

FIVE CENTS

## Still Poverty **Amid Plenty**

about \$2000 a year—between \$35 and \$40 a week—to maintain themselves at just a sub-sistence, just a decent mini-

tion's men and women who are 65 or over have anything approaching that total of money to spend-either in earnings or in pensions or in income on in-

"Even worse, almost 6 million of America's 12 million citizens in the over-65 age group are now struggling to meet minimum living costs of \$1000 a year with \$500 or less

"And that's why, in this era of record boom, we see the strange phenomenon of 5,700,-000 Americans on the relief rolls of our 48 states-getting cash help and medical care....

"What are we creating here -what warning is pounded home by the startling statistic that half of our older folks haven't even 50 per cent of the minimum income they need to

Porter, N. Y. Post, Nov. 26.

COLLECTIVIZATION AND PEASANT RESISTANCE UNDER STALINISM

. . . page 6

They Boycotted Franco's Fake Election ... page 3

## British CP Tries a New Tactic

. . . page Z

It's the 'Times' That Says So —

## **Europe's Crisis:** Capitalist System 'Does Not Work'!

#### **By SAM FELIKS**

The big question at the meetings of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization always turns out to be the same one: How is Western Europe going to pay for the tremendous rearmament program? Military goals have been set; and before there is even a realistic chance that they will be met, new and more drastic demands are made by Washington. The result has been a creep-

ing economic crisis threatening to drag down all of Western Europe.

The story that occupied the center of the stage at the Ottawa meeting of the NATO last September was also the main attraction at this November meeting in Rome, and will be foremost at the January meeting in Lisbon No one at NATO is proposing

a solution to the economic crisis, because no one thinks it can be found. It is only the Americans who have even talked in optimistic terms-but then that is expected of them. For if not they, what can be expected of the Europeans? The result has been the well-publicized "smiling confidence" of General Eisenhower, which it was thought could impart confidence to the European people while he (Turn to last page)

# **U.S. Deal with Adenauer Reflects**

The West German Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, has come to an agreement with the Western occupying powers on a proposed settlement of the relations between West Germany and the governments of the United States, France and Great Britain. Thus the Allies have met their target of negotiating a "contract" with Western Germany before the end of the year. It will be a long time, however, before this "contract" can be put into practice, and there are ample reasons to believe that this may never take place.

Two factors have contributed mightily to the speed with which Adenauer and the Allies have been able to reach agreement. The first is the ardent desire the people of Western Germany have shown for an early unification of their popularity and power of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, a popularity which has grown in large measure because of the SPD's position on the related problems of

It is an open secret that the Allies regard the Ger- many is concerned, they have man Social-Democracy, and been willing to give Adendanger to their plans for the the political tide which reintegration of Western Ger- cent elections have shown is many into the military sys- running strongly for the SPD. tem of the North Atlantic Treaty. And as this integra- ment reached on November affairs except on three question is the chief goal of Al- 22 in Paris, Western Ger- tions: the Allies have the lied (and particularly Amer- many is to get full sovereign- right to resume control of ican) policy as far as Ger- ty in domestic and foreign

According to the agree-

For a United Independent Germany



German Socialist Leader

(Tern to last page)

#### Page Two

LABOR ACTION



#### By AL MANN

CHICAGO, November 25 - The low level of internal politics in The United Auto Worker's Region No. 4 hit bottom this week when a Ford Aircraft employee accused unknown "kidnappers" as saying: "Trotsky will take care of this from now on."

The story broke on the day of the Ford bargaining election at the huge plant on the southwest side of Chicago. It concerned an alternate committeeman, George Duke, who told his wife that he had been kidnapped by three men and forced to drink a sweet drink that knocked him out. He could not remember how he parked his car in the garage, how he managed to get home and get into the house

Although taken fairly seriously by the newspapers of Chicago, this episode was a laugh riot in the plant. The men figured out that he had to give some excuse for coming home late after drinking and made up the story. Another version was that he probably lined up a babe who gave him a mickey.

This moderately amusing story would usually not need reporting in LABOR ACTION. However, the serious nature of this incident is reflective of the situation in Region 4 today. The regional office has not forgotten the last convention or the convention before that, and concerns itself solely with eliminating any opposition or potential opposition.

#### RECORD OF DEFEATS

Through the whole Ford drive the regional office planted people in the shop who spread stories about "Trotskys." Instead of fighting for an industrial union, the fight for positions in the future local was paramount. The Chicago locals were not asked for aid. The Skilled Trades Council of Chicago had to forcec itself on the scene, "Watch this guywatch that guy," was the theme throughout.

As a result the UAW lost the following crafts: electricians, pipefitters, truck drivers, powerhouse, metal polishers (soon to become 700 men), die sinkers, and pattern makers. The toolroom was won only because the Skilled Trades Department of the international had a capable person within the plant and was successful in welding the department into a pro-UAW unit. The production and maintenance unit had no opposition.

When this worker used the name "Trotsky" as an excuse for his night out it only reflected what

	e Ha Sub	11	100 E	•	2
	depen 114	dent s Wes	Socia 14	CTIO list Wee Street N. Y.	110.00
	lease a NEW 6 mon 1 yea	ths at	RENE \$1.0		on:
NA	ME	(plea	ise p	rińt)	
AD	DRESS				
zoi	NE	·····;	. АРТ		
CIT	¥				
ST	ате П В	ill me			
				nclosed.	

and the methods of Regional Di- in the city of Chicago. rector Pat Greathouse.

The Ford situation was not election in Local 719 at Electrosucceeded in obtaining a vice presidential spot by a 30-vote margin. They lost the guide post and subsequently were defeated for a shop-committee vacancy and failed to obtain any representation to the state CIO convention, even though one of their candidates was a member of the state board.

#### PICKENS EPISODE

The campaign at the South Side plant of EMD was one that would McCarran - McCarthy to put shame. The lowest type of socialist-baiting and flag-waving, plus pictures of Cardinal Spellman, featured a four-page paper of the Greathouse group. A cartoon which was typical of the style of Greathouse's publicity agent showed the mud level of the scarethinking of reactionary politicians.

This group went just a little too far. and charges were preferred against four men. They were suspended pending the trial. The two-thirds vote necessary to suspend was carried nearly unanimously-

The UAW-CIO is an advanced union. Its ideas often are in the vanguard of the labor movement. An experience at the summer school of Region 4 has caused a

LONDON LETTER ----

## the internal situation was at Ford deal of comment in union circles

One of the speakers on international affairs was Robert Pickunique. A few weeks ago at a by- ens of the American Friends Committee. This pacifist group motive, the Greathouse followers stands fairly high in labor circles. In December the committee has organized an International Policy discussion conference sponsored by all the labor leaders of Chicago (with Walter Reuther scheduled to speak). All, that is, except Pat Greathouse. He could ill afford to sign the call. After Pickens had spoken, a group of backward members mumbled that his position was "Communist" and suggested that he be thrown in the Illinois River.

At the concluding banquet Greathouse, who should have spoken in defense of the right of Pickens to have his position presented, stated that he did not know the man had been invited (a slap at Regional Educational Director Willoughby Abner) and that his position was not welcome at the school, and that if he ever came back he (Greathouse) would not care if he were thrown in the Illinois River.

With all the golden opportunities to organize the unorganized in the Chicago area, it is safe to say that only those shops that will "safe" in 1953 will be organized. It is a sorry commentary on the UAW situation in the second largest city of the country, and a city that has as much potential membership as Chicago has.

## **CP**, at Low Ebb, to Infiltrate Labor Party

## By DAVID ALEXANDER

This week news has come of a recent directive by the head of the British Communist Party for its members to enter the Labor Party "en masse."

Such a directive has been expected here for some time; there have been reports from the Holborn (central London) Labor Party of somewhat feeble attempts by Stalinists to enter. Also, a faked "correspondence" recently took place in the London Daily Worker upon the advisability of this move, and there was even some "discussion" of the issue.

CP members have been told to take bureaucratic jobs and to try to get hold of the machinery of the Labor Party and the trade unions.

This move, in reality, marks the defeat and disillusionment of the CP. Even at the height of Anglo-Russian good will, they had only about 50,000 members and fellow travelers. Even then their news er nad daily circulation of 100,000 and this was maintained by party members selling the paper at subways.

#### NO LONGER A FACTOR

Today, their newspaper has a circulation of about 40,000 and it is more expensive than other dailies. It loses some thousands of dollars a month. Furthermore, they were recently hit by a libel suit; General Anders, the Polish ex-commander in chief, won his case against them and collected \$5000.

Despite puffed-up claims of a 34,000 membership, the real number is not believed here to exceed 3000. Even the CP's fellow travelers could only add perhaps another 5000.

What is even more unhappy for them is the fact that they are completely ignored. In the last election they lost 10 deposits (all their candidates had to forfeit them, as they gained less than one seventh of the total votes in any of the districts where they. ran). In the election before, they had lost 98 deposits.

In short, the British Stalinist party is to-

#### day no longer a factor in politics at all.

In this development, what has happened in Britain contrasts instructively with both the Continent on the one hand and the United States on the other. The contrast with Western Europe is clear, of course: it is in Italy and France that the mass membership and support of the Stalinists is greatest outside of the Stalinist police states themselves.

#### LABOR'S WAY

In these countries, radical workers, who are as disgusted with and antagonistic to capitalism as the majority of the workers of the world, have seen no place to go to express their sentiments other than the CP. They join or support the CP in their desire for a militant anti-capitalist party, even though many of them metaphorically hold their nose while doing so, and many others United States and their other sostill have to find out that the Stalinist party cialist comrades across the globe. is "militant" and "anti-capitalist" not in the interests of the working class or socialism but solely in the interests of the rival imperialism of Moscow. In Britain, the CP has been forced into its present state of weakness and futility because the Labor party member, urged him to con-Party, and particularly its left-wing currents (the Bevan group prominently), has on and a regular port of call in offered the workers a lead and a hope.

With regard to the United States, the contrast is pointed up by the relative absence of any government-sponsored witchhunt and anti-red hysteria as a factor in whittling down the CP. Stalinism has been defeated and held down here POLITICALLY, not by police-state-type measures which threaten far more than the civil liberties of the Stalinists alone. And this has been done because of the pre-eminent position of the Labor Party in the working class.

With the Tories back in power in Britain, a recrudescence of strength for the Stalinists could conceivably come if the Labor Party and its left-wingers seriously compromised itself or capitulated in the fight against Torvism. But this is not in the cards for the next period.

**Canadian Students and Socialists Hear Shachtman** 

SEATTLE, November 25 - Max Shachtman made a whirlwind visit into Vancouver, Canada, on November 16 at the invitation of British Columbia Socialists and the Students' Civil Liberties Union of the University of British Columbia. Delayed by an unexpected grounding in his flight Portland, the touring from Shachtman jumped out of the car and onto the speaker's dais at UBC with only seconds to spare.

"The state of civil liberties in my country would be comical." he said to his attentive Canadian audience of 60 students, "if i weren't tragic-a denial of democracy and free opinion."

He outlined the vicious irony of the attorney general's "subversive list" which cracks down, not on the basis of enemy espionage or overt acts against the state, but against the holding of opinions and the expression of free thought by unorthodox people in a capitalism girding itself for total global destruction.

"The attorney general believes in free speech," the speaker continued, "for himself. He is free to say this organization, or that, is subversive—and that's what free speech is for, isn't it? He's only expressing his opinion! But to try to find out why your organization is subversive, or who has accused you, what the evidence is upon which he acted, or how to rebut the charge by adducing evidence in your behalf—that is where you end up in the squirrel cage. Round and round you go and you always come out in the same place, with

#### the same answer: 'By presidential decree we are not able to disclose that information."

When the speaker outlined the problems of workers in the U.S. in the rising tide of anti-democracy, he pointed out the obvious cause-the increasing need for capitalism to expand or perish to produce or decline in the face of an awakening Asia and a twopower world. The needs of a garrison state could no longer tolerate the huxury of free speech or opinion, he said.

After the hearty applause Shachtman had a bouquet of his own to toss to the Canadian stu dents. "It's strange to see a university like this where the students run their own government and grant full rights to political clubs of every hue, and allow speakers of any persuasion to address them so freely. Could this be Paradise?'

#### KOREA PRE-VIEW

After a tour of the sights, eyeing the magnificent views of the rugged snow-covered mountains across Burrard Inlet as the guest of Earl Birney, UBC professor, poet and author, Shachtman addressed a socialist forum held in a private home before an enthusiastic and lively group of 75 peo-

"Korea," he said, "is a preview the greater struggle between the two great power blocs. After a year and a half, the only result of any note is-stalemate. The lesson it teaches to both contestants is to line up an overwhelming strength before risking a plunge into World War III. The stakes are big—but so are the risks, and until victory can be assured by overwhelming superiority, neither will take the risk.

"That," he emphasized, "gives the great masses of the world who want no part of either camp a breathing spell in which to organize. What can oppose capitalism? Socialism! And what can oppose Stalinist totalitarianism?-Democracy! Only in democratic socialism have you the answer to capitalism and Stalinism - the third camp, hostile-to imperialism and reaction."

Shachtman pointed out the impracticability of the American policy of bolstering discredited regimes. "We support the dictators, and the Stalinists capture the people of backward countries by default. Given a choice, they would take neither."

"The challenge is great." he finished, "to rally the peoples of the world for peace, for self-determination and economic betterment without strings attached. that is the role of democratic socialists and of the free labor movement of Canada and the Without these millions committed to either side, both Russian and American imperialism must give

pause. Thanking Max Shachtman, the chairman, Harold Mason, CCF sider British Columbia as his home away from home from now the northwest on any tour for the ISL.



December 3, 1951 "ABSTAIN FROM VOTING!" SAY THE SOCIALISTS -By RICHARD TROY

dictators to be toying with.

Washington's less enthusiastic friends.

propaganda organs."

FASCIST RIG-UP

strength. And, conversely, to participate in the election is an indi-

ball with the regime.

**Shachtman Tour: Seattle** 

SEATTLE, November 20 — Max for peace is in not supporting Shachtman, speaking in Seattle either reactionary war camp but as part of a national tour, met in a struggle for a socialist alternaa symposium with Scott Nearing tive to both. This can be carried to discuss "The Struggle for on in the U.S. by the formation Peace in the U. S." at Independ- of a Labor Party. ence Hall, Saturday night, No-Sunday evening, Mr. Shachtvember 17. man spoke before an enthusiastic audience on "The Consequences of

Nearing, speaking first, stated that he felt there was no positive 7 struggle for peace in the U.S. today. The USSR, he claimed, has a "vested interest" in peace while the U.S. has a "vested interest" in war; therefore we, as "peaceloving citizens," must support the USSR.

Shachtman made it clear that it was not a matter of two choices . the 14,000,000 votes received and the lesser of two evils. In re- the overwhelming support for the ality-the-only-positive-struggle left-wingers wherever they ran.

## WITH TEARS IN THEIR EYES ----

The London Times in a leader article for October 27

"Almost as remarkable as the virtual extinction of the Liberal Party-and as full of significance for the future-has been the triumph of Mr. Bevan and his associates. Mr. Michael Foot, Mr. Driberg, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Wilson, and Mrs. Castle were all defending marginal seats, and all succeeded in retaining them. It cannot be just a coincidence-nor only a tribute to their vigorous personalities-that, being so periously placed, they yet managed to survive when the swing of opinion, if it had run against them as against others, would have been large enough to oust at least three of them. It would seem to be clear, in fact, that there is among the rank and file of the Labor supporters in the country considerable sympathy for at least the more demagogic points in the case put by Mr. Bevan and his friends-and a failure to appreciate the nature and harsh implications of the rearmament programme. Mr. Bevan's position is obviously strengthened to the extent that he is not left isolated in the Parliamentary Party as he might well have been, and when the great debate in the Labor Party is resumed he can pose even more confidently than ever as the spokesman of the real heart of the Labor movement."

# Spanish People Heed Boycott Call To Ignore Franco's Fake Election

Despite last summer's deal between Madrid and Washington which helped to rescue the Franco fascist regime from approaching extinction, the Spanish situation remains unstable. Recent attempts by Franco to make it appear as if he is "liberalizing" his regime indicate the continued desperation of his position, for reforms, no matter how superficial, are dangerous playthings for

But there appears little choice for him. Since the future of the regime largely depends upon the United States, and since Washington is finding it difficult to sell Franco to the West as a reliable ally, Franco was pushed to make some moves, even if of the window-dressing variety, to placate

Of course, no one takes the "reforms" very seriously, even outside Spain itself. Sam Pope Brewer, the N. Y. Times correspondent, expressed the universal skepticism toward Franco's "democratization," stating quite categorically that "it is perfectly safe to say that Franco does not intend to permit any basic changes.' But inside Spain itself the "reforms" did not even merit such straight-faced treatment. The Barcelona correspondent of La Batal-Ia, organ of the socialist POUM, wrote that the Spanish people, "who have, through the hard experience of defeat, gained a greater political maturity, know what to expect and know enough not to be deceived by the promises or proclamations of the regime's

'As evidence of the "maturity" of the Spanish people the writer cites the simple but moving fact that less than 17 per cent of the eligible voters ("family heads") took part in the recent municipal elections, which had been publicized as a first step toward democmacy. The anti-Franco forces have been, of course, calling on their fellow citizens to abstain from voting in any Franco-rigged elections. The size of the non-voting population, then, is a test of their

cation that one is willing to play In the first place, the voters could only elect one-third of the members of the municipal councils, the remaining two-thirds having been appointed directly by the Falange or Falange-controlled professional organizations. Secondly, only those people could vote who had politically reliable records. Thirdly, most of the candi-

or, in some cases, by powerful position in the anti-Russian war

groups in the bourgeoisie. Fourthly, there was, of course, absoluteno opportunity for any sort of political campaign (so that, by comparison, even the Peron election atmosphere in Argentina of two weeks ago appeared free and open!).

These same conditions will be true of another batch of "elections" scheduled to be run off November 25. Therefore the POUM, and presumably other opposition groups, headline their newspapers: ABSTAIN FROM VOTING. And the vast majority of the people, either because they have heard this plea, or because they instinctively know the elections to be a farce, do indeed stay away from the polling booths in droves.

#### "DON'T VOTE!"

The POUM correspondent writes: "The complete abstention of the Spanish workers will show our strength and demonstrate once again the hatred we feel to ward the Franco regime. It will serve to make known to those who insist upon sustaining the regime the will of the whole country.' These are the ways in which the masses of our world find to express their feelings. In many countries, of course, the people, are denied even this very meager pleasure.

A POUM proclamation reads Workers! Don't vote! "For the sake of genuine demo-

cratic freedoms-"For the freedom of the press

and the return of the exiled— "For the defense of our rights-

Workers and Peasants: Don't Vote!

These "elections" are not Franco's only "concession" to the democratic susceptibilities many Westerners upon whom, ultimately, his continued rule depends. There is apparently a more liberal policy developing toward American businessmen who today are no longer swamped with Madrid red tape and restrictions in their negotiations. In addition the newspapers, still avidly pro-Franco, have launched into a civic-reform campaign, blasting the Madrid mayor for his civic neglect (this is what would be called healthy "self-criticism" in the Stalinist totalitarian states) They hope that these reforms will make it a great deal easier dates for the available posts had for the U.S. State Department to been handpicked by the Falange ease Franco into a more respected

the British Elections," a topic of

great interest at this time. After

giving a brief history of the Brit-

ish working class and of the La-

bor Party itself, Shachtman

showed that the last election was

not a defeat for the Labor Party

as the casual observer might

guess, but a victory in view of

bloc. The "reforms" are also designed to convince Washington itself of Franco's strength and good intentions. But, still and withal, all is not going smoothly between Franco and the numerous American military and diplomatic missions sent last summer to negotiate with Madrid.

There are no official reports on the character of the many conferences that have been proceeding in the last four months: but various unofficial notes suggest a number of stumbling blocks: Franco is a tough bargainer and displays a greater zeal in protecting his rejime than even in suiting Washington's strategical requirements. Convinced that his continued rule is indispensable to Washington he is asking a high price for his cooperation, And well he might, for pacifying his angry population, who cannot forget their great strike demonstrations of last spring, will not come easy. He is asking therefore for large credits and considerable military aid.

#### PEOPLE WAITING

But the American government does not want to sink a great deal of money into Franco's political

and economic morass. It wants chiefly a few bases for its own air force and for the new and larger Mediterranean fleet; and its representatives are under orders to "buy" these bases as cheaply as possible. Ultimately, of course, Franco may well have to capitulate to their demands since he faces no other alternative but probable internal collapse. But for a while at least he can afford to appear reticent. Consequently, negotiations are all very "deli cate," as the officials put it, on a plane which only hardened diplomats can fully stomach.

However, the editor of La Batalla warns against overestimating the magnitude or importance of these differences. "It mustn't be forgotten for an instant," he writes, "that without the American alliance Franco is irredeemably lost. And also that the leading American circles, to one degree or another, have decided to play Franco's game." Soon, then, the troubles may be ironed out; the construction of the bases will go ahead. And the "reforms" will be used by the gullible and the notso-guilible to show that Franco is not such a bad guy after all.

## THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY on the HOME FBI, Justice Dept. Didn't Strain Themselves in Fla. Jim Crow Case

By MEL HACKER

Sheriff Willis McCall is still free, "exonerated" by local Florida officials in the brutal slaying of Samuel Shepherd and the wounding of Walter Lee Irvin in the "Little Scottsboro Case." The Workers Defense League and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People have asked the Justice Department to bring McCall before the U.S. Supreme Court because McCall deliberately assaulted the two Negroes in order to deprive them of the fair trial ordered by that court. Attorney General McGrath has promised a full investigation "but the Justice Department and the FBI have not been overstraining themselves in this case.

McCall, it seems, has a past. In 1945 McCall was charged by six Florida Negroes with forced peoninvoluntary servitude and brutality. The charges, processed by the Workers Defense League, are still gathering dust in the Civil **Rights Section of the Justice De-**

These Negroes had all been arrested, assessed \$25 each-but never tried in court-for failing to work every day in the week for Herlong and Company, the Lake Region Packing Company, and the Grove Marketing Company in Lake County's citrus belt. Wages were often as low as \$1.20 a day.

"This High Sheriff McCall had made him a law and said it was put out by Uncle Sam in Washington," stated Mark Fryar, himself assaulted by McCall in 1945. "McCall said every Negro had to work every day or have a paper from his white boss telling why. They either locked you up or beat you up or both, and it cost you \$25 each time." McCall's law applied to all Negroes from the lowliest migrant to relatively well-off farm owners such as Fryar.

McCall assaulted and jailed Fryar for "laying off" on Saturday. When Fryar was brought to the prison he found nine other Negroes there on the same grounds. An FBI agent, who later investigated Workers Defense League com-

aints, inquired about Frygr, Told that the latter was unable to work as he was still recuperating from Sheriff McCall's assault, this "Mr. Monroe" of the FBI stated: "Well guess they had the right to arrest him and knock him on his head if he wouldn't work."

The next day "word" came to Mrs. Fryar that "they" planned to lynch her husband for going around making trouble and trying to "put the high Sheriff in trouble." Mrs. Fryar left that night, leaving her house and "carrying whatever I farm. could." The Fryars are now citizens of the Harlem slum. "I may starve," Fryar states. "but I'm never going back to Florida."

#### MIXED DRINKS

Legislation calling for the automatic suspension of the liquor licenses of cabarets and restaurants which deny equal service to Negroes and other groups will be ducted by the Honest Ballot Asintroduced in the next session of sociation. Any reports of Ryan's the New York State legislature. The State Liquor Authority has refused to act on the Alcoholic Beverage Control Law which states that "service shall not be denied to any person on account of race, color or national origin."

#### CASUALTY IN A WAR

John Mitchell, Louisiana Negro who was seeking a federal court injunction for the right to vote, was shot to death during a "fight" with a deputy sheriff. Mitchell and two other Negroes recently filed suit in a federal court asking that George Blanchard, registrar of voters, be required to allow them to vote. They were denied registration solely because of their race and contended they were being denied civil rights guaranteed under the Constitution. The suit is scheduled before Federal Judge Porterie, November 29.

## TWO HELD OUT

The Yanceyville (North Carolina) trial of Mark Ingram, a sault with intent to rape." has

ended in a mistrial. He was charged with looking "peculiarly" at a white girl in a tobacco field 68 feet from where he was standing. The two Negro members of the jury voted for Ingram's freedom. The jury had previously been sent to their homes rather than to a hotel because of "segregation problems."

FRONT

## WITCHHUNT

New York City Superintendent of Schools Jansen has recommended that the Board of Education dismiss all teachers with past or present membership in the Communist Party, Jansen was bitterly attacked for this proposal by floor speakers at a meeting of the Board of Education.

#### LYIN' RYAN

Joseph P. Ryan, czar of the International Longshoreman's Association, has rejected a proposal that future union elections be condemise as suppressor of rights have evidently been somewhat exaggerated.

#### COPS AND CABS

The New York Police Department's Hack Bureau has been severely criticized by Supreme Court Justice O'Brien for trying to revoke the cab license of a taxi union organizer. The ACLU is working to restrict the bureau's dictatorial powers over cab drivers.

Peter Green, who helped organize some 6,000 drivers in the Independent Taxi Drivers Organizing Committee, was pronounced by the Hack Bureau to be a cardiac and physically unfit to drive. After cardiographs proved that Green was not suffering from any heart ailment his license was returned to him a few moments later when the department wanted to "examine his accident record."

Green states that the Hack Bureau is "under the domination of fleet owners" who want to prevent Negro farmer charged with fas- the taximen from joining any Page Four



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

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

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

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

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its 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!

INTERESTED?

acquainted

Independent

114 W. 14th Street

New York 11, N.Y.

 $\square$  I want to join the ISL.

Socialist League-

 $\sqcap$  I want more information about the

ideas of Independent Socialism and

with the

the ISL.

Name

City

Address

Get



spenders were:

shows that some of the biggest

The American Farm Bureau

American Medical Association.

the reactionary "doctors' trust":

\$332,894, plus another \$77,000 for

The National Association of

Association of American Rail-

A General Electric Corporation

official defends war mobilization

director Charles E. Wilson from

attacks on him by the NAM-

what do they want? It seems to

me that Charlie is trying to save

them from themselves. I'm scared

to death that some day he will

blow up and leave, and if he does,

our last bulwark in Washington

is gone. These boys won't come to

Washington to work with Wilson

for them in their own best inter-

ests."-The Nation, Nov. 24.

. and they won't let him work

The GE official need not, how-

ever, be scared about losing his

last bulwark in Washington. The

mobilization agencies are crawl-

ing with bulwarks, as the CIO

has pointed out name by name, all

of them trying to save the NAM

Bankers around the nation have

been hiking interest rates-in the

name of patriotism, they said. It

would discourage borrowing and

But in its November 12 issue,

"Development of the week: The

the magazine Newsweck reports:

prime rate on bank loans went up

for the third time in 13 months.

It's now 2¾ per cent, the highest

frank in saying everyone else is

making money, why not us? Also,

bankers feel that those who are

after loans really need the money

and will have to pay for it. It can

be safely predicted the rate will

"Reasons: Banks are very

boys from their own stupidity.

Patriotism —

"keep down inflation."

in 17 years.

Lesson XXX

"If they don't want Wilson,

Whom Does Wilson

Electrical Companies, the power

Federation, lobby for the big land-

lord farmers: \$637,512.

its publicity unit.

roads: \$188.013.

Work For?

trust lobby: \$323,546.

#### NEW BREED OF LOBBYISTS CLEAN UP

An article in Look magazine opens some windows on the lobbyist operatives working for foreign governments who "go on the thecry that it costs money to get money.

"They dispense funds lavishly to American attorneys, lobbyists getting back their investment a thousandfold." the article says. Some of the palm-greasing went to "American lawyers and economists, including scores of former federal officials." One is "smart and affable"

Serge Rips, who worked for the Board of Economic Warfare and the Foreign Economic Administration. He, the article says, got from the State Department for Thailand "clear title to \$43 million gold held in Japanese banks." "Rips paid \$109,720 of his fee to Isadore G. Alk," who "served as financial adviser to General MacArthur's command in Tokyo, and also "knows the ins and outs"

in Washington. "Biggest regular retainer among agents for foreign governments," the article says, "is the \$75,000-ayear fee paid by the government of Spain to Charles Patrick Clark, lawyer-lobbyist deluxe. He was hired by the Spanish government to change the Washington atmosphere toward the regime of dictator Franco.

"Magnificent is the word for Clark's performance. Congress earmarked \$62,500,000 for Spain." "Top foreign-agent law firm in the country since the war has been the noted Washington legal factory of Covington and Burling, whose most renowed former member is Secretary of State Acheson. His son is employed by the firm. "In the postwar years, this law, firm and its members have garnered a total of \$457,474 in fees and expenses from foreign princi-

pals, including Poland." After giving numerous other examples, the article turns to the

'China Lobby for Chiang Kaishek's government on Formosa." It says "glittering fees are being earned" by Satiras Galahad Fassoulis and Miran Aprahamian," big operators in the International field. They appeared set to rake in almost \$750,000 by funneling military supplies to Chiang's forces on Formosa.

#### Lobbyists—Domestic

New congressional report on lobbyists' expenditures for the first nine months of this year go up to 3 per cent. What is INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM?

For information and literature about the Independent Socialist League, write:

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



#### ANALYSIS OF UMT COMMISSION REPORT .---**Conscription News**, Nov. 15.

The bulletin of the National Council Against Conscription has some shrewd points to make on the recent report of the special President's Commission on National Security Training which recommended universal military training on October 29; among them the following:

"The introduction to the commission report says that the world has returned 'to frontier conditions' and this 'demands a frontier response,' by which it means the only way to handle world problems is by military solutions. Nowhere in the report is the United Nations mentioned, or international negotiation, or world disarmament or social change that would eliminate the conditions of poverty and imperialism in places like the Middle East where the Soviet Union is able to lay the groundwork for her program.

"The report says that 'the major problems we face in the world will be of long duration,' that we must not fluctuate in our military strength by reducing it in times of relative calm and that UMT will keep us steadily strong.

"Both in the introduction and in the rest of the report there is repeated frequently what seems to be the real reason for the advocacy of UMT. Our young men, says the report, have gone to war 'largely unprepared psychologically or physically. . . . Too often their early education has failed to impart to them a clear awareness of their implicit obligations to bear arms. . . This denial to our sons of the facts of their world and the proper interpretation of those facts . . . has left them unprepared in military skills and mental outlook . . . (emphasis added). This emphasis on proper interpretation of facts and on mental outlook reveals that psychological indoctrination with its results of regimented thinking one of the major purposes of UMT.

"The commission does not like the fact that our citizens have permitted their hope that war could be abolished 'to blind them to the hard fact that armed conflict in its various forms has ever been endemic in the world.' This is the idea that we are always going to have war, that it is inevitable and each generation must learn this if it is to justify the need for permanent UMT.

"The outline of the commission program reveals that the army, navy, air force and marines would each 'conduct its own UMT program.' This means that there will be eight separate military establishments, since the UMT 'must be accomplished as a function separate from the functions of the regular forces.' Each of the four armed forces thus would have administratively to run two organizations at the same time and would also have to operate one or more reserve organizations and see that they get refresher training. view of this, was the commission whistling in the dark when it said: 'The UMT program should be so conducted as to strengthen, not weaken, the combat capabilities of the forces in being.'



## THE SPANISH POUM'S RESOLUTION ON WAR, FOR 3RD CAMP

The Spanish POUM - the initials stand for Workers Party of Marxist Unity-is an important socialist force in the fight against the Franco tyranny, and also a leading revolutionary socialist tendency in Europe. In October, "somewhere inside Spain," it held its 8th convention, adopting a resolution on the war and the international situation and a resolution on the Spanish struggle, among other decisions.

Below we present important sections of its resolution on the war, a statement of its Third Camp position against both the capitalist and Stalinist war blocs. It testifies to the close communion of ideas in fundamentals which exists between this militant vanguard of the Spanish working class and the Independent Socialist League.

#### (2) The Korean war is a conflict between the two eat powers which are struggling for world domination. North Korea is a "popular democracy" similar to those of Eastern Europe, that is, set up by Moscow. South Korea is a semi-feudal, despotic and corrupt regime imposed and maintained by Washington. The military assault by North Korea on South Korea as well as the armed intervention by the U.S. are acts which have nothing to do with the real interests of the Korean people.

(3) The two powers presently engaged in struggle, not only in the Korean war but also in the general cold war, are U. S. capitalism and the Russian bureaucracy. Although different in social nature, both powers play fundamentally reactionary roles and represent formidable obstacles to humanity's march toward liberty and socialism.

(4) U. S. capitalism constitutes the last fortress of a type of society—capitalist society—which today is in full decadence. Its mission now consists in defending, everywhere and by every means available, the regime of private property, the exploitation of the working class and colonial oppression. The Russian bureaucracy, the product of the degeneration of the October Revolution, has installed in the USSR a new exploitive society. Under its rule the conquests of the 1917 resolution have been destroyed and the working class has been robbed of its most elementary rights and needs. The Russian bureaucracy does not oppress the peoples of the USSR alone. It also oppresses a whole series of countries—the self-styled "popular democracies—which it has reduced to a merely colonial status.

(5) The consequences of the Korean war have profoundly modified the international situation in all aspects: economic, political, diplomatic and military. U. S. capitalism has reinforced its control. over the European economy; it has imposed intensified rearmament; it has transformed the Marshall Plan, the Schuman Plan and "European unification" into mere instruments of the rearmament policy; it has concluded an agreement with the Franco dictatorship and is preparing to revive German and Japanese militarism. On its part, the Russian bureaucracy has intensified its military preparations and has subjected all of its satellites to an iron economic, political and military police dictatorship. In the West and in the East, the popular masses are paying for the consequences of the international tension with the cruel worsening of their lot. . . .

(8) The Korean war, which is a partial foreshadowing of what a world war would be like,

#### popular masses to the danger of a new world conlagration. This resistance-spontaneous, unorganized and inchoate-has made important advances in the U.S., to all appearances also in the USSR and in the "popular democracies," and, above all, in Western Europe. This resistance shows up more or less clearly in the following facts: (a) the inconsistent and passing attempts at independence made by some of the governments of Western Europe; (b) the appearance of the Bevan tendency in England; (c) the growing popularity of the 'neutralist' thesis; (d) the "warnings" from the Vatican and various capitalist sectors to the U.S. leaders; (e) the general crisis of Stalinism; (f) the oppositions, which have been brutally beaten down, that keep springing up in the top ranks of

the Eastern European countries. (9) The intensive rearmament will aggravate the economic, political and social difficulties of the Western European governments, will compromise the Labor Party experiment and will appreciably reduce the living standards of the popular masses. All this will strengthen the sentiments in favor of independence from U. S. imperialism and raise new problems in the workers' movement. The firm stand of the Bevan group and the growing uneasiness in the ranks of the Labor Party are the first signs. The latest "purges" in Prague and Budapest are excellent indications of the popular opposition to the brutal colonial methods of Russian imperialism -which are dictated to it largely by its rearmament needs-an opposition which finds its representatives in some of the Stalinist leaders themselves. (10) Under these circumstances, the workingclass movement has to be the animator of a powerful international movement against the war danger and the motive force of an independent third camp. But unfortunately it is divided and its forces scattered. The social-democracy, which has been strengthened in some countries (Belgium, Germany, PROTEST RALLY the Scandinavian countries) through the weakening of Stalinism, acts, with some exceptions, as a wing of the Western capitalist camp. The Communist Parties behave as what they are: mere instruments of the political and military strategy of the Kremlin. Only a few minority organizations and tendencies of the working class maintain an attitude of independence with relation to the two blocs, strive to rebuild the workers' movement, and to find a road which can prevent the third world

war and lead to socialism.

(11) The POUM, faithful to its glorious traditions, its programmatic principles and its socialist perspec- ploitation of Mexican wetbacks. tive, proclaims that its general slogans are:

Neither Washington nor Moscow! Against the third world war! For bread, peace and liberty!

For the next period it establishes the following tasks: (1) Active intervention in all independent movements and activities against the war; (2) close collaboration with all forces independent of capitalism and Stalinism; (3) support of the regroupment of the revolutionary socialist tendencies and organizations

> Subscribe — \$2 a year LABOR ACTION

December 3, 1951



has considerably increased the resistance of the



Shachtman Gets Big UC Audiences

#### (Continued from page 1)

struggle he was obviously conscious of the future implications of the dean's action. Under his excellent chairmanship, the debate proceeded smoothly and democratically to the end.

The question for the evening was an extremely important one for American students: "Resolved: the Conservative Party can provide a better solution to Britain's internal problems than can the Labor Party." The recent Tory victory in England, hailed in the American capitalist press, was defended by a diffident academician from Mills College. A Rhodes scholar, a student of 19th-century British history and one of the most popular professors at Mills College, Dr. Herrick was the only conservative in the area who could be found to debate a socialist publicly.

#### A CASE FOR TORYISM

Except for his own cheering section from Mills ( a local woman's college), the audience was unanimous: Herrick's defense of the Conservative Party and its policies was a first-rate disaster.

His arguments for the superiority of the British Tories came down fundamentally to these: (1) the Laborites recognized this superiority by calling for new elections! (2) Churchill's austerity program is "better" than Labor's; and (3) the men in the Conservative Party are younger and therefore more flexible and can adapt their moves to the needs of the time.

In his rebuttal, Herrick, cornered and driven to the wall by Shachtman's speech, could do nothing more than give out the same three points-adding nothing and subtracting nothing. Coming from the rather more rarified atmosphere of Mills College, he found it impossible to face a determined and confident opponent. After a few remarks about "Victorian" socialism, about the polemical intensity of Shachtman's talk and the "intricate" and "complex" character of British economic problems, he was finished.

He spent the rest of his time denying the existence of all classes but the "middle classes," which he defined as "those people who are confused." He included himself, rather humbly, among these people and ended up with a long and rambling story about a middle-class English family "of my acquaintance" which was reduced to the necessity of working for a living by a series of overly high estate taxes. His defense of the Conservatives was-to put it kindly-impotent and embarrassing. Shachtman won the audience from the very beginning. Giving a short historical review of the decline of imperialism and the rise of the Labor Party, he explained why the Conservative Party was bankrupt. Defining the main problem of Britain as a problem of production, he predicted that the British working class would refuse to cooperate with hated Tory government. "The recent elections have brought the classes in England to an historical turning point," declared Shachtman. "The Tories have only one solution to the problem-revive the empire. This they cannot do."

#### SOCIALIST SOLUTION

Finding little in Herrick's arguments to refute, Shachtman was comelled to give a speech rather than a debate. He ridiculed Herrick's dea that there was no real solution to the problem of the gap between imports and exports and presented the image of a cooperative pooling of the resources of Western Europe into a federation of socialist nations. "This is the only solution to the problem and only the Laborites can move in this direction. The support given to the Bevanites indicates that the British workers want this type of radical transformation of the economic situation," Shachtman declared.

Before the rebuttals, the floor was thrown open to fifteen minutes of questions from the audience. All types of questions were asked indicating an intense interest in the debate. "What about Labor's imperialist moves in Iran and Egypt?" asked one not-too-innocent questioner. "What about Labor's fiasco with the groundnuts scheme?" asked a determined Conservative. Question after question poured in.

Although critical of many of its moves, Shachtman vigorously defended the Labor Party from all its defamers on the right. "The failure of the groundnuts scheme is 'peanuts' compared to the billions annually destroyed through American and British war production. Yet no one screams about this destructive waste of resources." Shachtman, of course, made very clear that he was opposed to the Labor government's imperialistic treatment of Iran and Egypt and came out for the right of selfdetermination for those countries.

This was undoubtedly the best attended and most highly appreciated debate of the school year. It admirably attested the desire of the students to listen to real debates and to their opposition to the "iron curtain" which has increasingly throttled the intellectual atmosphere of the university.

## Nightmare

A Texas newspaper explains why it is an attack on the American Way of Life to fight the ex-

Loss of the wetbacks, says the Houston Post, "would mean that many persons living in the Rio Grande Valley would be unable to afford servants. They would end up mowing their own lawns and washing their own dishes.

"Parents would find their social functions hampered by the necessity to stay at home with their children, instead of turning them over to a wetback nurse.

"You might say that people in the valley cities would find themselves living about like everyone else.

The following day, Wednesday, a protest meeting had been organized for Max Shachtman at the university's famed Sather Gate. A coalition of diverse political groups had recently saved the gate for free speech; now a coalition of four student political groups were sponsoring a protest rally against the administration's new ruling. The meeting was set for 1 p.m. immediately after the pep rally for the big game.

Page Five

Unfortunately sporadic rain during the morning kept many away and almost forced the entire meeting to be called off. The many students waiting for the meeting to start, however, provided a good argument for going ahead anyway.

One by one the four sponsoring organizations got up to speak. Bob Armstrong of the Students for Democratic Action made a brief speech against the ban on Shachtman and demanded that civil rights and academic freedom be reinstated. Tom Sheff, chairman of the local Young People's Socialist League, spoke on the reactionary and arbitrary character of the dean's action and the danger represented by the use of the list. The Young Republican League came out for Shachtman's right to speak and attacked the list.

The Socialist Youth League speaker, Bob Martinson, analyzed the dean's move as the beginning of the second round in the fight for academic freedom at Cal. After praising the united character of the protest meeting he went on to speak of the necessity for concerted student action against the subversive-list criterion. To achieve this he called for the building of a campus-wide action committee of students' organizations. "Go back to your living-groups, political and social groups and elect representatives who can come together to fight for students' rights," he declared. The audience stood quietly and listened, in spite of the cold and damp.

#### UNDAMPENED ENTHUSIASM

The chairman of the meeting spoke next. Professor Harold Winkler, lately of the Political Science Department of the university, was well known to many students as one of the famous group of non-signers who had been thrown out of the university for refusing to knuckle down to the Board of Regents.

"The situation has reached the point where the citizen must rewin the rights he has lost in open political action," he said quietly. "I am a conservative. I wish to conserve the past liberties of the American people which are fast disappearing before our very eyes." No one left he meeting even though the rain was increasing in intensity.

As Shachtman began to speak the rain became steadily heavier. The students protected themselves as best they could with books, papers and binders but still there was no move to leave. Many of the students were without raincoats and were completely soaked within five minutes. With the rain reaching a crescendo Shachtman spoke for twenty minates. He attacked and ridiculed the administration to the great delight the students who laughed and applauded. There was a great feeling of sympathy for Shachtman who stood alone on the speaker's stand in the driving rain: he could not appear in the empty classrooms of the nighty State University but was forced to speak under these conditions.

The enthusiasm was spontaneous and warm. No one was going to leave, by God, even if the heavens were to come down. Bursts of laughter and applause punctuated the talk. As the meeting ended two hundred students walked slowly away from Sather Gate; most of them felt they had participated in a highly unusual event.

On Friday, November 23, Shachtman spoke once again at a meeting held under the auspices of the Independent Socialist League in Oakland. About fifty people appeared to hear a speech on "The Struggle for World Power," after which refreshments were served. During the week Shachtman also had an interview over station KPFA, which has also promised to broadcast parts of the debate.

will all the to get the states of

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.

NAME

SCHOOL (IF STUDENT)

N. Y. Socialist Youth League Class — Sunday Evenings at 8 p.m.



December	2	LEVIATHAN IN CRISIS	
December	9	STALINISM: THE ROAD TO 1984	G
December	16	THE WAY TO FREEDOM	-
December	23	DEMOCRACY AND THE NEW SOCIETY	
December	30	THE WAR WE NEEDN'T HAVE	
January 6	1.1	WHERE TO BEGIN	

Jack Maxwell Gertrude Blackwell Phyllis Hoffman Hal Draper Julie Falk Jack Maxwell

STATE

At LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

## By HAL DRAPER

The dispatches of the past few months from Yugoslavia have reported increasing government difficulties in the face of a widespread and stubborn peasant "strike." The peasants' immediate resentment is directed against the state requisitions of grain and leads to their reluctance to carry through the sowing when they know that a large proportion of their crop will be taken away anyway, and to their reluctance to put their produce on the market for the city population.

Belgrade has mixed threats with cajolery, promises with punishment, but the problem hangs on. Thus the Tito regime runs deeper into a crisis which is also chronic in type among all the Stalinist states of Eastern Europe.

As compared with the Moscow-dominated leaders of the satellites, Tito has two big advantages in dealing with the situation and two big disadvantages. In examining the case, it is possible to see a great deal about the general character of the peasant problem behind the Iron Curtain and the Stalinist "solutions" to it.

Basic to such a consideration is the fact that in breaking away from the domination of the Kremlin, Yugoslavia at the same time still retained the same fundamental Stalinist (that is. bureaucratic-collectivist) forms in its economy and social life. It struck out on a national-Stalinist course. To understand the sources of its present peasant problem, both sides of that hyphenation are important.

It is necessary to remember, to be sure, that Yugoslavia has also recently gone through a famine and period of crop-failure due to natural causes. (The right-wing and monarchist Yugoslav émigrés tried to hint darkly, while Belgrade was seeking U. S. grain, that Tito was somehow responsible for the crop failures. These people would undoubtedly have given the same devil-theory for a typhoon or earthquake.) But while that intervention of nature naturally exacerbated the problem, it is plainly not at its root.

#### The Specific Yugoslav Problem

The two butts of peasant resentment are (1) collectivization by the state, and (2) the state requisitions of grain. Leaving aside the nature of Stalinist (including Titoist) collectivization for the moment, here are some notes on the specific Yugoslav problem.

.

In the first place, the immediate economic drive which most directly led to the Tito-Stalin break in the first place is also one of the biggest underlying factors in the present peasant crisis. This is the rate of industrialization set by the Tito regime.

In its over-all economic perspective for its satellites, the Kremlin had a division of labor mapped out: Poland and Czechoslovakia in particular to be emphasized for industrialization tied to Russia's own war economy, while the overwhelmingly agrarian South Balkan countries were to remain very largely the traditional "bread baskets"—a role for the latter which had also been assigned to them by the Nazi occupation. Against this, in the interests of their national power, the Titoists looked to modernize and industrialize the country, reacting against their assigned role which relegated them to permanent tenth-rate backwardness. Yugoslavia's five-year plan, even before the break, set itself a pace faster even than the northern satellites. After the break, this perspective was if anything intensified.

But such a relatively breakneck, if not adventurist, industrialization perspective necessarily meant a heavily intensified squeeze upon the 80 per cent of the population which consisted of the peasants.

To appreciate this it is enough to remember that Belgrade announced some time ago that since the end of the war the city populations have grown so much larger that only 66 per cent of the population is now on the land. The difference has gone to the cities, presumably.

It may appear that this is not very upsetting since there are still the same number of mouths

to feed, whether they are on the land or in the cities. Certainly, it is not a question of a lack of labor power on the land. A good proportion of the 80-per-cent peasant population had been "surplus"-not needed for working the land and unable to be supported by the land's produce. They starved, to put it simply.

**Collectivization and Peasant** 

But when this surplus population goes to work in the cities as a result of new industrialization, they can no longer be simply allowed to die off. It is not only vital to the plans of the regime that they be fed, but as heavy industrial workers they must be fed even somewhat better than a surplus peasant. The land must produce that much more to feed them.

While they were on the typical small holding of the Yugoslav peasant family, they were around to share the scarcity. Now the grain must be TAKEN AWAY from that small holding to go to the cities. The state is forced to appear before the peasant as an expropriator of his produce, even if it expropriated only the same amount which formerly went to the surplus peasant population.

#### The Pace and the Squeeze

At the same time, the character of the Titoist industrialization program stands in the way of a normal and voluntary development of peasant collectivization.

That industrialization program set a fast course in particular toward heavy industry. For a firm alliance between an urban proletariat and vast peasant majority, the economy requires above all sufficient light manufactured goods such as are demanded by the peasantry in exchange for its produce; and for socialist collectivization, it requires a sufficiency of agricultural machinery such as can make large-scale collectives both profitable and attractive to the peasant. These were necessarily slighted by the Tito five-year plan.



If Russia had been the "land of socialism" which the Titoists had represented it to be, it could have made up this deficiency, and boosted its satellites along the road of a healthy development in the interests of the people, by itself providing the missing factors through its greater industrial strength and development. It is unnecessary to add here that this was by no means the intention of the imperialist exploiters in the Kremlin, who were interested in what they could squeeze out of their new satrapies, not in how they could help them-interested in how they could gear the satellite economies for the benefit of their own war machine, not in promoting a beneficent course of economic development.

The Tito regime tried, and is still trying, to drive ahead with its economic plans in spite of the fact that neither of these economic prerequisites existed (production of light manufactured goods and agricultural machinery for the mechanization of large collectives). Its economic demands on the peasantry remained. Hence the intensification of the squeeze on the peasant.

Now, as we have indicated, in type, this situ-

ation exists also in the Russian satellites around Yugoslavia, which also-for reasons both similar and specific-are forced into collision with their peasantries without being able to enter upon a socialist course of alliance with the peasantry. But for Tito, the situation is worsened by two considerations which have flowed from his break.

LABOR ACTION

#### Plus and Minus for Tito

(1) The Stalinist virus in his peasant policy remains, but the Russian power is no longer there to back him up against the peasant mass. His regime faces the mass of peasants on its own. In (for example) Poland, the Stalinist regime functions at bottom as the proconsul or gauleiter for the overshadowing neighboring power of the foreign oppressor. The peasant hates, hangs back and even finds avenues of sporadic resistance, but he knows that the power he is resisting is not merely a thinly-based government in Warsaw but the might of the Russian forces of repression, which stand behind the thin line of Polish quislings. Tito separated himself from this source of comfort.

Without the reality of Russian power behind Warsaw, it is to be doubted how long that regime could last in the face of the hatred of the people. But in Tito's case, this relative disadvantage is, of course, set off against the fact that the very same break with Moscow also gave him a towering source of strength in mitigating the effects of peasant discontent.

The same peasantry which resists Tito's collectivization and requisitions, also (there can be little doubt) vigorously and enthusiastically supports him as against Moscow in the face of the Russian imperialist threat to the national independence of the country. The present reports of peasant discontent have emphasized (quite credibly) that this resistance has remained on the economic level; there is no alternative political force before the peasantry to Tito's to lead the nation against Moscow; there is no evidence that we have seen of any significant pro-monarchist movement, and there is no significant democratic socialist force in the country to act as a rival pole of attraction. The peasant therefore resists on the economic level—that is, he does not raise the question of political power.

(2) Tito's second difficulty, as compared with the satellite fuehrers, has come into existence in the most recent period (since the Korean war) with the turn in foreign policy taken by Belgrade toward support of and involvement with the Western bloc in the cold war. While this point is necessarily speculative, we freely point out, it can scarcely be doubted that the increased economic dependence of the Tito regime on the West. the U.S. in the first place, has emboldened the peasantry to resist the demands of the state, if only on the economic level.

It does not require profound political reasoning on the part of the peasantry—about the social identity of their own private-property base with the capitalism of America—for them to understand that Tito is on the spot before U.S. "public opinion" and governmental prejudices if he were to try to answer the peasant "strike" with the previous methods. He is under some restraint. The peasant feels his oats.

Here again, however, the very same development which puts Tito at this disadvantage also carries with it a factor of an opposite sign: the economic aid from the U.S. which came along to him with his turn to the West in international power politics.

It is quite beyond the reach of the information available to us to try to estimate which factors outweigh. which. We can only point out at this time that these are the forces in play.

#### Stalinist Industrialization

The existence of an agrarian problem is not, of course, peculiar to the Stalinist regimes; on the contrary. Before the war, the peasants of the South Balkan countries. (Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania), which were the least industrialized in Europe, were deeply ground down in poverty and exploitation. The laments of the anti-Tito right-wing émigrés over Tito's peasant policies are the usual disgusting hypocrisies of exploiters whose hearts are wrung by the spectacle of a rival exploiter getting away with the spoils which should "rightfully" be theirs.

To be sure, before the war the agrarian problem was



The link between industrialization and the agrarian problem under these conditions was threefold: (1) most important, industry in the cities would provide jobs and livelihood for the surplus population on the land; (2) industry would provide manufactured consumers' goods to raise the standard of living of the peasants on the land; (3) industry would produce agricultural machinery to modernize agriculture itself.

Industrialization was therefore the great need of the Balkan economy, including its agricultural economy; and this need was conjuncturally met in the specific need for industrialization which the new Stalinist regimes shared likewise. (This applies as much to Yugoslavia's still Moscow-controlled neighbors as to Yugoslavia itself.) The Stalinist regimes had more than one reason to set a course toward industrialization, among them the demands of Moscow's war economy. But this reason was adventitious compared with a more basic motivation, which has to do with the social base of a regime founded on totalitarian bureaucratic collectivism and the Stalinist ideology. To such a regime, any independent peasantry is a continually acute political danger, ever threatening to become fatal. When 80 per cent of the country consists of such a small-land-holding peasantry (as in Yugoslavia), the situation is extreme.

#### Stalinism and the Peasant

near-hunger.

Most important, a regime which by its nature is based on totalitarianized collective property is necessarily in unstable equilibrium as long as 80 per cent of its people do in fact base themselves on private property.

independent peasantry.

Now it is true that any economy which is not based on private property would face a similar problem, and this includes socialism; and it is well known that the Russian Revolution in its time, under Lenin, likewise faced the problem of the peasantry. For socialism also, the only permanent solution, not only from the point of view of the state power but also of the people themselves, is collectivization. What is involved is the gulf between socialist collectivization and Stalinist collectivization.

Most immediately it appears as a difference between voluntary collectivization and compulsory collectivization. But this difference is not merely a matter of democratic sentiments or a spirit of humanitarianism toward the peasants, as opposed to Statinist brutality and such a mass slaughter as took place in the period of Stalin's forced collectivization. It is an economic and political question at bottom.

### Socialism vs. Stalinism

the cities.

part of this discussion).

# **Resistance Under Stalinism**

not that of big landowners who directly oppressed peas-ants on their land, as it was in czarist Russia. If anything, a basic cause of peasant distress was just the reverse: the atomization of small landholding with overpopulation on the land. The peasants could not scratch a living out of their poor holdings, while the state's toll was taken in taxes as usual. The land could not support the numbers trying to live on it, and there was no place where they could go. Even aside from the tax squeeze on the peasants; the problem could not be solved without the modernization of the country-specifically its industrialization. The pre-war regimes remained sunk in the mire of Balkan backwardness, keeping their peoples down with them.

For the same reasons that such a peasantry has always found it most difficult to act as a cohesive political force even for its own demands, IT IS ALSO MOST DIFFICULT TO TOTALITARIANIZE THEM, scattered as they are over the land, semi-independent because of the land's produce itself even if it is a kind of independence in the midst of

A capitalist-landowners' regime, like the pre-war Yugoslav government, not only can live with a small peasantry but base its political power on their backwardness, no matter how reactionary, dictatorial or fascistic that regime might be. There is a basic social compatibility. Not so with the bureaucratic collectivism of Stalinism. But the need of Stalinism for industrialization, which conjuncturally jibes with the needs set up by the agrarian economy, is-and this is the rub-a need not only for industrialization but also for the speediest elimination of the independent peasantry as a class. Being founded on totalitarian restraints and terror when necessary, it cannot long live in compromise with them, or take too long a view of its perspective on the elimination of the

Socialism cannot exist without democracy, and (first of all) it is therefore incompatible with the compulsory collectivization of the land especially in a country where the peasantry constitutes an overwhelming majority. To carry through such a program, the state has to be set up over the people, and this cannot be confined to the peasants alone, especially when innumerable ties still exist between the peasant population on the land and masses of ex-peasants who have been proletarianized in

Secondly, a compulsory, collectivization which is designed basically to straitjacket the peasantry as a potential focus of political discontent cannot be economically productive and efficient if it takes place without any of the economic prerequisites for collectivization (prerequisites which we have already mentioned in the first

The totalitarian state is driven into an economically disruptive policy to maintain its totalitarian power. (Let us note in passing that this general formulation of the process is just as true in the industrial sphere itself, and not only in the sphere of agricultural policy: the factories too, bound into the totalitarian straightjacket, become festering sores of waste, inefficiency, poor-quality production and paralyzing fear from top to bottom.)

In their consideration of this problem, Marxists have rightly always emphasized the need for pushing collectivization only insofar as the peasants become ready to accept it, and that they become ready to accept it only as the state can make it economically attractive. Lenin polemized not only against coercion in general but also against any expedients of INDIRECT coercion.

It is the latter which has especially characterized compulsory collectivization under Tito since the break. There are even anti-Stalinist socialists who seem to think that the term compulsory collectivization can be associated only with the brutal holocaust on the countryside which was initiated by Stalin's knout-wielders in the 1930s, when peasants were forced into collectives with mass deportations to Siberia and shootings. The essence of the matter is not changed when peasants are forced into collectives by tax decrees and regulations, as well as bureaucratic harassment, which make it impossible for an independendent peasant to stay out and still hold on to a blade of his grain.

The Tito regime, while denying forcible coercion and every once in a while denouncing officials who have been too "zealous" in this direction, have not concealed the fact that "indirect" compulsion is their policy. As a matter of fact, in the Stalinist satellites today, it is also "indirect" compulsion which is the primary method: not Warsaw nor Sofia nor any of the others have as yet dared to enter upon the bloodbath which Stalin carried through in Russia.

#### Lenin's Warnings

But this "indirect" method has no more in common with socialist collectivization than its prosecution by other (i.e., forcible) means.

Especially in the years from 1918 to 1921, Lenin frequently came back to this point to stress it again and again. Unlike some of Tito's placatory propaganda speeches to his peasantry, it was not a matter merely of a disclaimer of coercion. Lenin hit hardest on the question not in public speeches so much as in the policy-making conferences of the governing organs; and not merely to disclaim coercion but to explain, educationally and tirelessly,

#### ENGELS ON COLLECTIVIZATION

What is our attitude toward the small peasant? ... We foresee the inevitable destruction of the small peasantry, but it is not our mission to eliminate it by our interference. And, secondly, it is equally evident that when we possess the state power, we shall not think of forcibly expropriating the small peasants-with or without compensation, that is immaterial-as we are obliged to do in the case of the large landowners. Our task with relation to the small peasants is primarily to transform their private production and property into cooperative production and property, not by coercion, but by dint of example and by offering public assistance for this purpose....

We can never promise the small peasant to back his individual farm and individual property against the superior forces of capitalist production. All we can promise him is that we shall not against his will and by force interfere in his economic relations. -The Peasant Question in France and Germany.

1894-5.

#### DO NOT DARE TO DOMINEER!

You cannot create anything here by coercion. Coersion applied to the middle peasantry does great harm. This stratum is a numerous one, it consists of millions of individuals. Even in Europe, where it nowhere achieves such strength, where technology and culture, city life and railroads are tremendously developed, and where it would be easiest of all to think of such a thing, nobody, not even the most revolutionary of socialists, has ever proposed adopting measures of coercion toward the middle peasantry. . . .

We must particularly stress the truth that here coercive methods will accomplish virtually nothing.... Here coercion would ruin the whole cause. Prolonged educational work is what is required. We have to give the peasant, who not only in our country but all over the world is a practical man and a realist, concrete examples to prove that the commune is the best possible thing. . . .

On this question we must say that we encourage communes, but that they must be so organized as to gain the confidence of the peasants. And until then we are pupils of the peasants and not their teachers. Nothing is more foolish than when people who know nothing about agriculture and its specific features fling themselves on the villages because they have heard of the advantages of socialized farming, are tired of city life and desire to work in agricultural districts-nothing is more foolish than when such people regard themselves as all-round teachers of the peasants. Nothing is more foolish than the idea of applying coercion in the middle peasant's economic relations.

The aim here is not to expropriate the middle peasant but to bear in mind the specific conditions in which the peasant lives, to learn from the peasant methods of transition to a better system, and not to dare to domineer! That is the rule we have set ourselves. . . . When it is stated that we must strive to gain their voluntary consent, it means that the peasants must be convinced and convinced in practice.

why a policy of coercion was incompatible with socialist policy.

As a reminder, we append some of the highlights of his argumentation. It will be noted that he is talking about the "middle peasant," that is, the peasant who neither hires out his own labor power nor hires others, These were the mass of the peasantry in Russia: even more are they the mass of the peasantry in the South Balkans, including Yugoslavia. Twice in this period, he recalled to the Bolsheviks the words of Frederick Engels on the same problem, written some 25 years before. Seyeral times he stressed that the objective of large-scale industrialization, and therefore collectivization, could not be accomplished by some quick drive but was a work of "generations."

The characteristic of Stalinist collectivization is that its primary goal is the totalitarianization and bureaucratic statification of the peasant in a fashion as close as possible to that of the worker who is controlled in the factory. As the theoretical analysts of the Ukrainian revolutionary socialists have pointed out, this aim has reached its most complete expression so far in the Moscow scheme for "superkolkhozes." But Stalinist Russia is far more advanced along this road than any of its satellites, which still face the more elementary task of breaking the resistance of the peasantry.

Just as nationalization of the factories is neither socialist nor "progressive" per se, and is in fact an integral part of the reactionary policy of the new exploitive social system of Stalinism, so is this true also of its bureaucraticcollectivization of the land.

The socialist revolution against Stalinism is in the interests of the peasant masses behind the Iron Curtain as it is in the interests of the workers. Where, as in Russia itself, the small peasant holding has long been swept away by forced collectivization, it does not mean turning the clock back as far as the form is concerned. The socialist revolution means, once again in our time. giving the land back to the land-toilers who cultivate itby democratizing the control of the new forms that have been established. The new Russian Revolution can no more go back to the old than the socialist revolution in the West can or should go back to the small-enterprise forms which have been outmoded by monopoly capitalism. The struggle is for a workers' and peasants' democracy.

They will not allow themselves to be convinced by mere words, and they are perfectly right. -Lenin, March 23, 1919. Italics in original.

#### RESOLUTION BY LENIN

While encouraging cooperative associations of every kind, including agricultural communes of middle peasants, the representatives of the Soviet government must not resort to the slightest compulsion in the creation of such associations. Only such associations are valuable as are started by the peasants themselves on their own free initiative and the advantages of which have been tested by them in practice. Excessive haste in this respect is harmful, since it may only tend to aggravate the aversion of the middle peasants to innovations.

Representatives of the Soviet government who permit themselves to resort even to indirect, not to mention direct, compulsion in order to get the peasants to join the communes must be called to strict account and removed from work in the rural districts.

-Resolution of the 8th party congress on Policy Toward the Middle Peasantry, 1919.

#### A WORK OF GENERATIONS

Only a material base, technique, the employment of tractors and machinery in agriculture on a mass scale, electrification on a mass scale, can solve the problem of the small farmer, make his whole mentality sound, so to speak. This is what would radically, and with enormous rapidity, transform the small farmer. When I say it is a work of generations I do not mean tha it is a work of centuries. You understand perfectly well that to provide tractors and machines, and to electrify an enormous country, must, at all events, take no less than decades. This is the objective situ--Lenin, March 15, 1921.

#### ON LARGE AND SMALL INDUSTRY

These comrades [who emphasize the necessity of large-scale industry for socialism] have simply misunderstood the relation between our state and small industry. Our main task is to restore large-scale industry; and in order to approach the task of restoring large-scale industry at all seriously and systematically we must restore small industry.

--Lenin, May 26, 1921.

Same - get

#### THE TRANSITION TO COLLECTIVIZATION

We dealt with this transition [to collectivization] in a number of legislative acts; but we know that it is not a matter of passing laws, but of carrying them out in practice, and we know that this can be done when we have a powerful, large-scale industry capable of bringing the small producer such benefits as will enable him to see in practice the superiority of largescale industry....

So long as we have not remolded them [the peasants], so long as large-scale machine production has not remolded them, we must ensure them the opportunity of freely carrying on their business. 

there is no address and a lite our mode



# **U.S. Deal with Adenauer**

(Continued from page 1) the government if they feel that the security of their own military forces is endangered; they reserve the right to decide the future of Berlin: they reserve the right to decide on the question of unity of West and East Ger-

Further, Allied troops will remain in Germany, but the occupation of the country as a political relationship will end. German rearmament will depend on the creation of a "European army." This means that West Germany will not be permitted to build up an integrated army

-of its own, but will furnish contingents to the projected • European army which will be directly under General Eisenhower's command along with the regular na-

dinated power in Europe. And the most vital political and economic question which

many in Europe, and in our an yoke. opinion, rightly so. Schu-

only if they have the same campaign it is waging on this East and West and indeed be- This is indeed a peculiar at a freedom to make the decision as to its form and extent as have the peoples of France or Britain on their own armament. Further, it is the position of the SPD that for the Germans the question of the unification of their country is more vital than the question of rearmament, and in any event cannot be subordinated to the desire of the American and other Allied aovernments to see West Germany firmly integrated into their military camp.

#### SUPPORT SPD

There is no doubt that the majority of the people of West Germany support the SPD in this position. They have backed its insistence that the Bonn government take up the unity overtures made by the Stalinist puppets who rule Eastern Gertional forces of the Atlantic many, and propose concrete pact powers. There will be steps for the unification of no German general staff or the country. They have shown themselves quite will-Thus Western Germany is ing to postpone the question to gain a large measure of of "integration" with the sovereignty. Yet this sover- West in the interest of the eignty is to be purchased at unification of the country, to the price of remaining indefi- the extent that the former nitely an unequal and subor- stands as an obstacle to the latter. The SPD has shown that it has complete confidence that if the country can faces the country, that of its be unified under the proper unification, is to be left in the democratic safeguards, the hands of powers over which workers and the people genthe German people can have erally will resoundingly repudiate Stalinism and preconcept of the future of Ger- passing under the totalitari-

macher has insisted that the socialist movements in the dangers of a European German rearmament is a other European countries Korea; it would invite the matter which must be decid- have not shown themselves Germans-and possibly the liable one than the British, tant, a truly international ed freely by the German peo- ready to support the German worst kind of Germans-to American and French divi- socialist movement be con-

question. The attitude of the tween peace and war. But Bevan wing of the British La- that is not to say that unifibor Party as expressed in an editorial in the London Tribune of November 2 is a good illustration of this.

#### TRIBUNE'S VIEW

After sketching the recent stages in the struggle over the unification of Germany, the editorial points out that the obvious purpose of the Russians in proposing unity at this time is to block the rearmament of Western Germany.

"What the Russians obviously hope to achieve," the editorial continues, "is a total withdrawal of all British, American and French troops from Western Germany, with the quid pro quo of a Russian withdrawal from Eastern Germany. To bring this about they would be willing to sacrifice the Communist regime in Eastern Germany, for there would always be the more attractive possibility that a reunited 'neutralized' Germany of that sort might one day be drawn into their orbit, not because of any German pro-Communist sympathies but because of what Germans might easily regard as reasons of expediency.

"The Western powers cannot agree to such a project in the present circumstances without doing infinite harm The SPD has rejected this vent a united Germany from to their own cause. To create a vast military and political no-man's-land in the heart of It is to be regretted that Europe would not only invite

cation and some kind of compromise is impossible.

"The Russians may be prepared to agree to unification under a non-Communist regime at the price of preventing German rearmament, even without the withdrawal of the occupying forces. That remains to be seen. But if they are, it would be a bargain which the Western powers should not turn down."

The first thing which strikes one in this passage is what appears to be a complete absence of concern with the desires and interests not only of the Germans as a nation, but of the German working class and even more specifically, the German socialists. The editorial speaks of the "Germans" as if they were a homogeneous entity. Indeed, the only distinction made is between "the worst kind of Germans" and the rest, with the strong inference that it is the former who are likely to gain in strength if the country is unified.

But even worse than this is the assumption that the only thing which prevents Germany from becoming a vast "military and political no-man's land" is the presence of foreign troops on German soil.

It would appear that for the Tribune the German working class, led by the Party, simply does not exist ple, and that this can be done Social - Democracy in the become the arbiters between sions in Western Germany. structed.

titude for the section of a party which has gained vast popularity in its own country on the basis of insisting that rearmament, i.e., the development of purely military might, must be SUBORDI-NATED to the political and economic interests of the working class!

#### INTERNATIONALISM

And the reference to "the dangers of a European Korea" would border on the ludicrous if this were not such a serious matter. Surely the editors of the Tribune are aware of the fact that the military aggression typified by Korea was made possible by the division of that unhappy country imposed by the Stalinist and capitalist powers, and that in this respect the continued division of Germany and not its unification presents the danger. Yet even more important, to compare Germany with its highly developed workingclass movement to poor, backward Korea is to stretch analogy far beyond its legitimate bounds.

The SPD of Germany is far closer to a policy which corresponds not only to the true interests of the German workers, but to those of the workers of the whole world, than is the Tribune in this matter. It behooves British socialists, as well as Americans, to give them every support in their insistance on the priority of German unipowerful Social-Democratic fication and complete independence. Only thus can a as a political force, or at any truly internationalist socialrate that it is a far less re- ist policy, and equally impor-

# The System 'Does Not Work' -

(Continued from page 1) But even the Americans are no

Michael Hoffman, the N. Y. Times correspondent who has spent the post-war years in Europe covering its economic development, seeks to point out the reasons for the failure of the rearmament program. Coming from a non-socialist source, it can only add emphasis to what has long been said about Western Europe on this score. Faced with this problem the Marshall Plan was

like fly-swatting at an elephant. Hoffman wrote on November 25: "It cannot be repeated too often that what is mainly wrong with Europe's economic system is not that it is unfair to some economic classes of the population or that it is not like our own system, but

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

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

that it does not 'work.' It does not provide for enough people for enough of the time the combination of incentives and rewards needed to bring about the complex kind of cooperative action neces sary to utilize effectively modern industrial and agricultural producechniques. It has been work ing just enough better than communism to make it possible to avoid applying methods of totalitarian states so far. But no amount of talk or appeal to ideals can fend off totalitarianisms, red or white, if they alone seem to the mass of the people to be able to make the system work at all."

#### THE "WISE MEN"

The extent of the dispair and even cynicism inside of the NATO organization is shown by their attitude toward their bureaucratic administrative apparatus. Two more top-level committees were formed at the Ottawa meeting. One consisted of the finance ministers of the Big Three-the U.S., Britain and France, and are sarcastically referred to as "the Three Wise Men" who are seeking the way out of the NATO crisis. The other committee, made up of the 12 NATO members, are referred to as "the Twelve Apostles": all sitting down for their last supper. This is another way of saying that the Europeans feel neither war nor the preparations for war can offer a solution to

any of their problems. It is only a variety of the American chauvinist who can believe that an atomic world war can bring utopia, à la Colliers magazine.

#### BOTTLENECK

One by one as the Western European nations begin to rearm they are thrown into the midst of an economic crisis. The first was Britain and within a short time her trade gap began to widen, dollar and gold reserves to decline. Already the Churchill government has announced a cut in imports and an austerity program exceeding anything under Cripps, France was the next nation to move in the direction of fulfilling her NATO military commitments, and a similar situation has developed in France, With Britain and France as examples, it is small wonder that rearmament has been lagging.

The bottleneck is not in the organization of a European army or in developing the most efficient committee set-up to run NATO. The basic difficulty is in the European economy as such. It is the fact that West European capitalism no longer can function. Compared to Asia and Africa it is a modern economy but it cannot meet the needs of the European people, war economy or not, as it is presently organized on a capitalist basis. The rearmament program clearly shows this obsolescence.



HOME-THRUST FROM THE YUGOSLAVS

STALIN" ON THIS SQUARE, AND SINCE THEN NO ONE HAS DARED TO BE THE FIRST TO STOP CLAPPING.

("Jež" - Beograd)

Reproduced from Review of International Affairs (Belgrade)

703-1PEL