

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JUNE 14, 1954

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

## Enthuse!

The decision of the loyalty board in the Oppenheimer case broke as we went to press last week, and by now press comment on it has left very little for us to add. The N. Y. Post particularly came through with a violently denunciatory editorial which made the main point so sharp that it could not be overlooked by anyone. That was: The Oppenheimer decision breathed the very rationale and method of totalitarianism and the totalitarian mind.

The real count against Oppenheimer was his refusal to change his own mind on the advisability of the H-bomb program, after the government had decided to go ahead; and moreover (in a passage which bids fair to become famous) he is condemned because of his failure to get "enthusiastic" about the program once it was decided on. This was capped by the fantastic conclusion: Oppenheimer is "loyal" and even "discreet," but he cannot be cleared. . . .

Summarizing the business was Herblock's cartoon, showing the AEC office with the famous office sign "THINK" in the waste basket. On the wall instead is the sign "ENTHUSE."

In their decision, the AEC loyalty board majority translated the witchhunt ideology into pure Stalinism. And the eminent New York Times, which so detests McCarthyism, could get off only a miserable editorial which discussed the infamous document as if the editors had hot mush in their mouths.

## Calculated Numbness

Val Lorwin (whose case was reported in detail in last week's LA) made a remark in the course of an interview which

(Continued on page 4)

## Indo-China War: "90% Political"

Says Secretary Wilson—but Senator Talks of Using A-Bombs

By GORDON HASKELL

As the negotiations at Geneva drag on, the American people are being treated to a bewildering mass of conflicting proposals and bits of "inside information" on what the real danger is of U. S. entry into the Indochina war.

For instance, Senator Styles Bridges, Republican of New Hampshire, said on a radio program that he favors use of the atom bomb in Indochina rather than sending American troops there.

**"To save American lives I would use the atomic bomb anywhere," Senator Bridges said, adding he would have done so in Korea.**

Bridges claimed that there appears little prospect of United States involvement in Indochina right now, "but I think it could come in a subsequent period."

### WILSON'S DISCOVERY

Newspaper reports do not indicate whether Senator Bridges specified just what targets A-bombs would be directed against in Indochina. As the vast majority of the people in the country oppose French rule, and would presumably oppose American intervention also, perhaps Bridges has in mind wiping out the whole country in order to "save American lives."

The U. S. News & World Report states that Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson has come back from a trip to the Far East "convinced that U. S. military commanders are right in their conclusion that the Indochina war—at this point—is more a political than a military problem. One high officer refers to the war as 90 per cent a

political problem; 10 per cent military."

Other reports claim that Wilson is now adamantly opposed to military intervention. The U. S. News & World Report goes so far as to claim that the "official line" in Washington is now that the war involves France and the native peoples, and is considered more as an insurrection or civil war than an international one.

### KEPT IN THE DARK

The magazine goes on to say, however, that should China enter the war, the United States would jump in with "massive retaliation" against all parts of China and take the risk of starting World War III.

It should be clear that neither C. E. Wilson's views, even if accurately reported, nor those of Senator Bridges necessarily indicate what the Eisenhower administration will actually do about the situation in Indochina. They simply point up the fact that the American people are being kept in ignorance of what is being planned, and have no say in it.

Actually, the danger of war continues to increase daily. All indications point to an early attack on the French in the Red River delta area. Every serious military observer believes that if such an attack comes, and if the Stalinist Vietminh throws all of its power into the attack, the French would be swept out of the area by a combination of military pressure and popular disaffection in the rear.

In the lull since the fall of Dien-bienphu, and since the open collapse of the American proposal for a Southeast Asian military alliance, there has been a fairly consistent effort by the Eisenhower government to discount the importance of such a defeat to France in Indochina. But this was chiefly a

(Turn to last page)

## Liberal Party at Crossroads, Leader Says

Dubinsky Publicly Poses Dilemma: A More Independent Party—or No Party

NEW YORK, June 6—Unclearly but unmistakably, the leaders of the Liberal Party are letting it be known that in their view the party faces a crossroads, and that some drastic decision must be made soon.

This feeling on the part of the leadership has manifested itself in two ways: (1) President David Dubinsky of the ILGWU, the Liberal Party's chief backer, has made it clear that in the future he expects the party to pay its own expenses without heavy subsidy from the union; and (2) the same Dubinsky, in a speech, raised the question of whether the party should continue to exist.

Why this kind of talk all of a sudden from Dubinsky?

### NO "FREE RIDES"

On May 26 the Liberal Party held its 10th anniversary dinner at the Hotel Commodore, and it was at this affair that Dubinsky chose to speak publicly, if cloudily, of what was cooking in his mind.

On the one hand, he made some points which seemed to take a militant direction. In fact, the N. Y. Post's report of the speech played this side up exclusively. "Dubinsky Bars 'Free Rides' for Candidates" was its headline. The Liberal Party leader, it said, warned candidates that they will have to take a pledge to support the party after election. "Everyone knew whom he was talking to and about, but just to make sure Dubinsky even singled out the names of F. D. Roosevelt Jr., Javits, Halley and Wagner.

"They were elected; they kissed us on the forehead; they waved us farewell, and we were left holding the bill. We were in debt, but they were not indebted," said Dubinsky with unwonted public bitterness.

He likewise threw in digs at the Liberal Party members and voters themselves, who support the party but do not support it financially. "These voters and these candidates like our quality merchandise but they don't want to pay for it. They want it free."

Liberal vice-chairman Alex Rose later told the press that "Dubinsky was telling a lot of Liberals they'd have to remain Liberals after election."

Dubinsky's speech was filled with bitter jibes indeed against the fair-weather friends he had supported in the Democratic and Republican parties. "Before the election, they say 'Thank God for the Liberal Party.' After they're elected, they just say 'Thank God,'" was another biting comment.

### BIG QUESTION

He posed the question in his mind: "The big question for me is: Is there enough financial and moral support in New York to support a party of quality and not of quantity? The answer lies with the liberal community. In this answer lies the future of our party."

The following weekend, the N. Y. Post's publisher, Dorothy Schiff, in her regular column, wrote openly that "last week the Liberal Party celebrated its

(Turn to last page)

### Good for GM . . .

Things aren't tough all over. Business Week (May 22) reports that the average increase for a group of the country's top executives was "something like \$11,000." That's for the men whose salary averaged \$144,000 a year.

(But weekly pay for workers in manufacturing fell \$1.20 as compared with April a year ago.)

Of the eight executives with yearly pay of over \$400,000, six work for the General Motors Corporation, the magazine also revealed.

## UAW Beats UE-FE Rival At Harvester

CHICAGO, June 6 — The UAW-CIO has finally won a significant election against its UE-FE rival in International Harvester.

The latter union (Farm Equipment division of the independent United Electrical Workers, which is Stalinist-dominated) lost the Moline Works of IH by a vote of 1326 to 311. The UAW beat both the UE and the Independent Association of Machinists even in the Tool Room. This is the first time the UAW has succeeded in winning a production unit of IH, though in the past it has managed to win a few small tool-room units and an office workers' local.

The Moline Works is the same plant that in 1949 produced a rout of the UAW organizers with many a cracked head and broken bone.

What happened this time was that the entire local leadership and every past president worked for UAW. The last contract which the UE-FE signed with the company was just too much for them to stomach. The Stalinists lost the plant as a result of their defeat in the 1952 strike and their signing of a company contract that took away all the workers' past gains.

It was a terrific campaign and both sides threw everything they had into it. In order to win the election the UAW painted quite a rosy picture of UAW conditions at Harvester, and this will make it rough on the organizer that has to go into the plant to negotiate a contract.

While the UAW contract is far superior, International Harvester is still one of the worst employers in the country and gives battle to any militant union. The fact is that in this campaign the company tried its darndest to prevent the election and wrote a 26-page brief to the NLRB calling upon them to deny an election.

The Stalinists did a little red-baiting themselves. One of the UAW organizers, John T. Watkins, had been subpoenaed before the Velde committee. Velde, who was interested in destroying the influence of UAW-CIO in his congressional district (Caterpillar Local has 15,000 members), called Watkins before the committee. Watkins denied he had ever been a CP member, but while an officer of UE had followed the Communist Party line. He refused to identify anyone in the Quad City (Rock Island, Moline, Davenport and E. Moline) area as members of the CP, following the advice of UAW counsel.

The UE used this in the campaign in a most disgraceful way, but in a jurisdictional scrap with the Stalinists you can expect anything.

The next big election will probably come in the fall at the huge Farmall plant in Rock Island. The UAW election victory followed closely after a victory over the UE at the John Deere Planters Works a month earlier.

## Is McDonald's Talk of Secession a Cover-Up?

By PAT HARMON

GARY, June 6—The deadline contract date between the Big Steel companies and the United Steelworkers of America is June 30. Contract negotiation began and ended in record fashion.

The steel workers' union adopted a 1954 policy whose high points included: higher wages, improved insurance and pension plans, a guaranteed annual wage, seniority improvements, shift bonus, holiday pay, supplemental workmen's compensation, full union shop, reporting allowances, contracting-out work, elimination of geographical differentials, master contracts, etc.

With steel functioning at around 72 per cent of capacity, with the steel workers being hit very hard with layoffs especially in the Pittsburgh, Canton and Youngstown areas, the demands of the union take on real significance.

However, after the momentary flourish of beginning negotiations, the demands and the Union's fight for them seem to be receding into the background. What seems to be looming is a fight within the steel workers' union on whether they should secede from the CIO or not.

# LABOR'S SCOPE

## Trade-Union Democracy: Three Unhappy Cases

By BEN HALL

A draft constitution for the proposed Oil and Chemical Workers Union, circulated for approval among unions contemplating affiliation with it, contains the following unhappy clause:

"Any member guilty of slander, or circulating or causing to be circulated false statements about any member, or any member circulating or causing to be circulated any statement *wrongfully condemning any decision rendered by any officer* of the organization shall upon conviction be suspended from membership for a period of six months and shall not be eligible to hold any office in any branch of the organization for two years thereafter." (Our emphasis.)

Notice that the offending statements against *any ordinary member* must be "slanderous" or "false" to be punishable. But in criticizing *any officer* it suffices that the criticism be merely "wrongful."

**This whole clause is so obviously bad and so subject to bureaucratic restrictions upon democracy that we would like to hear it defended simply out of curiosity: how does the mind of the lawyer who concocted this proviso operate?**

The Oil Workers Union (CIO), principal inspirer of the new unified organization, is not one of the hardened, conservative unions in this country; it belongs among the more progressive groups. When it defended the right of one of its former staff members, Harvey O'Connor, to refuse to give testimony on his political beliefs before a congressional investigation committee, it became one of the first, if not the first, anti-Stalinist unions to take such a public stand.

### SAD EVIDENCE

If such a union slips such a clause into its constitution it provides sad evidence of the feeble character of the democratic spirit inside the American labor movement.

**Union policies are decided upon by the majority through the group which holds power; it interprets what is "right" and what is "wrong" through its control over union machinery. Democracy is hardly tested by "rightful" criticism of officials. No one needs democratic rights to express what is "right" when ruling officials decree what is right.**

Every administration considers its actions "right" and rejects the criticism of oppositions as "wrongful." Democracy can protect freedom of discussion only when it protects the critic whose views are denounced by the majority as "false" and "wrongful." When "false" and "wrongful" views are outlawed, policy disputes and election con-

flicts are settled by bureaucratic suppression and not by free and open debate.

We can imagine what might be said to justify the constitutional clause. The union must be protected, it will be argued, against wild, irresponsible criticism. But the danger in the labor movement comes not from the eruption of uncontrolled, extreme opposition but from the settling dead calm which stifles the voice of dissent.

### DOES REUTHER NEED A CLUB?

One example of how a super-insistence upon "responsibility" by minorities in discussion and the demand that they observe all the punctilios of polite debate affects democracy is the case of Chevrolet UAW Local 659, in Flint, Michigan.

The International Executive Board of the UAW has clamped an administratorship over the local and put 14 members and officers on trial. For years, this local has remained one of the few lonely hold-outs against Reuther, opposing his policies and his administration; and not always in polite language.

Among the charges against it, as reported by the *Michigan CIO News*, are the following: (1) that the Local 659 publication, *Searchlight*, refused "to conform the matter published in the *Searchlight* to the policies of the International union," and (2) the *Searchlight* published matter of an "anti-union" character in defiance of the decision of the 1951 UAW convention.

**The first charge speaks against itself. The Reuther administration is solidly entrenched; it has a thousand local unions and hundreds of local publications; hundreds of paid international representatives are all repeating the same slogans, the same demands; and the same policies every day, every week, every month. Here and there, local union papers criticize official policy. Does the welfare of the powerful UAW demand that they be suppressed?**

### MATTER OF LANGUAGE

The second charge is more serious. Anti-union material? This is how the *Michigan CIO News* reports the case:

"UAW Vice-President John W. Livingston, who heads the General Motors Department, said that for a period following the 1951 convention the situation improved in Local 659 but in the last two issues the *Searchlight* has carried articles attacking the UAW-CIO board of review in the GM grievance procedure as 'anti-union, unethical, unjust, inefficient, incapable, and the direct inference, if not the direct charge that the board is in collusion with management.' The board of review is an agency of the executive board which screens grievances to be submitted to the GM impartial umpire."

In other words, *Searchlight* is now condemned because of its extreme criticism of the official leadership. It is accused of "anti-unionism" because it, in turn, denounces a certain grievance procedure as "anti-union." What the arguments are on either side, we do not know. The fact is that the debate is settled by repression. It seems that a local has no right to use harsh language.

But such language is not a Local 659 monopoly.

At the same 1951 convention which first warned Local 659, Reuther opened a campaign against Carl Stellato, president of Local 600, who was opposing a dues increase. At that time, Stellato was

in the Reuther caucus. But Reuther excoriated him as a union wrecker, a saboteur, and a disruptionist because he campaigned against a raise in dues.

Perhaps *Searchlight* has leveled unpromising, even irresponsible charges against the top officialdom. But so did Reuther in the fight against Stellato. He, however, can afford to be carried away by the passions of debate for he holds unchallenged power.

### CAUCUS RIGHTS

Returning to the oil workers' constitution, we note that it contains no provisions relating to the formation of inner-union caucuses. That is as good as can be found.

In most unions, the highest crime of all, punished by instant expulsion, is the formation of organized groups to press inside for changes in leadership or policy. Union constitutions never expressly establish the elementary democratic right to set up formal oppositions. But in a few unions, notably the UAW and the International Typographical Union, caucuses have been informally recognized as a regular aspect of union life. A decisive test of the democratic character of any union is its attitude on this question.

Unions like the UAW and ITU stand out as welcome, but too rare, exceptions. The proposed oil union constitution says nothing; we will have to see.

One of the frankest, if pitiable, arguments against allowing inner-union groups appears in the April 1954 issue of the *Black Worker*, official publication of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters (AFL), edited by A. Philip Randolph. A front-page editorial somewhat abruptly launches into a bitter stricture against the resort to petitions by members to gain their aims inside the union.

### HORRIBLE EXAMPLE

Just what prompted the harsh words we did not know and after reading the editorial we know as little as before. Suffice it to say that the petition, innocent and mild as it may seem to ordinary people, must be rooted out. But the editors are really after something else. It is worth recording in detail as a sorry example of bureaucratic logic whipping itself into a froth.

"The petition is not only in conflict with the sound trade-union principles, but it is disruptive and destructive of the purposes and aims of the union. Petitions are disruptive because they create a caucus-organization situation amounting to an organization within an organization, which is an artificial, unreal, and contradictory condition. This situation is bound to make for chaos, confusion, and conflict. It is utterly impossible for a petition to be planned and executed except by some of the members of the union getting together in some organized form such as a committee, to discuss and agree upon a petition and ways and means for getting it before the desired official of the union. Naturally, the members planning for such a petition would not do so within the offices or halls of the union, and hence they inevitably are compelled to resort to the use of the caucus, which is the best possible method a group of workers can use to weaken a union or any other organization. It is a matter of common trade-union history and knowledge that no caucus practice of the membership can be tolerated simply because it is the kiss of death for the union. As a matter of fact, any meeting for the good and welfare of the members of the Brotherhood, rightfully, is expected and required to be held under the supervision of the Brotherhood and within its offices or halls. Rump-caucus meetings of any union are irregular, unconstitutional, and against the best interests of the union and its members."

This twisted reasoning turns everything inside out. If union members cannot decide what exactly they want and how best to get it without meeting in groups, then obviously the right to form caucuses is an indispensable democratic right. Without this right, union members are ordinarily powerless to defend a point of view in opposition to the organized machine of the leadership. And such is the normal state of affairs in the American trade-union movement.

Next month, perhaps, the *Black Worker* will gush editorially about the virtues of our democratic way of life and castigate the enemies of Russia's one-party system.

## LONDON LETTER *Dispute Rises over Laborites' China Junket*

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, June 2—The Executive of the Labor Party has decided to send an 8-member delegation to China in response to an invitation from the "Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs." The delegation will include Attlee, Bevan, party chairman Burke and general-secretary Morgan Phillips.

The Conservative government was not consulted, as its undoubted approval would imply a desire for relations with China which would find no favor in the eyes of the American government.

Needless to say, there has been considerable controversy in Labor circles over the wisdom of this delegation to China at this time. The arguments on both sides go somewhat as follows.

In favor of the decision, it is argued: (1) None of the members of the delegation is a Stalinist fellow traveler, and therefore none is likely to have the wool pulled over his eyes. Every opportunity should be taken to see what is happening in China.

(2) It is just conceivable that the Labor Party could exert some slight democratic influence on Mao's regime.

(3) It is very desirable for the Chinese people to see members of the Labor Party.

### THE DIM VIEW

Perhaps the more cogent arguments are those made on the other side:

(1) The Stalinist regime in China is totalitarian and undemocratic. The visit gives the impression that the Labor Party approves of it. This impression is even more likely when one realizes that, since the Chinese people have no experience in parliamentary democracy, it will not be difficult for their regime to make the people think that the Labor Party tour is a good-will mission sent by the British government to Mao.

(2) None of the members of the delegation can speak Chinese, and so it is

very unlikely that they will be able to learn very much by speaking to the people.

(3) The act of sending the delegation indicates a good-will on the part of the Labor Party to the Mao regime which his regime hardly merits.

(4) All that is likely to come out of the visit is a laudatory statement by the Labor Party delegation about the economic efforts of the "People's Government" coupled with some strictures on its regime.

### NOTE ON TOURISTS

It is interesting to recall two visits of a similar nature. Not long ago Attlee visited Yugoslavia. In his discussions with Tito, he came to the latter conclusion: "How is it that you can call yourself a democracy when you have only one party?" he asked Tito. The soi-disant "President" was not in a very talkative mood that afternoon.

A couple of weeks ago, the President of the National Union of Students—a democratic non-political union representing all British students—returned from a similar visit to Moscow. He found the people very friendly, inquisitive and naive. The officials he spoke to were very wary, however.

He asked one bureaucrat why Trotsky's works were no longer published. He was told that Trotsky's role as a counter-revolutionary was well-known and no one wanted to read his works.

Mr. Jarvis also asked another usually difficult question. Did they believe Beria was a traitor? Yes, of course. Was he a traitor since 1938? Yes, the charge has stated so. How did they know some of the present leaders were not traitors? History had shown that they weren't...

The N.U.S. delegation was one of the few that has been to Russia with its eyes open. We hope and trust that the Labor Party's delegation will have its eyes wide open when it visits China.

## *British Colonialism Hits Uganda Again, Prepares Forces for Violent Suppression*

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, June 2.—It was announced in London yesterday that, for the second time within six months, Sir Andrew Cohen, Governor of Uganda, has proclaimed a State of Emergency in Buganda, one of the most advanced territories in the colony.

The announcement contained the usual verbiage about "law and order" lapped up so uncritically by the right wing press. The specific charges were that around Kampala, Ugandans had intimidated with threats of violence those who had not cooperated in the "Boycott British Goods" campaign run by the Uganda National Congress.

Trouble started last November when the Kabaka of Buganda was forcibly deported to Britain for saying that Buganda did not wish to be associated with an East African Federation. He asked that Buganda be transferred from the Colonial Office to the Foreign Office, as he did not believe a proposed East African Federation would leave even as much power in the hands of Africans, as there is in Buganda today.

The deposition of Mutesa II was met with considerable popular hostility, so much so that the queen's tour through the region was cancelled. A State of Emergency, declared on the Kabaka's deposition was lifted, however, on March 10th.

### LAUNCH BOYCOTT

Popular agitation against the governor and his Legislative Council had increased continually, and so Cohen brought in a deportation ordinance whereby so-called "trouble makers" could be deported to other parts of the territory without due process of law.

This highly undemocratic ordinance was considered by the Uganda National Congress. They realized that, were they to be provoked into a first class clash with the Legislative Council, they would lose heavily so they decided on a highly effective alternative. They announced a boycott of the purchase of all British manufactured nonessential goods for a period of 3 months to begin with. The effectiveness of this move is seen when one realizes that the total interest of the

white settlers in Uganda is as a market, and most of their wealth derives from trading with Africans.

Naturally, in attempting to enforce the boycott there had been a few incidents of the kind which the governor found as an excuse for declaring a State of Emergency. The colonial secretary, Mr. Lyttelton, admitted that there had been no cases of physical violence in the campaign. He claimed that there had been forcible prevention of buying and selling, forcible return of goods bought, purchases seized and thrown away, etc. All these charges, even if they were widespread and true, hardly add up to the reason for proclaiming a State of Emergency.

At the same time the governor has banned three African newspapers, the *Uganda Post*, *Uganda Express* and *Uganda Eyogera*, under simultaneous emergency powers. He alleges that they have stirred up racial tension. Furthermore, he is making it clear that "he counts on the other vernacular papers to adopt a responsible attitude." He has got the African chief minister Mr. Paulo Kavuma, and Resident of Buganda J. P. Birch to agree to his repressive measures.

Various Labor MPs wanted the government to debate the situation in Buganda, but the speaker would not allow it. However, one member of Parliament wanted to know if the colonial secretary considered the boycott of British goods itself as being the real cause of the emergency and not the alleged intimidation designed to enforce it. If Mr. Lyttelton hedged a little on the answer Socialists know that it was really only a rhetorical question.

As the political situation there gets more and more tense, the imperialist answer is clear. The commissioner of police has called for volunteers "of all races" to undertake police patrols in and around Kampala, the capital. Troops of the Uganda Battalion of the King's African Rifles "are available should they be required."

It is the deepest misfortune that imperialists have provoked trouble in Buganda, a state in Uganda where Africans have more control of their political destiny than any other colonial country except Gold Coast, in the whole of Africa.

## French Catholic Left Set Back by Vatican

By EDWARD HILL

Within the last six months, there has been considerable evidence of changes in the attitude of the Catholic Church toward its most ambitious social experiment: the working-class apostolate in France. There has been the initial action of the Vatican toward the worker-priests, the visit of the French Cardinals to Rome to plea for a partial continuation of the program, the changes within the Dominican order and, most recently, the episcopal letter of the bishops and archbishops of France.

All of these incidents portend a fierce struggle within the church between its "progressive" and "integrist" wings. Yet none of them appear decisive, signaling the victory of one side or the other. But at the very least these actions indicate a trend toward the right more marked than any since World War II.

Within the politics of the Catholic Church, it was the French who have represented the most vigorous and militant front of social experimentation during the last decade or so. As a result, there has been a suspicion on the part of more reactionary elements in the Church, the Spaniards for instance, that there was a resurgence of *Gallicism*, of national religious separatism.

### FERMENT IN FRANCE

The French movement was probably strongest in its intellectual efforts. Indeed, its theoretical rationalization was based precisely on the knowledge that the church had lost a real mass base among the people, and especially among the working class.

In one of the seminal documents of the movement, the Abbé Micheneau characterized France as a "pagan" country. He called for an apostolate similar to that of the early Christians, with a special emphasis on living with the people rather than preaching. The worker-priest movement was the most advanced group animated by this point of view.

Intellectually, this development attracted some of the very best minds in Catholic France. It succeeded in recruiting the late Cardinal Souhârd, who, in a series of pastoral letters like *Growth or Decline*, advocated an intellectual and social position which obviously bore the marks of priests like Jean Danieloux and Henri de Lubac, both Jesuits.

This ferment penetrated deeply into the Dominican order in France. Among the laity (and this movement placed special emphasis on lay participation in church affairs), the social-Christians developed the journal *Esprit*, founded by the late Emmanuel Mounier, a "personalist socialist" who eventually joined the short-lived RDR.

### RIGHT SHIFT

However, attacks were made throughout the years of growth by other elements within the church. Lubac ran into trouble—specifically for theological notions presented in his book *Sur-Naturel*, but by implication for his over-all position. (Lubac wrote an entire book on Proudhon, *The Un-Marxian Socialist*, without once mentioning that the entire work of the subject of his essay was on the Index.) And in 1951 the encyclical *Humani Generis* was widely interpreted as a theological attack on the Catholic leftists, possibly emanating from conservative French Jesuits.

However, within the last half a year, hostility toward the left Catholics has come out in the open. The Dominican leadership has been shuffled, the worker-priest movement crippled, and a pastoral letter issued which contained rebukes toward the specific position of the intellectuals and workers in the movement.

Three points were emphasized by the French bishops. First was the question of the Catholic school. The hierarchy "rejected and condemned all ideas which would imply a change, or replacement, in the traditional doctrine of the Church," i.e., an insistence on the necessity for Catholic schools, and a certain hostility toward government policy on public education.

The second criticism was aimed more directly at the heart of the Catholic-left position: against the notion of class struggle. The bishops scored "the fact that Catholics are unaware of the dan-

ger presented by the Marxist concept of class struggle. For a Marxist, class struggle is not simply a fight for the liberation of the workers, nor merely a desire to advance the good of the workers... but rather a school, the means by which to teach those who are in the process of accepting the entire Marxist dialectic."

### JOCKEYING OVER VATICAN

The third point was related to the second. It condemned those Catholics who thought they could separate atheism from the politics of Stalinism. These, said the bishops, "ignore the fact that the triumph of Communism would mean the certain annihilation of the Catholic religion in France." However, this criticism also struck at Stalinoid tendencies which have always been present in the thinking of the French Catholic left.

However, on the positive side, the French bishops did not take a right-wing, integrist stand, but rather that of moderate criticism. They entitled their document, "The Church in the Heart of the Modern World Faced with New Civilizations," an indication that a good part of the general point of view remained.

Moreover, in the case of the Dominicans, the changes in personnel seem to be more in the nature of face-saving than of a purge. Those deposed were not replaced by right-wingers but rather by those substantially in sympathy with the social-Christian attitude.

Yet, there is larger significance in all of this which cannot be overlooked. It centers around the Vatican itself. The ill health of the pope has stirred up a great deal of controversy on who will be his successor. And this may also account for the political jockeying visible in the action in France. It is also probably a factor in charges within the Italian church.

### IN ITALY TOO

In Italy, more or less simultaneous with the developments in France, the right scored another victory. A liberal youth chairman in Catholic Action was tossed out, and more power gravitated toward Luigi Gedda, the acknowledged leader of the right-wing social-Christians. At the same time, discussion on the relative merits of various Italian cardinals mentioned for the papacy increased on obviously political lines.

The Church, as Stalin is said to have commented, has no battalions. Yet it does have a great power, certainly not so mechanical and rigid as is dreamed of in the philosophy of Paul Blanshard, but nevertheless quite real. It is essential to point out that the French case of the worker-priests does not present a clear-cut victory of the integrist right; though it obviously represents a substantial triumph in a skirmish.

To socialists, who have learned that it is possible to fight together against capitalism along with certain elements within the church, particularly those under attack in France, these incidents are profoundly disturbing. And in world politics, they raise the possibility of a political shift within the Vatican, especially if the present pope dies and the right is able to consolidate its power through winning the Chair of Peter.

### YOU'RE INVITED

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

## Not in the Headlines

### Dubious Item

The Chicago Tribune for May 24 carried a special interview by one Marion Wilhelm with Trotsky's assassin, "Jacques Mornard," in his Mexican jail cell. The article headline was a bit misleading:

"ARDENT RED, LEON TROTSKY'S KILLER ADMITS."

Miss Wilhelm leads off with the claim that the murderer has finally admitted that he is a Stalinist, a "passionate Communist," although he originally pretended to be a "disillusioned Trotskyist."

Actually, what the article quotes from Mornard is hardly that definite. If it can be believed, however, Mornard did sound off on foreign politics in an unusual manner:

"I am passionate for one side! You, of course, are probably passionate for your Christian God. I am passionate for my side. I am not going to say whether it's for the east or west, but perhaps you find my observations somewhat tinged in one direction. . . ."

"Is Russia threatening the U. S.? The people of the U. S. don't believe so. The truth is the U. S. needs a huge military economy to support itself. . . . The U. S. has imposed military bases all over the world. . . . If State Secretary Dulles spits out of the right side of his mouth and you spit out of the left side, then you're a Communist. . . ."

And so on with some anti-U. S. jibes on Guatemala, Indochina, etc. There is no explanation given on why Mornard suddenly decided to air his politics to a Chicago Tribune correspondent.

### Gulliver

"All crimes against the state are punished here with the utmost severity; but if the person accused maketh his innocence plainly to appear upon his trial, the accuser is immediately put to an ignominious death; and out of his goods or lands, the innocent person is quadruply recompensed. . . . and proclamation is made of his innocence through the whole city."

The above dispatch from Lilliput by Jonathan Swift described how one form of McCarthyism used to be handled.

### Suspicious Type

James P. Cannon, discussing an opposition faction in his Socialist Workers Party:

"What is the next thing we hear? That they are full of 'grievances' against the party 'regime.' I always get suspicious when I hear of grievances. . . ."

—In the *Fourth International*, Spring 1954, p. 51.

### Warriors for "West"

What kind of Germans want to fight in Adenauer's army? So far, in eighteen months 140,000 volunteers have come forward; but 40,000 of these will only accept non-military duties.

Another 40,000—according to the *Manchester Guardian*—will probably not be accepted for service. "There is, in fact, no superfluity of volunteers"—in fact, most Germans don't want to fight.

But some do. Of these volunteers about 50,000 are ex-officers and N.C.O.s of Hitler's army.

While ordinarily we don't run a Poetry Corner, we're making an exception to quote the following from *Peace News* (London). Reginald Reynolds doesn't do a bad job with a difficult metrical form in his—

#### BALLADE FOR ANCESTRAL VOICES

*Sir George Thompson, nuclear physicist and Master of Corpus Christi, is reported in the Manchester Guardian as saying . . . that "What our age needs is not so much permanent peace, which is unattainable and perhaps not even wholly desirable, but sanity in its wars."*

As Hitler said (who wants a better guide?)

Perpetual peace is not a healthy state;  
There is a golden mean for homicide  
In bombs that kill but not obliterate.  
Our modest duty is to re-create  
The world of Genghis Khan and  
Tamurlaine,  
Or Alexander, who was called the Great  
Because his wars were gentle and  
humane.

War for War's sake—all sane on either side;

Slaughter's the aim, not to discriminate.  
Toss for the choice of weapons: have you tried

Napalm, Sir George? It's a heroic fate!  
Or, with a club, could you not emulate  
The cannibal (so eminently sane)  
Who served his prisoner upon a plate,  
Because his wars were gentle and  
humane?

If the United Nations would provide  
Some place for bashing people on the  
pate.

Then Nature's Pruning Hook could be  
applied

With more precision. One might  
speculate.

In pools and private bets, then calmly  
wait

The close of play (reading the number  
slain)

And good Sir George's name commemo-  
rate

Because his wars were gentle and  
humane

#### ENVOI

Master of Corpus Christi, on the date  
When something hits you—harder than  
your brain—

I hope that there will be a record "gate"  
Because your wars were gentle and  
humane.

## SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

one has to remember as one reads things like the Oppenheimer decision.

Lorwin was discussing his personal, psychological reaction to the unbelievable witchhunt case which he found himself going against. How did he keep himself going, fighting for vindication in a world which had become half-fantastic?

"And then again," he remarked, "maybe it was a matter of just dulling your own imagination, a kind of calculated numbness."

Even on most decent readers who scan it and indeed condemn it, we imagine that the Oppenheimer fantasia induces a sort of "calculated numbness." What would happen to the mind which really tried to face the truth that peers out of it—the hideous truth, if you'll pardon the expression: the truth that this product of sober, respectable, non-McCarthyite, middle-of-the-road, pretty average specimens of the prominent-public-citizen type was basically cut out of the same cloth as the wildest moments of the Stalinist Moscow Trials. . . .

And all in the name of defending the nation against the horrors of Stalinism.

It is a spectacular and frightening token of how a reactionary system, seeking in a frenzy to defend itself against Stalinism, inevitably starts turning into an image of what it tries to fight with reactionary methods.

### Idiot of the Month

It has long been our private hypothesis—not to be confused with a principle of Marxism—that in short-run analyses we socialist journalists tend to make a characteristic mistake in trying to discern the meaning of some events. We try to read a logical meaning into governmental actions, weighing political motivations, forces, etc. The frequent mistake (so goes this private theory) is that we do not make sufficient allowance for the sheer power of stupidity in day-to-day affairs.

We offer the Idiot of the Month, Senator Knowland.

The press now reports that last April 14 GOP leader Knowland inserted into the *Congressional Record* a document which he claimed to be a "blueprint for the conquest of the world by 1973," drawn up for Moscow by Mao Tse-tung or somebody. Who wrote the document, how, why, or what, really does not matter, however, because even assuming its authenticity, there is only one thing "sensational" about it.

In brief, this purported "blueprint of conquest" sketches a perspective wherein

## McDonald's Talk—

(Continued from page 2)

had an article on the subject of the Lewis-Beck-McDonald meeting. Because of his ability to get inside dope we quote at length from his article of June 3.

"Here in Washington three weeks ago Messrs. Lewis, McDonald and Beck convened for lunch and a televised press conference to further their cold war against the CIO and AFL leadership. Mr. Lewis, as spokesman for the group, said they discussed the need for joint political and economic action by their coal, steel and trucking unions and decided to meet again from time to time. He suggested the group is dissatisfied with the leadership Mr. Meany is giving the AFL and Mr. Reuther is giving the CIO. He evaded a question aimed at discovering whether the group is considering forming a third federation. . . ."

"Mr. Lewis considers Mr. Reuther a 'pseudo-intellectual nitwit.' Mr. McDonald shares this view. In addition, he resents bitterly Mr. Reuther's victory over his candidate, the late Alan Haywood, for the presidency of the CIO after the death of Philip Murray.

"All three react politically in more 'conservative' fashion than ex-socialist Reuther, that is, they are inclined to put more stock in gains at the bargaining table than in political action. . . ."

The *Wall Street Journal* correspondent throws in another motivation also which is worth mentioning:

"Mr. McDonald doubtless has hopes of succeeding the aged Mr. Lewis as captain of the miners' union. Mr. Lewis believes that joint coal-steel union bargain-

ing with the nation's steel producers would strengthen his hand in negotiations with the ailing coal industry."

Galpin continues, "Perhaps the three are in fact contemplating setting up a third federation. But, if so, this is no reason for their current harassment of the AFL and CIO leadership. And until Mr. Beck achieves substantially more autocratic control over his Teamsters and Mr. McDonald over his Steelworkers than either has now it is extremely doubtful whether they could pull their unions out of the AFL and CIO anyway."

### Fulton Lewis Case

The American Civil Liberties Union has been taking a vigorous free-speech stand in the case of the criminal libel indictment brought against Fulton Lewis Jr. by the state of Maryland.

Lewis, of course, is the extreme-reactionary radio commentator, who is next door to being classifiable as a fascist propagandist.

The imbroglio started when Lewis was involved in a controversy with state officials over enforcement of the liquor laws. The indictment against him charged that the libel occurred in a letter from Lewis to Maryland Governor McKeldin "unlawfully and maliciously devising and intending to traduce, defame, and vilify" the trial magistrate of St. Mary's County. Lewis' letter said that this judge "is completely incompetent, physically as well as mentally, and has rarely been able to sit on the bench since he took office." Lewis also denounced the court as lax in enforcing traffic laws, and for some other reasons.

For these expressions of his unflattering opinion about the court, the state moved to punish him for criminal libel. The ACLU denounces this as a shocking abridgment of free speech.

As far as we can see from the ACLU's statement of the case—without being experts on criminal libel law or on Lewis' beef against the county authorities—the union is richly justified in intervening on Fulton Lewis' behalf.

Certainly the fact that the victim is a near-fascist himself cannot be considered any reason for overlooking a manifest abuse of the right to free speech.

But what about our fresh-baked "liberal" school of thought which has discovered the new gospel that we must not accord democratic rights to people who wish to use democratic rights against the interests of democracy? Do they think a Fulton Lewis Jr. should have any democratic rights—or does their principle apply only to Stalinists, as indeed they would like?

ing with the nation's steel producers would strengthen his hand in negotiations with the ailing coal industry."

Galpin continues, "Perhaps the three are in fact contemplating setting up a third federation. But, if so, this is no reason for their current harassment of the AFL and CIO leadership. And until Mr. Beck achieves substantially more autocratic control over his Teamsters and Mr. McDonald over his Steelworkers than either has now it is extremely doubtful whether they could pull their unions out of the AFL and CIO anyway."

### HOMER MARTIN TYPE

The continual discussion of the subject in the press of Big Business can only mean that the matter is far from dead.

The history of the United Automobile Workers had a character similar to Dave McDonald. His name was Homer Martin. He thought of himself as the God-chosen leader of the auto workers to do with the workers as he saw fit. He caused a split in the UAW that might have completely destroyed the union but its rank and file and the democracy of that union saved it at the famous Cleveland convention of 1939. Homer Martin finally ended up working for the Ford Motor Company.

The steel workers have the same problem today with Dave McDonald. We for our part hope that the steel workers can rise to the occasion, save their union, and reinstitute real democratic control. If this happens, McDonald could get a job with U. S. Steel, but he is more likely to end up in Hollywood, which is his real first love anyway.

The standard biography

**KARL MARX**

by

**Franz Mehring**

\$3.50

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street, New York City



**LABOR ACTION**

June 14, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 24

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Asst. Ed.: GORDON HASKELL,

BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## THE BENDING CROSS

A BIOGRAPHY OF  
**EUGENE V. DEBS**

by

Ray Ginger

Now, while they last  
only \$1.00

Order from:

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

## YSL Fund Drive Needs Your Help Now—or Else

By SCOTT ARDEN

By the time this article goes to press there will only be three weeks left of the first national Fund Drive of the Young Socialist League. The three-month drive is scheduled to end on June 30.

To date, only \$937.50, or slightly less than 63 per cent, has been received against the total quota of \$1500. The seriousness of this situation cannot be accurately gauged unless it is clearly understood what is at stake.

A thorough re-examination of the YSL's plans and perspectives, with a view toward cutting them down, will be required if the drive falls short of its goal to any considerable extent.

And that's putting it in its mildest possible form. Actually, *Challenge*, the *Young Socialist Review*, newsletters, tours, camps, conferences, pamphlets, and the ordinary (but vital) day-to-day functioning of the National Office will be dangerously affected, to say the least.

Chicago, New York and Newark have definitely said that they expect to completely fulfill their quotas, though even in these cases it will be difficult. Los Angeles and New Haven have both indicated that they too will be able to make full 100 per cents, though they may require a time extension to do so. Berkeley has pulled itself out of the "0" class with a fairly substantial jump—but reports that outstanding pledges do not cover the full \$100.

The real danger areas are Boston and "At Large"—with Berkeley still standing much too close. Boston shows, as yet, no hope of giving up its low-man spot, and the "At Large" contributions have fallen off badly.

### WE MUST REACH GOAL

The "At Large" quota is perhaps the most important at this point. Depending, as it does, not on organized units of the YSL but on our scattered members-at-large and our friends—and especially on the latter—we have no accurate way of estimating the extent of success we may reasonably expect.

It is therefore necessary to call on every reader of *Challenge* to make a contribution now. Members who have already given must seriously consider giving again, even if this means borrowing money. Friends of the YSL cannot be exempted from this appeal. If you have delayed contributing, now is the time for the delay to end. Send your contribution now!

We are not asking the impossible and certainly have no intention of doing so. The goal of \$1500 is a reasonable one and can be achieved. Most school semesters are over and many of our members and friends who last week could describe themselves as "non-working-students" will be working full-time through the summer period—with a resulting increase in income.

You can, in all probability, contribute. The conditions of organizational existence of a socialist group today force us to urge you to do so.

The YSL has no "Angel." You, as a member or friend, are our only source of financial support. Give us that support.

## What's the Score?

	Quota	Paid-in	%
Total	\$1500	937.50	63
Chicago	200	164	82
New York	675	501	74
At Large	170	100	59
Newark	50	30	60
New Haven	35	20	57
Los Angeles	200	82.50	41
Berkeley	100	40	40
Boston	70	?	?

# Why Is American Zoot-Suitism Spreading to European Youth?

By MAX MARTIN

Articles in newspapers and magazines of recent months indicate that a phenomenon heretofore associated only with American youth has developed and spread among young people in at least two European countries. The phenomenon we refer to is "zoot-suitism"—the inclination to dress in fantastically outlandish and gaudy clothes and to accompany such costumes with unusual hair styles.

The "zoot-suit" affects personality airs, frequently of the swaggering kind. More important than the outward manifestations, however, are the inner attitudes which they reflect or accompany; these range from juvenile delinquency and criminal activity on the most harmful end of the scale, to be found among a small proportion of "zoot-suit" youth,

## YSL Rally at U. of C. Attacks U. S. Policy In Indochina War

By JACK WALKER

BERKELEY, June 4—Speaking at noon today before the University of California's Sather Gate, Berkeley's new YSL chairman Charles Shain urged that U. S. troops be kept out of Indochina. In his talk he criticized both the political and military consequences of such a move in supporting a dying French colonialism and threatening to start World War III, once China entered the war and "massive retaliation" against China followed.

Neither of the present contenders are concerned with Vietnamese independence, Bao Dai being a French puppet and the Vietminh being subordinate to Russian and Stalinist imperialism. He detailed the numerous twists of the Indochinese Communist Party following Russian policy, through the Popular Front days, and early post-war "co-existence" period. When called upon, Vietminh has unhesitatingly—if regretfully—sacrificed the struggle for independence to meet its international Stalinist obligations.

The audience, rising from 50 to 150 from noon to 1:30, attentively followed the presentation and questions and answers in the following exchange. Several months ago both the SWP and SLP had sponsored unsuccessful street meetings here, where their speakers' arguments failed to hold the report of the crowd. The YSL, while not demonstratively moving the audience to its side, held good control of the meeting and received friendly comments after the meeting was over.

For a change there was no police photographer in provocative evidence, perhaps through accident or perhaps by decision as a result of recent protests against political police observers was groups. Among the police observers was one cop who had had his explanation for attending liberal and radical meetings, ostensibly to listen to U. C. teachers, shattered by the Berkeley chief of police who said that police attended political meetings to find out what subjects were on the mind of persons in the community.

The local "co-ordinator" of Students for America demonstrated his concern with democracy by calling to the attention of one policeman that the speaker's trailer was in front of a fireplug. Thus the speaker descended to the sidewalk five minutes before the meeting was scheduled to end, carrying on the discussion for a while there with the crowd before retiring. When he left, the SFAer was being hostilely raked over the coals as our more direct anti-SFA arguments were being followed up.

to attitudes of cynicism, apathy and escape from reality on the other end.

Press reports of the rise of this tendency among British youth have appeared lately and it is discussed somewhat more fully in Peter D. Whitney's "Britain's Zoot Suiters—The Edwardians," an article in the magazine section of the *N. Y. Times* for June 6. The sartorial aspects of the British version of "zoot-suitism" are caricatured after the dress of the dandy of the Edwardian era (1901-1910, after King Edward VII).

The May issue of the *Progressive* carries a piece by G. E. R. Gedye, entitled "Socialism's Skeleton," which deals with similar trends among Austrian social-democratic youth. Gedye's report is based on a book, *Der Junge Arbeiter von Heute—Ein Neuer Typ* (*The Young Worker of Today—a New Type*), by the Austrian writer Karl Bednarik.

### "AMERICANIZATION"

The more exaggerated features of dress to be found among the British "Edwardians" do not seem to be present among Austrian youth. Instead, we find the manifestations of the "new type" in attitudes toward life and toward the S. J. (*Sozialistische Jugend*), the youth section of the Austrian social-democratic party, to which a huge proportion of working-class youth belong.

Bednarik places the blame for this situation on the thesis that socialism can no longer appeal to youth; for this he has won the applause of Austrian capitalists. This need not concern us here, except to note that there is a point to Bednarik's argument—which will be discussed below—but not his point.

What does the "new type" of Austrian working-class youth look like? Gedye, undoubtedly paraphrasing Bednarik, summarizes it this way:

"... the youth of today is devoid of ideals, disinterested in life itself, flees from reality to gangster films, swing, and boogie-wogie, apes the most exaggerated demonstrations of the 'American way of dressing,' and lives its life in a mental and moral vacuum...."

"... this flight to the screen [that is, to seeing American movies—M. M.] has ousted the socialist ideology and the socialist ethos of the young Austrian worker of today, replacing class solidarity and endeavor by a mean and selfish individualism."

He continues to pay his dues to the organization, but resentfully, and keeps away from meetings and activities. He has little or no interest in politics and indeed is rather scornful of it. Bednarik contrasts these S. J. members with the pre-Dollfuss socialist youth. For the most part Austrian socialist youth of the '20s and '30s were intensely serious and devoted to the movement; they were idealistic and had an avid thirst for learning to steel themselves for the struggle for socialism. The current Austrian young socialist certainly compares unfavorably.

### DISTORTED MOOD

What can we say about these phenomena? We can begin by postulating that neither a political analysis nor a general social analysis can account for its development exhaustively; part of its causation lies in the realm of individual and social psychology. But some general conclusions and a few political angles relating to it are obviously clear.

Such moods and trends arise out of general feelings of frustration and of the failure to find meaning in life as well as specific discontents with economic conditions. It involves therefore a way of revolt, a revolt against these conditions and an attempt to put an end against them. According to Whitney, one English psychiatrist regards it as an attempt by these boys to live their drab lives by dressing up.

The tragic aspect of this revolt lies in

its meaninglessness and utter futility; the sad thing is that the spirit of revolt is not organized meaningfully, primarily in meaningful political channels, that it takes the form of an escape from reality instead. Yet we can easily understand why it does take on these aspects.

The feelings of frustration and impotence which youth feel flow from the nature of political life today, from the feeling that the most important decisions affecting their lives, primarily the decisions relating to hydrogen-bomb war, are being made behind their backs. This feeling must necessarily be more pronounced in Europe than in America. Even if European youth believes that it, together with other sections of the population, controls its governments, it also has a feeling that the decisions of its governments do not matter, that only what Washington and Moscow do matters.

This situation is particularly evident in Austria which lacks real sovereignty and is divided among four other powers. Hence tendencies to flee from reality seem to make sense: "There's nothing we can do anyway."

This may also partially account for the aping of American dress which is to be found in these tendencies in Austria and Britain. For if the United States is the great power, if it is dominant in such a large portion of the world, if it seems to be all-potent, maybe some of its "magic" will rub off. This may be a fanciful speculation but it can possibly be operating unconsciously or semi-consciously to produce the "American" aspects to be found in European "zoot-suitism."

### WHAT APPEAL?

The problem of why the revolt has taken these forms has to be faced. Why these, and not the socialist youth movements in both England and Austria? Bednarik suggests that it is because socialism has lost its appeal, because most of the demands of socialists have been fulfilled. Echoing his fantastic assertion, the *Oesterreichische Bildungsfunktionar* opines that the trends of non-cooperation among youth are the result of it being "no longer necessary to secure better conditions of life and work." Here we have an important clue.

For what has failed is not the appeal of socialism but the appeal of this socialism which has forgotten that the aim of the movement consists of the assumption of power by the workers and the creation of a socialist society.

To operate as if social security and better housing constitute the *raison d'être* of the socialist movement, that its demands have been achieved, that all that needs to be done is to defend these gains from a possible resurgent reaction, this truly cannot appeal.

If present-day Austria presents a picture of "socialism," who can blame Austrian working class youth for not being interested, for wanting to flee reality?

Were the Austrian socialist movement genuinely struggling for an independent and free Austria, then its youth could feel that they need not be forever impotent and incapable of affecting their conditions of life. Were Austrian socialists struggling for the creation of a socialist society, then Austrian S. J. members could root their visions in reality. Of course there is no automatic correspondence between the political ideologies of the British and Austrian socialist movements and "zoot-suitism." But it is certain that a revolutionary socialist program and only such a program, could offer an appeal which would begin to counter the moods now current.

## Get The Challenge

every week — by subscribing to *Labor Action*. A student sub is only \$1 a year.

# DISCUSSION: BRAZILIAN POLITICS & SOCIALIST POLICY

## I—The Fight in the Socialist Party

By BRASILEIRO

RIO DE JANEIRO, May 21—Corresponding to the chaos that exists in the political camp of the bourgeoisie is the disorganization of the working-class movement. The only organized political force in the workers' movement is the Communist Party under the banner of Stalinism and the leadership of Luiz Carlos Prestes, the most prominent Stalinist figure in Latin America.

The CP can represent a political danger to the Brazilian bourgeoisie because, under the present conditions of chaos and crisis, it would be relatively easy for Moscow to organize Stalinist "guerrillas" and launch a China-type experiment in the country. Of course, it is problematical whether the CP here has as much prestige and influence as it had in China and whether the Vargas regime can be considered to be as rotten and corrupt as that of Chiang Kai-shek. I think that both questions should be answered in the negative as far as Brazil is concerned.

But nevertheless the fact remains that the Stalinist party is the sole organized and militant force opposed to the bourgeoisie, and this fact carries with it great danger not only for the bourgeois owning class but also for the working-class movement.

The other political organization of the Brazilian working-class movement is the Brazilian Socialist Party, formed out of a heterogeneous alliance of reformists, radical democrats, revolutionary elements and ex-Trotskyists. This party has a relative importance only in the state of Sao Paulo and, of course, is much weaker than the CP, in its ideological level as well as in the organizational sense.

The relative growth and importance of this party can be ascribed to its alliance with the group of Christian-Democrats of Janio Quadros, the mayor of Sao Paulo, which is the most important industrial center of Brazil. The united forces of the Socialists and of Quadros' Christian-Democrats gained the people's support and won a victory over the rightist conservatives of the UDN and the government party (Vargas' "Laborite Party," Partido Trabalhista). The united front took over the city government of Sao Paulo; of the five municipal directors, two are members of the SP.

This fact could have had very important consequences, because Sao Paulo is the most important industrial center not only of Brazil but of South America and the number of industrial workers here reaches the 900,000 figure. It could have had important consequences if the Socialist Party had had a real workers' and socialist policy.

### SP FATE AT STAKE

But this young organization is being transformed into an electoral machine without any real influence among the trade unions and in the workers' sections of Sao Paulo. At present the political fate of the SP is involved with the political career of Quadros, who wants to win the governorship of the state of Sao Paulo.

In this pre-electoral period there are two major political camps: the UDN (National Democratic Union) as the democratic rightist opposition to the Vargas regime, and Adhemar Barros' Progressive Party, which, as a new bourgeois force, claims to represent the heritage of the Vargas regime and aspires to the leadership of the bourgeois camp. But in industrial Sao Paulo the position of the government seems to be weak, and the Socialist Party dreams of the establishment of an independent political camp under the leadership of the city's mayor, Quadros.

To a certain degree the situation of the SP now can be compared to that which obtained in New York City after Mayor Impellitteri's victory. The people of Sao Paulo are tired of the pro-business and corrupt policy of the administration as well as of the old conservatism of the UDN, and a victory by this radical popular sentiment over the traditional political forces could be quite possible in the state, just as the victory of Quadros in the city was possible.

This problem of socialist policy was discussed at the state conference of the Sao Paulo SP. The state executive of the party—which really can be considered to be its national executive because of its weight in the movement—proposed support of Quadros as official candidate of

LABOR ACTION has recently carried discussion articles on the Brazilian political situation and the policy of the Socialists by two correspondents, Comrades Madeira and Joao Machado. The two articles on this page are by a third correspondent who discusses particularly the political line of the Socialist Party of Brazil in the most important industrial area of Sao Paulo.—Ed.

the SP for the state governorship. The opponents of this policy fought against the Quadros' candidacy on the ground that as a typical petty-bourgeois politician he would only profit from the support of the Socialists and then make a rotten compromise with the government camp.

### LEFT WING VIEW

But the opposition lost the struggle, because it was divided among three tendencies: (1) one section demanded that the party put up its own Socialist candidate; (2) another advocated electoral abstention; and (3) a third favored support to Prestes Maya, who is backed by the rightist UDN.

Of these, the strongest and best crystallized tendency was for an independent socialist candidacy and for an electoral campaign under the SP banner.

The state committee, under the leadership of Gikovate and Abramo, supported the alliance with Quadros, arguing that this is the only possible alternative and the only way to set up a new political camp opposed both to the government party and to the rightist opposition, which could win the government of the state and in this way organize the popu-

## II—Danger of a Vargas Coup d'Etat; Quadros Party Splits Over SP Alliance

RIO DE JANEIRO, May 28—The political and social demagoguery of dictator Vargas, who has decreed a minimum wage for the workers, is having profound repercussions among the bourgeois parties of Brazil.

Of course, the minimum wage represents no danger to industry. The bourgeoisie can raise prices, and has raised them, thus annulling the economic effects of the president's bill. The bourgeoisie is angry not because of the wage increases, but because it fears an increase in the popularity of the ex-dictator and his reelection to the presidency.

The most important organs of the rightist opposition, *Correio da Manhã* of Rio, and *Estado do Sao Paulo* accuse the president of a "coup d'etat tendency" and of dictatorial methods of government over the official parliamentary system.

Is a Vargas coup d'etat possible? This is very dubious not only because the military opposition to the ex-dictator is very strong, but because the working class movement has lost, it seems to me, in a great degree, confidence in the government and is searching for new ways of economic and political action.

### CDP SPLITS

That this is really so is demonstrated by the decision of the Socialist Party of Sao Paulo to back the candidacy of the mayor of that city, Janio Quadros, for state governor. This decision, which was fought by the left opposition in the party, has had greater repercussions in the bourgeois circles of Sao Paulo than among the workers. The bourgeoisie is frightened not so much by the growing influence of the Socialists as by the possibility that it might lose the reins of the state government in Sao Paulo where the government party is very weak, as is the rightist UDN.

The present state governor, Lucas Gar-

lar forces under the leadership of the Socialist Party.

Some opponents argue pessimistically that this policy will end up in bankruptcy because the Quadros-SP combine is certain to be defeated in the election. But even if Quadros is elected, the SP will lose its own independent role and will tend to be transformed into an electoral machine of bourgeois politicians.

The establishment of an independent Socialist camp can be achieved by organizing the independent workers' movement, by educating the workers in independent union policy, by defeating the bourgeoisie in strikes, and not by a rotten electoral alliance with a petty-bourgeois politician who is going around begging the support of every bourgeois political group.

### DEFEAT FOR SOCIALISM

It seems to this writer that the defeat of the opposition at the SP conference was also a defeat for socialism and a victory for petty-bourgeois electoral opportunism. With this policy our comrades are reduced to the tools of Janio Quadros' electoral combination and the Socialist Party is reduced to a job agency in the city and state government administrations. It is the old story of reformist opportunism and of discredited alliances between "socialists" and petty-bourgeois politicians.

It is not very likely that the workers will support the Socialist Party even if they would support a new candidate against the traditional bourgeois and government forces. The most conscious and revolutionary workers will not come over to the SP after this rotten compromise with the radical-democrats. More likely they will yield to the attraction of the Stalinist party as against "socialist" opportunism. The new electoral policy of the Brazilian SP will end up not only with the bankruptcy of the party but will also make impossible the growth and consolidation of the "third force" idea.

This defeat for socialist policy in the SP reflects not only the backwardness of the working class movement in Brazil but also the crisis of revolutionary socialism and its weakness in South America and the world.

and that of the UDN. The secret of this Janio's victory was the discontent of the people with the corrupt policy of the government and rightist parties which is called "the spirit of the 22nd of March" (the date of the city council elections).

To hinder the strengthening of Quadros' position in his own Christian Democratic Party, the state court has rejected the registration of the new state executive committee of the CDP, because it backed Quadros' policy. In addition, the right wing opposition in the Christian Democratic Party has adopted a resolution against the minimum socialist program, denouncing it as "communism" and expelling the leader of the party because of his acceptance of the nomination by the Socialist Party.

To a certain extent, this division in the Christian Democrats strengthens the position of the PSB (Brazilian Socialist Party) majority which want to create a new political force in Brazil, a new current of "radical democracy" directed against the rightist UDN as well as against the government machine and Adhemar de Barros' new party. Undoubtedly the position of Janio Quadros is now weaker in relation to the Socialist Party, because the division in the Christian Democratic Party is only an expression of the growing tendency of the bourgeoisie to surround and isolate a possible rival for power.

### THE SOCIALIST WAY

The blow against the candidate of the PSB is a powerful one, and the tendency to isolate him will grow. It is quite possible that under the growing pressure of the bourgeoisie Quadros and the Socialist Party will lose the elections, and in this case the new political camp will die before its birth.

The only correct road for socialist policy appears to be the organization of the workers under their own socialist banner and political action for their own socialist program under their own party's leadership. The majority argues that the Socialist Party is too weak to undertake any action and therefore, even if it could initiate such action, it would remain without any political significance.

But the division in the Christian Democratic Party, the candidacy of Quadros and the growing importance of the PSB is a consequence of the growing pressure and disappointment of the working masses. The only way to give expression to this growing political discontent is political action under their own socialist banner, with their own socialist candidate. It is not excluded that the Socialist Party could win the election for Quadros and hence bureaucratic positions in the government as a result of its growing importance in the bourgeois political camp. But this will not win the conscious workers for socialism, as these workers are backing the Communist Party, are following its "socialist" program and "socialist" slogans and they will not leave their "socialist" fight for the electoral policy of the PSB.

The PSB could win, in the best case as a result of this policy, only the middle class elements who seek bureaucratic positions and parliamentary careers. Even if it wins the election for Janio Quadros, the Socialist Party will transform itself into a "Janist" political machine and not into a socialist workers' party. In this situation the loss of the electoral campaign in Sao Paulo could be more healthy than its victory. For a sound defeat in policy and in life is often better than a rotten, putrid "victory."

## READ ABOUT INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM

in the series of special pamphlet-issues of Labor Action

10 cents each

No. 1—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism

No. 2—Independent Socialism and War

No. 3—The Fair Deal: A Socialist Analysis

No. 4—Socialism and Democracy

No. 5—What Is Stalinism?

## BOOKS and Ideas *Steinberg: In the Workshop of the Revolution*

# Partner of the Bolsheviks: A Left-SR Account of 1917-18

IN THE WORKSHOP OF THE REVOLUTION, by I. N. Steinberg.—Rinehart and Co., N. Y., 306 pages, \$4.

By HAL DRAPER

Steinberg is the only surviving member of the first Soviet coalition government of 1917-18, a leader of the Left Social-Revolutionary Party which was the partner of the Bolshevik party in carrying through the October Revolution. And this book is his account of those great days, whose very events are now so clouded by dispute and dubious interpretation.

In view of this, it would seem, here is a book which should have been widely received as a very important contribution to the history of the revolution. But it has made no great stir, and that is not too hard to understand.

For one thing, in the first three chapters Steinberg eloquently defends the legitimacy of the October Revolution against the Kerensky regime, up to and including the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly. This fails to pass the rigorous contemporary tests for bona-fide "anti-Bolshevism," as demanded by the current American Party Line.

It is true that in his next 18 chapters Steinberg is as "anti-Bolshevik" as even perhaps the *New Leader* might wish, but it is already clear that Steinberg cannot expect to be hailed as a Great Thinker even by his fellow anti-Bolsheviks.

Whatever may be considered the weight of Steinberg's own strictures against the Bolsheviks, it is a fact, certainly, that the fundamental bases of anti-Bolshevism in its Standard American Version are badly shaken.

Steinberg's main offense against the Rules and Regulations Governing Standard American Version Anti-Bolshevism is that he presents the 1917 upheaval not as a conspiracy but as a real people's revolution. And he is also very inconsiderate of the myths about the "democratic" Kerensky regime which the bad bad Bolsheviks overthrew, as well as of the Menshevik and Right S-R allies of Kerensky.

### DAMNING PICTURE

Actually Steinberg's language about the "moderate socialist parties" (Menshevik and Right S-R) is very mild, but the outline of the picture he paints is damning enough. That picture is of an elemental revolutionary upsurge of the masses from below, determined to throw off all oppression and equally determined to end the war, which the rights and moderates tried to oppose, and which the Bolsheviks (and Left S-Rs) supported. This was the simple difference between the historic reality and the S.A.V. anti-Bolshevik myth of a "conspiracy."

Of the right-wing socialists, Steinberg writes that they believed "that the necessary conditions were not yet in evidence to realize the program of the people. They conceived it impossible to end the war without the cooperation of the Allied powers. They thought it utopian to transfer political power to the working classes since, in their view, the capitalist order in Russia was inevitable. Their interpretation of the revolution as only a democratic bourgeois succession to czarism demanded, of course, a corresponding strategy—the strategy of class compromise and political compliance. This strategy put the moderate two parties (Mensheviks and Right Social-Revolutionaries) halfway between the bourgeois and the working-class programs, gave their activities an air of vacillation and, in fact, fortified the position of the bourgeois camp."

Now, to be sure, the S.A.V. anti-Bolsheviks argue strenuously that anything beyond a bourgeois revolution was indeed impossible, but what Steinberg points up sharply is that this line meant that the right-wingers had to set themselves against, and get ready to suppress, the

revolutionary dynamism of the people. It is because the S.A.V. has to get around this inconvenient fact that the myth of a "conspiracy" was born.

By the time of the new Kerensky government of July 10, Steinberg relates, "Kerensky had lost hold of the ties of confidence which once had bound him to the people." Discrediting redounded not only against Kerensky but also against the Menshevik and Right S-R ministers who joined his cabinet.

"The main speaker for and exponent of this rootless coalition," writes Steinberg, "was the Social-Democrat (Menshevik) Tseretelli. As minister of the interior, he dispatched a circular to the whole country designed to redouble the power of the government commissars against the active local soviets. He ordered these commissars to block the 'illegal distribution of landed properties,' the 'appropriation, ploughing and sowing of other people's lands.' He thus sustained the policy of his predecessor, Prince Lvov. Every circular of this kind was like a match thrown into the powder keg of the revolution."

### ON KERENSKY

Being highly concerned with the democratic forms of the revolution, Steinberg especially emphasizes the transformation of the Kerensky regime into a "quasi-dictatorship"—with the consent and support of the very democratic Mensheviks and S-Rs who were later to issue howling blasts of anguish at every step the Soviet government took even to defend itself against armed insurrection.

Steinberg's general sketch of the whole development, of course, contributes nothing new to historical knowledge, its main interest lying in the character of the narrator. There are vignette touches here and there:

- In August, at the State Conference organized by Kerensky, we see the scene where Bublikov, a leading industrial capitalist, steps up to shake Tseretelli's hand before the assemblage, an impressive piece of symbolism while at the same moment a general strike of workers in Moscow was going on. . . .

- While we all know that Kerensky and a few die-hard slanderers still preserve the chestnut about the Bolsheviks being "German agents," we can read in Steinberg that the Kerensky government itself was thus accused. In the manifest of the Kornilov revolt, the reaction declared: "The Provisional Government, standing as it does under the pressure of the Bolsheviks in the soviets, works in full agreement with the German General Staff." . . .

### A "NEW WORLD"

With regard to the seizure of power itself, Steinberg is typically ambivalent. "The Left Social-Revolutionaries," he relates, "did not think it advisable to precipitate such a rebellion. In their opinion it would be sufficient for the [Soviet] Congress to maintain the positions of the people and lead the revolution to the Constituent Assembly. But they felt that, if the masses were to rebel, they would not stand against them."

No initiative toward revolution—and no opposition to it: you just go along with the surge of the people. The Left S-Rs could never have been leaders of the revolution, the role that had to be played by the Bolsheviks, and on the other hand they could never have been enemies of the revolution. They combined the fuzziest of ideologies with real revolutionary sentiments, a combination which doomed them to be simple fellow travelers of the revolution.

They had no political compass of their own, but, as sincere revolutionists, they could feel which way the revolutionary aspirations of the people were blowing. When that wind stopped blowing in one clear direction, they were lost.

Steinberg does not link up his above-quoted reference to the Left S-Rs' coolish opinion on the seizure of power with

what he describes later as the great result of the "inadvisable" rebellion. Left S-Rs like Steinberg never could orient themselves in the crisscross of events and policies, but they could respond like sensitive barometers to revolutionary élan:

"The October Revolution brought tremendous exaltation to vast sections of the Russian people. After eight months of frustrated expectations, there was now a profound sense of relief. It is true that there was also great bitterness about the past, great anxiety for the future; but the deepest sensation which October aroused in the people was joy. In city, village and army, people rejoiced in the fullness of their liberation, in the limitless freedom that now summoned their creative efforts. It was as if the walls of Jericho had crumbled before their eyes. A new life called to them with a thousand voices: from now on 'everything is possible to man.' 'Everything is possible' did not mean license and willful destruction, but full freedom to satisfy the constructive urges and the noblest ideals of man.

"All aspects of existence—social, economic, political, spiritual, moral, familial—were opened to purposeful fashioning by human hands. Ideas for social betterment and progress that had been gathering for generations in Russia and elsewhere seemed to wait on the threshold of the revolution ready to pour forth and permeate the life of the Russian people. The issues were not only social and economic reforms and thoroughgoing political changes; with equal zeal the awakened people turned to the fields of justice and education, to art and literature. Everywhere the driving passion was to create something new, to effect a total difference with 'the old world' and its civilization. It was one of those uncommon moments of self-perception and self-assertion. The storm passed nobody by: neither those who hailed it as a blessing nor those who spurned it as a curse."

### COALITION ISSUE

It was this climate of a world reborn which in the first place doomed the Constituent Assembly as a vestigial remnant of the "old world." When the Constituent Assembly was swept away in the tide, it scarcely created even a ripple. It had ceased to have any significance.

What played a greater role at the time was a different question: coalition cabinet or one-party cabinet. And here, in Steinberg's account, we come to another reason why determined anti-Bolsheviks will not like this book. The reason is this: even when Steinberg is doing his best to be as "anti-Bolshevik" as they come, he just can't seem to squeeze out any facts to give color to his strictures. The trouble, it would seem, is that he has old-fashioned prejudices against simply inventing suitable "facts" to fit S.A.V. specifications.

Steinberg and the Left S-Rs were enthusiastically in favor of constituting the first Soviet government as a coalition of all the socialist parties, including the Mensheviks and Right S-Rs. But the latter made it impossible, for a simple and straightforward reason: they were against the revolution and would enter its government only to behead it. Steinberg uses some language blaming "extremists" on both sides (Bolsheviks as well as the rightists, presumably) but every fact in his account speaks one way only:

"Protesting violently, the Mensheviks and Right Social-Revolutionaries quit the Second Soviet Congress when it proclaimed the Soviet Republic. Thus, the moderates caused the final split in the camp of the working classes and facilitated the establishment eventually of a purely Bolshevik government. . . ."

### HONEST BROKERS

So the Left S-Rs set out to be the honest brokers who would bring the right-wing socialists back into the coalition. After all, these right-wing social-

ists had lived more or less happily in a coalition government dominated by imperialists and capitalists; why should they be so intransigent about entering a coalition with revolutionary socialists? It disconcerted the honest brokers no end.

On the day the first cabinet was established, the Bolsheviks formally invited the Left S-Rs to name three representatives. At this point the Left S-Rs refused, on the ground that they wanted an all-around coalition. So the Bolsheviks had to set up the cabinet themselves.

Negotiations for the inclusion of the rightists continued, but uselessly; for the condition which the Mensheviks and Right S-Rs set for their participation was breathtaking: nothing more than that Lenin and Trotsky (by name) should be kicked out of the government! Fantastic as it seemed, they were not even clever enough to try to undermine the revolution by stealth; they openly demanded, just as if they had not been defeated and discredited, that the revolution behead itself in order to obtain, as reward, their own worthy personages, now a little shopworn from being kicked around by Kerensky but still willing to "save" the revolution for capitalism and the war.

### "AMAZING"

"It was amazing," writes Steinberg. "During the February period, the Mensheviks and the Right Social-Revolutionaries had countenanced all possible coalitions with bourgeois parties, even when they were openly reactionary. But the same leaders now rejected indignantly the idea of a socialist coalition, that is, cooperation with the Bolshevik Party, which at that time was still weak and still sought support in other related elements. Lenin's face for them seemed to eclipse all of the revolution. And again they unwittingly helped prepare the ground for his future dictatorship."

So Steinberg complains that "Lenin's secret political purpose" was a "dictatorship" all the while; but whereas Steinberg was clever enough to mind-read Lenin's secret thoughts, no one else in the country had to be half so clever in order to see that it was in fact the right-wing socialists who were torpedoing any unity.

The Left S-Rs finally joined the coalition themselves, and their course afterwards is another story.

Steinberg's account of the Constituent Assembly adds nothing new to the question. What he chooses to emphasize, however, is that it was the right-wing socialists (again) who excluded any possible compromise.

### "INCREDIBLE PRETENSE"

When the Constituent Assembly met, Chernov (Right S-R leader) was elected president, and—

"Of all possible attitudes toward the Soviets, Chernov (and the Right Social-Revolutionary Party that stood behind him) chose the most dangerous, if not the most foolish, tactic: he simply ignored the Soviets, as if they did not exist at all. His major speech, which naturally encompassed all cardinal issues of the revolution, was delivered with the incredible pretense that the Constituent Assembly had convened in a social vacuum. He announced that negotiations for peace would be started with the Allied powers; that the socialization of land would be carried through; that the federative rights of all nationalities would be proclaimed. Not with a single word did he mention that all these vital tasks were already being realized in the country and followed with intense interest in the whole world.

"What did all this mean? By implication it was a challenge to the Soviets and the masses that stood by them. For the Constituent Assembly, the only chance of survival lay in some compromise with the revolutionary forces that had already struck roots. It would have been easy to find some legal, constitutional and political form for such understanding. But this one way of averting civil war within the camp of the working people was ignored by the majority [of the assembly]. Did it then hope that the Soviets would simply capitulate?"

Like all the others in the mainstream of the revolution, the Left S-Rs now looked on the Constituent Assembly as an obsolete reminder of pre-October Russia.

So end Steinberg's "pro-Bolshevik" chapters. As already mentioned the rest of the book succeeds in being "pro-Bolshevik" in an entirely different way: so transparently flimsy and even, in places, downright foolish is the case it attempts to erect against the Bolshevik government that every S.A.V.-indoctrinated reader must squirm uneasily as he reads it.

(To be concluded next week)

# Indochinese War — —

(Continued from page 1)

result of the fact that the collapse of Dulles' policy left the government with no alternative policy to offer at the time. Unless American military forces are already on their way to Indochina behind the backs of Congress and the American people, there is little likelihood that the U. S. could intervene effectively in a battle which might well start during the last two weeks in June.

Yet it is one thing for the United States government to accept the fall of Hanoi as something it can do nothing about, and quite another for it to accept the loss of the whole of Indochina to the Stalinists.

## GOP'S DILEMMA

It is quite true that the struggle in Indochina has been and continues to be "90 per cent political." But that is also true of the cold war as a whole. Yet it has not prevented the American government (and this goes for the Truman administration as much as for that of Eisenhower) from seeking to redress its political weakness in the struggle with military power. The United States has proved itself just as incapable of developing a political program for Indochina as it was for Korea and for China itself before that.

**For the Republicans to give up Indochina now because to try to fight for it is hopeless would deal a death-blow to their potent propaganda claim that the Democrats "surrendered" or even "betrayed" China to the Stalinists.**

Thus, there are powerful reasons which press this government toward military intervention. This does not mean that such intervention is inevitable. But it means that it is most likely unless the voice of the American people is raised in strong protest: *No U. S. military intervention in Indochina!*

## Some Comments from the Left

### The New Leader, May 31

This spokesman of State-Department-liberalism does little more these days than to wring its editorial hands in despair. "It is very difficult to write about the Indochina crisis," its editorial of May 13 begins, "because only one fact seems indisputable: the Communist armies are on the offensive."

The editors then go on to blame France for "her seven-year denial that there was an Indochinese crisis, her seven-year opposition to internationalizing the struggle, and her continuing resistance to Indochinese independence under representative government." Britain is blamed for too great optimism about negotiations. Only Dulles gets faint praise for his (unspecified) "efforts . . . to meet the Indochina crisis." The editorial closes on the plaintive note: "At this point, a dynamic policy of containment would be preferable to this stagnant version of 'liberation,' but even that now seems very, very difficult to achieve."

### The Progressive, May 1954

The Progressive states the case for Indochinese independence now, and lays the lash on French colonialism as the chief criminal in the drama, while not sparing the Stalinists for "playing their corrupt trade of exploiting other peoples' misery and hunger."

Chief stress is laid on the need for serious negotiations with the Stalinists to establish a basis for co-existence:

"The tragic weakness of American foreign policy today is the fact that we are imprisoned by our own propaganda, that we do hobble ourselves to our adversary's advantage. We could begin now to live up to our potentialities for world leadership by taking the initiative for a negotiated settlement of the conflict in Indochina, under United Nations auspices, and by formulating those 'minimum conditions' on which we are willing to live and let live with the Chinese Communists. Anything less can only lower our stature further in the decisive areas of Asia, and weaken our alliance in Europe—results which are topmost among Soviet aims. The basis of a creative American foreign policy in Asia must not be to buck, but rather to back the revolutionary aspirations of the people for independence and a better life."

### The Militant, June 7

The mouthpiece of "orthodox Trotskyism" continues to write about the war in Indochina as if the only Stalinists concerned are in the Kremlin, and not at all running the Vietminh. The Vietminh? That is "the heroic Indochinese people fighting against tremendous odds for national independence and social change" and "the Indochinese revolution."

According to the Militant, the twin dangers are (a) that the United States will enter the war and reimpose imperialism, or (b) that the Kremlin will sell out the Indochinese revolution for a deal with the capitalist imperialists in other parts of the world. In the May 31 issue the Militant denounces the Pabloite leadership of the "Fourth International" for adopting the Stalinist slogan for a truce in Indochina. Only a complete and immediate victory for Stalinism in Indochina, it appears, will satisfy the demands of these "orthodox Trotskyists."

### The American Socialist, June

As for the American supporters of Pablo, they manage to discuss the Indochinese crisis without once referring to Stalinism in the whole article as a factor in the situation. (Correction: the only reference to "Communism" appears in a long quote from Senator Ed Johnson of Colorado.) There is one reference to "Ho Chi Minh and his resistance movement," and after that, to the Vietminh without any political description, or descriptive adjectives whatever.

The lead article on Indochina is hardly to be distinguished from that which appeared in the Progressive, except for its failure to mention the Stalinists, or to advocate ANY policy except opposition to American intervention in the struggle.

Thus the editors of The American Socialist, who recently broke from the Socialist Workers Party on the ground that this organization fails to recognize the revolutionary character of Stalinism, continues its policy of never stating its basic point of view on the world struggle, of letting its readers guess at the ideological foundation of the magazine.

In short, it reads exactly like the organ of some Stalinist-front group which has been created to catch the innocents who cannot stomach the strong medicine of the straight Stalinist press.

## The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

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

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

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

# Liberal Party Crisis — —

(Continued from page 1)

tenth and possibly last birthday. . . Mrs. Schiff herself kindly recommended to the Liberals that they follow her own example of entering the local Democratic Party and reforming it from within.

## NOT IN THE OLD WAY

It is fairly clear that this outburst does not arise from any specific event but from uneasy pondering at the top of the party over the party's whole future.

On the one hand, Dubinsky (and perhaps other leaders) seem to be recognizing that the party CANNOT GO ON IN THE OLD WAY—i.e., mainly endorsing "good" Democrats or Republicans and

seeking to act as a "balance of power" and pressure force. Its own course of development, even its partial successes along these lines, have driven it to the point where an indefinite prolongation of this course is impracticable.

There is now undoubtedly more sentiment than ever before, in Liberal Party ranks, for independent candidates under its own banner. Even the leadership can no longer fail to see the direction it must go, even though this is not always true for reasons of general principle.

For example, in the looming New York gubernatorial contest, shall the Liberal Party support FDR Jr.? That is a harder question than may seem to the naked eye. Having raised the ladder whereby this young man climbed into Congress, the Liberal Party has felt ever since then that Junior climbed into the window and then not only kicked the ladder away but added some gratuitous cuss words. For years now, FDR Jr.'s name has been something of a symbol in the party for the careerist who wished only to use the party as long as he could climb higher. Even Dubinsky's back is feeling sore from the heels of all the people who mounted up on it and then took off with a vicious kick.

## TORN IN TWO

In other words, on one side this whole development is precisely the one which we have foreseen and looked forward to: the point where the party sees that the next logical step is toward clearer independent political action.

But—and this is the other side—this development has been in a party, isolated in New York, which is surrounded by a national ocean of politics in no way resembling the New York situation. The

politics of the city and state can never really be successfully isolated from national politics, and at every turn, the forces pushing the Liberal Party toward independent action are negated by the national forces pulling the party toward support of the Democrats, in the absence of any national third party of its own.

The cloudiness of Dubinsky's speech on May 26 was the ambiguity of one who feels torn in two directions.

## VANGUARD ROLE

It may well be that the ILGWU leadership, which has hitherto been the main financial prop of the Liberal Party, wishes to pull out from under; and this withdrawal could well undermine the party, because of its moral consequences, as well as financial reasons. That would be a scandalous end to a movement which has been a vanguard force for labor politics in America, relatively speaking.

The Liberal Party membership and militants can show that it is entirely false to speak of a "party of quality" or a "party of quantity" as alternative pieces of "merchandise." The huckstering psychology in terms of which Dubinsky formulated his dilemma is revealing, but no help in solving the party's problem.

"No third party movement has arisen," complained Dubinsky in his speech, and no doubt this plays an important part in his thinking. How much has he and the Liberal Party leadership done to foster a national third-party movement? The Liberal Party, in the last analysis, must look upon itself as the vanguard detachment of such a national third party of labor and liberalism, and go forward in this spirit to greater independence, not less.

## World History—Year by Year

### The bound volumes of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves. Completely indexed from 1949 on.

1950-52.....\$3 per vol.

Bound volumes of LA are also available back to, and including, 1942, at somewhat higher prices depending on the year. Prices on request. A complete set of bound volumes for the 11 years from 1942 to 1952 is available for \$40.

Independent Socialist Press  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

## The Handy Way to Subscribe!

### LABOR ACTION

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

Please enter my subscription:

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

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE