN.

KREMLIN SCORES
In opposition to the resolution were Guatemala, Mexico, Uruguay, Israel, Yugoslavia—and Russia, together with its satellites. It is easy to point out the hypocrisy of the vote by the Russian regime, totalitarian itself and hardly opposed to Franco's totalitarianism on democratic principles. Was not Russia allied with Hitler for a whole period? Did not its intervention in Spain have an effect in producing Franco's victory?

The point remains that it is the U. S. which finds itself compelled to lean upon and support, in one form or another, the regime of Franco and his counterparts in other countries—the Bao Dais, Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-shek. This is the beginning of an answer to the question with which this article starts.

The other point is that Russia exploits United States dependence upon reactionary regimes abroad in its propaganda battle for support of the peoples. In the case of Franco, the best known, the most notorious, the most infamous representative of totalitarianism of the fascist variety, the Stalinists will have their field day. Support of Stalinism will be encouraged within Spain itself, where disillusionment with Stalinism as a result of the fiasco of the Civil War was greatest. The same will be true among the hundreds of thousands of exiled Spaniards in France, South America and all over the globe—exiled because Franco overthrew the republican government by force and violence and installed his Falange in power.

The unchanged section of the 1946 UN resolution recognizes these facts. Then, the assembly recognized that "the Franco Fascist government of Spain, which was imposed by force upon the Spanish people with the aid of Axis powers, does not represent the Spanish people and by its con-

tinued control of Spain is making impossible the participation of the Spanish people with the peoples of the United Nations in international affairs." At that time, and still on paper, the assembly proclaimed that if a government were not established in Spain which derived its authority from the consent of the governed, which was committed to free speech, religion and assembly, and held elections free from intimidation, it would consider "adequate measures" to remedy the situation. Now there are new wars and new totalitarian friends.

The representative of Uruguay explained why he voted against the softening of relations with Spain: "Not a single voice has suggested here that there has been any change in the Spanish government. We must be consistent in our belief that no government established by force of arms would benefit from such action."

The United States and UN armies are in Korea presumably because a government was attempting to impose its will on the people of South Korea by force and violence. But the UN beckon ever more strongly to the Spanish usurpers by force and violence. The Stalinists will beckon, and effectively, with the cries of peace and a "new society" against such blatant stupidities of the old.

FRANCO GETS A LIFT
At the time the UN vote was taken, Franco staged "a triumphal entry" which was triumphal only in the UN and in the controlled Spanish press. Everywhere else it was a dud, above all in Madrid, where shops, office and factories were closed to facilitate a mass demonstration to greet him on his return from abroad. "Hundreds of thousands," according to observers.

According to Sam Pope Brewer, explaining the flop in the New York Times (November 5), "Spaniards are no longer hypnotized by slogans about the need for uniting to defend themselves against international hostility or by those that imply that the only alternative to the Franco regime is communism.

They are hungry and they know of widespread corruption in the lower ranks of the regime and they see their country gradually going down the drain while other countries in Europe that have been through World War II are struggling to bring their feet again and working back to their old standards of living."

The United States, of all countries, has been holding on to the theory that the only alternatives in Spain are Franco or Stalinism. Its present course is of a piece with that philosophy. Opening of the UN agencies and the International Bank for a loan can only resuscitate the Franco regime at the head of a country whose economic condition could not be more deplorably described than in the quotation above. The specialized agencies of the UN in which Franco Spain will undoubtedly be interested are the Food and Agriculture Organization, World Health Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the aforementioned International Bank, since they are all active and are sources of funds.

It is this type of policy which distinguishes the United States in world affairs, which captivates men's minds with Stalinism, which makes them prefer it to Western democracy, which explains the allegiance of the Chinese to Mao Tse-tung, which prolong and extends the war.

By LEON TROTSKY

Marxism in the United States

35 Cents Order from Independent Socialist Press 4 Court Square Long Island City 1, N. Y.

THE PRO-TITOISM OF THE SOCIALIST LEFT—16 How the Yugo-Stalinists Fight Bureaucracy

By HAL DRAPER

Stalinism needs a "whip" over its own bureaucracy, Stalin explained. We added last week: the bureaucracy which is so universally denounced in the whole Stalinist world (not less than in Tito's Yugoslavia) is not the fundamental phenomena of the bureaucratic-collectivist system which flow from its totalitarian control, but only the symptoms, the consequences, which are inherent in that system and which are also its gravediggers. They denounce "bad attitudes," methods of work, rigidity, lack of initiative, disregard for people's feelings, etc.

The Yugoslav Tito-Stalinists also naturally condemn these bad things—and also add that they are left-overs from capitalism, not (perish the thought!) outcomes of their own system:

"Here, in our country, there is also a tendency toward domination by bureaucracy for, as we see in Marx, it is a law that this becomes a danger, a necessarily conditioned phenomenon, a necessary remnant of the old class society in the struggle for the creation of a new classless society." [Djilas, *New Roads to Socialism*. My emphasis.]

Or as Tito said, in the speech quoted last week: "It is a disease which is inherited from bourgeois society. . . ." To be sure, bureaucracy also grows in bourgeois society, but it is precisely the most deadly growths of bureaucracy which are peculiar to Stalinist society.

The Yugo-Stalinists, like other Stalinists, see bureaucracy as an administrative problem. The danger of which Kardelj wrote was that "the administrative apparatus is greatly expanded and becomes more complicated. This gives rise to the danger that the apparatus will become dissociated from the people, the danger of bureaucratization." [On *People's Democracy in Yugoslavia*.] The Stalinists are indeed mortally afraid of dissociating their bureaucratic apparatus from the people; their aim is to tie the people in, ever more tightly.

Boris Kidric put it: "It is the question finally that our apparatus does not increase numerically above the real need of the working people." This question with regard to bureaucratization—more exactly, *overbureaucratization*—is especially fatal for the Yugoslavs.

"Bad" Bureaucrats and "Good" Bureaucrats

For it must not be forgotten that the Tito bureaucracy is not operating in the vast Russia of today, a continent in itself, with tremendous natural resources, immensely industrialized in comparison with its past. Unlike the Kremlin's bureaucracy, it is operating in a small and very poor, backward and unindustrialized land which has its back to the wall, economically as well as politically. It can afford few luxuries even for its own privileged class. In self-defense, for its very life, the regime is forced to crack down on the overhead expense of bureaucracy to the fullest extent compatible with retaining the loyalty of the bureaucrats, while trying to convince the latter that they too have to make "sacrifices."

Trotsky pointed out in *The Revolution Betrayed*: "In its first period the Soviet regime was undoubtedly far more equalitarian and less bureaucratic than now. But that was an equality of general poverty. The resources of the country were so scant that there was no opportunity to separate out from the masses of the population any broad privileged strata."

This was with regard to the development of Stalinism out of something which was not Stalinism. The Tito regime was born with the indicia of the system upon them, with the pattern before them. It is not for them a question of separating out a privileged stratum—it is separated out now—but of curbing it. Within the limits of retaining the loyalty of the retainers, it is still forced, as a temporary expedient, into an anti-bureaucratism which is "strictly from hunger."

"To the extent that we keep on achieving this aim, we will have less bureaucratism and our administrative apparatus will become less expensive," wrote Kardelj. It is the administrative approach again, of course, and more concretely the *costliness of over-bureaucratization* with which he is concerned from his point of view.

It follows from this that the Stalinist "fight against bureaucratism," which is entirely within the framework of the bureaucratic-collectivist system, is a drive against the "bad" bureaucrats as against the "good" bureaucrats. The "bad" bureaucrats are those with the bad habits, etc. Said Kidric: "We fight against bureaucracy and bureaucrats, we do not undermine those honest officials concerned with the cause of our working people. . . ."

The people do not come into direct contact with Tito or Stalin, Kardelj or Molotov, Rankovic or Beria; they deal with the little bureaucrats below, upon whom their anger is loosed. The problem of the bureaucracy is how to avoid having the people directly identify the whole regime and whole system with the "bad" bureaucrats—i.e., the servants of the regime whom they see in the flesh:

"One problem which must be faced in totalitarian states is how the public media shall deal with the bureaucrat in order to avoid the appearance of being completely identified with him and his corporate interests and ideology. Goebbels . . . tried to deal with this problem. . . . The Soviets, for their part, have adopted a different technique for dealing with an analogous problem. They encourage and manufacture criticism of individual functionaries guilty of abuses and malpractices of various sorts. These accounts, so far as I can see, are seldom wholly negative." [Paul Keesemeti, in *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Summer 1950.]

New Privileges for the Bureaucracy

This drive against "bad" bureaucrats has, as its other side, special rewards and added class privileges for the "good" bureaucrats. The specific difficulty in Yugoslavia is that the regime, crushed under an economic crisis as it is today, has precious little available with which to reward even its own!

This did not stop the Tito regime from announcing, as recently as last July, a special bonus system for "good" bureaucrats. It had been heralded in the speech by Kidric which we have already quoted, which was made in Ljubliana on March 20:

"We fight against bureaucracy and bureaucrats, we do not undermine those honest officials concerned with the cause of our working people. . . . On the contrary a real struggle against bureaucracy and a too-numerous apparatus [Note this!] will enable us to improve the material situation of the officials concerned with the well-being of our working people—because we know very well that in that respect regular relations have not yet been established everywhere."

The Titoist bureaucracy, which aspires to be like the Russian bureaucracy just as Tito aspires to Stalin's place in the Yugoslav scheme of things, make their demands. The regime has to weigh the dangers of imposing restraint upon them against the danger of losing their loyalty—especially with the Cominform ready to pounce on disaffected bureaucrats.

Only this last July, the Tito regime therefore published a new decree awarding "special supplements" to the salaries of the bureaucracy:

"This supplement will be given to the functionaries in the form of a lump-sum bonus at the end of the year or of the quarter-year, or again at the termination of the work, and will go up to 20,000 dinars. . . . By virtue of this regulation, there is foreseen also monthly supplements for work which requires more technical knowledge and more experience. These supplements vary between 400 and 3000 dinars a month. This new regulation will make it possible to estimate and recompense the functionaries with greater precision in accordance with their merits. Up to now monthly supplements had been distributed on a small scale. . . ." [Tanjug, July 15.]

The New Decree

The recent heralded decree purporting to abolish special privileges for the bureaucrats did not wipe out this very concrete privilege, which rewards the bureaucrat, and not the worker, for successes in achievement. This latest decree on "equalitarianism" pretends to hold the bureaucrats down to a broad ration no higher than that of a worker—but note:

(1) His ration is that of the most privileged worker, which is relatively quite high.

(2) More important, no worker in Yugoslavia expects to actually get the ration which he is theoretically entitled to. New York Times correspondent Handler went further: none of them get it, he says. The bureaucrat does.

(3) Most important of all, and sufficient in itself to puncture the pretension of the decree, the worker and peasant *does* live on bread; the bureaucrat does not, any more than the average American worker lives on bread. For him alone, other foods are available, in addition to the villa in Dedinje in which he lives and his other privileges.

This does not gainsay the fact that Tito, in a desperate fix, would (I am very sure) like very much to reduce the overhead cost of the bureaucracy by their voluntary acceptance of a more Spartan life. It has nothing to do with an equalitarian philosophy: it is, again, "strictly from hunger."

Any success he may have in this direction is shadowed by the threat of disaffection. It was, indeed, startling to read in the dispatches that high officials of the state openly violated the "anti-bureaucrat" decree by grabbing food, like pigs in a trough! It underlines both the extreme economic situation of the country, the character of Tito's bureaucracy, and the futility of the standard Stalinist attempts to whip the bureaucracy into line from above in a system which depends for its life upon these very bureaucrats as the class basis of the regime.

From the Top Down

Finally, as Trotsky put it (quoted last week), "The accusation [of bureaucratism] is always directed from above downward and is a method of self-defense on the part of the upper circles."

It is not the heart of the regime itself which is bureaucratized—no, it is, on the contrary, the cops of the bureaucratic regime who have the task of—abolishing bureaucratism. Kardelj, in his *On People's Democracy in Yugoslavia* made sure that the boys knew where to look for the bureaucratism they were called on to scotch:

"Some comrades think that bureaucratism centralism is a problem only in connection with our federal [national] organs of government. This conception is completely erroneous. As a matter of fact, there is no doubt that, owing to the correct policies of our party, bureaucratic centralism has been most successfully pushed back in the federal branches of our government, although even there it has not yet been completely liquidated. However, it is much stronger in the central organs of the Republican governments [members of the constituent republics or provinces], in the various general and central boards, and even in our [local] People's Committees, so far as their relations with subordinate organs are concerned. The tendency toward bureaucratic centralism is especially strong when the lower organs of state authority are not functioning properly."

In other words, bureaucratism is something for the hierarchy to fight on the echelons BELOW them. It is truly a typical bureaucratic conception—i.e., a typical Stalinist conception—of the fight against bureaucratism, and can be understood only when we understand what such Stalinist types mean by "bureaucratism" in the first place.

In contrast, Trotsky commented on debureaucratization: "If the bureaucracy was compelled in its struggle for a planned economy to dekulakize the kulak, the working class will be compelled in its struggle for socialism to debureaucratize the bureaucracy." The conception of the Tito-Stalinists is that it is the task of the bureaucracy itself to debureaucratize those below them.

(Next week: Bureaucratism as double gravedigger of Stalinism.)

For living Marxism—read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

The Socialist Youth League of BERKELEY

AUTUMN CLASS in MARXIST SOCIALISM

Thursday evenings at 8 p.m. 466 Tenth Street, Room 218 (Half block west of Broadway), OAKLAND

Session 5 . . . Nov. 16: Marxism and Anthropology
Session 6 . . . Nov. 30: Religion and Capitalism
Session 7 . . . Dec. 7: The Evolution of Stalinism

Puerto Rican People Are the Victims --

(Continued from page 1)
tion on earth, according to the legal relationship—not some backward section of Africa or Asia.

It was not always so for this proud people. When the U. S. took the island over from Spain, official reports mentioned that the Puerto Ricans were a happier and more contented lot than their West Indian neighbors. What happened in over 50 years of U. S. rule?

The story is not merely one of imperialism's effect on a colonial people. It is specifically the story of America's type of imperialism. The authorities in Washington, when the occasion arises as it did last week, like to boast of all the "good" they did the Puerto Rican people, the moneys poured in for roads, schools, relief, etc., the "white man's burden" which they assumed. The British sahibs liked to talk the same way about India, until they were ousted.

But the U. S. never sought to build a wideflung colonial empire in the British fashion. Its path of imperialism was through the penetration of the dollar and the straitjacketing control provided through economic domination rather than through mastery by arms. But, being a colony, Puerto Rico's lack of political independence made it impossible for the people to take the slightest step to limit or condition the tying-up of their country by American capital. The plight of Puerto Rico today is the end-result of that domination by American capital, unchecked and unmitigated.

Sugar—and Bitterness

"I know of no other region of the world where foreign capital is more powerful than in Puerto Rico," wrote Bailey W. Diffie of CIGNY in 1940, author of a study on Puerto which had been published almost a decade before. If it is U. S. capital he is talking about. Partially or completely dominated are Puerto Rico's sugar industry, tobacco manufacturing, fruit growing, banks, railroads, public utilities, steamship lines and many lesser businesses. The money poured into the island, which Washington likes to point to, certainly did good for someone, but the Puerto Ricans would find it hard to see what it meant for him.

American capital forced on Puerto Rico its present fatal one-crop economy, an economy dominated by sugar plantations, which in turn are largely owned and controlled by U. S. capital.

At the beginning of the American occupation, the official 1899 survey showed, 93 per cent of the farms were owned by their tillers and 91 per cent of the cultivated areas were owned by their occupants. Today, the plantations cover the best land in this mountainous island, only half of whose land is arable anyway. The large majority of the people have been expropriated from it.

By being incorporated into the U. S., Puerto Rico came behind the U. S. tariff wall. It was also made subject to the Coastwise Shipping Act, which requires Puerto Rico to ship exports and imports exclusively on U. S.-flag boats, at monopoly rates. Behind these tariff barriers, Puerto Rico has been cut off from the rest of the world in trade. As was not true under Spanish rule, Puerto Rican economy is tied to the U. S. by golden bonds so tight that it would take generations to untie them if they would. Today 95-98 percent of its trade is with the U. S., in U. S. ships.

Under Spain coffee was the No. 1 crop, but since coffee is not protected in the U. S. market, it died (helped to death, it is true, by hurricane-wrought destruction in the fields also), and with the dominance of coffee went whatever might have become a native bourgeoisie. The lack of any substantial economic base for a native bourgeoisie (in this land completely surrounded by foreign capital) is one of the reasons why the independence movement is the property largely of the poor masses with few upper-class spokesmen and articulate intellectuals.

Sugar came in and U. S. investors took over the land. Besides owning or leasing one quarter of all the sugar lands (the best), the four biggest foreign-owned sugar corporations' mills manufactured half of all the sugar produced (1932-33 figures). That gave them a stranglehold. As opportunities for expansion in the industry lessened, the corporations' reinvestments inside Puerto Rico declined; the profits went out of the country even more. In 1920-35 the three largest absentee owners of Puerto Rico's sugar fields left only a quarter of their \$31 million profits in the island, profits made out of the toil of the *fiberos*.

The 1940 census showed a startling fact: less than one tenth of one per cent of the farms—27 big farms with one eighth of the total farm area—owned over 20 per cent of the value of all farm land and buildings, and 46 per cent of all farm implements and machinery.

Kept Backward

Munoz, the same governor who is now busy rounding up his opponents on the island, had a Land Law passed in 1941. Its preamble described the situation thus, in the text of the law itself: "The sugar latifundia has spread its tentacles within the vast area of its dominions; to the operation of commercial and industrial establishments, and of grocery and general stores; has limited the circulation of money, has caused the annihilation of communal life in many of the urban centers; has made it impossible for thousands of human beings to be the owners of even the lot where their homes are situated, all to the consequent unbalancing of the economic structure of the island."

When America took over, the people raised their own food. Today in this one-crop economy half the food must be imported—high-priced food from America. This is one of the reasons why Puerto Rico is the biggest market for the U. S. in the world—per capita.

Whenever Puerto Ricans attempted to build native industries, their attempts were killed by U. S. manufacturers who dumped their goods on the island to prevent the rise of competitors in this market. As a colony without any rights, Puerto Rico could not defend itself with a tariff wall. While increasingly suffering from the

inevitable effects of agrarian overpopulation in a backward economy, it could take no steps to industrialize itself. In the last 50 years under U. S. rule there has been a steady increase in unemployment: from only 17 per cent in 1899 to 30 per cent in 1926 and around 40 per cent since 1940.

The benefits of imperialist exploitation are blessed indeed! The Washington authorities pretend outraged indignation at the very notion that they have any relation with Puerto Rico except that of the charitable uncle, doing nothing but good at great cost to themselves. Meanwhile it is true that three of the four big sugar corporations, absentee owners, averaged about 12 per cent annually on their capital investment and paid out about \$2,700,000 annually to U. S. investors (1923-35 figures) or 7.9 per cent on the investment. They maintained high profits even at the bottom of the great depression. And in the last 15 years, Puerto Rico has become a million-dollar-a-day market for U. S. goods.

In summary: U. S. capital has pulled plenty out of this little island of two million, and in return it has given its people an economy so distorted, shaped and hogtied to U. S. interests that insecurity and poverty are rampant for the masses, industrialization has been prevented, and backwardness has been fastened like an iron collar on the people.

Truman's Promise

With the end of the Second World War, colonial movements for independence swept the world. In a situation where Britain lost its India, where France had to step its empire back to the so-called "French Union," where the Indonesians forced Holland into compromise by armed rebellion, the U. S.—which can get along without little Puerto Rico much better than Britain without India!—could not expect to maintain business-as-usual in its island colony. No account of what the U. S. has gotten out of Puerto Rico need pretend that the island is of very great importance to U. S. capitalism or U. S. imperialism as a whole. In the postwar world situation, the U. S. too moved to lift colonial controls.

In a message to Congress on October 16, 1945, President Truman declared: "It is now time, in my opinion, to ascertain from the people of Puerto Rico their wishes as to the ultimate status which they prefer. . . . He proposed, in effect, that a plebiscite be held in which the islanders could declare themselves in favor of one of these: (1) increased autonomy under the present relationship; (2) statehood; (3) union with the United States. In words, therefore, Truman granted the Puerto Rican people the right of SELF-DETERMINATION. He has never done anything about it.

Certainly, this is the elementary right of the Puerto Rican people! There cannot be a democratically-minded person in the country who can fail to demand that the islanders be given a chance, in a free vote, to determine their own relation to this country—to choose independence and have that independence granted, or to choose statehood and be accepted, or to declare for any other political status they desire.

It was with reference to this statement of his that Truman, after the assassination attempt, figuratively washed his hands of responsibility for Puerto Rico and sanctimoniously said that his conscience was clear. But U. S. proposals on independence have been overlaid with two jokers in the deck; and in any case none of the independence proposals have ever been implemented.

The New Constitution

Instead Puerto Ricans have been presented with a new constitution, on which they are to vote in a couple of months. This constitution was presumably drawn up by the Munoz government; in any case the people have had no part and no say in it. No constitutional convention of any kind was held. It was drawn up from above, and the people can say only yes or no. So far from this being real self-determination, it is not even self-determination on the question of how to modify the present status short of independence.

The new constitution provides for continued U. S. control of the Puerto Rican government sufficiently to guard any basic interest of the U. S., even aside from the kind of control exerted internally due to foreign control of the Puerto Rican economy. Munoz is the first elected native governor of the island, since last year, and the new constitution provides for continued election of the government by the people—EXCEPT for three key posts:

- (1) The state auditor, without whose signature the government can spend no money, will still be appointed in Washington. An "auditor" sounds like a lowly official, but his power is that of the purse strings.
- (2) The justices of the Supreme Court will still be appointed in Washington.
- (3) The governor, though elected by Puerto Ricans, is sworn to execute the laws of the United States, and there will be a "federal coordinator" above him to see that he stays in line. This super-governor, the federal coordinator, is Washington's man.

The people may or may not accept this new constitution as a partial deposit on complete autonomy, but it does not negate the fact that Truman has never taken any steps to carry out his pledge.

One of the reasons for this, given the fact that there is no overwhelming reason why the great and mighty state of the U. S. cannot afford to loose the chain on a little island in the Caribbean, may be the opposition of the military. Their view came out in 1945 in the hearings on the then Tydings bill for Puerto Rican independence.

Yes, Senator Tydings of Maryland, a purple-eyed reactionary, did indeed introduce a bill to give Puerto Rico its independence! Before discussing his bill, however, we note here that one of its strings was the provision that present military and naval installations on the island be retained by the U. S. This was not enough for the navy's representative, who said:

"The amount and type of facilities that the navy may need in Puerto Rico in the future cannot be foreseen now. For that reason, the Chief of Naval Operations is opposed to any bill for Puerto Rican independence that provides only for the retention of naval and military reservations, and does not also provide for the right of expansion of naval and military facilities, and the selection of new sites at any time in the future, if necessary to the national security. The United States must be the sole judge of its own future military requirements in this area."

Especially in these cold-war days, this adds up, of course, to no independence at all; and the new constitution, for all its added autonomy, is sufficient to give the navy what it wants.

Independence: Promise or Threat?

But why, in any case, does a man like Tydings press for Puerto Rican independence? Not even Tydings really pretends that this is due to his democratic spirit or love for the Puerto Rican people. On the contrary, Tydings' attitude toward Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans is hostile and vindictive.

The answer also points to the problem presented by independence to the Puerto Ricans themselves.

From Tydings' side, one of the "whereases" in his bill is the tipoff: "Whereas the economic conditions in Puerto Rico are such that the people of the U. S. and the federal treasury are increasingly subjected to financial strain to alleviate the economic distress in Puerto Rico. . . ."

This is Tydings' own angle on the question, being an "economy" man, but his presentation of the bill sharply brought out the fact that even many Puerto Rican advocates of independence drew back from support of his bill. For, given what the Puerto Rican situation has become after 50 years of U. S. rule, independence would cast them loose in a world for which U. S. imperialism has unfitted them, would disrupt their entire economy as it has been built up to now. It would deprive them of their present advantages as a part of the U. S. (and besides the tariff protection, another is the kickback which they get from excise taxes on exports), and they are unequipped for even a go at economic independence.

The U. S. has kept the island without industry, with an economy dovetailed to that of the mainland, as we pointed out. Independence at one strike could be an economic catastrophe in this situation. The greatest crime of American imperialism's operations is that it has made Puerto Rico equally untenable either as a part of the U. S. or as not a part of the U. S.! This is the notorious Puerto Rican "paradox" or "dilemma."

It is this fact, and this fact only, which undercuts the Puerto Rican people's desire for independence, and which gives color to the claim of some apologists that "the Puerto Rican people don't know what they want" or "most of the people are not really for independence."

First Step: Self-Determination!

That is not true. Except for the upper crust, there is little doubt that the mass of people desire independence and nothing less; but in the face of the economic reality that has been done to their country in 50 years, their most articulate spokesmen tend to draw back from independence pure-and-simple, understandably. The *Independencistas* argue that, given sovereign rights, a national tariff could build up a native industry and change the economic picture. The rub is: How long will it take to undo the U. S.'s damage, and how many will starve meanwhile?

The Munoz regime and its Popular Democratic Party has taken another tack. Munoz proposes no "political" solution; the problem is solely economic, he says—industrialization. To this end his government has set up its "Operation Bootstrap" (the name is suggestive of the almost hopeless desperation which animates it) through which it drives to lure U. S. capital into Puerto Rico for the purpose of setting up new and diversified industries, mainly light industry. To this end, a tax holiday was declared: new enterprises will be tax-free for 12 years, partly tax-free for three years after that, and taxed at low rates even after that. The second lure to U. S. manufacturers is the cheap labor supply—Puerto Rico advertises its misery.

If this plan succeeds in substantially furthering immediate industrialization, it can be only out of the hides of the Puerto Rican workers; and since the new industry, by the very setup, will be U. S.-owned, it will only ensure continued complete domination by U. S. capital and the flow of profits out of the country.

In the air also is the idea of an independent Caribbean Federation, which has been much talked-about in the various islands, including Cuba. The idea would meet with many difficulties but there is no doubt that an independent Puerto Rico as a part of a Caribbean Federation would be many times more viable than an independent Puerto Rico cast adrift by itself.

There is most reason to believe that what the Puerto Ricans really want, aside from their hopes of getting it, is independence PLUS: that is, plus the continuance of present U. S. forms of aid to its economy. For ourselves, there can be no doubt that they have every right to get just that. It would be slight repayment, considering this country's resources; for the agony of a people which was imposed on them without their wish and against their will. Such a pledge by the U. S. would wipe out the Puerto Rican dilemma overnight. It is hardly to be expected from a capitalist United States, but it would be one of the first acts of a socialist America.

What we demand first from this capitalist United States, however, is the very elementary step which Truman himself promised: a free vote in which the Puerto Rican people (not Munoz, not the sugar corporations) can determine their own fate, the elementary right of genuine self-determination.

That is what the spotlight should be on, not on the misdeeds of a handful of misguided Nationalist followers.

Shadowy Independence of Philippines Wears Thin, Bell Report and Proposals Indicate

By RICHARD BURGESS

With considerable reluctance, the Truman administration has finally released to the public the report of the Bell Economic Survey Mission to the Philippines. The report, drawing a vivid picture of the corruption, inefficiency, and general bankruptcy of the U. S.-supported Quirino regime, was completed after a two-month study by the mission, headed by Daniel W. Bell, banker and former undersecretary of the treasury.

After the report had been submitted to President Truman, the latter told a press conference that it would be "some time" before the document would be made public—if at all. Word of the contents of the report leaked out, however. Commented one conservative news weekly: "There's that old familiar smell of China all over again."

Indeed, the odor of the putrescent body of American-backed Philippine capitalism is clearly discernible to all but the most insensitive noses.

In the Philippine Islands themselves, despite the official secrecy, the report was anything but a secret. President Quirino's government, as sensitive to criticism as most other corrupt regimes, issued a blistering attack on the report. This criticism was issued through Quirino's personal secretary and acting head of his government's information service. After the repercussions were felt, this worthy gentleman was fired, and the statement itself was declared to be "unauthorized."

But the statement, in its remarkable frankness and unadorned cynicism, remains an invaluable document illustrative of the real feelings of certain sections of the Filipino capitalist class.

POT AND KETTLE

First, the attack demands publication of the report, to "inform the . . . people what it's all about. . . . What is not widely understood," it continues, "is that Philippine's 'bankruptcy and corruption' have an intimate relation to the American example in racketeering and to the insidious inspiration provided by conspicuous consumption, otherwise known as the so-called American standard of living. . . . Filipinos, there is no question, are inefficient all right—even in their grafting—due no doubt to their simple lack of sufficient experience. With more time and greater chances, they will yet show that they can equal or even surpass the stink familiar and now taken for granted in Washington and such very proper exemplary

centers of power, prosperity and culture. . . .

"The Filipinos are now getting it in the neck, because they are not rich enough to cover up their own stink and be lofty and moral about it before a devastated and hungry world. It costs a lot of money, dollars if you please, to enjoy that special privilege, and not having it, they accept momentarily the considerable inconvenience of being regarded always in the wrong, therefore properly damned and doomed. . . .

"The United States is so well endowed and powerful that it should not be too awkward and too embarrassing for her to display a little more becoming grace and modesty of spirit for the benefit of a needy and sorely distressed world—if only for the purposes of public relations, incorporated."

This is the statement of the frightened and jealous Filipino bourgeois, aspiring in vain to the status of his American counter-part—resentful of his inferior historic position as a mere compradore bourgeois—and afraid of being discarded by his American masters. Even though the Philippine government officially repudiated the statement, the Truman administration was nevertheless compelled to publish the Bell report, despite the ammunition it might provide for Russian propaganda.

FICTION OF FREEDOM

An examination of the report itself—of its recommendations, at any rate—reveals that the Filipino bourgeoisie has little to fear in the way of being discarded by the United States. The United States is just as dependent upon the corrupt Filipino capitalist class as the latter is upon the United States.

But the report indicates that the U. S. in the future will begin cracking down on the Philippine government. The fiction of political independence is wearing thin under the pressure of economic necessity.

Under the report, the United States will offer \$250,000,000 in loans and grants—to be closely supervised, controlled and directed by a U. S. technical mission—provided certain reforms are effected with the aim of eliminating some of the abuses that were uncovered by the Bell Mission, such as the following:

- The standard of living of the mass of people is lower than before the war.
- The inequalities in income in the Philippines, always large, have become even greater during the

past few years. Profits of businessmen and the incomes of large landowners have risen "very considerably."

• Prices are higher, in general, than those in the United States.

• Wages vary from the average 1 peso (50c) daily for agricultural workers to the 3 peso average for industrial workers.

• Almost nothing has been done to open new lands to the increased population, or to better the position of farm workers and tenants.

• The large overproportionate importation of luxury items and non-essential goods serve only to swell the profits of a few individual capitalists, leaving the bulk of the population in its traditional poverty.

• Teachers, and in some cases soldiers, did not receive regular wages from the government.

• Inefficiency and corruption are widespread in the government. The U. S. News and World Report gives some documented evidence of this:

- (1) The immigration racket, involving 19 senators and 83 representatives, in addition to President Quirino's own three brothers, consisted in the illegal sale of permits to Chinese immigrants.
- (2) The land racket, involving several high government officials, including one of Quirino's brothers, consisted in the sale of church lands to the government at exorbitant prices.
- (3) The surplus racket—also involving high government officials

BOOKS and Ideas

A Look into the World Next Door Are Mental Hospitals a Trap for the Sick?

THE WORLD NEXT DOOR, by Fritz Peters. A Signet Book, The New American Library, New York, 1950, 25 cents.

By LARRY O'CONNOR

Fritz Peters has condensed for the pocket book edition his gripping novel of the struggle of a young man to regain his stability after a psychotic seizure, and his equally valiant struggle against the inhumanity of the institutions provided by our society for the detention or cure of the mentally sick.

The story is told by a man who has obviously gone through the experience himself. To many readers the account of his inner struggle may be the most important aspect of the book. Its value in the field of psychology may best be left to experts, but it is certainly fascinating even to the layman.

Yet, for people with a social conscience, the account of the treatment given patients in the veterans' hospital in which David Mitchell is confined is of even greater importance.

Mitchell and his fellow patients find themselves imprisoned in a place where no doctor sees them for days on end. They are left to the tender mercies of a gang of brutalized male nurses whose chief concern is to terrorize the patients into meek acquiescence in the routine. The patients are prey to the helplessness of the individual caught in a rigid institutional machine, plus the added disability that any complaint or outcry on their part is taken by the bureaucracy which runs the hospital to be merely a manifestation of their sickness.

ENEMY IS OUTSIDE TOO

The book makes it clear that

—consisted in the sale at handsome profits of U. S. and Philippine army materiel.

MAIN JOB UNTOUCHED

The recommendations of the report are quite naturally limited to the aims of both American and Philippine capitalism. They suggest that the government "clean house"; in effect, they tell the grafters to "stop grafting," or at least to be a bit more discreet about it. There are some other interesting suggestions made—interesting because one might have assumed that this outpost of "democracy" had already embodied these concepts in its previously existing structure:

- That the right of workers to organize free trade unions to protect their economic interests be established through appropriate legislation.
- That a minimum wage for agricultural and other workers be established to provide SUBSISTENCE standards of living.

"These are minor aspects of the report. The major one is the creation of a United States technical mission whose function is to "assist" the Philippine government in carrying out "its agricultural and industrial development, fiscal controls, public administration, and labor and social welfare program . . ." in addition to being in "continued supervision and control" of the \$25,000,000 grant.

Despite all its talk of "basic" reforms, the key question of the

fundamental change in the treatment of mental patients in such institutions is possible as long as they are confined on a mass basis. Mitchell's best friend in the hospital is a former nurse who cracked under the self-brutalization which he found himself undergoing in the course of his training. He explains the process, and the fact that the nurses are also victims of the mass institutional treatment of psychosis in our society.

The patients not only have to struggle against their disease virtually without individual medical treatment; they also have to struggle against the attitude of the world outside the institution toward them.

When a patient shows definite signs of recovery, he is sent home on a trial visit. Here he is often confronted with the same family and other problems which originally pushed him toward his breakdown. His chief desire is not to return to the hospital which stands as a symbol of his most harrowing experiences. Unless he has been committed by a court, his family can prevent his return. Yet any exhibition of anger or serious anxiety over his family's insistence that he return after his trial visit is taken by them as a sign that he is still sick, and hence must return.

Even worse is the attempt of many families to exploit the sickness of veterans for financial gain. Driven by poverty or by greed, many families seek to get permanent pensions for their sick relatives by having them classified as permanently disabled by their sickness.

VICTORY—FOR ONE

This is a natural reaction of people in a society in which getting money by any means is considered a social virtue. Yet for

feudal-landlord system that dominates the islands is left largely untouched. The report speaks of "improving the lot of the tenants," of the purchase of large estates for resale to small landowners, of applying more advanced techniques for improving the agricultural output, etc. But of the abolition of the great landed estates, upon which the majority of the peasants work under truly medieval conditions, not a word can be discovered. This is the manner in which the MOST BASIC question in the Philippines is treated by the American mission.

Even if all the recommendations were followed—and it is exceedingly unlikely that they will be—the Philippines will only be able to survive as long as the United States continues to pump millions into it—which in turn will mean the continued tendency to return the Philippines to its former colonial status. Only a fundamental shift of power—from the hands of the corrupt bureaucracy of politician-capitalists to those of the democratic representatives of the masses of peasants and workers—can put an end to the deteriorating economic situation, and also prevent those masses from becoming supporters and sympathizers of the Russian camp. It is precisely such a fundamental step that U. S. capitalism, tied by a thousand and one economic links with the Filipino capitalist class—the very one it labels as "corrupt"—is incapable of taking.

the patient this increases the problem of recovery tremendously. In the worst cases, Peters describes families who visit their relatives in the hospital only to get them to sign their compensation checks, and who keep them in the hospital as long as they continue the checks.

But even where this is not the object, the patient who is badly in need of every assurance that he can get well, that he is not permanently insane, is thus confronted with the fact that society (that is, the Veterans Administration) considers him in fact permanently disabled and reminds him of this every month with its pension check.

Part of the drama of the book is Mitchell's fight against the whole hospital administration and against the social pressure which seeks to make him accept the permanence of his sickness, or at least to accept the pension which is a symbol of that permanence. It is not important that he expresses his revolt against the pension in terms usually employed to counterpose "rugged individualism" to "government paternalism." He is actually fighting for the right of an individual to be treated with dignity and not to be branded with a social stigma for life.

His struggle brings results. Not only does he win through to health, but his tenacity succeeds in bringing about the dismissal of some of the most brutal and bureaucratic persons who dominate his institutions. Yet the whole social pattern is not touched. He appears as a hero who is able to save himself and to help a few others, perhaps a bit too much so. Yet the dominant impressions left by the book is of the hopeless inadequacy of our society's provision for the cure of the mentally sick.

Why Were the Liberals Silent in the Campaign?

By GORDON HASKELL

One of the most interesting observations on the 1950 political campaign appeared in an article by James Reston in the New York Times for November 2 under the headline "Intellectual Left Silent in Campaign."

The article observes that although the labor movement is participating vigorously in the campaign, particularly in Ohio, the college professors, Hollywood writers and artists and other people in the "professions" who were at one time among the most vocal supporters of the New Deal have become silent and politically inactive.

Reston points out that this is true not only of that portion of the liberals who sympathized with the Stalinists or with their recent captive, Henry Wallace, but equally of the anti-Stalinists associated with the Americans for Democratic Action and even those who were pure and simple New Deal Democrats. To explain the feelings of these people he quotes one of them as follows:

"In the present atmosphere of suspicion, no liberal can get up and pronounce his views with any vigor without being smeared as a fellow traveler and without causing embarrassment to the candidate he supports and the institution he represents.

"Too many men have been attacked in the last year with impunity. The defense, no matter how persuasive or complete, never quite gets as much display or attention as the charges and never quite catches up with the accusations. Therefore, participation in the campaign now would merely damage our reputations without helping the candidates we supported."

ONE PRESSURE GONE

Reston points out, further, that strange as it may seem, the utter defeat and disintegration of the Stalinist-Wallace movement (in which defeat the ADA and the liberals in general played no small role) has made things more difficult for the Fair Dealers than they were in 1948. At that time it was easy for them to differentiate themselves from the Stalinists by turning the full force of their fire on them. Today, however, since there is hardly a trace of the Progressive Party left in the field, the Republicans have been able to smear the liberals with the Stalinist brush with considerable success.

There is another result of the Wallace movement which ought to be mentioned. We pointed out in 1948 that the very existence of the Wallace threat, Stalinized as the movement was and therefore unworthy of support, acted as a left-wing pressure on the New Deal and ADA liberals. It threatened to curtail the support of those who were tired of the two old parties and of the ADA-labor leaders' policy of going along with those parties. The anti-Stalinist liberals bestirred themselves under the banner of saving liberalism from Stalinism; under this banner their work was even tolerated by the conservatives. Now that this pressure is gone, the liberals have lost their impetus—because it was only a negative one to begin with.

The liberals, says Reston, have permitted the leadership of the offensive against the Stalinists to pass into the hands of the conservatives. They are now politically on the defensive, despite the fact that the New Deal and Fair Deal measures affecting farmers and industrial workers which they supported and pioneered most vigorously have "struck deep roots in this country and

have a very good chance of being rewarded at the polls."

The last sentence appears to be the key to the real reason for the difficulty in which the intellectual vanguard of the old New Deal and the Fair Deal finds itself.

WHY THE CHANGE?

It should be remembered that the red smear was not invented during the past few years. A large section of the press used it in every Roosevelt election. The "brain-trusters" were cartooned as identical twins to the bearded bomb-toting Bolsheviks. Yet in the past the liberal intellectuals were neither intimidated nor put on the political defensive by these tactics.

They felt that they were the bearers of a new kind of social revolution. They were going to save capitalism from itself and turn it into a better society for all. The labor movement was storming ahead in its great organizing drives and taming the arbitrary power of the "economic royalists" who were also being squeezed by the advance of social legislation. The charge that their program amounted to "socialism" or even "communism" could be laughed aside by them as well as by their leader in the White House.

They have been put on the defensive because even though the particular measures and policies they advocated have been adopted in large measure, the result has NOT been the better society which was their goal.

BLIND ALLEY

In short, whether they are capable of understanding this or not, the liberals of the Fair Deal are in a political blind alley which is of their own making. They do not have any idea of how to get out of it. They have no new domestic program which is capable of gripping the imagination of the people. In the realm of foreign affairs they are reduced to following the policies of the administration which consist in substituting military force for creative ideas which can gain the support of the peoples of the world.

But in so doing they become indistinguishable from the conservative Democrats on the one hand, while remaining exposed to the attacks of the reactionaries for their "radical" past on the other.

For them, this is the end of a political strategy, based on the idea that their role was to "apply pressure" inside the Democratic Party. As they have nothing new or better to offer the people, they represent no force which can "apply pressure." Now they can only "support" the more liberal of the regular Democratic candidates, and as this support is not wanted, they have no other course but to be silent.

The labor leaders are saved from the same fate only by the fact that they have at their disposal organizational machines which provide them with money and workers. As their ideas are identical with those of the liberal intellectuals, they find that the great energy expended by their machines bring minimum results. And the more "radical" they are or have been in the past, the more they have to accept the dictates of the regular Democratic politicians so as to stay in their good graces.

TIME TO THINK

They are the ones who have to yield to "pressure" because they can generate no political pressure of their own.

And this applies to the labor leaders and to the rank and file workers who have been accepting their blind-alley political strategy for so long a time. The "success" of applying pressure inside the Democratic Party has ended in a campaign in which repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the other measures most ardently supported by them are scarcely even mentioned by anyone.

We do not predict that this campaign will teach the liberals, the labor leaders or even large numbers of rank and file workers that they need a brand-new and independent political policy. But the current silence of the liberals indicates that they have something to think about.

Impellitteri's 'Hoodlum' Roundup a Disgrace

By L. G. SMITH

NEW YORK, Nov. 5—One of the most cynical and dangerous political maneuvers in the current wide-open election campaign here has been the arbitrary arrest of over 660 so-called "hoodlums" on the order of one of the candidates for office, Acting Mayor Vincent Impellitteri.

The acting mayor charged that he had got wind of intended interference in the elections by underground elements. Yet not one warrant was sworn or indictment brought against any individual charging him with conspiracy or any other illegal act. The men rounded up were in the main the small fry who live on the fringes of legality, and many of them were simply unemployed who have no police record or other brand as outcasts of society. All were charged with vagrancy, and men who had a police record were held on bail ranging from \$500 to \$1,000.

It is clear that a legal crime was committed by the police, on orders from the mayor, against over six hundred persons. They were deprived of their liberty without due process of law. They were subjected to humiliation and indignity by a police force which has recently been exposed as the collaborators and co-beneficiaries of the real racketeers in New York.

Only persons who have themselves been innocent subjects of the arbitrary power of the police can fully understand what it means to an individual to be roughly snatched off the sidewalk by a gang of tough cops, to be roughed up and cursed at the slightest sign of resistance or even objection, to be herded into a police van with a crowd of fellow victims, thrown in jail, lined

up before the lights, and finally railroaded through a kangaroo trial.

SOCIETY'S VICTIMS

Such acts by the police are only possible because they do not arouse serious protests from the mass of the citizens of the community. It is true that most of the newspapers in the city condemned the police roundup, but within a week the story was completely submerged by more dramatic events. The victims, however, were still victims, and arbitrary police power still was loose to terrorize the most helpless part of the population.

Why should socialists concern

Labor's Bloc --

(Continued from page 1)

Ferguson, the labor movement received a stinging defeat in that state.

There is no question that the "anti-red" campaign bore heavily on the numerous state elections. The GOP made the most of a false issue: that the administration and its various candidates were "communist sympathizers," and that it coddled the "reds" and permitted spies to infiltrate the government, that it spawned men like Alger Hiss and Owen Lattimore and adopted Communist foreign policy for the Far East—and so on ad nauseam.

The "anti-red" hysteria, however, was one produced by the administration itself when it inaugurated its loyalty oaths and purges, introduced legal action against the "reds." Whether it originated these acts or committed them as a result of reactionary pressure from the press, its own Congressmen, and the GOP is of no importance.

LABOR SETBACK

The fact is that the hysteria, created in the first place by the administration, rose to plague it in state after state, until the campaigns revolved around who did the most and who did it first. Even though the Stalinoid representative Vito Marcantonio was defeated by a Republican-Democratic-Liberal bloc in New York, this kind of campaign was bound to have an adverse effect on administration stalwarts like Helen Gahagan Douglas in California, Francis J. Myers in Pennsylvania, and even such an old-line reactionary as Tydings in Maryland.

The fact is, too, that what has become known as "McCarthyism," had its little day in this election and a considerable reason for this was the filthy role of the big newspapers in the country. But even this is only a partial explanation for the kind of election we have just observed and the results. Most important of all is the role of the labor movement and the kind of campaign it carried on and an external situation marked by a leaning to the right by a large part of the electorate.

The labor movement suffered a sharp defeat in this election, which carried with it some important lessons. The labor movement, through its PAC, LIPE, and the railway unions' Political League, participated actively in all the state elections, not merely with money. It organized its manpower

to go out into the streets and bring out labor's huge vote behind, for the most part, the Democratic candidates.

There was nothing really "independent" about labor's political campaign in behalf of these Democratic candidates. They did not choose them; as matter of fact, most were selected irrespective of the opinions or wishes of the labor unions. It had no independent labor program to challenge the political programs of the two capitalist parties; it merely allied itself with one of the parties in support of the "Fair Deal."

As a result, there was nothing distinguished or really independent about labor's role. Look at the record: it allied itself with Tommon Hall in New York to back a nonentity like Lynch for governor and Pecore for mayor. It backed another nobody like the colorless Joe Ferguson in Ohio, who was not even supported by Democratic Governor Lausche, and about whom the administration was extremely lukewarm, hoping for Taft's victory because it preferred him as the GOP presidential candidate in 1952.

And whom else? Yes, the labor movement in Illinois supported Scott Lucas as "labor's candidate," Campbell in Indiana, Carroll in Colorado, Loveland in Iowa and Fairchild in Wisconsin—all of them old-line Democrats.

As for the rest, the labor movement acted merely as the "left" arm of the Democratic Party, wasting its money, its strength, and its manpower in behalf of a party which is not its own, and whose program is not of its making. For immersing itself in the fifth of capitalist politics, the labor movement suffered a defeat which ought to be a lesson to its less-than-statesmanlike leaders.

Plug

The Guaranty Trust Company's "Survey" of September 28 says: "there are dangers in the growing acceptance of escalator clauses tying wages to the cost of living in an understandable effort to maintain the real purchasing power of wages. Such clauses . . . also tend to act as built-in wage-price spirals when not compensated for in other ways. Furthermore, many of the new contracts escalate upward only or have floors below which are not adjusted, thus narrowing the degree of flexibility in the largest elements of most production costs."

Such an attack is a boost.

themselves with the fate of these people, most of whom are, it may be said, either ex-convicts, petty thieves, race-track touts, confirmed bums, or otherwise undesirable and unproductive members of society?

We are concerned with them chiefly because we are concerned with democracy. They are human beings, and their rights must be protected like those of anyone else. They are the victims of our society, and many of them have undoubtedly been gradually transformed into human derelicts by the environment which wrecked them.

But the chief reason why every person who is consistently devoted to democracy and hence to socialism must protest this police outrage is that it establishes the "right" of the police to attack a section of society with impunity. And this takes place in the midst of a tendency for police agencies of one kind and another in the United States to exercise this "right" on a growing scale.

WHO CARES?

Today "hoodlums" are rounded up by the hundreds. The average citizen reads about it and shrugs his shoulders. Why should he be concerned? After all, he is a decent, law-abiding, hard-work-

ing, respectable citizen. No policeman is going to mistake him for a "hoodlum." This can only happen to someone else who, even if not guilty of any particular crime, is probably "undesirable."

Yesterday the police in Oklahoma City rounded up some Stalinists who were sitting in a truck which had some literature in it. The citizen shrugs his shoulders. After all, he is not a Communist and what happens to them is no skin off his nose. In Philadelphia the police arrested two organizers for the Socialist Party because they had some leaflets in their car. The "average citizen" is not a socialist, so why should he worry?

Of course, these incidents do not represent a consciously thought-out plan by some sinister political gang to gradually subvert the liberties of the people by selecting one small group of citizens after another for arbitrary arrest. Yet every exercise of such arbitrary power which goes without protest tends to accustom the people of the country to the idea that there is nothing seriously wrong with "nightstick law" as long as someone else is the victim. It also tends to strengthen those who would solve every political and social problem with the force of the police and other agencies of government.