

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

## THE CRISIS OF STALINISM

**A CP Leader Beats His Breast**

... page 2

**Malenkov Flirts, Pollitt Sweats**

... page 3

**In Warsaw the Turn Is Deeper**

... page 2

**The Social Crisis: A Door Opens**

... page 7

**LYL Leader 'Explains' the Turn**

... page 5

APRIL 16, 1956

FIVE CENTS

## General Strike in Spain!

General strike in Spain—again after five years: this is the great news as we go toward press time. On April 11, "thousands of workers" in the city of Pamplona went on a general walkout, initiated by shoe workers demanding wage increases.

In a couple of hours, reports the N. Y. Times dispatch from Madrid, the Navarre capital was "paralyzed." And: "Reports by the Spanish news agency said the strike 'appeared to be spreading to other towns of the region.' It is expected that later today the main urban centers will have followed the Pamplona lead."

Last August, at a national labor congress held by the Franco "labor syndicates," the delegates reflected so much

unrest and pressure from the ranks of the workers (explains the Times dispatch) that they even broke away from control to raise demands against the government. These demands included a living wage, and "greater participation in profits and in shaping management policies."

Franco did not concede these demands. The strike launched in Pamplona appears to be in response to the fact that when the regime did grant a wage raise recently, it was a pittance in comparison with the rise in the cost-of living.

### FIT TO PRINT

Warning to readers of the N. Y. Times: watch out for curve balls in the Madrid dispatches of correspondent Camille Cianfarra.

According to Cianfarra's dispatch on Pamplona, above, there never has been a general strike in any city under Franco before; he mentions that there was a strike, but not a general strike, in Barcelona in 1951; and he stresses that it is "regarded as surprising" that Pamplona should be the scene of the "first" one, since the "region" was an early supporter of Franco's revolt.

This is fantastic. The Barcelona struggle of March 1951 was a great general strike, according to the whole press. Not only that, but general strikes spread to other cities.

Not only that, but one of the biggest and best general strikes in this wave was exactly in the city of Pamplona, in May 1951. According to the press, 30,000 workers went out in protest against the cost of living, triggered off by a tumultuous women's demonstration, and most of the major businesses of the town were paralyzed for the duration of the strike, which was two days. The strike, moreover, ended in disciplined order with successful resistance to any victimization.

Cianfarra, as a Times foreign correspondent, has specialized in "good" journalistic relations with fascist regimes, Mussolini's and Franco's. He has often reflected their handouts in, the way modeled by Walter Duranty in Russia in his time.

## SPOT-LIGHT

With new fighting on the Egyptian-Israel border, the vicious spiral of attack and retaliation in the Middle East descends a few more notches in the direction of war—a war which, everybody agrees, nobody really wants.

This time the immediate guilt of aggression lies with the Egyptian forces, as commandos from the Gaza strip make forays into Israel. Colonel Nasser, it would seem, is trying to show his countrymen that he can do unto others as the others did unto him a little more than a year ago, in the same area. At that time, indeed, we pointed out that the Ben-Gurion strategy—even leaving aside its moral and political lack of justification—could achieve only the contrary of its declared purpose of stopping border incidents.

As long as Egypt and the other Arab states refuse to recognize the existence of Israel as a sovereign state and as a state with whom peace must be made, if there is to be peace in the region for all, their complaints against Israeli policies are fruitless.

No solution lies this way on any side. It is from below that revulsion must come against the reciprocal provocation of the rulers.

This past week the Supreme Court threw a decision in the direction of civil liberties, with a 5-4 vote upholding Dr. Slochower in his Fifth Amendment case. It is more than welcome, especially after the blow to the Fifth Amendment administered by the same court the previous week when it upheld the Immunity Act.

At this time, however, it is unclear (at least to us) to what extent this decision will serve to stop the practice of victimizing people who plead the Fifth Amendment. A Times story of the same day even says that other New York City employees who were fired, under the same Section 903 of the city charter as was Dr. Slochower, will not have their cases affected unless they also go up to the Supreme Court! Brooklyn College, which is forced to take Slochower back, announces in advance that it will immediately fire him again on the next handy excuse.

But the court decision seems to establish, at any rate, that pleading the Fifth is not to be taken as any admission of guilt, in other words, it reiterates the Constitution.

## Among the Allies

# 'Anti-Americanism' Is Mounting: Why?

By GORDON HASKELL

The growing political crisis of the capitalist bloc of nations is not simply a product of the pressure exercised by the Stalinist bloc upon it, nor indeed of a rising tide of socialist opposition from within. It is a result of the continuing colonial revolution, and of the normal internal rivalries and contradictions of the capitalist world.

The provocative anti-American interview of French Premier Guy Mollet which appeared in the April 6 issue of *United States News & World Report*, as well as the worldwide reaction to it, point up this fact very starkly.

In this interview, Mollet said a number of things. He castigated the United States for accompanying its foreign economic aid with "sermons" on how the recipients should conduct themselves. He expressed open disagreement with the American position that an agreement on the unification of Germany should precede any agreement on general disarmament, and sided with the Russian position that German unification can become possible only in the context of a relaxation of tensions which would be materialized in a disarmament agreement. He also denounced the United States for its failure to understand the "French position" in its struggle in North Africa, or in any event to stand staunchly at France's side in its hour of trial in that area.

### MOLLET'S ANGLE

Now, Guy Mollet is a "socialist," or to put it more accurately, he heads the Socialist Party of France. His particular variety of "socialism," it is clear, does not prevent him from continuing the military campaign against the people of Algeria in an effort to suppress their demand for independence. Further, it has nothing to do with any kind of doctrinaire, or sectarian, or even discernible proposal on his part to start introducing

socialism in France. This is not surprising to anyone who knows Mollet or the general character of the Socialist Party he leads, and is even inevitable given the kind of coalition government with which he has climbed to the premiership.

The fact that Guy Mollet has taken the unusual course of attacking the United States, the strongest military, economic and political ally of his country, in the public prints does not flow from his point of view as a socialist, even of the right-wing variety, but rather from his function as a defender of French imperialism.

He goes out of his way in the interview to make it clear that he does not oppose NATO as such. In this interview he expresses the authentic point of view of French liberal nationalism including its inclination toward a neutralist policy inside the NATO bloc.

### WORLD ECHOES

What were the international reactions to Mollet's interview? To start with, the Stalinists hailed it, as is to be expected in the current situation. Khrushchev told a group of Western correspondents:

"I agree with the greater part. It was good for the cause of peace and friendship. We cannot demand that Guy Mollet, a socialist, be in complete agreement with us. Guy Mollet is, of course, a socialist, but we firmly approve of what he says on questions of an international character and the criticism and remarks he made. We particularly like what he said about disarmament."

(Turn to last page)

## Shachtman Tour Starts 2nd Leg

The subject of the Stalinist 20th Party Congress in Russia, which has created an enormous interest throughout the world and thrown the Stalinist parties everywhere into a new turmoil, was the subject of the first half of The Independent Socialist League chairman Max Shachtman's national tour which took him to the West Coast.

Public meetings were held in Los Angeles, Bay Area and Seattle on the subject of "Stalinism Without Stalin." In addition, Shachtman met with branches of the ISL to discuss this latest political development and problems of the organization.

The second half of the tour will begin at Reading on May 2 and will take Shachtman to other cities in the East and Middle West, ending the tour at St. Louis.

This is the schedule:

Reading .....	May 2
Philadelphia .....	May 3
New York .....	May 4
Pittsburgh .....	May 6-7
Cleveland .....	May 8-9
Detroit .....	May 10-12
Chicago .....	May 13-15
St. Louis .....	May 16

Although Newark is not listed in this schedule, it will hold a meeting with Shachtman at the end of this series and prior to the resumption of the ISL hearings in its case before the attorney general.

Readers of LABOR ACTION are advised to watch the columns of this paper or local announcements of meetings.

## THE STALINIST CRISIS: UNITED STATES

# A CP Leader Beats His Breast

By GODFREY DENIS

As previously reported in *LA* (April 2) the Jefferson School has been holding a number of forums attempting to explain the new line for the American CP which is developing as a result of the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party. The last forum of the series was held April 4 with John Gates, editor of the *Daily Worker*, as the speaker.

In a way this particular talk was the most interesting of the lot since the major topic—"Democracy, Criticism and Self-criticism"—tackled the central problem in the minds of the faithful, the role of Stalin, as given in the latest version by Krushchev and Co.).

The audience, well over 300, included a considerable number of ex-Stalinists, sympathizers and the curious. Anti-Stalinists were present, some vocally at the meeting itself, and some outside were distributing *LABOR ACTION* and the *Militant*.

While there was nothing particularly new in John Gates' speech, the emphasis was disorienting for his flock, not merely because of the loud repetitions of mea culpa throughout the talk but also because of the rather obvious fact that Gates did not attempt to answer some of the real questions that had arisen from the limited discussion in and around the CP.

His basic theme ran something like this: Stalin made great contributions to Marxist theory and toward building the foundations of socialism in the USSR "from 1903 to about 1933." However, because of the distortions caused by the cult of the individual, distortions in part explained by the tremendous difficulties of the tasks before the Soviet Union, a number of injustices occurred. Also a number of distortions of Marxist theory became accepted.

The 20th Congress, the audience was told, was a momentous event because it marked the now-established strength of the "socialist bloc" and because it revised the distortions in theory mentioned above.

The main "distortions" were: Stalin's view that as socialism became more firmly established the repressive power of the state would have to increase; the "mistaken" notion that so long as imperialist powers existed, wars were inevitable; the "mistaken" notion that socialists could not achieve power peacefully in the still capitalist countries, whereas now, it seems because of the power of the "socialist" bloc, a gradual transformation via parliamentary elections is no longer excluded.

### REASSURANCES

Further, it appears that Gates now feels that the *Daily Worker* and the American Communist Party were lax in their defense of democracy in the U.S., and, as an example, he mentioned the Minneapolis Smith Act trials where, he feels, the party should have defended the "Trotskyites" although their politics are "degenerate." Now the CP defends democratic rights for everybody, we were told, at least in the U.S.

One of the worst mistakes, Gates said, was the expulsion of Tito's Yugoslavia from the "socialist" camp and the Cominform. This mistake is apparently no longer the fault of Beria, who was hardly mentioned, but was squarely laid to Stalin. The 20th Congress corrected this, and recognized the possibility of "alternate paths to socialism": Russia's, Tito's, Nehru's, and so forth.

Neutralism came in for high praise, and the release of the Social Democrats in Hungary, in Gates' opinion, raised the possibility of more than one party being permitted to exist.

However, to reassure those who might feel that if such an imposing list of errors were possible once, they could be repeated again, Gates assured the audience that the basically healthy nature of "socialism" was so strong that even if Stalin were still alive the re-evaluation would be going on, since insofar as Stalin was wrong he contradicted the social system in the USSR.

Gates gave an analogy, which he warned the audience not to take too literally. He drew the analogy between the USSR and, of all things—a trade union led by "misleaders or even dictators" which nevertheless is a working-class institution and fight for workers' interests. The rustling sound your reporter heard at that point might have been caused by the ghost of Trotsky stirring in his grave, as Gates borrowed this "trade-union analogy" to prove that Russia was

at least a "workers' state."

Gates then moved to the American scene. The old errors are responsible for the isolation of the CP from the united labor movement, for the mistrust it inspires in some honest though critical quarters, for the somewhat inadequate nature of discussions, criticisms and self-criticisms.

Criticism, Gates said, "all too often" went from the top down only, as against the correct Marxist-Leninist way of going both ways. This is because all kinds of ideas which approached those of various oppositions were treated as if they were disloyal and were suppressed in Russia (through an excess of zeal caused by the degeneration and treason of "some leaders" of the Bukharinite and Trotskyist oppositions).

### HARD QUESTIONS

The discussion period that followed Gates' talk was open, as far as the eye could see. A number of fairly routine questions were followed by at least two that were not.

## THE STALINIST CRISIS: POLAND

# In Warsaw the Turn Is Deeper

By A. RUDZIENSKI

In the period just before the 20th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, which condemned Stalin's regime, the "thaw" in Poland had gone further than it had in Russia. The rehabilitation of the Polish CP leaders who had been liquidated before the war was an announcement, in effect, of Stalin's political "insanity" and also a token of the political liquidation of some hundreds of "little Stalins" in Russia, Poland, and West Europe.

Therefore the (physical) death of Boleslaw Bierut, former president of the Polish "Popular Democracy," coincides with the political liquidation of Stalin's political machine, in the same way as the death of the old tyrant coincided with the end of his personal dictatorship in Russia. It doesn't matter whether Bierut was liquidated in the same way, perhaps, just as it doesn't matter whether Stalin was murdered by his collaborators or not.

As Bierut's replacement in the secretariat of the ruling party, Edward Ochab was named—the former chief of the security department of the Politburo. Since Ochab does not represent any political tendency of his own, the political leadership of the party is in the hands of Jakob Berman, Hilary Minc and (perhaps) Zambrowski—the men who managed the party during Bierut's life.

They are also all, in origin, old Communists from pre-war days, with links to the old staff of the Polish CP; thus they have so many grounds on which to hate Stalin that it is quite possible that the anti-Stalin turn will be deeper and broader in Poland than in Russia.

The *Trybuna Ludu* enthusiastically greeted the resolutions of the 20th Congress, appraising them as a "turn to the left." While Prague, Paris and Rome are trying to narrow the significance of the destruction of the Stalin myths, Warsaw is intensifying it more than Moscow. It would seem that the only hard pro-Stalin man in Poland was Boleslaw Bierut.

### CLIMATE WAS RIPE

But the main political problem is not that of Bierut's successor but of the new policy of the regime with respect to the opposition in Poland and abroad, that is, to the political emigration as well.

The regime is socially and politically weak; in spite of its successes in the industrialization and reconstruction of the country, because the political opposition was never as thoroughly destroyed as it was in Russia, and because there still remains, and even grows, a sponta-

"Why," asked an innocent, "did Rajk confess if he was innocent as we are now told?" Gates confessed his own "bewilderment," adding two other thoughts. First (after all there's no point in taking unnecessary chances) he said that we did not as yet have full information about what happened in Hungary; but secondly, if an injustice had been done, as now appears, then the culprits should be punished, especially under socialism.

The second question was even more difficult. What happened, asked an inconsiderate voice, to that well-documented spy ring that Tito ran in the Eastern Popular Democracies and the USSR? Gates did not know.

Following these two questions, the Cannonite city organizer took the floor and, after some confused remarks about the Chinese and German revolutions, praised Gates' "excellent" analogy between the USSR and a bureaucratic trade union, without even making the obvious point that socialists should fight against the bureaucracy in such a union and attempt to oust it. His particular question (unanswered) was why Trotskyist politics were "degenerate" since Gates analysis was similar.

Most interesting perhaps were statements made from the floor by two who were obviously members or friends of the CP.

One attacked Gates, the Central Committee, and the party press for the super-

neous economic opposition by the workers and peasants against the sacrifices required by the industrialization of the country.

More than 40 per cent of the people are still independent peasants; the social and economic reality demands an answer to the question: will the peasants be forced into the collectives, or will the political structure of the regime be changed?

Since today it is very difficult to destroy completely the economic independence of the Polish peasantry, there are likely to be reshuffles in the "popular power." Naturally the first step must come from the Kremlin, because they are the bosses.

The political climate in Poland was quite ripe for the new turn. It was not only the death of Bierut that facilitated the changes; even some organs of the regime had been critical of the government from time to time.

*Nowa Kultura*, the official organ of the Polish writers' association, had published a poem by Adam Wazyk, an old Communist, who described the situation of "dehumanized Poland" in very tragic terms. The responsible editor of this magazine, also a member of the state party, was suspended for publishing Wazyk's poem. The "cultural" press criticized the "administration" under the cover of loyalty to the regime, in typical doubletalk of course.

But the criticism has been getting bolder every day. Organs of the Polish regime are publishing replies to critics in the émigré press; they fight the latter of course, but in this way a broader public gets to know about the criticism from abroad.

It is almost as if the opposition-in-exile were writing and acting in Poland itself, because today it is only a short distance from Warsaw to London, the émigré center; and in London the emigration has full freedom and security for its activities, such as it could not have had even in a bourgeois-democratic Poland.

The political conflict between the regime's press and that of the emigration goes on daily, publicly, and, in this way, "legally," thus contributing to the increase in political looseness; so that the existence of the Polish emigration on British territory gives it a certain superiority in the political fight. This is one of the reasons why the Warsaw regime wants to convince all the exiles to return to Poland, at any cost.

On the other hand, in London itself there were voices raised saying that the political struggle by the emigration does not have any more possibilities before

it, and that it is necessary to seek new and "softer," "more liberal" political roads.

The second statement decried the lack of democracy in the CP, pointed out that "many, many good comrades were expelled from the party for merely attempting to discuss some of the ideas that Gates presented," and demanded a sharper re-examination of the American CP's "mistakes" and past record, particularly that of the leadership.

The meeting closed with an assurance by the chairman that the discussion would continue in The Jefferson school, where another class is now organized around the questions posed by the 20th Congress, the Party and the *Daily Worker*.

The CP here, as elsewhere, is reeling from the shock caused by the current discussion. Basic gospel is being questioned; and while the top hacks may be able to take the switch without too much trouble, the ranks are confused and increasingly demoralized.

The very receptiveness now evident around their meetings to the hostile anti-stalinist press—*LABOR ACTION* was being openly read in the meeting—shows that perhaps for the first time in years, at least until the lid is clamped on again, rank-and-file Stalinists are willing to ask questions and listen to other points of view.

In this period, the police-state raid on the *Daily Worker* and the Communist Party by the T-men was obviously a god-send to the party. It was repeatedly mentioned at the meeting and is obviously used to solidify the ranks until a new line is handed down.

it, and that it is necessary to seek new and "softer," "more liberal" political roads.

The political crisis in the emigration divided it, as we have reported before, between the "government"-in-exile of Zaleski (Pilsudski's ex-minister), and the "Executive" which embraces the political representatives of the traditional Polish parties (Socialists, Peasants, and the Nationalists of various hues). As we have also reported here, one of the "premiers" in the Zaleski government, Hanke, a politician of Christian-Democratic color, went back to Poland; and another ex-premier, Mackiewicz, is writing violent polemics against supporting U.S.-British policy as being harmful to Poland.

The Warsaw press joyfully supported the point of view of Mackiewicz. (Few people know that his cousin is the president of the Ukrainian republic in the USSR.)

### CRISIS IN EXILE

On the other side, the majority group of the Executive, supported by the traditional parties, is also undergoing a political crisis, because of its collaboration with U.S. British policy.

Its president resigned, and Adam Ciolkosz, a leader of the PPS (Polish Socialist Party), was invited to organize the new Executive. Ciolkosz, who is a left-wingish leader in the PPS, is the only man they have who can be balanced against the Warsaw regime, in the political tug-of-war with the latter. He was a vigorous fighter against Pilsudski and the "colonels," and went to prison for his activity. He never belonged to any government-in-exile because the bourgeoisie was afraid of him. He is a little to the left of center in the Social-Democracy, and so is considered a "radical"; he is looked on as honest and courageous.

Because of his past, he has great political possibilities, but he has his share of mistakes: in particular, collaboration with the right-wing Nationalist Party. While he argues that he had to do this as the only way to fight the Pilsudski group, my reply is that from the standpoint of socialism it were better to seek collaboration with the Populists (peasant party) or to remain in "splendid socialist isolation," rather than collaborate with the Nationalists.

But the Russians cannot take advantage of this mistake of Ciolkosz's collaboration with the Nationalists, because they themselves want to win over the Nationalists to collaboration. Thus Ciolkosz can play this card to his advantage.

# THE STALINIST CRISIS: BRITAIN

## Malenkov Flirts, Pollitt Sweats

By OWEN ROBERTS

London, April 5

A circus-like atmosphere has prevailed in Britain for the past few weeks with Russians, both dead and alive, topping the bill. So far only the clowns have capered in the ring, preparing the sawdust for the star performers—Bulganin and Khrushchev—who are due to step into the British limelight in about ten days' time.

The chief attraction up to the present has been the flabby-faced bureaucrat, Georgi Malenkov. Ostensibly in Britain to view the nationalized power stations, he has in fact engaged in a well-planned publicity stunt apparently framed to prove to the British public that Stalinists don't eat babies—at least, not now.

It is a fact that Malenkov has made a considerable impression upon the average Britisher. He has bounced babies on his knee, tickled their grubby cheeks and given them sticks of candy. He has flirted with the women to the point of complaining that "it is difficult to make love through an interpreter" and handed them large boxes of chocolates. He has dodged the official program and chatted to the workers, pinning "peace" medals of gold upon their overalls.

In fact Malenkov has behaved just like any office-seeking politician around election time. So much so that Morgan Phillips, secretary of the Labor Party, is reported to have remarked that Malenkov would make an ideal election candidate in Britain. Phillips had a better chance than most of knowing something about Malenkov because he was present at the private dinner given to Malenkov by the National Executive Committee of the party.

Nobody quite knows what was discussed in the long session after the dinner. NEC member Dick Crossman is reported to have said afterwards that Malenkov had told the NEC members at the dinner that Russia had been "cleaned up" and that all the "wicked things" had been stopped.

Aneurin Bevan seems to have been unimpressed; it is said that he had a forceful discussion with Malenkov about freedom of speech in Russia, at the conclusion of which he said: "Well, for goodness' sake don't teach Morgan Phillips the secret of unanimity."

If Malenkov has managed to soften the ground for his bosses and generally create the impression that he is a genial Pickwickian character, no such claim can be made for another recent visitor to Britain from Russia, Ivan Serov.

Boss of the Kremlin's secret police, Serov paid a flying visit here last week in order to check on security arrangements for the visit of Bulganin and Khrushchev. Whereas Malenkov received warm courtesies, Serov got a cold blast. "Who Wants This Odious Thug In Britain?" challenged right-wing Laborite *Daily Mirror* in a four-inch deep headline across its front page. Nobody, it seemed, wanted Serov and the *Mirror's* sentiments were echoed, perhaps in less forceful language, by almost every newspaper in the country.

### BEHIND BOLTED DOORS

It has, however, been a ghost that has really riveted attention on Russia during the last few days. The ghost of Stalin tramped the floor of Battersea Town Hall in London where the British Communist Party has been holding its 24th Congress, disturbed by recent changes and past memories.

But like their counterparts in Moscow during the 20th Congress of the Russian CP, the home-grown variety of Stalinists were a little bashful when it came to debating important issues. For six hours they bolted the doors while hearing the new Moscow line from general secretary Harry Pollitt.

If recent letters in the Stalinist *Daily Worker* are anything to judge by, the debate was a lively one. Many of these letters have suggested that if Stalin was a tyrant in his later years then the leaders of the British Communist Party should have spoken up before.

One reader, for instance, complained: "Those leading party people, did they know that there was something funny going on in Stalin's days? If they did, and some of us, if not many of us, think that they did know, why did they not report back to us like good Communists and democrats?"

Another reader said: "To substitute for correct leadership our unflinching readiness to turn somersault and argue with the same passion and absolute ac-

ceptance of the new conclusion as that with which we argued the opposite is to raise doubts among the ordinary people as to our political and, indeed, moral integrity."

The rapid switches in the party line also disturbed another reader who wrote:

"This rushing to extremes to condemn all things connected with Stalin is as humiliating and un-Marxist as the personal glorification we used to indulge in. Why don't we learn the lesson once and for all that Communists in Moscow (whoever they happen to be and whatever they happen to say) are not the fount of all worldly wisdom, and that we can, and should, evolve our own ideas as creative Marxists in our own right?"

The rumblings did not end with discussion on the debunking of Stalin. Some British Communists took the unexpected opportunity to have a crack at the leadership of the British CP.

Wrote one North Londoner: "It is time to put our own house in order, to encourage healthy controversy, to refrain from slamming down on ideological deviations."

A woman member of the CP hit out all-round in a letter which complained that "real criticism of policy is dying out in the branches and districts," that the "uncritical acceptance of leadership from the center" gave Labor Party members the impression that CP members were not "responsible individuals"—and that "adulation of the Soviet Union" does harm by lending weight "and genuine fear" that the British CP is only a "Russian tool."

### NEW OPPORTUNISM

At the congress itself there were obviously a number of CP delegates in sympathy with the critical tone of many of the letters appearing in the *Daily Worker*. But the opinion was unorganized and fragmented. Although several times delegates attacked the leadership of the British CP in a forthright fashion—even on one occasion to the point of alleging that the method of voting for the new executive was undemocratic—the years of Stalinist conformity won through.

Stalin, for instance, was hardly mentioned during the public sessions and thus the amusing spectacle was presented of Hamlet being played with the prince not appearing on the stage until the audience had all gone home.

The new line of the British CP leadership emerged clearly at the congress. A popular front consisting of "Labor, Communist, trade-union, Cooperative, professional, middle-class and progressively minded people, and even those sections which normally vote Tory, but are now facing the effects of Tory policy"—this was the goal set by the Stalinist general secretary Pollitt. The eback-room theoretician of British Stalinism, R. Palme Dutt, put it in a different way when he asked: "Is it not time to end the cold war in the British Labor movement?"

The opportunism of the Stalinists, and the way in which they prepared to double themselves over backwards in the hopes of gaining concessions from the right wing of the Labor movement, was amply demonstrated when the congress debated conscription.

The official CP line in Britain is to support conscription in principle but to call for a reduction in the length of service from two years to one year; but inside the Labor Party the left-wing demand is for complete abolition of conscription and this has gained some support inside the CP. Dealing with the subject at their congress the Stalinists had before them an amendment to the Executive Committee's report demanding an end to conscription on the grounds that it was part of aggressive war plans, unprogressive, undemocratic and an imperialist tool of murder, plunder and oppression in the colonies.

The Stalinist leaders' answer to this amendment was to plead for unity. They pointed out that the Labor Party, the Trades Union Congress and the Cooperative Movement all supported the idea of a twelve-month cut in conscription;

if the CP came out in favor of complete abolition, they argued, it might weaken the fight. The Executive spokesman asked that the CP's present line be supported because "the greatest unity could be built around that call which the Tory government could be made to concede."

The mover of the opposition amendment, a Scottish CP member from Glasgow, was forthright in his attitude and said that "we have a position which has created more confusion in our ranks than anything else" and which conflicted with the consciences of many CP members. The CP, he said, originally opposed conscription before the war because it was for a bourgeois, reactionary force. That was still the case.

### ANOTHER GHOST

When the count was taken at the end of the debate the Executive was supported by 205 votes to 105—which meant that about 200 delegates had not cast a vote on the issue and the leadership scraped in on a minority vote. Small wonder that the mover of the opposition amendment cried out "opportunism" to the leaders on the platform.

Throughout the congress the British Stalinists received frequent warnings from their leaders on the dangers of "Trotskyist" ideas and infiltration; indeed, the ghost of Leon Trotsky caused almost as much concern as that of Stalin.

First, when discussing the Labor Youth, the congress was criticized by a delegate for labeling all Labor youth as either "right-wing reactionaries" or "Trotskyists"—a criticism which was countered by the plea that the Stalinists should "protect" Labor youth from both the "extreme right and the extreme left."

## Rising Unemployment Figures Bring Tension to Auto Capital

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Apr. 7

A reminder that social and political tensions are increasing in this country, no matter what glowing viewpoints may be held by the supporters of American capitalism, came from three fronts here this past week.

In a startling counter-seasonal trend, unemployment in Detroit rose to 120,000 on April 1, a fact which the Michigan Employment Security Commission admitted was the opposite of their projections of March 1. The current rate of unemployment has been higher only once in recent years, and that was during the low point of the 1954 recession.

Nor is there any prospect of any pick-up here, since car inventories remain over 900,000; in fact, the April 1 figure is expected to be higher than the March 1 figure of 904,000. The next big change in auto employment will be downward, as the auto corporations go into model changeover late this summer.

Detroiters with their eyes fixed on Alabama were reminded in recent weeks that race prejudice exists here in potent quantity.

Mobs tried to prevent Negroes from moving into two homes; and in a third case, which obtained nation-wide publicity, a mob kept an Indian family from moving into the northwest section, believing them to be Negroes.

Meanwhile, this area was kept in a state of tension by the violence and consequences of the milk farmers' strike, which took on all the patterns of the turbulent days of 1937.

Dissatisfied with the conservative policies of the large Michigan Milk Producers Association, a group of dissidents organized into a Fair Share Association, and went to organized labor for advice and support. In addition, they hired Homer Martin, one-time UAW-AFL president, as adviser.

They demanded \$6 per hundred-weight for milk compared to a price ranging around \$4.48 or less. The CIO expressed sympathy and offered some advice, which was not taken. The dissidents took to dumping milk, halting trucks, putting up picket lines, and putting on a slambang campaign.

The efforts of the dissidents were sufficiently effective to force the Milk Producers Association to shift its tactics and also demand at least \$5 per hundred-weight, which the major dairies agreed to pay.

Editor of the *Daily Worker*, J. R. Campbell, wound up the congress with yet another plea for unity with the Labor Party, during which he warned Aneurin Bevan to steer clear of "the followers of Leon Trotsky" who are active in the Labor Party left wing.

The delegates to the congress had an opportunity to learn something of the shady Stalinist history of the past concerning Trotsky when, just prior to their withdrawal into secret session, they were handed literature jogging their minds about Trotsky's assassination. There are leaders of the British CP, said the leaflets, who refuse to acknowledge that they were aware of what Stalin was doing. "If your leaders had not blindly followed Stalin and endorsed his crimes as 'Socialist victories' the yellow press would have nothing to sneer about," said the leaflets.

Nothing happened at the CP congress to suggest that the Stalinist leadership in Britain is faced with a large-scale rebellion, but the general tenor of the congress and the discussion before it does point out the fact that there exists within the CP a vocal minority who are dissatisfied with the present leadership and the policy it is pursuing.

The congress also pointed to the fact that the Stalinist leadership in Britain is going all-out to woo the Labor movement on the basis of a "united front," and that every opportunistic trick in the Stalinist book will be used to achieve this objective.

The Labor left is at present enjoying the spectacle of the discomfort of the British CP. In recent weeks the *Bevanite Tribune* has kept plugging away at the CP in a fashion which must increase the discomfort of the Stalinists.

But the real test is whether the Labor left can steer clear of the Stalinist attempts at embrace and at the same time push a well-constructed line against the right wing which will serve as a counter to both Stalinism, whether it be "old" or "new," and Labor reformism.

Between that move—and the fence- straddling of the union movement under the theory that "we've got to respect our contracts"—milk trucks began to move, and non-striking farmers clashed with the strikers. Elsewhere a few skirmishes with cops took place. Finally, a series of sweeping injunctions against picketing, etc., broke the back of the strike. It was called off.

But the issues remain. Dairies did raise the maximum price they pay to farmers to \$5. Naturally, as they always have done, they passed the cost along to consumers, adding another half cent a quart. Detroiters are sore about it, and so are the farmers who are being made the scapegoat all the way around.

Interestingly, support from dairy farmers, from points as far east as New Jersey and west to Illinois, came to the strikers, a further indication of the growing character of the farm unrest prevalent in the country.

When the strike was called off, its leaders blasted the CIO for not respecting the picket lines. Gus Scholle, Michigan CIO president, wrote a long letter explaining that unions had to respect their contracts, and furthermore the strikers had failed to listen to CIO advice on how to conduct the struggle. The man in the middle, of course, is Governor G. Mennen Williams, whom the non-strikers blame for not acting firmer with the picket lines, and whom the strikers blame for using so many state troopers to escort the milk trucks to the dairies. It's a hot political issue in Michigan.

### STALINIST RUSSIA

A MARXIST ANALYSIS

By Tony Cliff

\$2.00

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

BRAZIL

# 'Practical Socialism' Gets Its Reward

By JUAN REY

Santiago, Apr. 4

In a series of reports during 1954-55 we described the stages in the crisis of the Brazilian Socialist Party which began with its opportunist policy in support of Janio Quadros. Another stage in this intensifying crisis has now been reached: the latest development is that Quadros has gone over to support of the new president Kubitschek, and there has broken out a violent internal conflict in the SP on whether or not to continue along the opportunist road by following in his footsteps.

A summary of what has gone before will be useful in seeing the whole picture.

The Brazilian Socialist Party came into being as a coalition of quite heterogeneous elements, including revolutionary socialists, ex-Stalinists, radical democrats, and liberals, with the hope of organizing a new workers' party which would avoid the errors of the Communist Party and replace it as an instrument of struggle by the working class and middle class. A small group to begin with, the SP won a bigger political role in the period when the power of the dictator Vargas was declining.

At the same time, a movement of radical democrats headed by Janio Quadros began its fight for power in the leading industrial state of Sao Paulo, arousing considerable hopes on the part of the masses. In the municipality of Sao Paulo, a coalition was effected between Janio's Christian-Democratic party and the SP, awakened a wide popular response, and resulted in the coalition's taking over first the city and then the state of Sao Paulo.

Janio Quadros became the state governor. He was presented to the people as the candidate of the SP, even though not a member of the SP, and he stated that he supported the "minimum program" (immediate demands) of the SP.

## LEFT WING DEFEATED

Before this alliance was consummated between the party and Janio, a fierce discussion had broken out in the party over this policy. The left wing declared itself opposed to the agreement with Janio and demanded that the party fight under its own independent banner and with its own party candidate. The supporters of the alliance argued that the party had a chance to grow and "make a political name" for itself, become a great "popular party" by supporting the rising radical politicians in the mayoralty and governorship.

The left wing was defeated in the party not only because these electoral illusions were very strong but also because the original revolutionary socialist group which had helped to constitute the party was now divided and without internal-cohesion, since some of its leaders were favoring support to Janio Quadros.

## The Case of Ignazio Silone ... Collapses

We are in receipt of a letter from Ignazio Silone informing us that he is abandoning any idea of a suit against LABOR ACTION (see our report on this affair March 26).

Silone writes that, on consulting a lawyer, he was informed that he had no basis for a case against us.

The only comment we need make is that it is a pity that Silone had to be told this by a bourgeois lawyer rather than by a socialist conscience; and we regret that a case which was so bad that a lawyer would not even bring it into court was enough for Silone to publish his threats in the Italian press.

However, we are also informed by our Italian independent socialist comrades that this ex-moralist has gone ahead with his disgraceful court-suit in Italy against Lucio Libertini and *Risorgimento Socialista*, the independent socialist weekly, which reprinted Libertini's article "The Case of Ignazio Silone."

There is no doubt whatsoever but that Silone will further discredit himself when (or if) he continues to go through with the suit in the court proceedings. We will report any developments on the Italian case whenever they occur.

In the state election which put Janio into the gubernatorial office, the SP got 100,000 votes and a relatively strong representation in the federal and state legislatures. But parliamentary victory was the beginning of a new internal crisis and of the political decadence of the SP as a socialist organization.

The strong pro-Janist right wing of the party now became so sure of itself that it ganged up on the Sao Paulo state leadership of the movement—the same leadership which had led the party into the alliance and to electoral victory—and ousted it from its position.

The same left-wingers who had supported the Janist coalition were now put out of office by the very opportunist forces they had built up; they were replaced in the leadership by a combination of ex-Stalinists and pro-Janist opportunists.

## JANIO SWITCHES

Thus the socialists were defeated inside the Socialist Party as a result of the "practical" policy which had led to the artificial growth of the party on the outside.

The secretary of the party State Committee of Sao Paulo, the founder and spirit of the party, was replaced by an insignificant gray figure. The electoral victory boiled down to winning the state secretaryship of public works, filled by Gaetano Alvarez, and the rectory of Sao Paulo University, occupied by Alipio Correa, both of them staunch Janinists.

These men indeed "made a political name" for themselves, but founders of the party like Dr. Gikovate, who had made the deal with Janio and gave him his political victory, found themselves out.

By the middle of last year, Janio's appeal even in Sao Paulo was already visibly petering out; his man was defeated for the mayoralty of the city, for example. But the bigger setback to the alliance came with the presidential election.

The SP supported the more liberal Tavora; Kubitschek was elected. Janio's influence was further weakened; the position of the socialist left was strengthened.

Now it is a public secret that Janio Quadros has gone over the head of the SP to make an agreement with the same Kubitschek who was denounced in the election as a menace to the country.

## STRUGGLE IN PARTY

And so the SP has been thrown into another political crisis. The careerist and opportunist majority want to go along in support of Janio; the left-wing minority cannot do this, for this is clearly betrayal of the socialist program and aims of the party.

The left wing published a statement which attacked the opportunism of the present State Committee and its desertion of the socialist objective; it was signed by Dr. Febus Gikovate, Cid Franco and Freitas Nobre. The State Committee replied by condemning them and suspending them from membership.

This drastic crackdown antagonized the party militants, and so the left-wing opposition has been gaining support. The fight will mount at the coming party meetings.

Unfortunately, this whole development has confirmed the fears we expressed about the party's opportunist policy. It has been shown, once again in this time of crisis of the revolutionary movement, that there is no practicality in an alliance between the revolutionary socialists and petty-bourgeois parties, and that it is better for the socialists to fight in their own way than to serve as a stepping-stone to further the career of bourgeois radicals.

But that mistaken policy is common among revolutionary elements in all of South America, and not only in Brazil.

ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

# 'Let My People Go ...'

By H. W. BENSON

Every now and then some first-class hypocrite or not-yet-certified idiot suggests that Negroes who don't like the South get out, and good riddance . . . or, if Northerners don't like the way Negroes are treated down here, why, just take them off our hands . . .

Thomas R. Waring, editor of the Charleston (S. C.) News, gave this advice when he spoke to the City Club Forum in Cleveland: "If you really want to help, I suggest you use the only method that will alleviate the problem—migration."

To make things clear, he suggests that Negroes, not whites, migrate. We ignore one aspect, namely the right of Negroes to live where they please, to take up another. Let us see how the conservative South reacts when the Negro really gets moving.

In the 1920s Negroes began to move off the plantations to take jobs in Northern factories. Here is how the Southern rulers acted, according to W. J. Cash in his book *The Mind of the South*.

" . . . the planters and labor-employing farmers set themselves ruthlessly to stem the tide by the traditional Southern methods of violence and coercion. The pattern of essential peonage which had generally persisted ever since the Civil War was reaffirmed and tightened; extra-legal patrols and sheriffs' posses engaged in a campaign of terrorization and forceful restraint; and the whip came back

into more general use than in a long while."

They were not going to release their source of labor and profits so easily.

During the last war, Negroes again got the chance to escape from Southern farms into the factories. Here is the plaintive lament of *The Ruston Leader*, of Louisiana, reprinted in the *New Republic* on July 5, 1943:

Because of the New Deal, complains the editor, his "black boy has left after ten years of good and faithful service. . . without warning, without providing any relief and in doing so he has put us in a terribly awkward situation. . . He has become the victim of our government's thoughtless program and has removed one more good laborer from the South where they are the muscle and backbone of our livelihood. Numbers of good Negro workmen have left the business and farms of this parish, possibly never to return, and the hardship which they are putting upon us who need them is going to ruin this section of the nation unless we find some way to remedy the situation. The bad part about this is that the very best of our Negroes are leaving. Those we have educated and trained to be useful not only to us but to be leaders among their own people are among the first to go chasing rainbows."

The only consolation we can offer is this: Southern Negroes are now doing their best to change things.

## DE GALINDEZ CASE:

# Picket FDR Jr. as Agent Of Trujillo Dictatorship

As insistent demands rise for a complete investigation into the mysterious disappearance in New York City of Jesus de Galindez, with agents of the Trujillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic as the leading suspects, it has been revealed that the Dominican dictatorship's legal representative in the U.S. is none other than Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr.

Galindez, a Spanish Republican exile and foe of Franco teaching at Columbia, had received threats to his life while working on a book exposing the Trujillo tyranny.

On Thursday evening, April 12, Dominican exile groups are sponsoring a picket line at a Democratic Party dinner where FDR Jr. is scheduled to preside, held at the Hotel Commodore.

The Roosevelt scion, who is still widely thought of as a liberal, actually came out in support of friendly relations with Franco some years ago. Recently he registered as a foreign agent for Trujillo's regime, representing its legal interests in this country.

His partner in the law firm is Charles P. Clark, a lobbyist for the Franco dictatorship, who gained notoriety in 1952 by assaulting columnist Drew Pearson. The retainer from Trujillo is \$60,000 a year for two years.

Sponsors of the picketline planned for Thursday, include two democratic Dominican groups, the Dominican Revolutionary Party and the Dominicans In Exile, and also the Spanish Republican exile group. They will carry a coffin symbolizing the victims of the Trujillo terror.

Also this week, a statement on the Galindez case was issued by five left-wing groups which had worked together with him in anti-Franco activity, including the ISL and Young Socialist League. Following is the statement.

## STATEMENT

On March 12, Jesus de Galindez disappeared in New York. Before this happened, he had made statements and written letters which showed that he knew his life was in danger because of his outspoken opposition to dictatorship in the Dominican Republic. This dictatorship was established, and is actively supported, by the United States.

We had the opportunity to work with Jesus de Galindez. A Basque Catholic-Nationalist and an exile from Franco's tyranny, he fought against dictatorship in many parts of the world. He joined

with us in protesting the execution and imprisonment of anarchists and socialists in Spain though he differed with us on many questions—his concern for freedom was not narrow and partisan. He was an active supporter of the Committee to Defend Franco's Labor Victims.

We wish to add our voices to those already raised in protest against his disappearance, to join with them in emphasizing that those responsible for this crime must be found and brought to justice. In this, we wish to express our solidarity with the group which has been formed and which has offered a reward in this case.

We have every hope that Galindez is still alive. As long as there is any chance that he is, no effort must be spared in searching for him. And if he has paid with his life for his convictions, then it is not only a question of our demanding that the criminals who perpetrated this outrage be apprehended; it seems also that we must rededicate ourselves to the principles of freedom, to that opposition to dictatorship in Spain, the Dominican Republic, Russia and anywhere else, which Galindez represented.

THE CATHOLIC WORKER  
INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE  
INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD  
LIBERTARIAN LEAGUE  
YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE



# LABOR ACTION

April 16, 1956

Vol. 20, No. 16

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

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL  
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## Leader of LYL 'Explains' Attack on Stalin

By EDWARD HILL

The New York Labor Youth League was given the line on the Twentieth Party Congress last week by Leon Wofsy, the national chairman of the LYL.

Wofsy approached his subject from a point of view previously associated with Isaac Deutscher—that Stalin was the result of a primitive-socialist accumulation in a backward society—but relied on his assertion that Russia was socialist to answer all objections.

During the question period, and immediately after the meeting, the LYL national chairman ducked a challenge to debate made by YSLers from the floor.

Several YSLers attended the meeting, taking the floor and challenging the LYL to a debate on the meaning of the Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist Party. In addition, the YSL distributed copies of *Challenge* and a special leaflet on Stalinism in front of the meeting hall.

The political center of the Wofsy line was the assertion that Russia is a socialist society. Following from this, criticism is permissible, discussion is to be welcomed, but any questions which raise the basic issue—the nature of the Russian state—are equated with John Foster Dulles and American imperialism. The revelations concerning Stalin are thus admitted to be serious, but any which related his errors and crimes to the social system which he led is to be dismissed as the politics of reaction.

Wofsy primarily relied upon the statistical evidence of Russian industrial growth to document his claim that it is a socialist state. He asserted, of course, that this development had taken place under the control of the working class, but not a single reference was made to the absence

of free working-class institutions in Russia.

When a YSLer challenged him from the floor, pointing out that Japan expanded its economy between World War I and II at a faster rate than Russia and under the aegis of a reactionary ruling class, he fell back on what he called the achievements of Russia in the field of education and culture and sports.

### OUT OF THIN AIR

Needless to say, Wofsy did not go into the fact that, according to the Twentieth Party Congress, education for the past two decades in Russia has been mis-education, i.e., determined by the whims of Stalin, based upon the now-discredited *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* and the later *Economic Problems of Socialism*. Nor did he deal with the recent statement of Russia's leading painter (Stalin's favorite portraitist) about the anti-artistic nature of cultural development for two decades.

Russian success in the winter Olympics at Cortina was naturally referred to as a consequence of "socialism" (comparison to the Nazi sport program oriented toward the 1936 Olympics was, of course, absent).

Having established his political base by this definition of Russia as socialist, Wofsy then went on to explain the de-

velopment of Stalin. Lenin, he told the audience, had foreseen that the transitional socialist state would have two characteristics: it would be both democratic and tremendously powerful. As a result of the backwardness of the economy, of capitalist encirclement, the threat of Nazi and American imperialism, the second part of this equation was over-emphasized—the state apparatus became overly strong and, in certain instances, anti-democratic. Enter Stalin. He was the expression of this development.

When Wofsy was asked if he, a self-confessed Marxist, was proposing the idea that an individual, Stalin, had materialized out of the thin air, with no relation to the social system which he led or the party which he created, he fell back on his primary argument: Stalin did create socialism.

### QUESTION OF A SYSTEM

In his talk, there was no realization of the fact that Stalin was indeed the architect of a social system, and that it is his party, his co-workers, his co-criminals, who now announce, top-down, to a cheering and unanimous congress, that Stalin made serious errors, even suicidal ones (as in the case of the Hitler Stalin pact).

Thus, the material conditions to which Wofsy referred—the backward nature of the society, encirclement, war, etc.—are conceived of as primarily affecting a single individual and of having no serious consequence in the social system itself.

The fact that the current "re-evaluation" is proceeding in a typically Stalinist, i.e., bureaucratic, dictatorial fashion, was simply slurred over. And time and time again, every objection was met with the simple assertion: but Russia is socialist.

The YSLers present were, of course, unable to counterpose a basic political analysis of Stalinism because of the limitation of time. The basic answer to Wofsy's line would have had to go into the complete absence of any working-class or democratic control in Russia, into the privileges of the bureaucracy (which have now been made more secure, i.e. free from secret police and arbitrary, Stalin-type interference, by the new line), into the destruction of all political opposition and so on.

It was because of the importance and complexities of the question that the YSLers present made an open and public challenge to Wofsy and the LYL to air them in public debate.

### FERMENT

At first, Wofsy tried to dodge the question, referring to sectarians who sat on the sidelines of history (this being his reference to the only nationwide socialist youth organization in America). In an exchange with a YSLer immediately after the debate, he based his refusal on two points: that he didn't want to provide an audience for the YSL; and that he knew from liberal (SDA) sources what a vicious organization the YSL was. He even went so far as to say that the LYL would prefer to debate various questions with pro-American-camp organizations than with the YSL.

Emerging from this meeting were several important points.

First, there is clearly a ferment in the LYL. These young people have been giving their political adherence to Stalin for years, and the "re-evaluation" has understandably affected them. Therefore, a certain amount of internal, and even public, discussion has become inevitable at this time.

The meeting itself was open, i.e., opposition points of view were stated from the floor, and even various YSLers voiced their doubts out loud (on the confessions of Rajk; on the top-down, bureaucratic nature of the new "discussion"). But it is clear that there is a fundamental limitation to debate: it must take place within the assumption that Russia represents a socialist society.

Secondly, it is also obvious that there are many sincere radical youth who have been attracted to the LYL out of opposition to the witchhunt in American society. Some of these people have been shaken by the cracks in the monolithic ideology of pro-Stalinism. They now hear voices, even from their own ranks, questioning the all-wisdom of various decisions which have taken place in Russia.

### WHY DODGE?

But if this discontent is to be politically meaningful, if it is to be a gain for democracy and socialism, it must issue into a realization that the man and the social system were consequences of each other; that Stalin was not a personal accident of socialism, but a result of a bureaucratic, anti-democratic society, the very antithesis of socialism.

It is because of the tremendous importance of this point that the YSL is continuing its efforts to meet the LYL in a democratic discussion. To those who remain sincere (if, from our point of view, misguided) adherents of the LYL, we say this: What is there to fear from such a discussion? Why did Wofsy dodge a debate with socialists and state his preference for talking with liberals who supported the witchhunt?

To these youth we say: Push your questions in the LYL; push for outside debate with other socialists; think over the implications of the Stalin revelations, not simply in terms of an individual, but as indicative of a nature of a society which could produce such an individual.

### BOOKS

Do they tend to incriminate you?

THEN DONATE THEM TO THE NEW YORK YSL'S

BOOK BAZAAR!

Bring books, pamphlets, records, prints, originals, etc. to our hall at 114 W. 14 Street now!

The book bazaar will be held May 11 — at 8:30 p.m.

### Get The Challenge

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

### THE AIM OF THE YSL

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

## Young Socialists Challenge LYL to Debate Issues

The following letter was sent to the Labor Youth League by the Young Socialist League, on April 9.

Sirs:

The repudiation of Stalin and the Stalin cult at the Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist Party has aroused a wave of interest throughout the world. As is revealed by the discussion taking place in the pages of the *Daily Worker*, it has also raised questions and stirred doubts in the minds of many members and sympathizers of the Communist Party in the United States. The same undoubtedly obtains for the members and sympathizers of the Labor Youth League.

This development at the Twentieth

Congress of the Russian Communist Party confirms to the hilt, in our opinion, all that the revolutionary socialist opponents of Stalinism said about Stalin for over thirty years.

But it confirms more than that, in our opinion. We believe that it confirms our view that not a trace of socialism can be found in Russian society; that the social and political power held by the working class as a result of the October Revolution was long ago wrested from its hands by those who ruled Russia under Stalin and who rule it today under Khrushchev.

With this analysis your members and sympathizers will not agree. Hence we propose a debate between a representative of your organization and a representative of the Young Socialist League on "The Meaning of the Twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist Party." The details of the debate can be jointly arranged by the two organizations.

At a meeting of your Manhattan section on April 6, Leon Wofsy, national chairman of the LYL, stated that it was interested in debating such questions with socialists. The Young Socialist League is the only nation-wide socialist youth organization in the United States. We therefore do not see how you can object to debating this question before an audience consisting of the members and sympathizers of the Young Socialist League, the members and sympathizers of the Labor Youth League, and generally interested students and young workers. We for our part would welcome a confrontation of the views of the LYL and the views of the revolutionary young socialists of the YSL.

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE  
MAX MARTIN  
National Secretary

### YSL FORUM • NEW YORK

#### REPORT ON MONTGOMERY RESISTANCE TO JIM CROW

Speaker:

Bayard Rustin

of the War Resisters League just returned from Alabama

FRIDAY, Apr. 20 — 8:30 p.m.  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

# Anti-Semitism and Arab Propaganda—II

## Anatomy of a Smear

By HAL DRAPER

In the first part of this article, last week, we discussed the anti-Jewish (as distinct from anti-Zionist or anti-Israel) strain in Arab propaganda. Presumably this is the purpose of the book which the Anti-Defamation League has just published—*Cross-Currents*, by Forster and Epstein, whose third section we are considering.

But the actual butt of this book, with regard to this matter, is far from just being allegedly anti-Semitic Arabs. One of its main victims is the organization known as the American Friends of the Middle East. At various points, stabs are made in the direction of any anti-Zionism. Under the head of what purports to be merely an expose of anti-Semites, there is adroitly woven in a thorough whitewash of Israeli policy on the Arab refugees and other matters; such a whitewash is the authors' democratic right, of course, but we are speaking of the way it is done; by smearing together, as if inextricably linked, criticisms of Israel policy with anti-Semitic rubbish.

The book, in other words, is a noteworthy example of a tendency on the part of Zionist circles, and their friends, to use and abuse the cry of anti-Semitism as a means of intimidating or discrediting any critics of Zionist or Israeli policy. This is what the present article is concerned with.

### CHARGES

But first on the Arab angle:

The Forster-Epstein book presents a certain amount of evidence purporting to link up Arab officials here with notorious American anti-Semites like Gerald L. K. Smith, James Madole, Allen Zoll, Merwin K. Hart, Robert Williams, etc. The latter's names pepper the whole section.

Briefly, the evidence adduced in the book, stripped down to its essential content, would indicate that: these American anti-Semites use Arab charges against Israel as part of their anti-Semitic propaganda; they have pressed Arab officials to accept their help in "fighting Zionism"; Arab officials have had lunch with them and discussed with them what they can do; some of them have toured the Arab countries and have been received in friendly style; certain Arab officials have given them money for publishing articles supporting Arab charges; Arab officials have helped circulate pamphlets on the same subject published by such anti-Semites.

In most cases of a serious charge, the proof rests on the assertion that so-and-so did or said such-and-such in private conversations or at meetings such as could be reported only by undercover agents. The weight of most of the evidence would depend on one's evaluation of the reliability and nature of the ADL's undercover agents and sources.

### LOOSE METHODS

There are almost no distinctions made among Arabs: an Arab is an Arab. An Arab may be quoted without necessarily bothering to mention whether he has any connection with the Arab Information Center here or not; whether he has any connection with others cited; whether he has any connection with any Arab government. Each is quoted as if he were an official representative of the Arab world. At any rate, this is the effect achieved by the method of presentation used in the book, which consists of inter-bureau "memos" of ADL offices, juxtaposed one after the other, with no necessary relationship or explanation.

Anti-Jewish or even pro-Nazi tirades from Arab newspapers in various countries are quoted with no indication whether these quoted newspapers are responsible spokesmen for any significant Arab viewpoint, or which viewpoint, or what they are. This looks like the other side of the coin of the Arab office's habit of quoting Israeli papers as if they were all identical, even when one of them is *Kol Ha'am*, the Israeli CP organ.

This will have to do for the "Arab" part of this book's target; for we repeat it is not this aspect that we are most interested in at this point.

Students in the art of propaganda-

slanting would do well to study the methods of Forster and Epstein.

The main method is to interweave, juxtapose, and sandwich-together the activities and ideas of known anti-Semites with all other activities and ideas which the authors are interested in discrediting. We have already mentioned that the literary method—a series of compiled office "memos"—allows for complete free-wheeling in the interweaving process; there is no necessary continuity between successive memos, and often there isn't any relation.

Thus at one moment the reader will be reading some hair-raising statement quoted from (say) Allan Zoll in vilification of Jews; in the next paragraph he will be reminded of the Arab demand that Israel take back refugees; somewhere along, there will be thrown in some link between an anti-Semite and the Arabs—say, a note that so-and-so came to lunch. If we look at the "filling" of the "sandwiching" process, it turns out in many cases to be a number of criticisms of Israeli policy which are common among all kinds of critics of Israel, including Jewish critics, and which have nothing whatsoever to do with anti-Semitism.

### THE TIE-IN

This, as a matter of fact, is systematically done in the introduction to the whole section. This introduction is not put together in the form of "memos." It is written out as a setting of the stage for the "memos."

Here, in brief, as their introduction to a study of anti-Semitism, Forster-Epstein go through Arab charges against Israel. Then the connection is made: "whatever the themes of Arab propaganda may be, one of its goals in this country is precisely similar to that of every dyed-in-the-wool American anti-Semite. . . . This calculation [by the Arabs] determines the goal of their propaganda here, and that goal is also the over-all aim of the professional American anti-Semite, whatever his motivations: it is the utter destruction of Jewish prestige in America."

This—and it is the heart of the book's discussion—seems quite similar to the well-known Stalinist proof that Trotskyists are fascists: for do they not share the fascist's goal of discrediting the Socialist Fatherland?

Here is another important Forster-Epstein connection: "When Arab sources inspire a propaganda argument in their continuing anti-Jewish campaign, its theme immediately becomes a regular part of our native bigots' stock in trade."

Now Forster-Epstein are not here referring to, themes like the "Elders of Zion" fable. Not at all. They immediately list two. Both are charges not against "the Jews" but against (a) Israel, and (b) Zionists. Both are criticisms that have been made plentifully by responsible, liberal, Jewish and pro-Jewish critics of Israel and Zionism. Much can be said about them. But this book is interested only in weaving them in as Arab and anti-Semitic "lies."

This procedure is the typical sort of thing about which we are concerned. It colors the character of the whole book.

### REVELATION

In a subsequent disclaimer of this very method, the authors protest that it would be "inaccurate to equate Arab representatives with native hate-mongers." This sounds very fair. They are not interested in "equating." They are intent upon the effective "amalgam," the tie-in, in a context where charges against Zionist and Israeli policy are indignantly mentioned and indignantly rejected as tainted with the anti-Semitic amalgam.

In this context the authors permit themselves to write that those Palestin-

ian Arabs who did not flee during the war "have retained their property" and "enjoy equal rights" with no qualifications. This assertion has little resemblance to the far more complicated and much less pleasant truth.

With regard to the method of equating anti-Semitism with anti-Zionism, there is an especially simple example on page 361; a memo ("Middle Eastern Correspondent to Research") quotes the Cairo radio—"verbatim," it emphasizes, so as to imply that here is something damning. The entire quote is as follows: "The information office which was opened several days ago by the Arab countries in New York is the first step. . . . There is no doubt that Zionist propaganda and influence in the United States is strong. The new Arab bureau in New York should expose all Zionist plots and propaganda to the American people. We must not squander any more time in agreeing on a policy for that bureau."

That's absolutely all. No comment, as often. Presumably some revelation has been communicated. It is the memo before and after which have something to do with anti-Semitism. There is no connection at all among them, except that they are printed one after the other. And the only reason we chose this particular example to quote is that it is short.

### EQUATION

As a mirror-image of the method used by the anti-Semites themselves, the authors play fast and loose with the equation: Zionists = Jews. Compare the following two passages, for example.

On page 328, a "memo" says Rahim of the Arab office has told friends that "Most Americans do not distinguish between Zionists and Jews," and this fact has to be carefully exploited.—On page 369 a "memo" quotes from a "directive" to students put out by the Arab office itself. It is a remarkable memo. There was obviously absolutely nothing in this "directive" that has the remotest appearance of anti-Semitism. Yet a page and a half is spent on it. Among other things, the following sinister note is found:

"This little gem of propaganda by omission [says the memo, apparently cognizant of the fact that there is nothing really quotable] is all the more significant in that the students are also directed: ' . . . the most important point is to stress the difference between Jews and Zionists.' . . ."

That's all on this! The first was an undercover report on what Rahim was supposed to have told friends. It is, if anything, refuted by the "directive" which the same Rahim's office puts out semi-publicly. Both are equally evidence of some sinister intention.

### DOUBLETHINK

Now, of course, as everyone knows, it is a basic tenet of Zionist education and ideology precisely to identify Zionism and Jewry. Zionists always speak in the name of "the Jews." If anti-Semites, for their own purposes, systematically refuse to distinguish between Zionists and Jews, it is equally true that Zionists, for quite contrary purposes, systematically do likewise. There is scarcely a paper or publication in the land which does not headline actions by the government of Israel as having been taken by the "Jews."

In fact, the only people who systematically insist on distinguishing between Zionists and "The Jews" are anti-Zionists.

Yet, in a system of doublethink which has few parallels outside the Stalinist world, Zionists frequently denounce criticisms of Zionism as being "anti-Semitic" as such.

Take, for another example, the smear campaign against the organization called American Friends of the Middle East, headed by Dorothy Thompson, Garland Evans Hopkins, and including many outstanding and prominent American figures. References to and attacks on it and on Hopkins take up pages and pages in *Cross-Currents*. There is not the slightest evidence of anti-Semitism on the part of this organization that is adduced in the book, even by undercover "memos."

Yet I am willing to bet a week's salary that many a reader of the book will come away with the conviction that the AFME has been implicated in anti-Semitism. "Implicated" is indeed the word: it has been done solely by the Forster-Epstein interweaving method of innuendo.

The case of the AFME is typical of a broader field.

As this writer interprets the politics of the AFME people, they represent that school of thought in American policy-thinking which believes that U. S. imperialist interests lie in cultivating the goodwill of the Arab states rather than Israel. This view represents the opposite of the often-heard Zionist and pro-Israel argument that American imperialist interests lie in an alliance with the "democratic bastion in the Middle East," Israel.

In this sense the AFME and its similars are "pro-Arab," i.e., within the framework of American imperialism.

The Zionists and their spokesmen are reluctant to make this type of analysis. The very last thing they want to say about this school of American "patriotic" thought is that it is motivated by such considerations. They often like to claim a monopoly on "respectable" motives for themselves.

Hence the constant, unremitting campaign of these propagandists to paint their opponents as tainted, not simply with an objectionable view of American imperialism's best interests, but with something dirty and discreditable: anti-Semitism.

This is what is behind the large role played by the AFME in the pages of *Cross-Currents*.

### SOME IMPERIALISTS

Only a few weeks ago, in the pages of the *N. Y. Post*, the long-time-Zionist Max Lerner published one of the most disreputable smears printed anywhere about Garland Hopkins and anti-Semitism. When Hopkins made a defensive reply, Lerner came back with a rejoinder which in virtually so many words argued flatly that anyone who criticizes Zionism is going in for anti-Semitism, for don't we know that anti-Semites slyly use "Zionism" as a cover-word for the Jews . . . ?

It is usually done more subtly than in Lerner's disgraceful way.

It is under this head also that one must understand the wide-spread insinuations and charges that old reactionary, ex-Secretary James Forrestal, was an anti-Semite, as "revealed" in his published *Diaries*. Forrestal was "merely" a prime example of a thorough American imperialist hard-headedly trying to choose allies for the "American Century."

The same thing goes for the late Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin under the last British Labor government, and his "reputation" for anti-Semitism. Bevin's policy in the twilight of the Palestine Mandate was (again, in this writer's opinion) one of the most vicious and malevolent in the evil history of British colonialism, but there is not a shred of evidence that it had anything to do with anti-Semitism, whereas it clearly flowed from the line taken by British imperialism in the period.

One of the most prominent contemporary victims of the anti-Semitic smear has been Professor Arnold Toynbee, since the appearance of the eighth volume of his *Study of History*. Toynbee very forcibly takes the side of Arab rights as against Zionism. It is perhaps needless to say that I do not agree with much that he writes on this subject as or anything else; but that has nothing to do with the loud charges of anti-Semitism that have been made against him for his stand.

### TIME TO WARN

The anti-Semitic smear has been increasingly used by pro-Zionist propagandists and apologists as a substitute for political argumentation and as a means of evading an accounting of their own positions.

*Cross-Currents* does this, on a book-size scale now.

It works. It intimidates, it discredits. It takes a fair amount of courage even to stick your neck out in front of the charge, which you know will not be slow in coming, with powerful amplification behind it. The subject is a tender one. The field is sensitive. Why bother?

However, it not only "works," but is being overworked. It is bound sooner or later to discredit itself, but this means also discrediting the cry of anti-Semitism. Even while it "works," it does not help the cause of a real fight against anti-Semitism.

It is not the interests of the Jews as a group that are promoted by this Zionist method. It is time that more democratic voices were raised to warn against it.

## STALINISM WITHOUT STALIN — Part IV

# The Social Crisis in Russia: A Door Opens

By HAL DRAPER

The last question raised (in Part III last week), was the nature of the societal crisis in the Russian system, whose pressure lies behind the concessions of Khrushchev & Co.

We invited attention not merely to speculations about the power-struggles among the few top bureaucrats in the Kremlin, but to the internal social relations of the bureaucracy as a class—that is, of the ruling class as a class—of which the Kremlin leaders represent only the apex.

For this purpose we want to go back to the analysis which we made on this point after the death of Stalin, then see how it looks now, and then contrast it with the effort at a similar social analysis by the theoreticians of British Bevanism, which recently appeared in the *London Tribune*.

The "relaxation" and soft line which followed hard on the death of Stalin created much of the same atmosphere that was recently generated by the news of Khrushchev's attack on Stalin. As so many have put it, the latter was a second burial; and there was a similar outbreak of galloping illusions about the "end of Stalinism."

As now, we had to patiently explain that the alternative to the illusions is not the stand-pat view that "nothing has changed." It is a social system that has to be understood, and this guards against both views: on the one hand, upheavals, turns and important changes are to be expected in a social system, especially this crisis-racked system of Stalinism; and on the other, a social system does not come to an end because a leader dies or because a totalitarian myth is debunked and junked.

"What Are the Social Roots of the 'Relaxation' Crisis in the Kremlin?" was the question we asked in a long article in our July 6, 1953 issue, and since we think the general train of thought of the answer we suggested is still relevant now, we're willing to refer readers to it again.

### BETWEEN TWO PULLS

In a few lines, it went like this—beginning with the first half which attempted a sketch of the basic social-economic contradictions of bureaucratic-collectivism as a system, namely, the contradiction between the totalitarian political structure, which enforces conformity from the top down, and the need for a flexibly planned economy, which requires initiative and responsibility from the bottom up.

Precisely because this type of exploitive society is not capitalist—that is, its cement is no longer the "blind" laws of the market—it can be held together only by conscious planning, which replaces the market as the regulator of the economy. It must be planned, or it must be chaos.

But no modern complex industrial society can successfully be planned merely from the top down, i. e., without being self-correcting through the "feedback" of democratic give-and-take between the upper and lower echelons on every level. Planning is possible in a socialist democracy; real planning is impossible in a Stalinist totalitarianism. But it is still essential: quintessential, but impossible.

In practice the economy reels between its two pulls: the tops must clamp down on the ranks below in order to keep them in line, in order to bull the plan through; the tops must loosen up on the ranks below in order to give leeway to correcting impulses and initiative when the bureaucratic heavy hand whips the system into an impasse.

In the 1953 article, we tried to trace this through the discussions before Stalin's death at the 19th party congress, and then in the developments that followed Stalin's death, in order to show what it was that had been released by the one-man dictator's disappearance from the scene. The "disarray," weakness and confusion that followed left the Kremlin incapable of resisting, as strongly as before, the incessant pressure from below, from the ranks of the bureaucracy, for a relaxation in the forced pace, relaxation from the murderous supervision and control from above, for men who had never been given much chance to enjoy the perquisites of a ruling class but who in many ways are harder-driven than the workers at the machines. And such a relaxation also implies an international relaxation.

### TRANSMISSION BELT

And so on along those lines. But this sort of analysis of the ruling-class internal dynamism is not separate and apart from an analysis of the pressures on the ruling class as a whole from the workers.

"We have been concentrating on the intra-class relationships between the lower bureaucracy and the tops of the party hierarchy. But precisely because the former is 'lower,' it is in the middle between the party hierarchy and the masses. It is they who have to drive the workers as they themselves are driven; but the whip is no automatic solution....

"In spite of the whip, a 'cold' class struggle goes on, in the elementary form of absenteeism, malingering, indifference to the job ('sabotage'), indifference to quality, low productivity, etc. The factory manager is bedeviled by the fact that the workers have the least of inducements to give their all for him. It is known that these lower bureaucrats even go so far as to offer bribes and inducements to snatch labor from other plants when hard-pressed. In a different sense from the working masses, the factory manager also wishes that it were possible to offer them greater inducements to produce

at their peak—more consumption goods, more crumbs from the table, more concessions.

"In this way, side by side with their function as the tyrannical whips and oppressors of the regime, and not at all in contradiction with it, the inevitable tendency must also arise, out of their own immediate interests, for the lower bureaucrats to act as transmitting belts for the needs of the people....

"The pressure from below is transmitted through these lower sections of the bureaucratic class...."

The social basis is thus created for factional tendencies on top, leaning in the direction of different emphases and solutions; and it is another question (the province of the novelists, cryptographers, etc.) as to what personal names are attached to these leanings.

### CALCULATED RISK

Thus, the 20th Congress (using the "meter" described in Part II) indicated a desperate need to allay this pressure of discontent from below, not only from the great masses—as indicated at Vorkuta—but also from the bureaucratic ranks, pressures such as had been eased when Malenkov promised his turn to consumers' industry, and which were again bottled up by Khrushchev's "hard" line to reinstate the primacy of heavy industry and unremitting sacrifice.

The 20th Congress, as far as anything has indicated, made no concessions whatever on this heavy-industrial orientation. So much the more necessary to find other sops to quiet the dogs of discord.

The main function performed by the sacrifice of the name of Stalin is reassurance to the strata below in their main demands which flow from the social forces described: the demand that the murderous pressure from the top down be eased; that the lower echelons have more of a say in determining their enjoyment of their exalted class status; which means, if they are to continue to do this, that they must share more of the power, and therefore that the concentration of all power in the hands of one personal embodiment of the system must be prevented.

It is not ideas about democracy which push forward this social demand; it is this social demand which turns out to be a demand for greater participation by the bureaucratic ranks in the councils of the ruling class itself, i. e., which turns out to raise a kind of democratic aspiration. It is therefore subversive and revolutionary, in its own way, just as the "cold" (or warmer) class struggle of the masses is revolutionary. Though conceived in the spirit of utter Stalinist loyalty, it bears the seeds of disintegration for the system. It opens the door for destructive forces to pour in.

Of course, this describes potentialities. It describes calculated risks taken when the tops enter upon such a course. The dethronement of Stalin is a promise, to be sure; it gives nothing yet; far cheaper for example, than wage concessions, or a revision of the economy to provide more consumers' goods, etc. But it did open doors, with a violent suddenness, that had to be slammed shut.

### THE FIRST DEMONSTRATIONS

This is the basic significance of the Georgian demonstrations, no matter what turns out to be the specific force that organized it.

If, as reported in Moscow, it was indeed a "pro-Stalin" demonstration, nobody is under any obligation to believe that the pictures of Stalin which were reportedly held aloft among its banners were anything different from the ikons held up as protecting images by the masses who marched behind Father Gapon to the palace of the Tsar in 1905. (I am not here predicting another 1905 revolution.)

Or—as could be argued on excellent evidence and with a convincing background—was it an outburst of nationalist (anti-Great-Russian) hostility on the part of the Georgians, connected psychologically if not logically with the fact that Stalin was a Georgian?—In any case, a door was opened.

Or—as is at least a possibility—was the reported key role of university student elements (sons of the bureaucratic strata) an indication that these demonstrations were triggered off from above, that is, from elements within the Georgian bureaucracy as part of a struggle of factions within it? For it must be kept in mind that one of the great dangers, to the bureaucracy, of not being able to resolve their internal disputes with ease by the decision of one all-powerful arbiter, is the temptation always beckoning one side or the other to appeal down below for support—i. e. call in some section of the broader masses, if only the broader masses of the bureaucracy itself to begin with.

Along this road lies suicide for the regime. In the last analysis this is why the push back to one-man rule is bound to reassert itself.

### THE SUBMARINE

In any case, a door was opened, if only a crack. A totalitarian system is a social organism completely immersed in class hatreds, as a submarine is immersed in water. A hatch on a submerged submarine cannot remain at rest "slightly open" for any length of time at all. The waters rush to pour in and throw it aside, wide. The crew who run it will struggle to slam it shut as fast as possible. If they cannot do so at once, they will resist the onrush of the waters until they can, thus keeping it "slightly open" in dynamic tension. Meanwhile they will man the pumps.

The social mechanisms of a complex system are not as mechanical as the model taken above, and so the analogy is grossly oversimplified. All the better to convey, not a one-to-one correspondence of model and

reality, but the main lines of the basic picture.

The 20th party congress opened a door. The deflation of Stalin was the most spectacular item. For the ranks of the bureaucracy as well as the masses, there were other promises.

There was a promise of a revision of the legal code, with the implied pledge of instituting a more relaxed reign of stable and predictable "law and order" instead of the draconic ever-present arbitrary threat of the uncheckable whip from above. For the bureaucratic ranks, there was a strong confirmation of the principle of one-man management of enterprises—implying that the drive which was in fact the main feature of the 19th party congress was called off; the drive to use local party organisms as coordinate (and interfering) supervisory whips over the enterprise managements.

For the masses there was a promise of a shortened work-week, and some specific concessions in upgrading low-wage levels, extending maternity leave for women, etc.

Concessions in given social situations can have a dual impact: they can simultaneously quiet discontent—and embolden demands. Democracy and idol-smashing are heady—subversive in principle.

### 'PRAVDA' SETS THE LIMIT

So only a few days ago Pravda ordered the hatch dogged-to. So soon, so soon! The most important thing is not that this came. It had to come. The important thing is that it came so fast.

In an April 5 editorial Pravda denounced the "rotten elements" in the party who were taking advantage of the anti-Stalin campaign to "question the correctness of the party's policy." It thundered against "anti-party statements." It warned:

"The party cannot permit freedom to discuss problems to be taken as freedom to propagandize views alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism because this would contradict the party's rules and its principles."

These "rotten elements," said the voice of the Kremlin, "try to make use of criticism and self-criticism for all kinds of slanderous fabrications and anti-party assertions."

It made it absolutely clear that these warnings were not based on abstract fears. According to the AP dispatch from Moscow, Pravda named "certain persons at local anti-Stalin meetings" who had gone beyond the circumscribed limits of the turn.

"The paper [said this dispatch] cited an example of a meeting of party workers at an unidentified scientific laboratory where four members of the party had made 'slanderous' speeches 'directed against the party's policy and its Leninist foundations.'"

The other party members at this meeting did not object to this "rottenness." At another meeting of "party members in the Moscow regional statistical bureau" there were "provocative anti-party statements." In this same editorial, it is once more made clear that Trotsky will not be rehabilitated....

"Halt!" says Pravda; thus far and no further. And this not even within sight of the outer limits of the Stalinist system, in spite of the excited chirpings in the West about the "end of Stalinism."

Whether the unleashed forces can be reined in at the same point in all other places is to be seen. In the satellites, it is clear that in Poland the Stalinist elements are straining to push it further, while in Czechoslovakia they are dragging their feet. In Italy the CP soft-pedals the impact of the turn, while in the U.S. CP spokesmen like John Gates seem to be glad that the new line gives them a chance to change over to more popular public positions and unleash some democratic demagoguery.

### 'THINK FOR YOURSELF'

But at the radiating point of the anti-Stalin turn, in Russia itself, it is clear that the limits of the turn have been reached for the nonce, at least pending new explosions and new "disarray and panic."

It is therefore diverting in a sad sort of way to read now the earnest front-page lead article in the February 24 issue of the Bevanite organ, the *Tribune* of London. The banner is "Speeches That Shook the World." It is a paean of excited hails to the 20th congress. Here is what the editors saw in Khrushchev's speech, the italics being in the original:

"The Khrushchev message took six hours to deliver, but its essence can be summed up in three words: *Think for yourself!* Two hundred million people, long imprisoned by dogma and mesmerized by the frown of a dictator, are encouraged to start working out for themselves the answers to the manifold problem of an expanding economy."

Of course it does not take the Pravda editorial of April 5 to disabuse one of this glassy-eyed enthusiasm. The delegates whom Khrushchev spent six hours exhorting to *Think for yourself* all voted like obedient cattle for the new revelations just sprung on them.

But if the Bevanite editors had to write this unfortunate paragraph, it was because it was an introduction to the exposition of their theory; for they have a theory. Their theory told them what really must have happened at the congress; so it did happen; and so they wrote it down, that's all, in italics and all.

The theory itself—which is very similar to Deutscher's—is well worth examination, if only because it too tries to turn its eyes to the social needs of the bureaucracy, and because it is formulated in *Tribune* with an overconfidence which makes its bare bones evident.

Next week—Part V:  
The Bevanite Theory, and the  
Titoist Experience

# 'Anti-Americanism' —

(Continued from page 1)

The reaction from Bonn to Mollet's article was immediate. Adenauer's foreign office issued a direct statement attacking it.

"If now the French Chief of Government declares the policy followed by the three governments at Geneva was wrong and thinks disarmament should precede the solution of the reunification and security questions, then he seems to indicate a certain readiness to accept the agenda demanded by the Soviets.

"The Federal Government will leave no doubt that it does not share that opinion. No German Government will be ready to discuss seriously proposals that are to bring about an easing of tensions on the basis of even a temporary recognition or silent acceptance of the division of Germany."

The German pro-socialist Frankfurt *Rundschau* commented:

"What the opponents of Adenauer's foreign policy have feared for a long time has become an acute danger today—namely, that at the end of the chancellor's play for power, which looked on reunification merely as a side issue, there would result an agreement among the big powers over the head of Germany, leaving it without power, without unity."

## 'PREACHER' SAM

In Britain, the reaction was widely divided. The pro-Tory *Daily Mail*, in a typical imperialist outburst:

"M. Mollet, the French premier, was right when he said the Western Allies, especially the U.S., 'wander in isolation, often in competition with each other.'"

"The Americans, he said, had poured out fantastic sums in aid to other countries. Yet they were disliked because their help was always accompanied by advice. 'Every one of them is more or less a preacher.'"

"That is true. In sermons against 'colonialism' they have helped to preach faithful allies out of invaluable bases. But they have not preached themselves out of Okinawa, Formosa or Puerto Rico...."

"And all the time the Reds are influ-

encing nations by superb propaganda which a disunited West cannot hope to match. It is not good enough. If the Americans will not act with us, we must go it alone.

"We should find that the U.S. would support us because she would have to. For, if the integrity of the Middle East is a prime British interest, the strength of Britain is a prime American interest."

(We cannot forego comment on the way in which the British imperialist editorial writer has unwittingly compared the status of the Middle East vs. Britain with the status of Britain vs. the United States.)

## A PRETTY PASS

And finally, the conservative (pro-NATO) *Corriere della Sera* of Italy really rips off the lid of the cauldron of inter-imperialist rivalries:

"Speaking frankly: What does the French government want? France has 100 reasons to complain about her allies—both old and new. *The Economist* (London weekly) published this list of reasons: The offers that may have been made to Morocco in case it wanted to leave the franc area; the troubles given to France by American businessmen in Morocco; the fact that England doesn't do anything to prevent the arms traffic through Libya; the anti-French broadcasts in Arabic of the Cyprus radio."

"On the part of the Allied governments, however, these examples do not warrant disloyalty, and, if the French government had intimated through diplomatic channels: 'Either you quit this behavior or we denounce the alliance,' she would have been perfectly right.

"But the fact that France's foreign minister and prime minister speak in public as they have... arouses the suspicion that the French government wants to buy itself the sympathy of the East at the expense of the alliance. The sympathies of Moscow she already has won; the proof is the warm approval of Khrushchev for Mollet's interview. But it is doubtful that Khrushchev's

sympathy can give France peace in Algeria."

Things have reached a fine pass in this alliance, have they not, when the responsible spokesmen of the ruling party in one country throw the charge at the leaders of the government of another that what they are really trying to do is to curry favor with Moscow at the expense of Washington?

## TENSIONS

The list of grievances could be extended indefinitely.

The British complain that the Americans helped talk them out of their base in Suez.

All of America's allies complain that American high tariffs make it impossible for them to break loose from the humiliating necessity of accepting American handouts.

Guy Mollet is not the only Frenchman who is cool to the idea of German unification, or to put it more delicately, who does not find this the most pressing international issue at the moment.

Britain, France and most of the other European allies are pressing the United States on its intransigent position with regard to recognition of the Stalinist government of China and its admission to the UN.

Meanwhile, in the Middle East the classic type of finance-imperialist struggle over oil is complicated by the problem of Israel on the one hand, and the fear of Stalinist encroachment on the other. But this struggle is not quieted, let alone held in abeyance in the face of the common enemy.

Now a listing of these tensions, disagreements, rivalries, contradictions and conflicts could be worked up into one of those "scientific" demonstrations that the capitalist alliance is about to break up, or even that war among the capitalist imperialist rivals is more likely than war between the Stalinist and capitalist blocs of nations.

Such is not at all the case. But it is vital to understand that the inter-allied struggle takes on more virulent and critical forms today precisely because the immediate military pressure of Stalinism has been considerably reduced.

## IN 'DEFENSE' OF DULLES

This is another demonstration of the proposition which Third Camp socialists have been pointing to for years: that the capitalist and Stalinist camps both feed on each other, that they gain strength and internal cohesion and support from their peoples and allies precisely to the degree that they threaten each other with warfare and conquest.

In this connection one could even say a word in defense of the indefensible Mr. Dulles. Even a statesman at the head of the American alliance would find it impossible to reconcile the interests and drives of all the allies.

America is the super-imperialism which is seeking to ride herd on the sub-imperialisms allied to it. At the same time it seeks to keep the recent and present colonial peoples within the capitalist orbit, while maximizing its influence

## 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 unremitting 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!

among them at the expense of the older imperialist powers.

The interests which clash here are really not reconcilable in their fundamentals. No government can be a friend of both the French and of the Algerians until Algeria is free; or of the Greeks and the British until Cyprus is free; or of colonial master and colonial subject as long as colonialism, and hence the struggle against it, exists. The attempt to do so simply leads to a development of hatred and suspicion from both sides.

Socialists believe that America must make a choice. This government by nature makes the wrong choices. We believe that America can become a powerful force for democracy and freedom in the world only if it chooses the side of democracy and freedom in these conflicts—that is, the side of the colonial peoples, of the masses all over the world who are struggling for equality and democracy.

## ISL FUND DRIVE

# Bring Up Those Percents!

By ALBERT GATES  
Fund Drive Director

Since our last report in the issue before last, we have finally passed the half-way mark in our Fund Drive to complete the \$10,000 quota. At this writing, contributions of \$5689 have received making a percentage of 56.8.

There have been some shifts in the standings as a result, but the front-runners remain. No new one hundred percenters turned up, but at least three quota bearers are close to it: the National Office, Los Angeles and Bay Area. They may well make it in the next week or two.

Behind them stands another group which contains the two

largest quotas, Chicago and New York. At present, Chicago is still far ahead of New York, but both have a formidable job ahead of them. Chicago still has almost \$700 to go, or about 35 percentage points, while New York is a fraction below 50 per cent. A good showing by them would help drag up the group surrounding them.

We still haven't had much assistance below these 40 per centers. They aren't the heaviest quotas in the campaign, but at this stage they are as important as those up front. This time every contribution, no matter its size, is important in the final reckoning.

And what about our friends and sympathizers? We haven't heard from them for a while. We need their assistance as in every fund drive and we count upon it, too.

Here is your chance to scan the box score. When you do, you will find out what is necessary for you to do.

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE			
City	Quota	Paid	%
	\$10,000	\$5689.20	56.8
St. Louis	25	60	240
Oregon	50	50	100
Natl. Office	1,250	1065	85.2
Los Angeles	650	526.45	80.9
Bay Area	400	300	75
Chicago	2,000	1310	65.5
Streator	25	91	364
Newark	400	223	55.7
Cleveland	150	80	53.3
Detroit	350	170.75	48.8
New York	3,800	1834	48.4
Philadelphia	200	77	38.5
Pittsburgh	200	58	29
Seattle	150	20	13.3
Buffalo	150	0	0
Indiana	100	0	0
Akron	25	0	0
Reading	50	0	0

CONTRIBUTE TO THE ISL FUND DRIVE

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

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL's Fund Drive.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY STATE

(Make checks out to Albert Gates)

It's going to be on FRIDAY, May 4, in New York

# Celebrate May Day

with the ISL and YSL

SHORT TALK BY MAX SHACHTMAN

SPECIAL SKIT ON THE 20th CP CONGRESS

DANCING—SOCIAL—REFRESHMENTS

AT ADELPHI HALL, 74 FIFTH AVENUE, near 13th Street