

BLP Ranks Back Bevan in Vote!

As we go to press, newspaper dispatches indicate that delegates' sentiment at the convention of the British Labor Party is dominated not by the right-wing leadership but by supporters of Aneurin Bevan.

It is clear, dolefully reports the N.Y. Times' London correspondent, that the party conference "had swung far to the left of its present moderate leadership," both "by its deed and its words." He explicitly ascribes this leftward swing to the "rank and file" of the party, while consoling himself with the thought that the big trade-union bloc votes at the convention still hold the majority for the Attlee right wing.

No programmatic fight has taken place at the convention because of Attlee's tactic of calling for a new election this month-a step explained by many observers as motivated precisely by the desire to avoid a showdown at this convention. The test vote took place on elections to the seven (out of 27) places on the party Executive which are determined by the local branches.

In this vote, all Bevan supporters were re-elected with a bigger vote than ever before, Bevan himself topping the list as usual. At the same time, "the conference turned thumbs down on most of those connected with the government's rearmament program, especially those who have had the temerity to stand up in meeting and support it." These included Defense Minister Shinwell, John Strachey and two other ministers.

The rank and file of the Labor Party are with Bevan and against the Attlee-right-wing rearmament policy. This is now a recorded fact.

Socialists of India and Japan Declare Unity In Fight for Third Camp vs. Both War Blocs

of Japan. We are pleased to of the French Social Demo-

Lohia at his meetings in the of socialism. The difference United States from which he in terminology is of no conwent to Japan on his way sequence; in meaning, they back to India) and by Hiroo are the same thing. They are Wada, chairman of the For- not at all the same thing as eign Affairs Committee of that "Third Force" which is, the Social Democratic Party for example, the watchword print the full text of the crats. There it is nothing but statement on our front page an excuse for giving up the and commend it to the close fight for socialism in order to effect a working agreement with the "progressive" capitalists at home and with Where we speak of the American imperialism abroad. The Indian and Jap-

anese socialists reject the "world of communism"-a term which they apply quite erroneously, if understandably, to Stalinism. Stalinism has no more in common with communism than it has with socialism; less, if anything.

But their rejection of Stalinism does not bring the authors of the joint statement into the camp of capitalism, today dominated by the United States. They do not, out of hysterical, panicky and uncomprehending fear of Stalinist imperialism pledge their arms to American imperialism as their protector.

That's the course of the **European Social-Democrats** and their American counterpart, but not of the socialists in Japan and India. In the fight for democracy, for national independence, for socialism, they depend not on the two world reactions, but as is only proper for genuine socialists, on their own program and the independent organization and action of masses of the people themselves:

"We socialists are aiming to achieve this third world of socialism, and our primary objective in Asia is therefore to obtain the coordination of all Asian forces of socialism and democracy, which will combat and defeat equally the other two Asias of status quo and vested interests on the one hand and communism on the other."

TRUE FRATERNITY

Likewise gratifying is the cooperation to which the representatives of the two parties pledge themselves and the mutual respect they show for one another. This elementary attitude for socialists is in stark contrast to the disgraceful and disgusting attitude adopted by most of the leaders of the big Social Democratic parties of the "modern" and "civilized" countries of Europe. They (Turn to last page)

JOINT ANTI-WAR DECLARATION For the Indian and Japanese Socialist Parties

(3) The Socialist Parties of India and Japan are convinced that world peace can be indefinitely secured only when the retarded two-thirds of the world, parts of which, like Africa, are still under political subjection, is raised to a decent level of well-being and strength. Such an equality among all parts of the world can alone realize a healthy balance of power and thus eliminate war.

(4) We sincerely desire that Japan be accepted by all the sister nations of Asia, in the belief that the peace and prosperity of Japan depend on the peace and prosperity of other Asian peoples and that Socialist Japan will never allow a reversion to the dark days of militarism and imperialism. We pledge that progressive Japan will do its utmost toward achievement of economic prosperity through supply of techniques, machinery and machine tools to all the sister nations of Asia, in particular, Burma and Indonesia.

(5) In carrying out these common aims, the Socialist Party of India and the Social Democratic Party of Japan will work in close cooperation. Meanwhile, the Social Democratic Party of Japan will shortly send a delegation to India. We hope that a conference of all Asian Socialist Parties will soon be held.

For the Socialist Party of India: Rammanohar LOHIA, Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee. For the Social-Dem. Party of Japan: Hiroo WADA

Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee.

Reuther on Defensive in Speeches To UAW: The Old Oomph Is Gone

By WALTER JASON

Page Two

DETROIT, Oct. 1-The dissatisfaction among the ranks of the United Auto Workers (CIO) has reached the point where President Walter P. Reuther found it necessary to call a series of special meetings to explain the program and activities of the international union in relation to the big issues of the day.

In a three-hour speech before 500 secondary leaders of the East Side local unions here, Reuther touched on all subjects bothering the rank and file. It is very significant that Reuther spent exactly 50 minutes of that time attacking the record of John L. Lewis, for the figure of the coal miners' chieftain looms large on the UAW horizon at the present time. Reuther repeated this speech to a West Side conference, a specially called General Motors delegate conference, and Sunday at Flint, Mich. Probably he will speak again at the Chrysler delegate conference called for this week

This sudden spurt of "innerunion" activity on the part of the Reuther leadership testifies for itself that the leadership has at last caught on to the fact that it is further and further removed from the ranks in the shop, and that the secondary leaders in the union have been both unable and unwilling to take on the full heat generated from the shops.

RESPONSE COOL

Unlike previous major policy speeches of Reuther in recent years, the current one is primarily defensive; for the speedup issue, lavoffs, short work weeks and the toll of inflation are pressing heavily on the workers, and they are sore. Basically, Reuther's difficulty at the moment is his inability to produce the goods. He just doesn't have answers that satisfy the ranks.

This was shown in the rambling character of his remarks, his evasion of certain issues, his playing down of others, and his inability to arouse any enthusiasm among the audience of a kind that used to be taken for granted when Reuther spoke.

Sensitive to the charge of John L. Lewis that the "intellectual geniuses of Solidarity House should spend more time on breadand-butter issues and less time running around in Washington,' Reuther explained how his struggle on production bottlenecks constituted "one of the biggest breadand-butter problems of our un-

Speaking in terms of "we," Reuther told of his conferences in the White House with war moofficials and with C. E. Wilson, and how "we are ironing these things out." He explained how he helped Ford, GM and Chrysler get vital materials, sub-

\$1.00

114 W. 14th St.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

Only \$2.00 a Year

The FIGHT for SOCIALISM

by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and

program of Independent Socialism

INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

and even read a letter of appreciation from Nash-Kelvinator Corporation for his efforts.

The whole thing didn't quite go over. With estimates of from 125.000 to 150.000 auto workers due to be unemployed this winter, the argument that it would have been worse isn't especially appealg. Reuther's old technique used to be to ride along the resentment of the workers, put the blame on the corporations in a "Give 'em hell" speech, and leave everyone pepped up with his promise to win new worlds.

He sounded far more like a production expert discussing technical and impersonal aspects of industrial activity than the Walter Reuther whose dynamic qualities won him leadership of the world's largest union.

LEWIS' SHADOW LOOMS

Some of his old fire was there in his "work-out" of John L. Lewis. He ridiculed Lewis' "free enterprise" philosophy; he blasted Lewis for not joining the United Labor Policy Committee; he condemned Lewis for breaking with Roosevelt, and he told the audience of the vicious blow Lewis gave the UAW by his blocking an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Law which would legalize UAW union-shop contracts now in jeopardy as a result of an NLRB decision. He also told of some of the contracts of District 50 which do not stand up to UAW stand-

And he contrasted the democratic tradition of the UAW with the personal dictatorship of Lewis in the coal miners' union. "Can you imagine Ford Local 600 in the coal miners' union, acting the way they do here?" he asked. Of course, when he criticized Lewis for hand-picking regional directors he didn't get the response he expected. Too many delegates remembered behind-the-scenes activities of recent UAW conventions.

How deeply Lewis is involved in UAW factionalism is an open question at the present time, but certainly the anti-Reuther forces feel quite stronger because they feel a pinch they can turn to Lewis for backing. They know, as Reuther does, that in various Detroit shops, some rank-and-filers have signed petitions to ask Lewis to take over and build a new union! In one local, some secondary leaders were expelled from the UAW for petitioning District 50 for a charter, according to findings of a trial board. Now if UAW union-shop elections ore invalidated, such elements may give the UAW and Reuther serious trouble.

In this period when fabulous the auto industry, the Lewis philosophy of "They got theirs, let's get ours" appeals to the ranks in the shops far more than Reuther's

Cloth-bound \$2.00

New York 11, N. Y.

rifice and his mild criticisms of big business.

EVADES ON SPEEDUP

Reuther made a very effective defense of the idea of escalator clauses, and told of the UAW's fight to preserve it in Washington circles. Also he emphasized the importance of the annual improvement factor. However, he overdid himself. His claim that the escalator clause was part of a long-range program of the UAW simply doesn't fit in with the facts as known to most active UAW leaders. At the GM conference one delegate was so incensed at Reuther's broad claims that he accused Reuther of hypocrisy and reminded the delegates that in 1950 Reuther swore, before GM negotiations, "to get rid of the escalator clause if it's the last thing we do.'

Nor did Reuther's remarks on the speedup issue make much impression. He claimed he had no evidence on it. "Give me the facts Send in the reports. We can't do anything unless we have the facts." declared on this and the layoff issues. Of course, that was an evasion of the issue. Everyone in Detroit knows about the Chrysler speedup. And at the GM conference, when Reuther claimed "there

stitutes for unavailable materials, speeches about the need for sac- are many GM shops which do no have a speedup issue," a delegate challenged him: "Name one!"

> His charge that "the speedup issue is a convenient brick to have around to fling at the international union" didn't sit well with the large Chrysler delegations who are facing the issue daily. As for his charge that it's a 'political issue." Reuther seems to have forgotten that it was precisely he who made it a political issue in his fight against the Communist Party program of incentive pay during World War II, and he alerted the ranks to the dangers of speedup then!

WEAK IN SHOP ISSUES

The insistence of the Reuther leadership that they'll support strikes on the speedup issue is another evasion of the problem, just as his suggestion of going through grievance procedure also doesn't solve the problem. The company strategy of picking off one small group after another, of firing key leaders, and of provoking wildcat strikes which the union proceeds to suppress, are all calculated to cool off the ardor of the ranks for strike action. The ranks feel they won't get real backing. They become and are demoralized in many shops. This is the situation which management



Atrocity

A portion of an obituary notice which appeared in the New York Times on the famed conductor Serge Koussevitsky has been brought to our attention recently. 并 It reads:

LABOR ACTION

He returned to Russia in 1917 and became conductor of the state orchestra, serving until 1920 when he left because of his strong objections to the Soviet regime. "I left Russia because of Lenin and Trotsky and the terrible things they did," he said years later. "I had a million dollars, and they took it from me."

is taking further advantage of. They are breaking long-standing agreements outside the scope of the written contract.

It is precisely in these shop problems, which are the daily grind of the shop union leaders, that the **Reuther** leadership shows itself furthest removed from the moods and outlook of the ranks.

Reuther's ridicule of the chairman of the shop committee of Dodge Local 3, for "getting himself fired by his blunders," didn't sit well with the audience, and even brought a rebuke from the chairman of another shop committee, who reminded Reuther: "None of us is perfect. We all make mistakes, and we think that man, as our highest bargaining agent, ought to get his job back!

It looks as if things are going to get a lot tougher in the UAW before they get better. And the haunting memory of unemployment during the depression is burning up the ranks, when they see war work going elsewhere and watch the growing lavoffs here.



NMU AND RIEVE LEARN ABOUT WAGE BOARD THE HARD WAY

By NORMAN SEGUNDA

Maritime workers on the East and Gulf coasts saw the Wage Stabilization Board, last month. cut a slice out of their wage gains. In June, steamship operators finally agreed to give the seamen wage increase of 8 per cent. While in this mood of generosity the employers granted themselves an increased income by raising freight rates. But the Wage Board intervened. Not to interfere with the rise in freight charges-this board doesn't trifle with such details-but to "control" wages. The Board refused to sanction the 8 per cent wage increase, announcing that it would allow only something like 6 per cent. And so matters stand.

Thus, we are reminded that the Board still maintains its so-called 10 per cent formula. That is, it will

not permit wages to rise more than 10 per cent above the level of early 1950. It was such a formula, among other grievances, that precipitated the walkout of labor from the Wage Board early this year. When labor leaders returned to war boards in April, they were still truculent and suspicious. The terms on which they went back were left hazy. What they won and what they didn't win couldn't be sharply defined. But one thing they made clear: they were going back, perhaps only temporarily; they would wait and see. And beware! If the trend of national policy did not change, they might walk out

By now, it is easier to draw up an account ledger of the wage stabilization fight. Although we must remember that the decisions of the Wage Board seem capricious and unpredictable, labor did win a modification of the most inflexible aspects of the first freeze. "Fringe benefits" became possible. Escalator clauses and wage increases to meet living costs were legalized.

A DRASTIC TURN

The basic 10 per cent formula from which all calculations derive remains. Even if labor were exclusively preoccupied with wages in the narrowest sense, it would be faced with the fundamental injustice of the wage freeze. Even the "fairest" wage freeze would make injustice permanent at a fixed level. But the labor movement more and more realizes that its existence depends not simply on the index of wages but upon politics and social program. That is why it demanded more than a readjustment of the wage policy of the Truman administration when it returned to the boards and insisted upon a drastic turn in all domestic policy.

None of that has come. Wages which are presumably protected by escalator clauses are now exposed to chiseling under new tax chemes. Small consolation to a UAW member who has received escalator increases to read in his union's magazine that pending legislation will raise his income taxes while going easy on the rich; that new hidden sales and excise taxes will whittle away the income he hought was protected.

None of the basic social dewhat it was in April. Except that at least to get his own union out.

labor "representatives" sit on government boards and give them moral sanction. Two weeks ago Emil Rieve, member of the Wage Stabilization Board, told the New York State CIO that he was tortured by the desire to get off the board-a board which, he said, is not interested in justice, only in mechanical formulas. But he restrains the stirrings of conscience. He remains—as window dressing.

Now the maritime workers learn what the Wage Stabilization Board is. Joseph Curran. president of the National Maritime Union, CIO, is incensed and he will fight. How and for what? He will go to court and demand that the seafaring unions be exempted from the board's jurisdiction. Naturally, we wish him success. But something seems queerly out of adjustment. A powerful federation of labor, the CIO, agrees to sit on the Wage Board and to submit disputes to it for impartial settlement: But its own delegate. Rieve, knows that the board is a trap. And the president mands of labor have been won. of one of its important unions Everything remains just about wants to get out from under, or



□ Bill me □ Payment encl. (stamps, currency or postal note)

October 8, 1951

By RICHARD TROY

"world opinion." TREATY IS DEAD

on the matter.

signed.

dle and Far East has been loosened incalculably.

Gladwyn Jebb, the British delegate to the Security Council, in his speech requesting UN action, remarked that there were many Englishmen who had urged that their government take military steps to protect its rights and privileges in Iran against an Iranian government which had no conception of law, morality and decency. However, Jebb said, His Majesty's Government chose not to follow that path because it was putting all its stock in the peace-making qualities of the United Nations. Of course, this type of pleasantry is to be expected in a UN debate; but there are very few who do not know

better. U. S. BACKS LONDON

which could cut that area off from

Iran Crisis Before UN

The Iranian oil crisis may be finally coming to a head after over a half year of increasingly unresolvable wrangling and maneuvering between Teheran. Washington and London. This is by no means to suggest that the Security Council, in whose lap the British have placed the question of one of the most determined anti-imperialist drives of the post-war world, has within itself the means of settling the issues involved. But the fact that Britain has brought the issue to the council is an indication of the critical stage of the dispute. Winston Churchill, in a campaign speech, criticized the Labor government for not using force to settle the issue once the threat of force was employed several months ago. But this is a highly irresponsible position, as is well known by now, since (a) the United States opposed the use of military means to settle the question and (b) military intervention would have raised more questions in the Middle East. from the point of view of Anglo-American imperialism, than it

might have settled. Consequently when the Iranian government ordered the remaining -350 British technicians to leave Iran by October 4 the British, although protesting the illegality of the action, had no choice but to obey. Unwilling to come to terms with the Mossadegh government on their own basis, they had no recourse other than to turn to the Security Council and

The British government has asked the council to order Iran. a member of the UN, to abide by last July's decision of the Hague International Tribunal, in which Iran was ordered to restore the oil properties to Great Britain pending further negotiations. The British, as this shows, are holding as stubbornly as ever to their extremely legalistic formulations

A treaty was signed between the two governments in 1933 which was to run for several decades. The British insist that, by the rules of international law, the Iranians have broken this treaty by unilaterally confiscating the oil properties. - By the abstract principles of what is called international law (in which little account is made of the "rights of self-determination") the British may well be right; but a great deal has happened to this planet since 1933 when the treaty was

Power relations have shifted so considerably that agreements made 18 years ago have lost much of their relevance. On the one hand Iran—like India, Indonesia and other "backward nations"have new eyes with which to see he world on the other hand, the hold of Western imperialism on the Mid-

As was suggested above, the British did not, and could not have, intervened militarily in Iran because such action might have set off a series of reporcus-

1

the West for decades. Even now the British and Americans are fearful, for example, of the growing anti-Western feeling in Egypt where there is heard much agitation against British management of the vital Suez Canal. The old codes of international law indeed do not correspond any onger to the events and relations our times. Even the might of American power, represented at recent conferences by Averill Harriman, has failed to buck the

But, nevertheless, the Iranian government, in a desperate position itself, has apparently been forced to take notice of the British action in the Security Council (whereas they completely ignored the Haaue decisions). But now that it has become apparent that the United States has fully committed itself to support of the British position the Iranians have nowhere turn (the overtures to the Russions having no real future, being only diplomatic makeweight). The British would probably not have brought the issue to the UN unless they were previously certain of American support.

COMPROMISE LIMITED

Certain editorialists have tried to make it appear as if the U.S. represents (in the words of a "imes correspondent) the "honest broker" in the dispute. This may have been true during the spring but it is now plain that throughout the summer the main efforts of U.S. diplomacy have been directed at bringing Iran around to the compromise offered by the

British. The recent refusal of Harriman to transmit an Iranian message to London made this clear as well as the fiery denunciation of Mossadegh by Henry Grady upon his retirement as U. S. ambassador to Teheran.

So with the consolidation of Anglo-American forces. Iran's position becomes more tenuous. Furthermore, although Mossadegh's popularity in Iran has never been greater (the opposition closed ranks with him last week after a temporary separation) he rules over a country whose main source of income remains paralyzed. The oil wells cannot be kept idle indefinitely; the Iranian economy is too dependent upon them; and a rearming West, despite all said to the contrary, must have them going again. Mossadegh is as aware as are American journalists that Iran is one of the weakest "links" in the chain now being constructed around Russia. Consequently he desperately seeks some solution to the problem, a solution in which Iran can save its nationalist "face."

Nationalization and confiscation is an irrevocable fact; little compromise is possible on this matter no matter what the Security Council decides (since the use of force, even with UN sanction, is unlikely). Eventually the British must resign themselves to the position of supplier of technicians to Abadan and leave everything else, including profits, to Iran. Every other solution is impracticable, and, at best, very unstable.

Labor, NAACP and ACLU Fight Witchhunt Laws in Pennsylvania

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 1-The citizenry of the Keystone state are to be temporarily spared the indignities of the Republican administration's "loyalty oath" and the Democratic-sponsored "Communist control bill." Both bills were apparently on the verge of adoption when the two chambers of the legislature agreed to recess until December. The recess was forced by the inability of Governor Fine to get through a state income tax bill. The governor claims that state operation cannot be financed without the new tax.

Last week a group of recalcitrant Republicans joined with the Democrats to defeat the governor's third attempt to institute the state wage tax. Simultaneously, though, both houses moved swiftly on the two "anti-red crusades.

The Musmanno bill, which would outlaw the Communist Party and 'similar" organizations, had its first and second readings in the Senate. The bill, in almost identical form, had already passed the House by a 145 to 8 count. The Pechan Loyalty Oath Bill, back for rewriting in the House after being approved in revised form by the Senate, narrowly missed passage because of the large number o absent representatives.

The reporting out of the Democratic Judge Musmanno's Communist Control Bill by the Senate Judiciary Committee came as a

surprise. The State Justice Department has called the law "unconstitutional." Committee Chairman Senator Kephardt had promised the American Civil Liberties Union that the bill would be killed in committee. But the committee gave the bill its approval and added a provision that those who aided proscribed causes could be prosecuted also.

WIDELY OPPOSED

The Republican's Pechan Loyalty Oath Bill now requires signed statements of public school teachers and state employees. University faculties were exempt as a substitute provision requires each university to certify each year that it is keeping its house clean of "reds." A recent amendment provides that anyone dismissed under these provisions could have access to hearings and court appeals. Another amendment to put public school teachers and state employees on the same basis as the university personnel was defeated. Also defeated was a Democratic move to send the bill back to committee.

Both of the two bills have been opposed by the two large Philadelphia daily papers, by both the AFL and CIO, by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the American Civil Liberties Union. It is to be hoped that the opposition can be strengthened so that both bills will be defeated when the legislature reconvenes in December.

DISCUSSION OF STRATEGY IN ANTI-STALINIST REVOLT-**Armed Guerrilla Bands Appear in Poland**

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Stalin is having a hard time in Poland, Following the last strikes and peasant riots, there has now also been an attempt on the life of Marshal Rokossovsky, in his own office and-according to persistent rumors-by the chief of his own staff, Major Poplawski.

The Polish press in England insists that Rokossovsky had to take a trip to Russia to avoid new attempts. He disappeared from Warsaw for two months and made his appearance on the Russian "holiday" together with Molotov and Zhukov, who spoke at length about "peace" and about "the danger of war and the Russian-Polish alliance against the imperialists."

The specter of the Polish insurrections against the czar frightens Stalin, who orders a new witchhunt trial in Warsaw and a new purge of the "nationalists," "Titoists," and "spies of nglo-American imperialism

And so Warsaw saw a big military trial directed against generals and colonels of the Polish army like General Tatar, Mossor, Kuropieska, Colonel Utnik, General Kirchmayer and Herman. All the defendants were officers in the Polish army before 1939, then leaders of the Polish Home Army, then fellow travelers of Moscow who were disappointed with Anglo-American policy. Now they have confessed their own "crimes" of collaboration with the Anglo-American intelligence services and preparation of a nationalist coup d'état in Poland.

THE POT IS BOILING

They charged the ex-general secretary of the Stalinist party, Gomulka, and the former military factotum, General Spychalski, with collaborating in the preparation of a "Titoist" revolt together with Mikolajczyk, General Sosnikowski and Popanski. (émigrés) and the British government.

These accusations are thorsions in the whole Middle East oughly fantastic; for the British

Kremlin in subjugating Poland and all of East-Central Europe, as did the Washington administration also. There was no material within the Polish Stalinist army for a Titoist revolt; and, since I knew Gomulka personally. I can say that he is too weak to fight the Kremlin.

Stalin's fantastic accusations in the Warsaw trial show that the master of the Kremlin is frightened by the specter of Polish insurrection and tries to exorcize it.

But the pot is boiling in Poland among the workers, among the peasants and among the youth, with hatred directed aaginst the **Russians. The Stalinist mouthpiece** on the Warsaw radio, Martyka, was killed in his home. Now the international press reports that a big guerrillg detachment of some 9000 people fought Russian troops in Ossowiec (where there is a Russian-Polish railroad connection) and wiped them out.

WHO ARE THEY?

Perhaps this is the protest of the underground resistance against the Russian annexation of Polish territory; perhaps this is a demonstration against war preparations in Poland. Military actions also took place near Bialystok and near Elk and Grayevo, at the Russian-Polish border in former East Prussia. The United Press reports that the guerrilla detachments are large and include not only Poles but also Ukrainians and Lithuanians. In Ossowiec the guerrillas dominated the situation for three days, before they were pushed out by the regular Russian army.

We have no information on who is backing this movement, but we do not think that it can be the spontaneous, desperate movement of Polish youth, backed by ex-Pilsudskists and nationalists, perhaps by some circles of the Polish emigration in England; but not by the traditional Polish parties, that is, the Socialists, Populists gevernment collaborated with the or National Party, which are col- people, we cannot support an ac-

laborating in the Polish Political Council in opposition to the Polish government-in-exile in London, which is dominated by ex-Pilsudskist and military elements.

If the new guerrilla war is based on the general resistance of the Polish people against Russia, it is in this writer's opinion politically premature and dangerous to the interests of the Polish working class and the future of Polish liberation.

An imitation of the historical Polish insurrections against the czar would be detrimental in the present situation. An isolated regional or even national insurrection against the totalitarian army would be crushed as ruthlessly as the Warsaw struggle which was jointly put down by Stalin and Hitler. The time for national insurrections and national revolutions is past, and only the international socialist revolution can solve the problems of national iberation. To the aim of national insurrection, we would counterpose a socialist revolution against Stalin

NO ADVENTURISM

The fight is now between American and Russian imperialism, and if the Polish nationalists now take up an armed struggle against Stalin they will fight only as the vanguard of American imperialism in Poland. They will be defeated and thus make easier Stalin's victory in Poland and the defeat of the spontaneous resistance of the workers and peasants.

The working class must wait for the inter-imperialist war to end with the defeat or weakening of both imperialist sides, to begin the independent social and national fight for their liberation, back-PPS (Polish Socialist Party) or ed by the international working the Populist Party. It could be a class, in the first place by the British and American workers. Only in this way can they achieve national and social liberation and the defeat of Stalinism.

While we wish to support every resistance against Stalin arising from the side of the oppressed

tion which is a premature nationalist adventure led by desperate officers.

We await further declarations from the leadership of the Polish opposition, particularly from the PPS. The Polish socialists and the leaders of the Polish peasant movement have a great historical responsibility. Without their support, there cannot develop in Poland any premature, adventurist. desperate guerrilla actions which could only provide a pretext for Stalin to destroy every trace of Polish resistance for long years.

The Polish working-class and peasant reformist opposition has a great historical responsibility. we repeat, because it can avoid a new and unnecessary nationalist defeat as the result of a movement which can only be in the interests of alien American interests.

[The strategical views expr by Comrade Rudzienski in this article are his own. We are glad to present them, in view of Comrade Rudzienski's close acquaintance with the Polish situation, but of course LABOR ACTION does not necessarily take a position on many such strategic aspects of the Polish struggle.

In one passage, however, Comrade Rudzienski seems to base his viewpoint not merely on strategic considerations but on the general political concept that "the time for national insurrections and national revolutions is past" (etc., to the end of that paragraph). If we understand this formulation correctly as he intended it, we quite disagree with this view of the relationship between national revolution and socialist revolution in the Stalinist world. It is a well-known difference of view, especially in the Polish revolutionary movement since Rosa Luxemburg; our own views are con tained in documents of the ISL on the question; and most of our readers, we expect, will be a quainted with the issues involved. -Ed.]

Page Four



The Independent Socialis{ League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capi- better. England has been different. talism 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 powor, is a brutal totalitarianism-a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Par/ies, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. HACK ARGUMENTS BY A PROSTITUTE 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 everpresent 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!



Tel.



A Stalinist on Lysenko and Materialism By PHILIP COBEN

There has long been something unique about the intellectual followers of Stalinism in England. In Russia and the Stalinist-controlled countries, of course, intellectual creativeness has long been a thought-crime; and Stalinist "intellectuals" in the Western countries are not very much

It is at any rate my opinion that, in the fields of history, philosophy and many aspects of basic Marxist theory, a number of worthwhile works have been produced by British Stalinist intellectuals in spite of their party-line-toeing in every case where official Stalinist orthodoxy is directly involved. Their works have often appeared as a palimpsest, with the party line crudely written over but not entirely destroying their own attempt to think independently and creatively on theoretical problems of Marxism in such a way as might not directly contradict Moscow's decrees in the field of ideas.

They could not have gotten away with this in Russia, to be sure, but this was their own contradiction. But how long can such a contradiction last, in the Stalinist intellectual climate?

Longer in England than anywhere else, apparently, but it gets them sooner or later. The thought is evoked by the pamphlet before me, published in London: "Dialectical Materialism and Science," by Maurice Cornforth, who has written other stuff which was worth reading. A British Stalinist intellectual like J. B. S. Haldane solved the contradiction by breaking with the CP. Cornforth has solved it by capitulating to the culture of the GPU.

Cornforth's "Dialectical Materialism and Science" is not a serious discussion of the subject indicated by its title. Unlike other works such as I referred to at the beginning, it is not a discussion of Marxist theory on the subject with incidental bows to Stalinist orthodoxy; it is a polemical defense of Stalinist orthodoxy in science with incidental references to Marxist theory. It reads exactly like a British rewrite of Zhdanov. This is most obvious in its treatment of Lysenkoist-Michurinist genetics.

Now obviously the subject of the pamphlet does not require that Cornforth defend Lysenkoism on the basis of scientific evidence. Quite justifiably Cornforth addresses himself to a different question, with its own interest. This is the Russian claim that Lysenkoism is a materialist (therefore good Marxist) theory, whereas Morgan-Mendelism is idealist or mechanist (therefore incompatible with Marxism).

Precisely because it is a Stalinist apologia, Cornforth's work has the interest of presumably presenting a defense of this position by an intelligent Britisher, not an abjectly servile Moscow parrot-professor. And our British Stalinist intellectual's attempt to do this turns out to be as pitiful as any published directly by the Kremlin.

Now naturally, the question whether Lysenko's theory or Morgan's compatible with Marxism is a quite different question from the truth of either theory. But it has its own importance for the Marxist.

Although Cornforth's work is peppered with cycophantic references Lysenkoism and its alleged "materialistic" basis, written with all of the empty arrogance of Lysenko himself, there is only one passage in which he even purports to explain why this is so. It boils down to an almost childishly stupid argument which, we presume, is the best he can do.

Morgan's theory of genetics, he argues, either "must suppose that evolution is the result of the operation of chance occurrences . . . random mutations [of the genes] upon which natural selection operates-in which case the action of the environment is represented as purely negative and destructive, killing off the unfit and leaving the others to survive and hand on their characters to their offspring-or else that some 'purpose' is operating, a 'life force' or an 'entelechy.' "

The second horn of the dilemma does, of course, imply idealism, but it has no necessary connection with Morgan's genetics. One expects Cornforth to explain why the first hypothesis is non-materialist also; he does so no more than his Russian fellow-prostitutes. He leaves it to be implied that the idealist outlook is involved in the concept of chance occurrence of mutations, counterposing the "accidental" character of these occurrences to "determinism." If he refrains from making this explicit, it can be because he is perfectly aware how positively ignorant such an approach is for a Marxist.

A little later, he actually quotes Lysenko's argument that "The Morgan-Mendelists . . . presume that such alterations [of the genes] cannot as a matter of principle be predicted. We have here a peculiar conception of unknowability; its name is idealism in biology."

The operating phrase is "as a matter of principle." This is a crude falsehood. Scientists do not know enough in this rather young science to predict mutations in genes any more than they can predict changes n the sunspots with any certainty, but neithe "a matter of principle": it is unknown but not unknowable.

As a matter of fact, the Morgan theory which hypothesizes the transferrence of inherited characteristics through very, very material genes (not "life forces") is far more obviously materialist on its face than Lysenko's vagaries.



LABOR ACTION

Shaplen, who is also a roving foreign correspondent for the New York Post, gives a devastating picture of French and American policy in Indo-China, obviously sick to the stomach at the spectacle, but more in sorrow than in anger. Of the sentiments of the people under Bao Dai, he leaves no doubt. "the only slogan that still means anything to the people of Vietnam is independence." He leaves no possibility for illusions about the "generous" offers made by France or about the setup of the French Union, either with regard to their motivation (pure pressure and fear of worse) or their real meaning (which adds up to not much more than a figment of independence).

He mentions that, as is well known, "the French are putting more into than they are taking out of Indo-China today. Five years of war have cost them \$2.1 billion and thirty thousand dead and captured." But that's out of the pocket of the French people at large. The colonial-enterprise profiteers are pulling out their profit more than ever, despite the war. He gives figures.

Bao Dai is still the same Bao Dai, and his government is still a puppet. Shaplen analyzes the composition of the cabinet (whose prime minister is a French citizen!). Bao Dai is as before "most of his time at his palace in Dalat

Shaplen is of the opinion that at least as late as 1946, Ho Chi Minh could have been won or kept away from Stalinist control (the "if" is a non-imperialist policy in Indo-China, of course) But he reports, like so many others, that today the Vietminh forces have been put thoroughly under the control of men firmly adhering to Moscow and/or Peiping. (But he still thinks Ho can become a Tito in the future.)

As for the U.S., "Unfortunately, it [the war in Indo-China] is also an American tragedy, for the prestige we have lost in all of Asia since August 1945, by identifying ourselves with the French struggle may, in the final reckoning, prove even more cataclysmic than the actual loss of Indo-China itself."

American aid under the current military program has not turned the military tide either. The French are using almost 100 per cent of U. S. material. Even the American ECA program in Indo-China, which is the bright spot for him, doesn't make him too happy. For one thing, he asks himself: "How much social and economic good can we still do in ratio to the 'harm' our military-aid program causes in terms of Vietnamese lives and homes destroyed by U. S. weapons?" And for another thing, it seems that the French "are desperately afraid we might take over from them, economically, in the future.'

GM Chief Lets Some Cats out of the Bag

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The escalator clause in union contracts is still being argued over both inside the labor movement, and in the country at large. This type of wage adjustment has been strongly advocated by socialists for over a decade as a springboard from which the workers could fight for higher wages. It was viewed as a device which would help to eliminate a constant, wearing struggle just to keep wages up with rising living costs in an inflationary era.

For a long time the idea of the escalator clause was fought by virtually the whole of the labor bureaucracy. They advanced the argument that the escalator clause would simply keep the real waaes of labor static, while the true function of the labor movement was to increase real wages and the standard of living of the workers. The socialists replied that in a time of bounding inflation even to maintain real wages was no mean task, and that in any event the escalator clause would in no way prevent unions from demanding wages or other benefits over and above the escalator.

This argument took on real flesh and bone when the United Automobile Workers signed their contract with General Motors two years ago. Although there had been other industries or at least calator agreements, the GM contract raised this into national prominence and made it a major spreading with lightning speed. of the UAW, but also beyond.

MURRAY STILL OPPOSED

Still, such agreements have by no means gained universal acceptance by the labor movement, and certainly not by the employers. Recently labor correspondents with pipelines to Phil Murray's desk have let it be known that the United Steel Workers will not seek the escalator clause when their contract with U.S. Steel is re-negotiated, but will strike out for some other pattern-setting demands. Just what these will be, no one knows yet. The Stalinist-controlled United Electrical Workers have again demounced the escalator clause, though we are confident that as its effects become known more widely, they will have to drop this argument against their CIO rival in the electrical field or lose heavily among their membership. Of course, the argument over

the escalator clause rages in gov-

ernment circles too. The question here-has been to decide whether it is inflationary, and whether it should be permitted to continue in effect even if the escalator clause eventually brings wages above the arbitrary percentage figure set by government agencies as the place at which the wage line is to be held.

The debate over the escalator clause was publicly joined by C. E. Wilson, president of General Motors Corporation, when he released to the press a private letter he had written a friend on the question. Sections of the letter quoted here appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on August 29 of this year.

Wilson first discussed general factors affecting the rise or fall of prices in the country. He comes the conclusion that the escalator clause is neither inflationary nor deflationary.

"As a matter of fact," he writes, "it tends to resist inflation to some extent since wages are only adjusted upward several months after the cost of living has increased and the facts recognized."

This, of course, is one of the chief weaknesses of escalator clauses as they are generally written now. They follow the cost of living increases in time, and lag concerns in which workers had es- behind them in amount. As time passes, the more militant unions will no doubt seek to speed up and improve the accuracy with which factor in American economic life. the escalator clause follows the Escalator agreements have been real cost of living. Yet it must be pointed out that the labor critics specially inside the jurisdiction of the escalator clause have never come up with an alternative which would keep wages up with the cost of living more adequately. Annual re-opening dates in contracts for wage demands are usually even slower in catching up with the inflationary spiral.

> DIVIDENDS AND INFLATION But even more interesting is Wilson's next observation, as an tory of the world has ever fought answer to those who seek to blame

	h · ·
Next-A I by J	L abor Pa ack Ranger
A Hard-Hitting, Mea Need for an Is	ty, Simple Presenta dependent Labor Po
25 cents a copy Independent Socialist Press	, 114 W. 14th St., New
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

C. E. WILSON JOINS DEBATE

of employees."

workers quite as much:

tal

And then Wilson goes on to make a statement which, although it is incorrect in itself, could well be pondered long and deeply by everyone who thinks that in our society the fundamental purpose of governments in fighting wars is to defend democracy, freedom, or some other universal ideal:

October 8, 1951





Reactionaries and Fascists Are Trying to Pinch Off School Funds

By MAX MARTIN

Last week's Youth and Student Corner dealt with the reactionary campaign which is currently being waged against public school education. At least six communities in the United States are at present the scenes of such campaigns. The pattern of these attacks is roughly the same in each instance. A committee composed of wealthy business men, semi-fascists, racists of the lunatic fringe variety and anti-"progressive education" cranks is organized. This group then swings into action.

It appeals to "taxpayers" to oppose construction of desperately needed new school facilities since this will result in increased taxation; it attacks "progressive education" as a breeder of juvenile delinquency and "communism"; it gets up lists of textbooks which are labeled "subversive" and it conducts witchhund investigations among teachers to ferret out deviations from political or social orthodoxy. Those who attempt to raise their voices in protest are smeared and denounced as "reds."

The local reactionary groups are aided in most cases by outsiders like Allan A. Zoll, a former associate of Gerald L. K. Smith and other fascists, the head of an outfit called the National Council for American Education, and Lucille Cardin Crain, the editor of an organ called Educational Reviewer. This magazine is a quarterly published for the

labor's wage increases as the cause of inflation:

"From a strictly inflationary point of view, I am quite sure that the extra dividend General Motors paid last year was one of the most inflationary things that General Motors had anything to do with in 1950, although there was no general criticism for such dividends. The increase in the dividend of two dollars per share on the new stock (GM split its stock in that year on a two-for-one basis.—Ed.) over the dividend paid in 1949 amounted to putting approximately \$176 million more purchasing power into the hands of stockholders. An increase of five cents an hour in the General Motors wage rate continued over a year for 400,000 people, and figuring 2,000 hours a person only has the effect of putting \$40 million purchasing power into the hands

his is certainly frank talk, quite unusual for a corporation head. And we commend it highly to the congressmen who have just voted their "soak the poor" tax law in the interest of "combatting inflation." But Wilson has even more to say, which should interest

"I am sure," he writes, "that your friend would agree that if the resulting increase in wages in towere all taken out of profits and dividends to stockholders correspondingly reduced, then there would be no change in the total inflationary effect on purchasing

WARS TO SAVE PROPERTY

"Basically," he writes, "all wars and preparation for war are inflationary, and no nation in the hisa war and avoided inflation; that

> rty! tion of the arty Order from: York 11, N. Y.

is, a reduced purchasing power of its currency. This is a fact worth noting. What actually occurs in time of war is that there is a shift equities between producers Ithose who have the health and strength to fight or work) and those who have accumulated wealth in the past and who are dependent on those who can work and fight for protection of their accumulated property. Perhaps this may seem to be an oversimplification of the matter and not entirely clear, but in a general way it explains the phenomenon of inflation in war time." (Emphasis mine.-L. O.)

That is a gem, a real gem. From the point of view of economics, to maintain that the workers (including those in the armed forces) get a larger share of the "equities" as against the capitalists is pure hogwash, unless Wilson includes in what the workers get the guns and tanks and planes with which they have to fight. But it is doubtful whether any socialist has put the purpose of wars waged by capitalist governments, particularly in our epoch, more clearly than this capitalist who says that wars are fought by the workers "for the protection of the accumulated property" of the rich.

UNIONS HOLD DOWN WAGES?

Mr. Wilson's letter has taken us a bit off the track of a discussion of escalator clauses in union contracts. However, there is one well worth taking up. He vigor-ously defends the GM contract with the UAW on the grounds that it has had a stabilizing influence in his corporation, and on the economy as a whole. He has high praise for the union's effectiveness in disciplining the workers, and seems to believe that the workers too are happier under the five-year contract. He states that although there may be some unions which have gained larger wage increases through strikes than the GM workers have got via the escalator clause during the period of its operation, the workers and employers in these industries have suffered much greater losses through these strikes. He

then goes on to say: "I am personally convinced that, if there were no unions and no labor contracts like General Motors has in the automotive industry, the increase in wages would already have greatly exceeded what has occurred. This increase to my mind would be much more comparable with the increase that

market with no unions and no contracts, labor would have been able to sell its services at a rapidly increasing price just as the owners of commodities have been able to do.'

If Wilson's whole letter were not written in a vein most friendly to the union in his industry, we would conclude that this statement is a sly attempt to propagandize the workers against unionism. As a matter of fact. it reads almost word for word like an article which appeared recently in the paper of the Socialist Labor Party, a sectarian organization which opposes all existing unions as enemies of the working class.

Actually, however, it appears that Wilson's letter was written for a person who was questioning the escalator clause from the employer's point of view, and he is attempting to convince this person that unions have the tendency to hold down wages in a period of inflation and a tight labor market.

THE NO STRIKE PLEDGE

It is true that when union leaders accept the idea of a wage freeze, or some version of the World War II Little Steel Formula, and give a no strike pledge to the employers, these leaders seek to prevent the workers from using their organizations in their own interests. In that case it can very well be that the union's discipline keeps wages in this or that industry lower than they would be if the workers banded togethe more spontaneously and fought for higher wages.

But this certainly has not been the case during the most recent inflationary splurge. Employers here and there attempt to "pirate" workers by offering them higher wages than they are getting under union contracts in established industries. But the general level of wages still is determined by the struggle of the unions. Only one fact need be mentioned as proof of this: in the vast majority of plants and industries in which labor is unorganized, wages are far lower than they are in the organized industries, and conditions (which contribute to the general standard of living of the workers) are far, far worse.

It would be foolish to contend that escalator clauses are a magic formula for workers under capitalism, and no one who supports them contends this. If unions get them in contracts, and then use this as an excuse to cease struggling for improvements, they can be an actual drag on the standard has occurred in commodities, for of living as well as the morale of if we had a completely free labor the workers. But the same can be

Committee on Education of the Conference of American Small Busines Organizations.

Page Five

The Reviewer peruses textbooks and other educational materials in common use in the elementary and secondary schools. Assignments to review these books are made by the editorial board of the magazine and in all cases go to extreme reactionaries, many of whom have absolutely no connection with the educational world. This is not surprising since the magazine is not concerned with pedagogy (except insofar as it condemns all the changes introduced into teaching technique in the last fifty years) but rather with right-wing political orthodoxy.

Needless to say, most of the texts reviewed are found to be remiss in the teaching of "Americanism." It must not be supposed that these books are by any stretch of the imagination radical or socialistic. Most of them seem to be considerably to the right of the Fair Deal.

This does not matter to these reactionaries. Any sentence in a text (and one is enough) which can be shown to be pro-Fair Deal or leaning in that direction is sufficient reason to question the "Americanism" of the work and to campaign for its elimination from the public school system. This applies not only to required texts for the students but also to optional and supplementary readings and books found in school

They Can Be Defeated

The Reviewer has condemned texts for containing sentences such as

(1) "Cooperatives bring electric light and power to many farms." (American Democracy, Today and Tomorrow by Goslin, Goslin and Storer.) What, asked the article on this book, are the implications of this? Is it insidiously trying to imply that private enterprise refuses to bring electricity to farms?

(2) "The control of wealth is passing into fewer hands." (Modern Economics by Corbett and Colvin.) This absolutely unimpeachable fact is condemned by the review as "leftist" propaganda.

In addition the magazine condemns the use of such adjectives as "underprivileged" and "unfortunate" with "poor people" since, they claim, the use of such words implies that their poverty is due to society rather than to their own worthlessness. The use of the word "democracy" in reference to our society is frowned upon and the worn arguments about our Founding Fathers having established not a democracy but a republic are trotted out.

One could dismiss all of the above as the rantings of lunatic-fringe cranks were it not for the fact that the current hysteria provides the background and atmosphere in which such forces can have the successes that they have indeed enjoyed in various places. Teachers and parents are afraid to fight back for the most part since they themselves will be labeled subversive

In only one of the six communities referred to above-Englewood, New Jersey-did the teachers put up a struggle in their behalf. A reactionary inhabitant of the community who is an admitted friend and admirer of the British fascist Sir Oswald Mosely had begun a drive against "red influences" in the schools. Textbooks were combed and children were coached to listen for references (favorable ones? neutral ones? to these people it doesn't really matter) to socialized medicine and "Communism."

A group of parents and teachers organized to counterattack. They obtained publicity exposing the reactionaries, hired lawyers to defend any teachers who would be attacked (announcing this in advance). This resulted in a real setback for the anti-public education forces.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

114 W. 14th St.

New York 11, N. Y.

🗌 I want more information about the Socialist Youth League. □ I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

ZONE ...

NAME.

SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).

said of any gain made by labor, like pensions, health insurance or vacations with pay. Every escalator clause in operation leaves much room for improvement. As is the case of other demands, unions are quite likely to accept a weak version of the escalator clause at the beginning. But once the principle is established, they can go ahead to strengthen it in later negotiations.

The important thing to keep in mind is that as the war economy goes along the clamor to halt the escalators will increase. The argument that they are inflationary will aather in volume. The unions seem to have been able to beat this back in the first round of "wage stabilization," but even this was accomplished only by a show of strength and boldness when labor walked out of the mobilization set-up. As the squeeze becomes tighter, we think it is safe to predict that the fight to save the escalators will become one of the chief battlefields of the class struggle.

BOOKS RECEIVED

...STATE.

Received from Claridge Pub. Corp., publication date September 15:

LABOR LAW: 300 Questions & Answers, by Reginald Parker. \$1.

Received from the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, publication date August 29:

THE WORLD OF COPERNI-CUS, by Angus Armitage. A Men-

tor book, 168 pages, 35 cents. THE TRIUMPH OF WILLIE POND, by Caroline Slade. Abridged, Signet book, 192 pages, 25 cents.

I SHOULD HAVE STAYED HOME, by Horace McCoy. Signet book, 144 pages, 25 cents.

YOUR WAY TO POPULAR-ITY AND PERSONAL POWER. by James Bender & Lee Graham. Signet book, 192 pages, 25 cents.

Page Six

October 8, 1951

By GORDON HASKELL

This is true not only of that portion of the German nation which enjoys the relative democracy of Western Germany, though it is they who are taking the political initiative. It is also true of the Germans, in the first place the German workers, living under Stalinist totalitarianism, but in a much different sense. change for iron-clad guarantees

expressing themselves politically except through their stubborn and mainly silent resistance to their Stalinist rulers' attempts to enlist their enthusiasm for their Russian puppet government. But even from behind the Iron Curtain they have been able to give litical feelings to convince the political leaders of Western Germany, and above all the Socialcan be relied upon to strike a powerful blow for freedom and democracy if they are given half the right to intervene in German

a chance. important fact which has emerged they will continue to control Berfrom the present stage of the political struggle for Germany. Six years after the collapse of Nazism the German working class, organized politically in the Social-Democratic Party, is forging rapidly to the head of the German nation. All the political calculations of the. occupying powers in both parts of the country, and certainly every at the very latest. move by the Adenauer government. has to be made with one question uppermost in mind: What effect will any action have on the power and prestige of the Social-Democrats?

U. S. CHAUVINIST VIEW

are determined to "integrate" Western Germany into their military and economic bloc. As is usual for those who determine Amer-North Atlantic Treaty Organiza-

yield to this one. For the Germans at this time, anything which contributes to this is a sign of "politi-

a sign of "resurgent nationalism," and all the other evils to which the Germans are supposed to be peculiarly addicted.

However, the views of the Allied high commissioners, and particularly of their American continthe New York Times.

the past two weeks gives as clear a picture as could possibly be obtained of the completely "American," that is, the utterly chauvinistic attitude of the American government toward the German peo-

ple. The foreign ministers of the United States, Britain and France met in Washington just ducted with guarantees of all before the NATO conference at democratic rights for all parties Ottawa. They decided that Ger- in both zones under international many was to be offered a wide supervision. extension of sovereignty in ex- This completely democratic pro-

The Lamentations of Sidney Hook The Professor Deplores 'Cultural Vigilantism' but Absolves the Government's Role

By EMMA STOKES

Sidney Hook, head of the philosophy and psychology department of the graduate school at New York University, pontificates periodically as a kind of self-appointed conscience of American liberalism, after having embraced and left most of the political movements of socialism.

Hook is exercised about what he terms "cultural vigilantism" in American life in the September 30 issue of the New York Times Magazine. His article begins:

"Letters, periodicals and visitors from foreign countries provide convergent evidence that a strange picture of American life and culture is being etched in acid abroad. Even in non-Communist circles in Europe and Asia, the view is sedulously being cultivated that the United States, posing as the chief defender of Western values of freedom, tolerance and respect for individual differences, is actually in the grip of an epidemic hysteria of witchhunting, Communist baiting and character lynching. It is sometimes alleged that a reign of terror-political as well as cultural-is rampant in this country, differing in degree but not in moral kind from the ruthless suppressions of the Iron Curtain countries."

Hook does not specify who is depicting this "strange picture," this "cultural reign of terror" that is being spread abroad. It is obviously not the Stalinists, to whose exaggerations most persons, and especially Professor Hook, are accustomed. They are apparently people of more seriousness and probity for Hook to become so concerned.

"Deplorable Incident"

The article continues:

"On the basis of one or another deplorable incident [sic] loud outcries have been raised in the press and on the platform that we are on the verge of fascism. Orators with greater eloquence than discriminating judgment announce that we are already living in a police or garrison state and that our traditional Bill of Rights functions only as a deceptive ritual to conceal the ugly facts of repression. Predictions have been freely made that before long we will be burning books in the street . . .'

Worst of all, these anonymously-made assertions have been "growing in volume even on this side of the Atlantic." They are picked up abroad by the peoples of Asia and Europe, "even in non-Communist circles" and "are cited as evidence that Europe and Asia must protect themselves from the two colossi of cultural intolerance-the USSR and the U.S.A.'

Who these "orators" are and who is making the "predictions" of "book-burning" is left unsaid throughout the article. But Hook considers the "exaggerations" dangerous because "They weaken the moral case of Western democracy against Communist totalitarianism." They tend "to anaesthetize people to a point where, if ever a genuine threat of a police state were to arise in this country, Cassandra cries of 'fascism' would leave them apathetic. This actually happened in Germany." (We thought, as once did Hook, that the failure of the working-class organizations to unite in struggle against Hitler was the main reason for the victory of Nazism.)

Synonym for Witchhunt

Hook asseverates that the most important harm done by these "exaggerations" is to divert our attention from the "real danger" which isthe not inept phrase is Hook's, the emphasis ours -"the cultural vigilantism of certain pressure groups in education, economics, art, science, entertainment, religion and other social fields." Not "epidemic hysteria," or political and cultural "reign of terror", if you please. Those phrases will distract from the real malady, cultural vigilantism.

Hook's argumentation is bizarre. For the only real "exaggerators" who level the charges of fascism and bookburning are Stalinists. The genuine, consistent liberals (a category which must exclude Hook), the thinking labor leaders, the Marxists and 'socialists have made the correct allegations, those that can be classified under the

charge of vigilantism, both cultural and political. Is it the latter against whom he inveighs? Hook is aware that these are genuinely concerned with what is happening to the tradition of the Bill of Rights, and not because of the march of fascists on the right but because of the blows against democracy which began at the top, in the government itself, and have permeated all layers and areas of society.

It's Those Communists Again

Hook significantly and deliberately excludes politics and government from consideration in his article, with a mention that the "political threats . . . are already being so freely debated these days from both the White House and Capitol Hill." By this omission, and elsewhere specifically, he removes from the government any onus for the phenomenon of "cultural vigilant-

But Hook does illustrate the phenomenon with copious and pedestrian notes. He states that opponents of progressive education, apparently organized on a national scale, link progressive education with communism, and is at some pains to prove that the connection is absurd. Reputable economists, he states, are labeled subversive for advocacy of a proposal such as a withholding tax on dividends-as have been the advocates of price and wage controls, rollbacks, public housing.

Needless loyalty oaths in education and other professional fields; the dictation of what textbooks should be used in classes by private persons and groups; condemnation of performers in radio and other fields of entertainment for their political backgrounds; condemnation of the contents of plays, movies and radio; the identification of the philosophy of John Dewey with that of Hitler and Stalin-Hook's article is replete with examples. He adds:

"Almost every day some incident reveals the growing pattern of cultural vigilantism which invokes the slogans of Americanism while betraying its best traditions."

In answering the question, "What are the causes of the development of cultural vigilantism?" Hook specifically exculpates the state power: "Nor is it true to say that the cause of cultural vigilantism is to be found in the activities of the government."

What are the causes? "The obvious main cause is fear of communism, and to the extent that fear is based on knowledge it is a healthy and legitimate fear." And: "That mood [the anti-Communist mood] is principally the cumulative result of a long series of actions by the Communists themselves-from the post-war usurpation of power in the satellite countries to the espionage cases and the invasion of Korea."

It is astonishing, but these are the shabby ideas that Hook is reduced to in evaluating the emergence of the problem he christens "cultural vigilantism." Of course, his arguments are designed to protect his own behavior in the post-war assault on civil liberties and his position of support to the U.S. in the war. He took the stand that Communist teachers should not be allowed to teach.

Hits Subversive List

We cannot but suspect that Hook is a little more aware of the role of the government than he vows, for among his proposals for reducing the incidence of cultural vigilantism are some that relate directly to the role of government. He proposes that "the attorney general's list of subversive organizations should be published only after hearings have been conducted and the relevant evidence published, including the demurrers, if any, of the responsible officers of the organizations. The loyalty program should be rethought and more selectively applied."

Thus, for the first time since President Truman decreed Executive Order 9835 and caused the attorney general to draw up a list of "subversive organizations to be used as an index for government employment, has



ALL publishers. Get ALL your books from LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

New York 11, N.Y. 114 W. 14th St.

Read about INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM Send for the two special issues of LABOR ACTION devoted to explaining the ideas of the Independent Socialist League -May Day 1950—The Principles and Program of Independent Socialism May Day 1951—Independent Socialism and the War 10 cents each

Sidney Hook publicly questioned, to our knowledge, the procedure employed. As LABOR ACTION has repeatedly shown, this order was a most powerful catalyst in producing the current hysteria, or "cultural vigilantism," if vou like.

The list has been published for four years now. No organization listed has ever received a hearing, a notification of the intentions of the attorney general or a notification of listing except after the event and in the public press. The attorney general's list was not and could not be confined to government employment. Its by now universal application in industry, commerce, entertainment -and in those fields Hook is especially worried about art, education and philosophy-was indicated.

Getting Alarmed

Another governmental measure, the Smith Act, is praised by Hook for permitting open hearings and appeal, even if its "wisdom" is questionable. Hook must recall that it was sanctioned by a sharply divided Supreme Court and passed because of the support of Truman's appointees, and that it made possible the prosecution and persecution of the Stalinists.

In dismissing the government's role in the generation of the current atmosphere, Hook ignores the disgraceful conduct of congressional committees, the habits of the Senate and the House which permit McCarthy, McCarran, Nixon, Mundt, et al. to run their sideshows. In consideration of the behavior of these legislators alone, how can Hook seriously believe his own argument that mere fear of Stalinism and the actions of the Stalinists caused the moods in American life which he fears today? Did he think they were not serious manifestations of anti-democratic feeling solely because they occurred on a governmental

Unfortunately, to have spoken about these things forthrightly would have seriously undermined Hook's position as a supporter of one of the imperialist blocs in the current cold war. Now that "anti-communism" has become a stock-in-trade and political plank for the Republicans, Truman himself-and Hook as well-are moved to issue a word of caution.

Politics and the government, and Hook's relation to them, which Hook wants to leave out of the discussion are of its essence and account for the shallow wass of Hook's reasoning. He is driven to lament the fact that 'instead of whipping up sentiment against the domestic agents of the Kremlin [we find it hard to believe that Hook seriously considers this a problem], the government has been accused by some of its critics of lagging behind the mood of the people. Although it is true that in some respects governmental measures have fallen short of proper standards of justice [mind you, allen short of proper standards of justice], government agencies, if anything, find their work hampered by the private fevers of cultural vigilantism which have arisen like a rash from the anti-Communist mood."

But the "anti-communist mood" was not something that sprang out of the feelings of an enraged people. It is worked up deliberately through the activities of the administration, the Senate and House, by the press and the tens and hundreds of official and unofficial bodies that dot the country, the self-appointed censors and patriots.

To further emphasize his concern lest the American temper be exaggerated, Hook recalls one of the worst periods in modern American history, the Gogan-Brown-Scully Bomb Squad of 1920 and the Palmer raids and mass deportations. Today's mood is not as dark in many ways; in some it is darker. But Hook plucks that period from American history because it is in many ways comparable to the present, if with many differences.

The Fingers Point to U.S.

Hook is hard pressed to defend his thesis that a wrong impression is created abroad about American democracy by those who exaggerate the truth. The colored nations of the world do not point to a Cicero, Illinois, because they are*Stalinists. The Europeans and Asians who criticize the state of civil liberties in the U.S. have ample right to do so. The U. S. is posing as the champion of freedom and democracy in the struggle against totalitarianism. Is it to be wondered that accusing fingers point at incident after incident in U. S. life which indicate a narrowing of freedom and democracy?

We suspect that the suspicious mood of these peoples begins not with ineidents in American life, but rather on native shores and starts with certain American dealings with the Chiang Kai-sheks, Bao Dais, Syngman Rhees, General Francos and their similars. Are they far from right in looking upon the current anti-democratic hysteria as an integral part of the American social scene rather than Hook's aberrant phenomena?

The fact is that democracy has received repeated blows in the United States and these blows have originated in the administration and Congress. The cold war, the threatening conflict with Russia, has forced the government to begin that struggle with a preparation of the home front in the only way it knows how: by industrial, political, military and psychological mobilization. To defeat and destroy Stalin's agents in this country, it has embarked on the road which threatens the bourgeoisdemocratic heritage of the country. The resultant stalinophobia supplants an understanding of the nature of Stalinism. The anti-democratic measure used against Stalinism are inevitably directed against genuine socialists, the only effective anti-Stalinists, against all radicals, liberals and non-conformists. And, in essence, even against Sidney Hook.

German Socialists Seize Initiative on Issue Of National Unity, against Pressure by U.S.

Germany is once again becoming the central political battleground in the global cold-war struggle. But in the closing months of the year 1951, the German people themselves are playing a much more important part in deciding their own destiny than has been the case at any time since the total defeat of the Nazi armies in 1945.

for the creation of a German

military force completely inte-

grated into the strucure of the

NATO armies. These ends were to

be accomplished through signing

a series of "contractual agree-

ments" which are to replace the

Although no text of these pro-

posed agreements has been pub-

lished, it appears that in addition

continued "decartelization" of

German industry, to provide for

the presence in Germany of Al-

lied troops as long as the Allies

deem necessary, and for repara-

tions. .The Allies will maintain

political life only if there should

arise a threat to democracy there;

lin, and will retain in their hands

the power of decision on the re-

unification of Germany, i.e., on

German foreign policy insofar as

according to an Allied timetable

which had as its target date the

end of the year or early spring

As soon as the decisions of the

Big Three foreign ministers were

known, the Russians initiated a

political counter-offensive. On

September 15, Otto Grotewohl.

East German premier, made a

speech offering unity to Western

Germany. This was followed by

speeches by other Stalinist digni-

taries, and was shortly endorsed

by General Vassily I. Chuikov,

Russian commander in chief in

The proposal seemed to come

closer to meeting the West Ger-

man approach to unity than any

previous overtures on this ques-

proposing a meeting of the repre-

sentatives of the East and West

German governments to discuss

ways and means of unifying the

country, and hinted vaguely at

certain "democratic guarantees"

with regard to such unification.

tion, although it was confined to

SDs MET CHALLENGE

East Germany.

All this was to be accomplished

it relates to Russia.

occupation statute.

The latter have no way of enough evidence of their true po- to the military guarantees, they are to contain assurances of the Democratic leaders of the West German working class, that they

This is the outstanding, the all

The present phase of the struggle has been initiated by the Americans and their allies. They ican foreign policy, the dominant considerations are military. Everything must be done to create a German military force which can supplement the forces of the

All other considerations must cal maturity," "democracy," a "broad understanding" of European problems. Anything which tructs it or even delays it is

The State Department has not favored us with a White Paper setting forth its views on the integration of Western Germany into the Atlantic Treaty system. gent, have been consistently 'leaked" through their "chosen instrument." Drew Middleton of

A study of his dispatches over

political strategy. The Stalinists can fret and fume and denounce all they want. Yet they will have the greatest difficulty in erasing from the minds of their subjects the fact that the German Social-Democracy is willing to risk its all on the democratic and socialist consciousness of the German working class on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

For it is quite clear that should the Stalinists accept this challenge, and succeed in winning a majority or even a large plurality under the conditions set forth it would be a tremendous political victory for Stalinism in Germany and in the world, even if the Western Allies were to step in and prevent unification from taking place. But by the same token, should the Social-Democrats or even the bourgeois parties win in democratic political contest, Stalinism would suffer a major political disaster even though it s quite certain that the Russians would not permit the unification of Germany under such circumstances.

WASHINGTON'S LINE

The world-wide propaganda machine of the American government speaks in the name of democracy. It is for democracy, for freedom, that America purports spend its wealth and the lives of its sons all over the world. It is democracy which the American government seeks to inculcate in ll the benighted peoples subject to American control or influence. What then was the reaction of the American government to this proposal of the German Social-Democratic Party, which was not only completely democratic in form but which showed the greatest possible confidence in the dem ocratic will of the German people?

The American government was against it.

In all this talk about reuniting Germany the Americans saw only a diversion from what they had decided is best for Western Germany right now: immediate "integration" into Western Europe.

As the Times pipeline put it:

"The Bonn government's statement tomorrow [on its demand for free elections throughout all Germany] is not expected to please the Allied High Commission for it will mean that for the time being the attention of the end of the year. These complaints, West German Parliament has it appears, express the main re

posal was an excellent stroke of been diverted from the prime objective of Allied policy, which is the writing of a contractual agreement between the federal republic and the Allied powers.

> "This agreement would give West Germany virtual independence and would also integrate German manpower into the defense of Europe. The Office of the United States High Commissioner believes this goal must be pursued singlemindedly, if it is to be achieved before the end of the year."

In a dispatch from Bonn dated September 25, the Times reports that "an abrupt and outright reiection of the Communist offer ... would have been in line with United States policy. . . ." And although it appears that the Adenauer cabinet had also been at first inclined toward such a course, the popular pressure behind the Social-Democratic proposal was not to be denied.

The same dispatch reports that "Dr. Heinrich von Brentano, chairman of the Christian-Democratic Union's parliamentary delegation, announced the support of his party, the most numerous and powerful in the Bundestag, for an earlier motion by the Social-Democrats calling for all-German elections under international control," and that "all the major parties . . . have now swung away from the government's attitude of abrupt rejection of the Communist offer."

PROPOSALS ADOPTED

And it was not only all the major German parties which were swinging away. It seems that even inside the Allied High Commission there was no unanimity on the question.

"There is a strong feeling among the deputies," the Times states, "that this is the psychoogical moment to call Premier Gotewohl's bluff and find out if the Communist government in East Germany really means what it says. With some deviations this is the line that British officials have been advocating for the last week.'

Over and over again the dispatches complain that this whole business about unity is "distracting attention" from or "preventing concentration" by the Germans on the contractual agreements which were to integrate Germany with the West by the

Conditions for Unification

(1) The electoral area shall form a single constituency and each party shall submit a list of candidates for the entire electoral area.

(2) Freedom of political activity in preparing and carrying out the election shall be guaranteed.

(3) All restrictions in passenger traffic between East and West Germany and between East and West Germany and Berlin will be repealed three months before the elections.

(4) Candidates for the national assembly will receive a guarantee of "absolute personal freedom."

(5) Before, during and after the elections no one may be arrested, detained, subjected to disciplinary action or dismissed from his employment because of his political attitude.

(6) Party meetings in public shall be permitted without restriction and shall be protected.

(7) The distribution of newspapers, periodicals and the reception of radio broadcasts are not to be restricted.

(8) Secrecy of the election shall be restricted. (9) Ballots must be uniform and voting must be in secret.

(10) Renunciation of any of these provisions will invalidate the entire election in any polling district concerned.

(11) Votes shall be counted in public by a committee consisting of representatives of all parties. (12) The preparation and carrying out of the election shall

be under international protection and supervision. (13) Protection of the election everywhere is to be entrusted

to international supervisory bodies and German authorities must comply with the directions of these bodies.

(14) The supervisory bodies shall safeguard the rights and liberties of the populace and every German will have the right to appeal to these bodies.

action of the American official toward any discussion of German unification

Page Seven

After some hesitation, Adenauer finally presented the Bundestag with fourteen conditions under which his government would agree to elections for a national assembly that would discuss the organization of a reunited Germany. These express the Social-Democratic position in full, and were approved by the Bundestag with only the Stalinist deputies voting against. Their motion that the East German offer of unity talks be accepted and a date set for such intergovernment discussions was overwhelmingly defeated.

THEY'RE AFRAID

The conditions under which the West German government will agree to all-German elections are important and we print them on this page. They set forth all the necessary guarantees for a democratic election. Adenauer stated at the same time that his government will apply at once for an international investigation of electoral freedom in West Germany under the supervision of the United Nations and challenged the East German government to do the same.

The American officials feel that since the Stalinist bluff has now been called, it is quite likely that the Russians will themselves have to step openly into the picture. They are fearful that the Stalinists might actually accept the formula for German unity drawn up by the Western powers at the Paris conference of foreign ministers in May and June of 1949, which was rejected by Vishinsky at the time.

Even they realize that to reject such an offer now out of hand, after the Germans of all parties have expressed themselves so strongly for immediate unification, would be disastrous. But from all reports, they are at a loss what to do if the offer is made.

What is the American government afraid of? Actually, it is not too easy to answer this question. appears that the chief element in American thinking, if it can be called that, is the fact that they have determined to swing a rearmed Western Germany into their camp immediately, and until this is accomplished they are simply blind to everything else involved.

SOCIALISTS WILL GAIN

Of course, there is an additional element which keeps cropping up in the dispatches. That is their realization that the German Social-Democracy has made a large step forward in winning the support of the German people by takng the initiative on German ur fication, and that if the struggle for unity is permitted to dominate German political life for any length of time, they stand to win most from it.

In a dispatch dated September 28 Drew Middleton puts it this way: "Instead of seeking to bring half of Germany, by far the richer half, into the Western community, the United States would have to raise its sights to the winning of all of Germany for the West.

"This would not be easy. In the first place the Communists have made great progress with the young people of East Germany. Then, too, the first government of a united Germany might well be a socialist regime headed by Dr. Kurt Schumacher, a less malleable subject for United States pressure than Dr. Adenauer."

That is well said, indeed! And it is said despite the fact that everyone who is not a political idiot knows that Schumacher and his party are hated far. more deeply and considered a much (Turn to last page)

All parties concerned realized that this was a maneuver on Stalin's part. No one in many but his miserable and discredited stooges pretend they believe there is an ounce of sincerity or good intention in the offer. But all Germans passionately desire to reunite their country, and for them, this is a political objective which must take precedence over all others, the moment it has the slightest chance of realization on a progressive basis. By this is meant simply: a basis which would neither expose Germany to the certainty of immediate war, nor to the extension of Stalinist rule over

the whole country. No sooner had the Stalinists launched their maneuver than the Social-Democrats in Western Germany took up the challenge and hurled it back in their teeth. They demanded that the Adenauer government take up Grotewohl's proposal and counter it with a demand for an all-German election to a national assembly to be con-



October 8, 1951-

Socialists of India, Japan

treat not only the people, but even the Social Democrats of the countries which were on opposite sides from theirs in the last war-Germany, for example-with a poisonously chauvinistic superiority. And their attitude and policies toward the people and socialists of the small countries, most particularly of the still backward, the colonial and semi-colonial countries, is, if that were possible, still more despicable. In this respect, they can learn a lot from the socialists of Asia, if they are still capable of learning any-

We too can learn from Asia. Yes, we "superior Americans" can learn from the "inferior and backward

clarity of action—that will come, we are convinced. But the entire American labor movement and working class of India and Japan the great and overwhelming importance of establishing and maintaining their own independence from the ruling classes of the entire world, and first and foremost, from the ruling class of their own country.

HAS NO PROGRAM

The "advanced" labor leadership of the United States, which presumes to give lessons (and even instruc-Asians." That is not because tions!) to the labor movethey know all the answers to ment of the rest of the world, all the questions. Not even has not even worked out a because we can always rounded political and social

agree with the answers they program of its own for the do give, or with the way nation, let alone a program they give them. What is lack- of its own for a foreign poling in that precision and icy of the United States. We clarity of position which are are not even speaking of a required for precision and socialist foreign policy, but of a democratic foreign policy. In this respect, the statement of the Indian and Japanese socialists shows how can learn from the socialists many thousands of miles they are advanced ahead of the American labor movement.

But not only in this respect. They are imbued with the great and all-promising idea of organizing the Third Camp of socialism, democracy and peace as a force independent of the two imperialist war camps and as a challenge to their world dominion. The joint statement, which is signed in the name of organizations which have real and growing strength among the people, is a splendid step toward the expansion of that Camp, now in



sion, Stalinist expansion- reliance, the independent those are the wrack and ruin movement of the people Asia, tomorrow throughout of the people. But the expan- themselves - there lies the the world. Capitalist expan- sion of the power, the self- grand future for mankind.

German Unity -

than is Adenauer and his conservative clique; that he and his party are intransigent opponents of Stalinism and that hence any political victory which would bring him to the head of a government of all Germany would mean an utter rout for the Stal-

malleable subject for United States pressure than Dr. Adenauer." That is, he is more independent; he is convinced that as long as Germany has not won its full sovereignty and is not in a position to treat with the other powers as an equal, Germany and hence the German working class will remain a subject of the manipulations of America and the

And in order to unite Germany, to create the economic and political basis for full sovereignty and equality, he is willing to rely on the democratic will of the whole German working class, in-

"The figure of Dr. Kurt Schumacher, leader of the socialist party," writes Middleton on September 29, "looms large both in the coming debate on integration d in the present been discounted by the United missions as untrustworthy and a demagogue; but it has been aphis power is greater than either realized. [Note: the British, it apillusions, for he does not mention them.—G. H.] It was Schumacher's socialist party that took and held the initiative in answering the Sowide election in Berlin. That has provided the Bundestag with a positive preliminary approach to the

Later in the same dispatch has been helped in his efforts to restore greater independence to of the occupation powers that if many would either fall to Dr.

Needless to sav. LABOR ACgreater menace by the Stalinists TION holds no brief for all of the policies of the German Social-Democratic Party. Our criticisms have been stated, and we will no doubt find other occasions on which to elaborate them further. Yet it is precisely that which instills an "almost pathological fear" in "some of the occupation powers" which we find most admirable in his approach.. That is what is called his "nationalism." i.e., his determination to struggle for the full national sovereignty of his occupied country.

NATIONALISM

In recent weeks there has been an alarming growth of militarist and chauvinist organizations in Germany. The German generals are forming "veterans'" organizations with an openly reactionary and militarist program. They feel that as long as the Americans are seeking to "integrate German manpower into the defense of Europe" as their prime policy, the day of the return of the military to a key position in German political life is not far off. Their politics are, of course, utterly reactionary; their ideology is com-. pletely chauvinist.

The nationalism of the Social-Democratic Party is of an entirely different character from the nationalism of the generals and their industrialist supporters. In fact, it is the policy best calculated to keeping these gentry from achieving their goals. For it recognizes and enlists the legitimate aspiration of the German people for national independence and self-determination in the fullest sense, while at the same time giving expression to their desire for both political and economic democracy.

And the American government's reaction to the new feeling of self-confidence of the German people as it expresses itself in their growing support of the Social-Democracy's demand for uniting Germany, for greater independence from American control, is quite typical. In the first place it is so "American" that it can see in this only an obstacle to Middleton states that Adenauer the pet plan for immediate "integration" into the West. And to the extent that it can even think beyond its simple formula for defeating Stalinism by increasing the military power arrayed his requests were not met Ger- against it, the American government has only a near pathological fear of the most consistently democratic and the most effectively anti-fascist and anti-Stalinist force in Germany.

FROM THE ICFTU INDICTMENT CAMPS OF THE LIVING DEAD

cerpt from the pamphlet "Stalin's so-called off duty time which is Slave Camps," published by the filled with voluntary brigades for International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, dealing with the "uranium slaves" in East Germany.

The following report is that of a medical doctor who was a prisoner in one of the camps in the uranium area in Jachymov, Czechoslovakia, which was quoted in the pamphlet:

General malnutrition causes blood diseases and lack of resistance to infection. Every second prisoner is suffering from either a rash, boils (furunculosis), carbuncles, lichen, scabies or diseases of the eyes. The heavy work to which very few of the inmates are accustomed — as they are mainly former lawyers, teachers, journalists, priests, politicians, officers, business people, industrialists or white collar workers -causes ruptures which cannot be treated and trusses are not available. Cases of inguinal hernia (in Czech sourkove kulu) among those over fifty are not infrequent and I have examined some where the ruptures reach the knees. Not even in these circumstances is the prisoner allow- the police, the lorries are filled ed relief from work.

DISEASE RAVAGES

Health conditions in general are deplorable. It is obvious that the exhausted human organism suffers especially during underground work. There are mass appearances of chronic inflamations of the respiratory tract, developing to asthmatic trouble and other complications. Cases of consumption are numerous. In the camp adjoining the "Slavkov" uranium pit, about 30 per cent of the inmates are suffering from tuberculosis, as far as I could ascertain. This situation is worsened by numerous accidents, and injuries caused by shooting-a regular feature during the nights.

After the evening signal by gongs made of old gun ammunition, no one is allowed to leave the barracks for any reason whatever, even during epidemics of enteric fever, and on such occasions the atmosphere of despair in the barracks is unbearable. The guards are brutal and sometimes beat the prisoners who live in constant fear and some on the verge of mental derangement.

Last week we carried one ex- The seven-day work week and the such tasks as peeling potatoes, shifting coal, building camp roads, etc., result in pitiful hide and seek between the inmates and the guards but there is usually no escape.

IMAGE OF HELL

Further deterioration of health conditions is caused by the complete lack of hygienic and sanitary arrangements. Barracks are overcrowded beyond description. At the sounding of reveille, half the occupants leave the barracks because there is no space for them to dress. Washing is limited to those who can grab a little water, of which there is almost none. They must wash in the same tins which they use for their food. Breakfast is usually ersatz coffee and sometimes bread. At 6 a.m. there is roll call lasting about an hour in all kinds of weather. Guards and staff run about madly, because usually they count the wrong number. They swear, slap and kick the prisoners and the peak is reached when the lorries arrive to take the prisoners to their jobs. With the assistance of and they rese en blocks more than a human ing class-enemies. transport. Each lorry is accompanied by several guards with ma chine guns (an exact replica of a transport to place of execution). In January last, one lorry traveling at full speed lost its side-wall. Twelve people fell out and suffered extensive injuries.

avoiding injuries while at work underground and fractures of the skull are frequent.

"BROTHEROOD"!

The latest reorganization of the camp system has allocated a new task to the central Vykmanov camp. It has become a labor depot for work carried out on the surface, while the camp "Bratrstvi" (Brotherhood!) is the pool for underground labor. Prisoners who are too old or who have been worked to exhaustion are now concentrated in Vykmanov, as they are unable to fulfil the norms demanded in the pits. Formerly, they were sent to forced labor camps in other parts of the country. But now no illness can bring relief. The camp is the center of the unwanted, who find liberation only in death.

Many of the dreadful conditions could be corrected or improved without difficulty, if the camp authorities were interested. But it is obvious that these camps are in fact extermination camps and every fatality is replaced by five others sentenced by the Peoples Courts. The camps, formerly described as being used for the reeducation of political opponents. have become a tool of the class warfare. with the aim of liquidat

Get ALL your books from Labor Action Book Service

There is no instruction

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

We can supply you!



New International: attractively bound in red cloth, with index .. \$4.00

 Combination offer: both for \$6.00 Cash orders only. Make out checks to:

> INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS 114 West 14 Street, New York City