

THE CASE OF THE FRIENDS OF FIGHTERS FOR RUSSIAN FREEDOM ... page 6

John L. Lewis' Strategy for 1952

**Bevan Scores Again in BLP** 

Democracy and the Working Class .. page 4

# **UAW Exec Takes Over Ford Local**

DETROIT, March 16—After a one-day hearing, at which the Reuther leadership acted as prosecutor, judge and jury, the international executive board placed a six-man administration over Ford Local 600, in spite of vigorous protests of the duly elected officials of that local union, the largest in

forces are in control-at least until the next election -of a local union which they have been unable to win at any time by democratic secret elections since President Walter P. Reuther assumed full leadership of the UAW-

The main charge against the four top officers of Ford

Local 600 — Carl Stellato. president; Pat Rice, vice president; Bill Hood, recording secretary; and Bill Grant, financial secretarywas that they were derelict in their duty because a small clique of the Communist Party was the real leadership of the local union.

. . . page Z

... page 3

Less than three months ago, Carl Stellato, confronted by similar accusations at a special board hearing. challenged Reuther to prefer charges against him and the other officers under the provisions of the union constitution. These would have been heard by a special trial board, as set up at the last international union convention. Un doubtedly, this would have been a far more democratic methodand for Reuther, a more dangerous one—than the legal but bureaucratic amputation now taking place. The prosecutor and the jury would not be the same individuals

When the news of the administrators over Ford Local 600 broke in the headlines, right after the congressional committee cut short its hearings and left town, an oldtime right-winger made the remark can ren used to beat those b-----s in elections."

This pithy comment summarizes the whole situation, and the problem.

### THE G-MAN BOARD

Why has the Reuther faction been unable, with 90 per cent of the UAW in its control, to build a cadre of union leaders and unite them on a sound progressive program that would smash the influence of Stalinism in the way that counts most, by defeating them in elections, by winning the rank and file away from their influence? Ford Local 600 is no different in composition from other UAW locals in this area. There seems little question but that Reuther has disavowed his onetime method of defeating Stalinism by a superior program and leadership.

The six administrators over Ford Local 600 are Walter Reuther, Vice-Presidents John Livingston and Richard Gosser, the two West Side regional directors, (Furn to last page)

Victims.

to the press in a direct rejoinder that while the Greek people ap-

ly praising the action of Peurifoy. Fremier Plastiras' apparently retreated from his plan to reinstitute simple proportional representation after the statement of Peurifoy. (Greece now operates with modified version, known as "reinforced proportional representa-

encouraged Papagos to introduce a motion of censure against the government in Parliament, charging ineptitude and lack of confidence. The Greek Rally leader also defends a clandestine organization, the "Sacred" Union of Greek Officers, as being a "patriotic organization" whose task was to keep communism out of the army. He also stated that this group, charged by the opposition with the intention of declaring a military dictatorship, was fully known to former U. S. Ambassador Henry F. Grady and Lieut. Gen. James A. Van Fleet, former head of the U. S. Military Mis-

The Papagos group parrots the demand of Peurifoy for majority representation in the new genera elections. They cite the instability of France, with its system of proportional representation, also subject to frequent crises-and to American criticism as a result.

What is entirely lost sight of by the opponents of proportional representation is that the crises stem not from proportional representation but from fundamental conditions present in the economic and political situation of each given country. Proportional representation is a more sensitive (Turn to last page)

# John L. Puts Mine-Safety Law First on 1952 Agenda

### By GERALD McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, March 15-Something is missing from the national scene this spring. Contract time is fast approaching for the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis has not said a word about a strike. Furthermore, he's not likely to! • This despite the fact that the union for months past has been very quietly building a huge war chest through heavy assessments on the membership.

• This despite the fact that anti-union violence has been steadily increasing in the Kentucky fields, where shooting at organizers and bombing their cars has been almost a weekly occurrence for the past year.

• This despite the fact that the work week in coal remains short—as it has been virtually since the end of the war.

• This despite the appalling disaster at Orient No. 2 Mine at West Frankfurt, Illinois, last December where 119 miners died in a company death trap.

This last point-the Orient No. 2 disaster-explains Lewis's peaceable behavior this spring. Just as after the terrible Centralia disaster, there is the possibility that Congress, under the pressure of this latest wanton slaughter, will pass a federal mine-safety law with teeth in it. Such a law-the Price-Neely bill-is now before Congress. Lewis sore. is not likely to do anything aggressive as long as he has hope that this desperately needed bill will pass.

Under the present law, federal mine inspectors have no authority to enforce their findings. Only state inspectors can do this, and state mine departments are uniformly in the control of the mine operators.

### WHY FEDERAL LEGISLATION IS NEEDED

Federal inspectors had declared the Orient No. 2 mine dangerous. State inspectors—the head of the Illinois Bureau of Mines and Minerals was formerly manager of Orient No. 2-said the mine was

safe. It blew up, and blew up 119 men with it. When the Price-Neely bill was introduced, the head of

the Pennsylvania Bureau of Mines rushed to Washington to testify against the measure. Pennsylvania, he boasted, had an adequate safety code. Within a week, the Carpenterstown No. 2 mine near Pittsburgh blew up, killing six. It was only because the explosion took place in a wet section, so that only methane and not coal dust blew up, that many more aid not die. Federal inspectors had warned that the mine was gassy; the "efficient" Pennsylvania inspectors had said it was OK.

Federal reports, which are purely advisory, are simply ignored by operators and state officials-thereby saving a little money at the risk of men's lives. Last year, for example, only 27 per cent of the hazards reported by federal inspectors were corrected

Coal mining is at best a hazardous occupation. However, the wast majority of deaths and injuries are preventable. The casualty figures at present are appalling. Last year, 790 were killed and 38,250 injured. In the last ten years, over ten thousand have been killed and over a half million injured. Further, the situation is not improving but getting worse. Last year, the frequency rate increased 16 per cent

over the previous year. There is a new element in the

The Langland Press

fight for federal enforcement of mine safety. This year, some of the operators of the big modern mines in the Northern fields are supporting federal enforcement while the smaller operators and Southern owners oppose the measure.

### **BIG OPS WANGLE**

The motive of the big operators not humanitarian, however. Coal is in oversupply, as is usual in peacetime. Stricter safety regulations would drive smaller, undercapitalized companies out of business. This would strengthen the hold of monopoly on the industry.

The operators who are supporting federal enforcement are not backing the Price-Neeley bill which has the support of the UMW, however. The big operators propose legislation which would affect the small competitor but leave loopholes for them. They are asking for the right to get injunctions setting aside the findings of federal inspectors until a lengthy court procedure has been followed. Thus, big companies with skillful lawyers and the right connections could largely circumvent the law, while the thousands of small operators who already lead a precarious economic existence would have a much harder time.

The union would not object to many of these smaller mines being closed. Located in remote areas and working only part of the year, many of them have

proved almost impossible to organize. Their closure would help make possible a full work week for union miners. The problem of short work weeks has so plagued the union that Lewis, the great advocate of free enterprise, has been unsuccessfully pushing a scheme whereby the government would subsidize the export of coal to Europe in order to keep the coal industry working more regularly

So long as there is the possibility that the Price-Neely bill pass, under the pressure of the latest disaster and of the coming national elections, Lewis is likely to postpone economic demands to accept whatever the steel workers win, if it is offered to him. (Lewis long ago promised the steel workers financial support in their current struggle, if they need it.) However, if safety regulations are again rejected -as seems likely-400,000 coal miners are going to be awfully

# "Vol. 4" of Marx's Capital **Out in English At Last**

volume of A History of Economic Theories, From the Physiocrats to Adam Smith, by Karl Marx, marking the first time that this work has appeared in the English language.

Students of Marx will know that this book is part of a four-volume work based on material which Marx had hoped to issue as the 4th volume of Capital. He died long before the project could be completed and his co-worker Engels was able only to complete the now famous three volumes of Capital. In his literary legacy, Karl Kautsky, the then theoretical leader of the German social-democracy, was given the task of editing and issuing this collected material, which he did in a German edition as Theories of Surplus Value, Marx's original title. A French edition appeared as A History of Economic Doctrines.

Kautsky completed Theories of Sarplus Value after years of the .most painstaking labor of deten material left by Marx. But almost fifty years have passed since the first appearance of the German edition before an English one has come out.

Although originally intended as the 4th volume of Capital, A History of Economic Theories could well be read as an introduction to Capital. The book deals with the forerunners of Marx and the material is a preparation for the study of Capital itself.

The material in this book covers the same ground as that which appears in the first volume of the four which make up the whole of the German edition. Terence McCarthy, the translator, writes that the second volume is already in preparation.

This publication-project is a noteworthy event for students of Marxism. It is by no means to be thought that the work is simply historical survey. It is chockfull of material casting important sidelights on Marx's economic views.

# Second Bay Area Case of Racism In Housing Has a Different Ending

### By JACK WALKER

OAKLAND, March 14-For the second time in less than a month the Bay Area made newspaper headlines on the issue of racial discrimination in housing. The first case was the Chinese-American Sheng family in South San Francisco. The second is that of the Negro Gary family in San Pablo (north of Oakland). However, the second case is the more vital of the two.

Readers of LABOR ACTION will recall how Sing Sheng asked for a democratic vote on his neighbors' attitude toward his moving into his new home, and how prejudice won 174-28, causing Sheng to sell his mortgage. This time it was different! Wilbur D. Gary, veteran and vicecommander of an American Legion post, who has been a Negro in America for 42 years knew in advance that there was strong prejudice against his moving into a newly acquired \$8700 home in the Rollingwood tract in San Pablo. Nevertheless he decided to gc ahead, in spite of the followng occurrences:

(1) His "neighbors" tried to get the former owner of his home to sell to them after learning that a Negro was attempting to buy it.

(2) A three-foot wooden cross had been planted on his front lawn the day before he was to (3) A brick had crashed through

his living-room window that same

(4) An offer to buy him out at a profit of \$1200 (prejudice is costly!) had been made by a Rollingwood Improvement Associationa categoric yes-or-no offer.

(5) The plate-glass window of the Richmond Negro real-estate dealer who had negotiated the transaction was smashed by a stone.

Thus the hostile crowd which milled around Gary's home for approximately five hours after dark on March 5, the evening he moved in, and which hurled taunts and stones at the residence, was clearly foreshadowed by the earlier events. Nevertheless, the San Pablo sheriff temporized until close to 11 p.m. before he and twenty deputies dispersed the hostile 150 and friendly 50 alike, promising to protect Gary the rest of the night. Previous to the sheriff's long-delayed arrival there was absolutely nothing between Gary and the crowd but the gradually rising group of

fifty friends who stuck by him. One of these, a Methodist pastor, planted an American flag on the road leading up to the house, and received the aprobrious epithet of "nigger lover" from many of his assembled congregation. A few persons stayed with Gary overnight, but apparently that

was the end of the violence. There are several points to be made about these two cases of racial discrimination.

### DEMOCRACY MISAPPLIED

First, there was a definite amount of organization of the prejudiced section of the neighborhood. In the Sheng case doorbells were rung and families were aorused against him on both racial and "communist" grounds ... although the latter was clearly inapplicable to this former Chinese Nationalist officer. In the Gary case there were both violent acts (cross, window smashings) and the attempts to buy him out. Against this, there is only the piecemeal response of a smaller group of people trying to aid the victom of prejudice as best they could. In the Gary case this was not good enough to prevent the seige of his home for several hours.

Second, it is the conduct of Gary that is striking the greater blow against discrimination. As Dr. Lester B. Granger, executive rector of the National Urban League (which organizes social workers' skills to improve the economic and social status of the Negro in the city) puts it in the San Francisco Chroniele:

"You don't go around and ask for prejudice, and then abide by it. That balloting in Southwood was a misapplication of the demo-

cratic process. The over-all loss (when Sheng didn't move in) is much worse than any piddling gain (obtained from the publicity).

"The Gary situation has much more optimistic tendencies. He's there and his neighbors will learn to know him and be ashamed of themselves. It's the record all over the country. A Negro moves in and people get excited. Then they realize Negroes are people like anyone else."

### ON ALERT

While Dr. Granger's emphasis on sticking it out is correct, it is necessary to realize the good that publicity does in itself. It checks the less prejudiced persons and often induces others who would otherwise remain "neutral" to come over to the minority member's side. The final, and I believe most im-

portant, lesson is that there is a crying need for more effective organization by the foes of discrimination, if they are to succeed in their good intentions. What that entails is a combined effort by such organized community groups as NAACP, Urban League, ADA, liberal and labor groups, etc., in alerting one another whenever there are indications of such cases

These groups, which socialists should help to bring together in coordinated action, can mobilize a large enough section of their members and sympathizers to produce an overwhelming showing that would clearly make violence impossible-or at least clearly a costly affair. With the "hot war" on civil liberties proceeding full scale, this is not just a "good cause" but a vital necessitv

arising.

TOTAL Dregon Streator Cleveland Pittsburgh Buffalo Oakland New York Boston General Chicago Youngstown Newark

Philadelphia

Baltimore

Los Angeles

Detroit

Seattle

Akron

Reading

Indiana

St. Louis

C	OMRADE TU	AYEV"
Novel of	e	
dern Russia		
	by VICTOR	SERGE

\$3.00

AN

Mo

OR SERGE Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE 114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

"THE CASE OF





337 pp.

Part I of the legendary "Volume IV" of Marx's Capital

A HISTORY OF ECONOMIC THEORIES

From the Physiocrats to Adam Smith

Translated into English for the first time

Order from:

# The Langland Press in New ciphering and organizing the York has just issued the first overwhelming mass of handwrit-

ISL FUND DRIVE The Fin By ALBERT GATES **Fund Drive Director** 

to the fund drive we are still running behind schedule. The \$725.50 received this past week took the drive over the \$4,000 mark, but percentagewise it is 18 per cent ehind the schedule for meeting the total goal in the campaign. The standings this week have not changed a great deal. Oregon \$20.



### March 24, 1952

# **London Letter** Labor Party's MPs Repel Attlee's Attempt to 'Get' Beyan

### By ALLAN VAUGHAN

Party.

LONDON, March 12-The two most important events in Britain are, firstly, the Budget, and secondly, the threat of split in the Labor

By the time you receive this letter, all the details of the Budget will have reached you, as well as the reports of the parliamentary debates following. It is significant that Arthur Deakin, the president of the General Council of the Trade Union Congress, has stated that "the increase in the Bank Rate means a return of the financial policy of 1931," for Deakin belongs to the extreme right of our party and he is very chary of using such strong language against the Tory government!

It is also important to note that this morning's Daily Herald, the Labor Party's official newspaper, has a large number of articles bitterly attacking the saving of 160 million pounds in subsidies, which will mean dearer bread, meat, milk, butter, bacon and eggs. The Daily Herald is beginning to respond to the terrific pressure from the Labor movement, and its vigorous style of recent months is a pleasant contrast to the dull, borng and stilted style we had to endure for six long years.

### RIGHT WNG REBUFFED

The second important event is the defeat of Labor's "shadow cabinet" in the Parliamentary Labor Party [the Labor Party's parliamentary group]. Despite the strenuous efforts of Attlee Gaitskell, Morrison and Shinwell to get a resolution censuring the 57 "rebel" MPs, they failed. The bare facts of this snub to the Attlee - Morrison strong line against Bevan will undoubtedly have appeared in the American press by this time. However, the

facts about the preliminary negotiations that led to the defeat of the right-wing resolution may not have reached you.

The reimposition of standing orders in the Parliamentary Labor Party is something that was to be expected, when such a large minority of Labor MPs voted against the majority decision, but the rebuff to the present leadership was far from certain. Withthe shadow cabinet there were misgivings about censuring Bevan, misgivings that were shared by many former junior ministers of the last Labor cabinet; and it was inevitable that a sizable minority would try to heal the split.

### LONDON VOTE DUE

Jim Griffiths, Chuter Ede and Hugh Dalton all resisted the Attlee resolution—and these were senior ministers in the last Labor government. More important still was the action of many junior ministers like Hilary Marquand, John Edwards and Kenneth Younger, who together with George Strauss and John Strachey prepared the way for reconciliation—a reconciliation that strengthens the hand of Bevan, a fact that can hardly have escaped the notice of the "moderate bloc" inside the Parliamentary Labor Party.

I may be mistaken but I believe that this rebuff to the leadership of the party may be the prelude to the resignation of the parliamentary shadow cabinet in the not too distant future. People like Jim Griffiths and Hugh Dalton would then fill in the vacated places of the shadow cabinet.

The Budget and the reconciliation of the wings of the Labor Party will help to give the party a large majority in the forthcoming London County Council elections. The extent of our victory will be a useful indicator of the strength of anti-Tory feeling in London, and a pointer to the results of the next general election.

These important events are a packground to the changes taking place in what I shall call the socialist Left of the Labor Party. An evolution as profoundthough naturally on a greatly diminished scale—as that in the Labor movement itself has affected the many Trotskvist individuals and groups that have entered the mainstream of workingclass activity. The great majority of active Trotskyists have left

the tiny sects (that is, tiny by comparison with the length, breadth and depth of the Labor movement, but not tiny by comparison with their original size in the days of the RCP) and thrown themselves wholeheartedly and unconditionally into the

maturing left wing of our party. Although the small groupings which remain did play a positive role, in however distorted a manner, a year or so ago, today, when alternative forms of loose association and liaison exist, and

when the active individuals have cut themselves loose from these closed-in groups, these groups play an injurious role in the creation of a genuine left wing-a left wing that is unconditionally loyal to the party as a whole but ever vigilant in constructive criticism of the conservative policies of the leadership. For the far-seeing socialists, it is not a question of having an entry "tactic," but having an entry "strategy" spanning a whole epoch of socialist endeavor.

## **FBI** Exhibits a Choice Stoolpigeon In California Trial of Stalinists

### BY DAVE BERN

LOS ANGELES. March 15-There is some evidence that the government prosecution of the California Stalinist leaders has backfired a bit, due criefly to the confused, often inconsistent, testimony of at least two of the government's main witnesses. However, one need not underestimate the powerful appeal of the red scare in influencing public attiudes, regardless of the character of government witnesses or of their testimony.

Previously, Lloyd Hamlin, an nformer for the FBI who was accepted as an important CP ac-" tivist for years, could only quote from Marx or Lenin, or tell about the Stahnist attempt to influence Negroes by posing as champions of civil rights, in order to "prove" the "conspiratorial" and "revolutionary" nature of the CP. Hamlin's testimony also sought to introduce, as relevant material, the "atheistic and materialistic" nature of Marxist philosophy.

The attorneys for the CP leaders showed up much of his testimony by pointing out inconsisten-

Among ISL branches, Pittsburgh

cies in the dates of alleged meetings in which certain persons' were alleged to be present.

The fourth government witness, Danny Scarletto, embarrassed his chiefs even more by his "errors" in statements of factual data and by his role as a selfconfessed ingrate who had reported the name of a woman who had befriended him. Even the conservative press indicated in its head. ings how Scarletto was put on the spot during cross-examination.

The Los Angeles Mirror of March 12 reported that Scarletto "admitted he had been friendly with an elderly woman member of the Communist Party. . . . He often visited her home, he said, and she referred to him as her son. He put a new roof on her home and she poid for the work. 'But you turned her in to the FBI nevertheless, didn't you?' [Defense Attorney] Margolis asked. Reluctantly Scarletto admitted he had exposed her as a member of the party. He also admitted he had turned in other members for whom he had done jobs and had given the FBI the e of a non-member to whom he had sold a subscription to the People's World, the Communist newspaper.

### AGENT-PROVOCATEUR

The defense also noted "that Scarletto has been living since 1948 with a woman to whom he is not legally married" and suggested the "possibility that Scarletto's testimony had been given in exchange for immunity from prosecution on Mann Act charges." Underlining the determination to match the government's own kind of tactics, including character assassination, if necessary, the defense wrung from the witness the admission that he had accompanied a woman to Ohio under the guise of being on a honeymoon.

On March 13 the LA Times stated that "Scarletto said . . . the Communists yelled and hollered when he, an undercover man for the FBI, said that as a mechanic he was well qualified to sabotage planes on the ground. . . The meeting at which sabotage was considered was attended by a Korean girl, Scarletto reported. She said, he related, that she didn't want her husband to fight in Korea, where he might kill some of his own people. Others, however, said that as many as possible should be placed in Korea where they might do good service as saboteurs."

The defense contended it would show that Scarletto had not been operating underground as he had claimed. Scarletto said he turned over to the FBI literature he received at meetings and copies of the People's World. Since this literature is sold at Stalinist bookstores and the paper can be purchased openly, one may wonder at the relevance of this testimony in the attempt to prove the underground and conspiratorial character of the CP.

The Times continued: "When he was asked to identify copies of the People's World, he frequently said he did not remember having seen the copies and when asked why, replied, 'Maybe I didn't take" it out of the wrapper."

The following day the Times dealt with Scarletto's testimony to the effect that the CP tried to "indoctrinate mothers in nursing schools, worshipers in Jewish synagogues and in a Unitarian church and members of the B'nai B'rith ... Scarletto went through another trying day in which he was asked to pin down various events as to dates and places of which he now and then volunteered he had hazy recollections." The witness was excused, but he apparently failed to offer any concrete evidence to back up his and the government contentions that the CP had "conspired to advocate and teach the overthrow of the government by force and violence."

Witness Scarletto's memory underwent a "dusting" job when "Attorney Branton asked [him] if he had seen Mrs. Kusnitz at a meeting in September 1951. Scarletto said he had. Then the attorney asked the government to stipulate that Mrs. Kusnitz had been in jail from July 26, 1951 until (Turn to last page)

nger's on	N.Y., Detroit,	Chicago, et al.

### Although there was a slight increase in the weekly contribution

and Streator remain in first place as the only areas who have reached 100 per cent or over. The SYL is still in third place as it continues to move toward its goal. It has made the largest financial contribution to the drive next to New York City. Right now SYL units stand in the following positions: Chicago \$358, New York \$202.50, Berkeley \$94, Detroit, \$40, Northwest \$30, General \$28, St. Louis \$25 and New Haven

Paid

\$4073.50

65

25

100

75

300

165

15

271

480

25

73

70

173

116

55

1227

837.50

Percent

32.\$

130

100

55.8

50

50

46

33

30.6

30

27.1

26.6

24.3

23.3

23

20

19

18.3

0

0

0

0

25

Quoto

\$12,500

50

25

1,500

200

150

650

500

000,

1,000

1,800

100

300

300

750

25

600

300

75

75

50

50

did best this week, reaching 50 per cent of its quota and moving into sixth place. New York City, which is far behind its pace of last year, is, however, slowly creeping up in the standings and now has passed 30 per cent of its quota. By and large, however, this was poor week for ISL branches.

A glance at the box score will show that most of them sent no money in and as a result there has been no change in their tions. This is a warning to all

branches. We have now passed the halfway mark in the drive. The next weeks are the critical ones. They will show whether the whole campaign is in jeopardy. We have never failed to complete a fund drive before and we know we are not going to fail this time. But to make certain that there is no failure, a quick upward turn in contributions is necessary.

This is warning signal No. 1. There are seven weeks left to the campaign, in which period \$8,000 has to be raised, over a thousand dollars a week. Again, the chance making this depends entirely upon the larger branches with the greater quotas.

We need to hear more loudly from New York first of all, and then from Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, Oakland, Buffalo, Seattle, Newark and Philadelphia. These are the areas which are holding back the drive. Now, let's see how quickly the necessary change is made. It can be done in one way only: Immediate collection and remittance of contributions to the national office!

	dent Socia t 14 Stree		eague			
	rk 11, N. 1					
New To	<b>FK II, N.</b>	•				<u>.</u>
Enc	losed is \$			as m	v contri	bution to
	s 1952 Fu				,	
	3					
NAME				·····		•••••••••••••••••
ADDRESS						1997 a. 1
			*************			**********************

### The **ISL** Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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





### By HAL DRAPER

Is the working class, the labor movement, the most important bulwark of democracy in our society?

We answer unequivocally Yes; and believe it has never been more important to emphasize this than today.

But an unequivocal Yes does not mean that the mere assertion itself adequately describes the real relationship that exists between the working-class struggle and the fight for democracy. Without a knowledge of the thinking behind it, which both elaborates and qualifies it, the assertion can be turned into a mere soapbox generalization. There's many a superficial critic of Marxism who would be at a loss in pursuing his avocation if he ceased to treat isolated generalities as if they conveyed the whole content of Marxist and institutions were swept aside

one by one.

"The easy old faith in the

working class as a bulwark of de-

mocracy has been shaken by yet

another dictator," as the article's

Marxists have "grappled" with

this "disconcerting" phenomenon:

and (2) if "the easy old faith" is

discarded, what are the implica-

tions-especially for the discard-

Now, do Marxists claim that,

for some reason, the working

class is inherently more demo

cratic-minded than others? Per-

people are not enamored of de-

mocracy as a "moral value"-de-

mocracy for the sake of democ-

racy-the democratic ideology as

made as a statement of fact; we

ourselves have the greatest re-

spect for democracy as a "moral

perhaps by those who remember

only Marxist catchwords, that we

stress something else: that the

decisive moving force of social

mass movements is the material

and economic interest of classes.

If "the working class is a bul-

wark of democracy," then, it can

only be insofar as there is a re-

lationship between democracy and

the ability of the masses of peo-

ple to achieve their class interests

The working masses of people

will support leaders who deliver

the goods. It is the test of prac-

tice. But this means two things:

(1) Like all other classes and

groupings, they take time to

learn-they can be and are de-

ceived, disappointed and duped;

or in temporary conjunctures can

be mollified with partial install-

ments of the "goods," as long as

It will be remembered, even

"way of life," etc. (This is

ish the thought. The masses of

Two questions arise: (1) How

subtitle says in large type.

THE WORKING CLASS

AND DEMOCRACY

So

ers?

value.")

under it.

thinking on the subject, or even the main content.

The other side of this coin, we should note in order to be fair, is the "Marxist" who does actually substitute such general formulas for a Marxist analysis; the two types feed on each others' products very happily, in a kind of symbiosis.

So, quite regularly, with ,an air important discovery, critics take pen in hand to write articles about the outmoded idea that labor has a special role in society with regard to the defense of democracy, with suitable references to the notorious fact that Marxism developed in the 19th century whereas, as is fairly well-known, we are now living in the 20th.

The text for today is such an article in the magazine The Reporter, which is fondly considered y its editor Max Ascoli as the dea-arsenal for the intellectual élite of the country. The article is by Theodore Draper, and it appears in the form of a review of Robert Alexander's book The Peron Era (Dec. 25).

Draper has observed that contemporary dictatorships, unlike the older ones, seek to win over the working class as well as the middle class, and he has observed the successes they have registered, and he finds this phenomenon to be one whose "implications are so unpleasant that the prevailing 'left - wing' ideologies, whether Marxist or non-Marxist in origin, have hardly begun to grapple with them."

His own grappling takes off, of course, from Peronism, since it is Alexander's book that is under review. Peron built his power and regime to a decisive extent on the support of the organized tradeunion movement. He gained the allegiance of labor by giving them real economic concessions, not merely promises: social insurance; real-wages increases; collective bargaining; stimulus to the rulers are capable of making union organization; government such concessions. It is not a quesposts for labor leaders. At the tion of "idealizing" the working same time, however, he established a dictatorial regime with fascist trappings which increas- through either books or manifesingly went in the direction of to- tos.

But (2) In the longer run,

class, which learns through its

checkered experiences and not

LABOR ACTION Independent Socialist Weekly March 24, 1952 Vol. 16. No. 12 Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. , under the act of March 3, 1874. Editor: HAL DRAPER Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles

sooner or later, capitalism cannot deliver the goods. Even in the world today it is virtually only the U.S. whose capitalism is still wealthy enough to keep its workers reasonably contented-that is, resistant to revolutionary ideas. But even in the United States, the aristocrat of the world, the labor movement still wins its gains, or maintains its standards, or slows up inroads upon its interests, only insofar as it wields the organized power of the tradeunion movement and all other instruments of pressure which democratic forms afford it.

In the last analysis, labor needs democratic institutions because it needs a free trade-union movement. Without its own trade-union movement labor is at the mercy of ruling-class exploitation, whether the ruling class is capitalist in the West or Stalinist behind the Iron Curtain.

This is what establishes the basic relationship between the workers' ability to fight most effectively for their own material interests, and their need for democracy. This is also why even union bureaucrats, however undemocratic they may be in internal union practices, are pushed to fight against encroachments on democracy.

As current events in this country show, their fight may be timid and compromising; but no other social grouping has as large and vital a material stake in the fight for democracy as does the working class.

The ideology of (say) the CIO leadership is no more advanced than that of the Fair Deal liberals, but the great social difference between the two is that the former has behind it the most present and potential pressure of the organized working class, which is forced sooner or later to come into conflict with the aims and needs of a government which is not theirs.

### **BEHIND THE FORMULA**

It is old stuff to play with the idea of a "benevolent despotism." and temporarily more-or-less benevolent despotisms have been known in history; but for the exploited class, such despotisms cannot remain benevolent very long for basic class reasons gets back to the fundamental Marxist idea that the emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself; it will not be given its due on a-silver platter; and for the working class to act in its own name, for itself, requires "winning the battle of democracy," as the Communist Manifesto put it. The working-class revolution is unique among social revolutions history in that, for the first time, it is the class on bottom which takes power, the class which represents the majority of humanity and not an exploiting minority; and precisely because it does truly represent the majority, it is democracy which is its most favorable element.

Finally: of the pro-democratic forces in society, it is labor which has the social power and weight with which to fight.

This is briefly what is contained in the shorthand formula that "the working class is the bulwark of democracy." This is also why the working class is driven by its needs to become "democraticminded" too.

### THE CASE OF PERON AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

The question then depends on the ability of a benevolent despot to continue to earn the allegiance of his subjects by "delivering the goods," not merely for a few months or even years, according to political and social exigencies, but for an indefinite period. This would indeed be a disconcerting phenomenon which would shortcircuit the working class's inherent need for democratic expression in order to assert its own interests.

LABOR ACTION

How is it with Peron? The somewhat amazing thing is that Draper apparently is unaware that the real economic gains which, he stresses, Argentine labor got from Peron when the latter was trying to consolidate his regime, are now more and more becoming a thing of the past. The dictatorship gave; it is now taking away. The standard of living of the Argentine workers is falling; Draper should have heard about this somewhere before mounting the saddle of his thesis and riding it too far. Articles in LABOR ACTION have chronicled this somewhat; we are ashamed to say that bourgeois observers have described it in greater detail. Argentine labor sees its silver-platter gains being taken back by the iron fist, now that the official Peronist "trade unions'

have been totalitarianized. Isn't this essentially the same thing that has happened in the Stalinist states? There too, important sections of the working class, following the war, in revulsion against capitalism, were corralled the Stalinists, or neutralized them, in the absence of a third alternative. They are now paying for it. But the hatred and opposition to the totalitarian regimes which mount in Eastern Europe lead the masses toward fighting for democracy, whatever the social content they give this democracy.

Draper writes as if Peron's can be of indefinite, if not permanent, duration. Here is all he actually writes about the growing signs of opposition to Peron: As the railway strike early this year showed, some workers can still be provoked into open resistance. Yet it is significant that Peron speedily increases his bribes to organized labor whenever his three pillars get shaky. He is now promising it the syndicalist state."

What "provoked" the railway strikes, if not precisely the fact that the "real economic gains' are going with the snows of vestervear-that is. the fact which he does no mention or does not know? And what a comedown it is, after he stresses how very real and concrete the former gains were, that the new bribe which (he apparently expects) will continue to hold the workers' loyalty is—an empty speech about "the syndicalist state" and such nonsense. By the "syndicalist state" Peron. of course, means the fascist corporate state. "Speedily increases his bribes," indeed!

The Argentine workers were deceived by Peron, as many another working class far more mature than it is has been deceived and for longer periods of time, but Draper will have no talk "deception." Alexander's about book speaks of "supposed economic and social benefits," and Draper replies: Supposed benefits? "It would imply that the Argentine workers have been taken in by a gigantic deception, that they are somewhat feebleminded." This is really too smug! We know quite a number of intelligent people, not to speak of the masses, who have been even more cruelly deceived, with less concrete reason, for many more years: ex-Stalinist intellectuals, for example, who stuck to the Stalinist illusion from the Third Period through the People's Front and the Moscow Trials and into the Hitler-Stalin Pact. . . The last thing we would call them "feeble-minded."

Draper need not lecture Alexander about the fact that the temporary gains were real ones: all he knows about it, after all, is gotten from Alexander himerly, they were illusory, deceptive, "supposed" benefits because he does not share Draper's implied theory about the Permanent Benevolent Despotism. Is Draper really thinking in terms of such a Permanent Benevolent Despotism? Unless his

article does him a grave injustice, this is precisely the "unpleasant implication" that we were warned of at the beginning. He writes: "When dictatorships used to be both politically and socially reactionary, the choice was easy. It was possible to believe that the fulfillment of the material interests of the working class had to bring about the fulfillment of po-

litical democracy. This was the faith of 19th century Marxism, which more or less permeated all 'progressive' movements. The working class was the bulwark of aemocracy. But what if dictatorships paid off socially? What

then?" (My emphasis.) And if this were not enough, he summarizes the "disconcerting implications" again as his very last words: "In the general decay of ideologies, the most oppressive of ideologies has a good chance of coming out on top if it pays off sufficiently. The 19th century faith was that the working class had to be politically democratic in its own interests. The 20th century seems to say that the workers cannot be had so easily, that

they demand something on account-from any side."

THE BLIND ALLEY

While we do not entirely underhold over the working class is or stand the last sentence, we gather at any rate that the "19th century faith" is quite obsolete, Dictatorships used to be politically and socially reactionary; in the 20th century they (or some of them, like Peronism and Stalinism) are not necessarily politically and socially reactionary. They are "progressive," or whatever term would be acceptable to Draper as the opposite of reactionary.

Thus, in giving up the "easy old faith," Draper finds, to replace it, only the very difficult lew faith (of the 20th century) in the political and social potentialities of the totalitarian state. He does not like totalitarianism. you understand, he is all for democracy, himself. But he has grappled with implications, unike the left-wing ideologies, and the truth is the truth: Stalinism and fascism are justified in their claims of being the material benefactors of the masses, even though they kill the soul. . . . The lord defend us from such defend-

We would not push this For that "faith" is a founda-

ers of democracy! far: it is far from certain that our subject really understands what he has written or has grappled with its implications. We would draw no conclusions about writers who play with such ideas in this rather irresponsible way. No one is condemned to being consistent, very fortunately. What we would exhibit, rather, is the blind alley of thought into which a would-be grappler is pushed when he turns his back on the "easy old faith in the working class as a bulwark of democracy. tion stone not only of Marxism and of the socialist movement but of any meaningful struggle today for democracy. It is behind the Independent Socialists' challenge: "The fight for democracy and the sfight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy."

> Subscribe to LABOR ACTION



March 24, 1952

self. To Alexander, quite prop



The serie Socialist Youth League Socialist Yo

# **Education as an Instrument of National Policy**

### By SAM FELIKS

"Education . . . as an instrument of national policy" is the main intent of the Truman-appointed Supreme Court majority which upheld the constitutionality of the New York State Feinberg Law. It almost said it in so many words when it proclaimed that the schoolroom is a "sensitive area . . . [in which] the state has a vital concern."

The schools are to be protected from the "pollution." real or imaginary, standing in the way of accomplishing this national policy. The Feinberg Law is not itself a positive step toward what the national policy is to be, but is rather intended to remove what is regarded as an impediment.

The New York legislature acted upon "common report" that "subversives" were infiltrating the school system with propaganda "sufficiently subtle to escape detection in the classroom." Since the legislators were unable to detect the propaganda, much less measure its extent. it was decreed that because a person belonged to a "subversive" organization he must be spreading "subtle" propaganda. Or to paraphrase the recent Smith Act decision: There is a "clear and present" danger that at some future time there would be he danger of subtle, undetectable propaganda! The Supreme Court seconded this thinking.

The attempt to mold education into "an instrument of national policy" has not been the result only of forces outside of the educational system, primarily the state legislatures and the federal government. The National Education Association in 1949 concluded its analysis of the function of education in the present world situation by stating that "if the schools develop programs that contribute to the nation's needs in time of crisis . . . then education can command the support it will deserve as an instrument of national policy."

### Attack on Academic Integrity

The educators, who at the time included General Dwight Eisenhower of Columbia University, who voted for this NEA resolution were undoubtedly thinking in terms of an expanded ROTC, perhaps UMT, and the training of scientists and technicians. But this is only one side of molding education into "an instrument of national policy." The other is an ideological indoctrination which is ostensibly "nonpolitical" since it favors neither the Republican nor Democratic Parties but rather both parties. And the further step is the elimination or silencing of ideological and political critics. It is in this latter area that the Feinberg decision stated that "the state has a vital interest."

When the major educational association in the U.S. announces this policy, it is renouncing the integrity of the school as an institution of independent inquiry. It is backsliding from its avowed purpose of presenting the truth and the development of the critical judgment through the presentation of all factual material and conflicting points of interpretation.

The only question of integrity of concern to the Supreme Court majority is "the integrity of the schools as a part of ordered society." It is the "integrity" of the schools as defenders of the status quo. There is not even the mention of

N. Y. ISL Presents -JAZZ NITE Jam Session — Recorded Jazz Classics Disc Jockey and Commentator: "Duke" Herman Fenwick and his fabulous collection of jazz platters Time: Saturday evening at 9—March 29 Place: Labor Action Hall, 114 W. 14 St. Contribution: \$1.00 **Liquid Libations** 

democracy, or of defending (let alone extending) a democratic educational system. To this extent, the spirit of the Supreme Court decision is close to that of the traditional conservative administrations and trustees of the major American universities and education boards.

Page Mvg

In the arguments that were raging at the time the Feinberg Law was proposed in 1949, it was often stated, most articulately by Professor Sidney Hook, that Stalinists should not be allowed to teach since they had given up their integrity as teachers by virtue of the fact that they followed the Communist Party line. Further they were unable to freely engage in the search of truth which contravened the party line, and that they used the classrooms to indoctrinate their students.

During the last three years none of these arguments held up. We are not aware of a single case in which a Stalinist teacher was discharged for any of the above reasons. The best example of this is the purge of Stalinist teachers in the New York City public schools. They have all been discharged over refusal to answer questions regarding membership in the Communist Party. A positive answer would have meant either dismissal under the Feinberg Law and possible eventual prosecution under the Smith Act.

What the Feinberg Law does is to get around any argument over competence or integrity, the teaching of "subversive" doctrines in the classroom, or the utilization of the classroom as a forum for one's own political views. These have been the traditional, and ostensibly the only, reasons for the dismissal of teachers. Now we have the court's doctrine of preserving the integrity of the schools as part of an "ordered society."

The Feinberg Law and similar legislation in other states, in a sense, are designed to parallel in the public schools the controls exerted by university boards and trustees in private schools and colleges. While these private boards have operated more or less in private, the control of public education is more in the open where the full reactionary implications of these policies can be seen. Contract on Bornas a

### The Invisible Pressure

The attacks on academic freedom are by no means of recent vintage. The alarming fact is that they are an integral part of the growing centralization of education threatening to impose a monolithic conformity over the educational systems. The job of molding conformity is more and more being supplemented by the direct intervention of governmental agencies imposing loyalty oaths. The large federalprojects for scientific research at many universities bring in the FBI to check the political views and affiliation of both teacher and students.

But there is a big difference between the conservative boards of yesterday and the present-day boards which are supplemented by the terrorization of Feinberg Laws.

Hubert Beck, in an excellent book Men Who Control Our Universities, highlighting the conservative and class bias of the college governing boards composed of businessmen, lawyers and ministers, quotes from Henry Bates, who was at the time (1923) chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors:

"The cases in which there is open and clear interference with freedom of speech will be few. The more baffling cases are those in which a steady and powerful, but almost invisible and impalpable, pressure of an academic hierarchy suppresses, discourages, and seriously interferes with the usefulness and development of the independent and original thinkers."

Compare this with today's situation, when Martin Essex, present chairman of the Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee of the National Education Association, writes: "From the vantage point of the NEA Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee, one is continuously confronted with the magnitude of varied movements that attempt to limit freedom to learn. A torrent of restrictive force is pouring at us. 'Freedom to teach without fear or favor' is seriously threatened."

The fight against the Feinberg Law and the other restrictive forces has been undermined by concessions to the idea of making education "an instrument of national policy." A real resistance to the reactionary tendencies today did not proceed from a solid base of supporting academic freedom and a democratic educational system. In many cases boards of education, trustees and teachers were in basic agreement with the witchhunters. The liberal forces were disoriented since their treasured Fair Deal government in Washington has been one of the main forces in the witchhunt hysteria : initiating the loyalty purge system, and packing the Supreme Court with men who have consistently voted against civil liberties.

would the 'material interests' say

### LABOR ACTION



### By HAL DRAPER

Page Six

This is about the case of the Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom.

As our readers have seen, we have been paying considerable attention in LABOR ACTION to the activities of American and Russian-émigré groups organized around the general aim of "fomenting revolution in Russia." We do this because we think that aim is so important. Any efforts which serve the end of blowing up the Stalinist tyranny from within, of whatever extent or importance, deserve cheers and encouragement and help.

But by the same token, groups of this kind whose nature and activities can only alienate and repet the democratic anti-Stalinist resistance cannot serve that end; they stand in the way. When, for example, U. S. government representatives or private U. S. groups tie up with the fascistic NTS (Solidarist) Russian émigrés they only serve to convince worthwhile elements either in the emigration or within Russia that this business of "fomenting revolution" against the Kremlin by Westerners has nothing in common with what they want. The same is true for that matter when a discredited politician like Alexander Kerensky is picked up out of the well-known garbage can of history and offered to the Russian and non-Russian people

under Moscow's heel as their leader, "made in the U. S. A." The same is true when the "fomenting" groups give the peoples under the Russian tyranny the understanding that it is Great-Russian chauvinism which dominates and motivates, or at least decisively confines and limits, the movement which is offered them. This was the Achilles' heel of, and led to the downfall of, the futile American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia, whose case we have followed in these pages. For outstanding among the forces within, which the Kremlin fears most, are the national-liberation and resistance movements of the non-Russian peoples who are oppressed by the regime, most particularly the people of the Ukraine.

Political questions cannot be divorced from this aim of aiding and awakening the forces of revolt among those people who are Stalin's first and most cruelly exploited victims, the peoples of Russia themselves. The latter did not accept "national-liberation" from the Nazis, once they learned their character, and they will not listen to talk about "liberation" from those who, they fear, merely wish to impose a different exploitive system in place of Stalin's-capitalist and imperialist exploitation.

We believe that only an anti-capitalist and anti-Stalinist appeal can, in part today as well as in the future, move the masses behind the Iron Curtain, and this has been borne out in the experiences of the Ukrainian resistance movement which we have reported. But it is not our purpose here to review this quesiton again. As when we discussed the American Committee for the Liberation etc., we wish to present a case which illustrates what not to do.

### The FFRF's Positive Side

The Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom was founded about a year ago, in February, with a couple of laudable objectives. Unlike the American Committee, it did not set itself the task of organizing émigré groups into a political movement. Its job was twofold: (1) to give help and relief to escapees from Russia by setting up stations on the Iron Curtain border, "welcoming" them to the West, in order to encourage others to do likewise and in any case create a good impression behind the border. (2) To carry on "education" in this country on the importance of such work.

The first job was and is sorely needed precisely because of the scandalous policy of the Western powers, the U.S. in the first place. The best that can be said about this policy is its cretin-like stupidity; it is enough to convince even a friend of Western imperialism that "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad"; and the people of the FFRF are good friends of Western imperialism

Even escapees from rather highly placed backgrounds were pumped of information—and then left to starve in the DP camps. There have been many such cases reported even in the U. S. press; by the grapevine channels which ore much more effective than the Voice of America, judiciously aided by the Kremlin itself, this became well known behind the Iron Curtain; the flood of escapes dwindled. The West as a haven of refuge became another pricked balloon for the bolder spirits who chafed under the regime: "They don't care about us."

The FFRF wanted to remedy this situation through private resources. Another American organization, the International Rescue Committee, already had been trying to work along these lines, with limited resources, but -one can't have too much of a good thing. So far the FFRF has managed to set up a "Freedom House" in Munich capable of handling a very small number.

But what was the "education" it planned to carry on? It aims to be non-political and non-partisan. Its main propaganda theme for home consumption is: We must distinguish between the Russian regime and the Russian peoples: the latter are our friends and potential allies; anything we say which gives the peoples the impression that we are "anti-Russian," rather than anti-Stalin, helps Moscow in its plans for world domination.

Now that, as far as it goes, is fine, of course. No doubt on this basis it garnered its list of "personalities" for its honorary National Committee, who lent their names to its letterhead, many of them prominent liberals or at least self-confessed liberals:

Norman Thomas; Sidney Hook; Dwight MacDonald; Arthur Schlesinger Jr.; James T. Farrell; Bohn and Levitas of the New Leader; Karl Wittfogel; Max Danish of the ILGWU; Albert Epstein; Pres. Gideonse of Brooklyn College; Louis P. Lochner; Daniel Bell; Leo Cherne: Max Eastman; Dr. Irwin Edman; Senator Flanders (R-Ver.); Isaac Don Levine; Eugene Lyons; Victor Riesel; Boris Shub; Freda Utley; and others. . . .

A bit heterogeneous, to be sure, but not quite as much so as the signers of the recent "manifesto" on the March revolution which was publicized in the press.

But if the sponsors of the FFRF thought it was going to stay away from "political" issues and thereby avoid "squabbles," they seem to have been disappointedthough we are not sure that all of them know it at the moment.

The FFRF began to distribute a couple of "educational" camphlefs. By no means do we think that the liberals in the list above have direct responsibility for these pamphlets, since we know that they were not necessarily consulted, the "National Committee" as such being purely a letterhead body. Many of them will learn of the pamphlets' contents only from this article or from the inquiries which preceded the writing of this article.

### An Ikon for the Tsar

Aside from folders and throwaways printed to give the general aims of the FFRF, the first pamphlet distributed was not printed by the FFRF itself. Having run a full-page ad in the newspapers inviting contributions and inquiries, the organization mailed this pamphlet along with its literature to all good citizens who clipped the coupon. It "merely" became agent for its distribu-

The pamphlet is Toward a Russian Policy by R. Gordon Wasson. Who Wasson is, we leave till later, in order not to prejudice the reader in advance. It is a small pamphlet of only 25 pages, much of which is also devoted to stressing that the Russian peoples should not be identified with the regime. As we said: so far, so good. But of the 25 pages, pages 10 to 17 are devoted to combating the "fashionable fallacy" that "the Russian people never knew a better lot than their present one.'

In this section, almost a third of the work, the unwarv reader will peruse the most glowing and gilded picture of the Russian TSARIST regime that this writer, at least, has seen outside of avowed monarchist propagandists.

No doubt there have been more enthusiastic pro-tsarwhitewashes performed by others; I am not sure what of importance they would have to add, unless it be to describe the tsarist autocracy as the acme of human civilization. But of course we are not accustomed to protsarist propaganda. Wasson's effort would seem to beenough.

Since this may appear to be incredible, in view of the auspices under which the FFRF presents itself. I have to quote, but I shall not take space to rebut or (what would more often be necessary) show how Wasson uses a formal or partial fact or half-truth to represent the actual reality of tsarism.

Tsarism was not a despotism: "The government that was overthrown in [March] 1917 was not a despotism. It was in substance a constitutional monarchy, though this term was not used. There was an opposition press, and opposition parties in the Duma or Parliament." The nobility had no power: "Survivals of hereditary social stratification were rapidly disappearing. There was no House of Lords in Russia, no constantly consulted reference books like Debrett's Peerage or the Social Register. The titled families and landed gentry exercised no legislative or executive functions, and enjoyed no legal privileges of practical value." In fact, Russian nobles never found their titles an "economic asset" until they found, as refugees in

the West that "we Americans had a weakness for titles"! You have just read a complete summary of the national tsarist regime! Unless otherwise noted, there are qualifications, ifs or buts given for any of the statements we shall exhibit.

"There was local self-government in cities and the countryside since the 1870s and it worked well, at least by our American standards."

. . . the Russians may be said to have once known, not many decades ago, one of those stirring epochs in history when the human spirit takes wings and a gifted people is lifted up by faith and hope." Wasson makes very explicit that he is talking "about Russia between, say, 1870 and 1914." Even the Kerensky regime is not mentioned.

"The normal foreigner and the average Russian were not conscious of police surveillance . . . food and clothing were ordinarily cheap and abundant. . . . Careers were open to talents. . . . One could cite any number of instances where persons of humble origin achieved top rank in all lines of endeavor. . . ." For example, the White Guard general Denikin was born of an ex-serf. "The quality of Russian education in schools at all levels in those times was exceedingly high. . . . by 1914 illiteracy was already beginning to be a problem of the advanced-age groups, for whom there had been no schools in childhood. . . . By 1914, 75 per cent of the arable land of Russia was owned by peasants . . ." and so on.

It is likely that over-suspicious readers may feel that some important counterbalance is being left unquoted, since I cannot reproduce the whole panegyric. What, nothing about the lot of the Jews, for example? Sure there is: to illustrate the independence of the juries from pressure, he cites the 1913 Beilis case when a Jew was acquitfed of a ritual-murder charge! Nothing about oppression of nationalities in the "prison of the peoples"? Not a word.

Well; ANYTHING unfavorable to tsarism, just a little? Not a word. Deportation to Siberia, maybe? "Much has been heard" about this, writes Wasson . . . and immediately launches into an attack on Stalin's slave-labor camps, pausing only to contrast them with the comfortable life which exiles led in the tsar's Siberia. . . .

Enough. Toward the end our historian remarks that he is "not pretending to give a complete picture" and denies that he wants to turn the clock back. A further point: it is one thing to agree that Stalinist totalitarianism is far more brutal than tsarism ever was; Wasson is quite another matter.

This is the pamphlet which the "non-political" and "non-partisan" FFRF distributes with the unwitting cachet of Norman Thomas, Hook, MacDonald, Schlesinger, Farrell, et al. Have these people stumbled into a monarchist front-organization? Not at all. I know of no evidence that this is the case. Then how on earth, in the name of all mysteries, does this organization, which wants to facilitate an appeal to the peoples of Russia, come to take responsibility for such an atrocity? Perhaps the eminent members of the National Committee can solve this enigma; I can only record a couple of facts.

The author, R. Gordon Wasson, is a vice-president of J. P. Morgan & Co. (Wasson's tenderness for the fa tsarist autocracy may be explicable if the reports are to be credited on the amount of tsarist bonds which the House of Morgan still holds, but that doesn't account for the FFRF.) Originally a speech, the work was printed by another banker friend of his, Altschuler, who is connected with the Lehman-Kuhn-Loeb banking fraternity, I believe. The office of the FFRF merely informs me that it was offered a "stock" of the pamphlets for distribution, and accepted, by decision of the office staff (the executive-secretary is Mrs. Lydia Tolstoy). "Did you read the thing first?"-"Well, we don't necessarily agree with everything in our literature. . . .

We don't know if the FFRF is of that much interest to the Kremlin but we have no difficulty in imagining the glee of the third deputy minister in charge of anti-subversive propaganda if he should have to work up a broadcast over the Moscow radio about the Western democrats who want to liberate the people from the "workers' paradise."... If we ever write a pamphlet on "How to Help Stalin Win the World," we should include Wasson as a leading ex-

### **Great-Russian Chauvinism**

But the FFRF has now anticipated us in the writing of that pamphlet, How to Help Stalin Win the World. The title is meant satirically, of course. This time we have an official product, signed by the organization as such, probably the work mainly of Shub and Eugene Lyons though the credit is given to "the research staff."

Here we will, of course, find no Wassonism. It is a horse of a different color. But some remarks are still in order, in view of the FFRF's wish to be "non-political" and "non-partisan."

The pamphlet leads off with the idea, again, that people and regime are not to be identified in Russia. Its main burden, in line with this, is a violent attack on those elements in the non-Russian opposition from the USSR who are national-chauvinist anti-Russians. Once reagain, this is fine. The main butt is the reactionary ABN (so-called "Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations"), led by a lieutenant of the fascist terrorist Bandera, friends of the Nazis, "war criminals," and racists. To the ABN, the enemy is the Russian people as such, at least as much as the government. The section makes interesting read-

It is the last chapters that contain the kick. For we doubt whether the FFRF has so much money as to publish, for its first pamphlet, an expensively printed booklet merely in order to lambaste the ABN. What it proceeds to discuss, in actuality, is the same nationalities question which proved to be the nemesis of the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia: most particularly the question of Ukrainian nationalism vis-à-vis the Russian state, which is today's "prison of the peoples.'

We wish to raise some questions for the consideration of the eminent personalities on the National Committee, trusting that they have read or will read the pamphlet which is put out under their sponsorship.

The new booklet spends pages on the crimes or mistakes of the right-wing Ukrainian (and other national) spokesmen who take a national-chauvinist position with respect to the Great-Russian people. It devotes a whole chapter to sketching the historic relations between Great-Russia and the Ukraine under tsarism, and still another chapter to the same since 1917.

QUESTION: Why is there not a single word said about the Great-Russian elements who take a nationalchauvinist position with respect to the nationalities?

The assault on the chauvinist-nationalists is all to the good, by itself. But it is not the ABN who are the most important stumbling-block to united action between the Great-Russian and non-Russian oppositions. This was proved by the experience of the American Committee, among others. It was the refusal of the Great-Russian émigré groups of the right to accept the minimum demands of the others. It is not the ABN which dominates the counsels of the Kerensky group, which is a whitehaired boy of the State Department. It is the chauvinist Great-Russians. It is not the ABN which is the main problem, but the chauvinism of the Great-Russian émigrés, who have the inside track with both Washington and some American "fomenters."

But about Great-Russian chauvinism, not a word. The authors of the pamphlet themselves, to be sure, we hasten (Continued bottom of next page)-

By PHILIP COBEN

Marxist writing about the evolution of prehistoric societies has tended to stem from the contributions of Lewis Morgan, whose Ancient Society was brilliantly used by Engels to apply the concepts of historical materialism to the early development of man, on the basis of what was then known. Morgan's work, of course, in the course of decades became overlaid by the mass of new discoveries and materials unearthed by anthropologists; his approach and general conclusions had been hailed by Engels precisely because they bore support to the Marxist method of analyzing social evolution: for the same reason, he was looked at askance by the bourgeois schools of anthropology of the last decades. It became rather fashionable for anti-Marxists, gunning for Engels, to dismiss Morgan's work as "obsolete"-which was as painfully superficial as any misguided Marxist's attempt to cling to the letter of Morgan's views in all

details as if it were revealed dogma.

concepts.

picture in anthropology, which, because it often comes close to the sensitive issues of social power and has a bearing on the social myths of bourgeois ideology, has been frequently distorted and confined by idealist biases.

The comparison between the role of Morgan's anthropology and Newton's physics, even to the limited extent it is put forward above, breaks down at another point. Anthropology stands between the so-called "exact" sciences and the very inexact social sciences in somewhat the same way in which the duck-billed platypus stands between the egglaying animals and the mammals; but in the important respect that we have noted, as one of the so-

to point out, come out in favor of self-determination for the nationalities. They are not Great-Russian chauvinists. They merely . . . cover up for the latter. Or so we tentatively conclude, since the whole context of the pamphlet literally cries out for at least a slap on the wrist in the

other direction.

nate clause:

impact on Russian culture."

pictured as a federation of nations.

# V. Gordon Childe's "Social Evolution" **A Marxist Scholar Looks at Prehistory**

### Gordon Childe.-Henry Schuman, N. Y., 184 pages, \$3.00.

That Morgan's work would be superseded by new knowledge was as inevitable as that the same would happen to Newton's science. It is easy to see, however, how shallow and unscientific would be a mere dismissal of Newton as "obsolete": it was superseded by further advances. but it itself was what made possible those further advances. Modern science has superseded Newtonian physics because it has developed it further, not because it has rejected Newton for pre-Newtonian

# That has not been the whole

SOCIAL EVOLUTION, by V. cial-historical sciences, its devel- the results of investigation. It is agree with him that only archaeopment was impeded by bourgeois class bias like the other social sciences. In economics, sociology and historiography, this was countered by the work of the Marxists themselves, from Marx's Capital to present-day socialist analysis of past and current history. But which Marxists became learned anthropologists, ethnographers or archaeologists, to con tinue the line of Morgan's work and "supersede" him constructively?

> There is a vacuum to be filled; it is not the only one, naturally. since, on the one hand, the great Marxist thinkers have naturally tended to concentrate on the social sciences which have a more direct and immediate relevance for the class struggle; and on the other, recruits to Marxism from these same social sciences have been more frequent because the problems explored by them are also more directly and visibly related to social issues.

### CHILDE'S PROBLEM

The interest of Professor Childe's Social Evolution is that it is a contribution to filling this vacuum. But only a contribution. Childe is an eminent archaeologist—in 1927 he was appointed the first Abercrombie Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology in the University of Edinburgh; he has directed numerous important field expeditions. He is also a Marxist.

.

(We might as well also make clear at this point that although Professor Childe has traveled in British Stalinist intellectual circles-and in the present book, for example, refers to Stalin in passing as "the leading exponent of Marxism today"-his approach to his own work does not have the least smell of the pro-Stalinist scientific apologist or of obeisance before the Kremlin's party line in science. For example, at a point crucial to his inquiry he takes a cruel fall out of the method of approach of the Russian official prehistorians: "In fact." he comments, "the Russian scheme of classification [of societies] assumes in advance precisely what archaeological facts have to prove," and the spirit there indicated, which pervades his writing, could not be more antithetical to spirit of Stalinist scientists-in-uniform.)

Two of Childe's previous works, What Happened in History and Man Makes Himself, may be familiar to readers through their pocketbook editions, and they should be. His Social Evolution is different. It is not primarily an historical account based upon a discussion of the problems of the investigation itself, around the central question:

How much do we know, and how reliable is our knowledge, of the extent to which there has been a uniform line of development in the evolution of the stages of primitive society?

Referring to the term "Bronze Age" for example, he remarks: 'But does this term give any clue as to the technical, economic, or even political development of the society thus labeled? I have spent twenty years trying to give some such values to the traditional Ages' and to make these archaeological stages coincide with what sociologists and comparative ethnographers recognized as main stages in cultural evolution."

At another point he formulates the question thus: "In other words, what, if any, forms of social organizations are common to all avage societies represented in the archaeological record but which change with the transition from savagery to barbarism? Secondly, can we recognize, within savagery and within barbarism, subdivisions that everywhere scucceed one another in the same order, just as savagery and barbarism do?" And elsewhere he poses the problem of correlations between social-political institutions and technicoeconomic stages."

### DIFFICULTIES

This, then, is why the reader who is at all interested in the field (as a layman, of course) will find Social Evolution absorbing and perhaps even exciting; and it is no part of the intention of this review to summarize Childe's detailed (sometimes technical) discussion of the archaeological record, let alone attempt to evaluate it-this reviewer is no archaeologist. In fact, to the socialist layman-more specifically, also, to this reviewer-one of the most interesting products of the book is the vivid sense one gets of the difficulties of the prehistorian. Marxist or otherwise, in working with the material; so many scientists in the field, to be sure, do not have this particular difficulty because they do not even raise the questions which Childe dscusses.

There is a certain amount of unfairness, therefore, in merely mentioning Childe's tentative conclusions, or suggestions for conclusions. For one thing, the book is by no means a rounded investigation even of the problem as Childe sets it forth, as he himself mentions once or twice. It is limited, with few exceptions, to the archaeological evidence. One may

ology can definitely settle the main problems of the chronology of social evolution, but in view of the fragmentary nature of the archaeological evidence, the contributions which ethnography makes, as well as early literature and history, would be necessary for a complete assemblage of all the material on which theories and hypotheses can usefully be based. Childe, perfectly aware of this, is mainly insistent that only archaeology can test the theories; hence his emphasis in this book. (In What Happened in History, or the other hand, his sources are properly wider.)

### CONCLUSIONS

In his chapter on "Conclusions," Professor Childe admits that "on the whole archaeology does not hold out much prospect of correlating social institutions with stages of cultural development as defined in economic terms." This remark has to be understood in the context of his previous discussion of the difficulty of archaeology in agining much knowledge about either the social-political institutions or the technico-economic stages of prehistory, let alone about the possible correlations of the two. But he is quite definite in coming to a negative conclusion: the archaeological evidence is "certainly unfavorable to any theory of unilineal evolution."

Now this is certainly unfavorable to anyone's tendency to try to establish a single and uniform line of evolution which is supposed to characterize all prehis toric societies ("unilineal evolution"): but Childe continues by making clear why, for the Marxist, such an extreme unilineal concept is by no means a necessary adjunct of the application of the historical - materialist approach. The following does not do justice to, but will suggest, the line of his discussion.

The developments in prehistoric societies did not run parallel to each other (the anti-"unilineal" concept again), and the reasons why they did not run parallel are to be sought for, indeed, in the material (technological, economicgeographic, etc.) conditions under which different cultures arose under primitive conditions. "But a comparison of the sequences summarized discloses not only divergence and differentiation, but also convergence and assimilation."

It is the latter idea that he elaborates. While carefully discussing the pitfalls of any analogy between organic evolution and social evolution, he adds: "When several genetically different groups of the same species are competing for the limited natural resources of a given region, the best-adapted group will in time eliminate all competitors. To this sort of process there are of course prehistoric, as well as historic, analogies among human societies or cultures. . . .

"But such total replacement of one society or culture by another is not the typical form of convergence and not that generally observed to lead to civilization. Two cultures may become more alike without losing their distinctive individualities.'

One of the chief instruments leading toward convergence is the diffusion (from one culture to another) of social advances. But "One society can borrow an idea -a technical invention, a political institution, a superstitious rite, or an artistic motive-only when it fits into the general pattern of the society's culture-in cther words, when that society has evolved to a stage which allows of the acceptance of the idea."

"In fine, then, the analogy between cultural evolution and organic evolution breaks down. . . . [But] with certain modification the Darwinian formula of 'variation, heredity, adaptation, and selection' can be transferred from organic to social evolution, and is even more intelligible in the latter domain than in the former." Above all, cultural evolution as "an orderly and rational process that can be understood by the human intellect without invoking any necessarily incalculable factors and miracles" is vindicated.

The Marxist-or the materialist anthropologist-has no need whatsoever to insist that there must have been an invariable line of development for all prehistoric societies: what is important is that it is possible to speak of a line of prehistoric social evolution only in the sense of the direction toward which the disparate and differentiated cultures tended to converge-or else they died out in the struggle for survival. And even this can be seen only as a tendency in the midst of variation -in the same sense that Engels, discussing historical materialism, spoke of the direction of social development as the resultant of many crisscrossing wills and forces, in the midst of which there are social tendencies which, in the long run, become overriding and decisive.

From this point of view, the conclusions toward which Childe's discussion points are far more "Marxist" than any rigid mechanical view of a uniform, unilineal and invariable succession of societies in prehistory.

### The Case of the Friends of Fighters for Russian Freedom

### (Continued from page 6)

QUESTION: In a really rather detailed 21/2 pages on the relations between the Ukraine and tsarist Russia, why is it that the infamous national-oppressive crimes of tsardom get off almost scot-free? We quote the sole mention which is tucked away on this point in a subordi-

"Despite periods of repression, under reactionary czars, Ukrainian culture did flourish, and had a powerful

No, it is not a question of pro-tsarist propaganda in this case, though it is interesting to see how many roads -lead to whitewash of tsarism, willy-nilly, among our "fomenters." This pamphlet has a different ax to grind. Its aim is to cast doubt on and discredit the legitimacy of the Ukrainian (especially the Ukrainian) national aspirations, as against the claims of an "integral" Russia,

Now, federalism as against separation is not outside the pale of discussion, though it can be decided only by the Ukrainian people; for ourselves, as for any consistent democrat, the position is that the Ukrainian people

must have the full and unfettered right to separate before they can even be urged to decide freely in favor of federation with (say) a free socialist Russia.

But this is quite different from a scarcely concealed attempt to argue away the very grounds upon which a Ukrainian people can be meaningfully distinguished, and which gives the solid ground for its national desires.

This is done through the way in which the history of Russian-Ukrainian relations is presented. It is, in the first place, a purely Great-Russian-chauvinist version of Ukrainian history. (Example: the impression is conveyed by both misstatement and omission that there has never been any serious Ukrainian movement for independence from Russia in its whole history!) Russian national oppression of the Ukraine is soft-pedaled (hence the whitewash of the tsars). The relation between the Ukraine and the Great-Russian power is represented one-sidedly only as mutually beneficial. In a chapter, "The Soviet Melting Pot," the thesis is developed that the Ukrainian people have been so thoroughly intermixed with the Russian that it is "not unlike our American melting-pot process." (The cutest "evidence" of this is Stalin's forced transplantation of Ukrainians to labor camps together with Russians!) In effect, Stalin is absolved of specifically national oppression in the USSR in order to discredit the force of nationalism as an anti-Kremlin force. The disingenuities and half-truths are numerous, including categorical statements on historical points which are quite obscure and moot (like the case of

the Ukrainian hetman Mazeppa). Even worse is the total absence of solid facts which do not fit into the tendentious picture.

We know that the gentlemen of the FFRF "research staff" consider the bogy of "Russian dismemberment" to be an obstacle to appealing to some sections of the Great-Russians; but that bogy cannot be evaded by misrepresenting the legitimate national aspirations of the non-Russian peoples.

At any rate it is clear that the FFRF has jumped with both feet into the knottiest problem of "émigré politics"actually a problem which should legitimately concern every anti-Stalinist democrat—and it has done so while firmly grasping the right hand of the Great-Russian group. and vouchsafing a finger to the nationalities.

This should be of some concern to the personalities of the National Committee who may be under the impression that they are sponsoring a "non-political" anti-Stalin Russian relief movement.

This article on the FFRF is being sent to the members of the FFRF National Committee and staff for their comment. Any comments received, of reasonable length. will be published.



# New Hampshire Merry-Go-Round

By GORDON HASKELL

job.

Just what did the New Hampshire primary "prove"? Frankly, not much. Perhaps one of the successful candidates, Senator Kefauver, had a point when he said it proved that the people would like to see "new faces" in the government. In a campaign in which there were so many unknown factors, and in which so many of the known factors (the candidates) left so little room for choice, this may have been a consideration. His remark about "new faces" as the burning issue of the day is interesting as an unwitting reformulation of the charge that the elections present a choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

The campaign "proved" also that the major Republican candidates are rolling in money. Modest estimates put the figures spent at \$150,000. "Supporters of Taft and Eisenhower," says Labor for March 15, "virtually carried money bags in on wheelbarrows. The bulk of the outside cash came from the Ohioan's rich hackers."

significant campaign? Our only in- of the little man. It is more acformation to date comes from tive in breaking strikes and turn-Murray Kempton's column in the ing down wage demands than in U.S. Proconsul

(Continued from page 1) barometer of the sentiments and feelings of the entire populace. The "strong government" so ardently desired in Greece (and France) will inevitably serve to bottle up and stifle a part of the voice of the electorate. Minority shades of opinion-as is pre-eminently the case in the United States-will have no chance for a parliamentary voice.

(Continued from page 3) December of that year." The witness could not say of this recent event what he had said of others when "he commented that he was being asked about matters that occurred five years ago when he joined the Communist Party at the suggestion of the FBI and agreed to make reports on meetings and names of attendants." More testimony of this sort and the public may begin to lose interest in the trials, in spite of press headlines and editorial fan- full implications of the governfare. Los Angeles has been subjected to a regular heavy dose of ceptance of spies and informers "red exposés" for years. The Hol- as ordinary, commonplace methlywood probes were squeezed for ods, and the creeping inroads on all they were worth by the press. civil rights toward the garrison Then for some time before the state.



The New Hampshire primary election has been dominating the news columns of the nation's press for the past few weeks. This is, perhaps, another demonstration of how a molehill can be turned into a mountain if enough columnists and reporters are assigned to the

writes that the CIO Political Action Committee made 5,000 pro-Truman phone calls, and after considerable effort succeeded in forming a United Labor Committee for Truman. Yet the workers voted for Kefauver.

"AFL political director James McDevitt," writes Kempton, "wrote to enjoin state AFL officials to stay neutral; most plumped for Mr. Truman anyway. The teamsters, with rare fealty to old Dan Tobin, went all out for Kefauver. And nowhere in New Hampshire could the pro-Truman laborites find a solitary railway brother who would join their committee." (Truman was breaking their strike over the weekend.)

### LOOSE AND RUNNING

"The labor voter is loose and running," Kempton continues. "At least for the moment, the union political machines can't deliver him to Mr. Truman on short notice. **CIO** professionals back from New Hampshire would say nothing more optimistic than that their people aren't implacable yet. Maybe 60 per cent of them would yield to a heavy pro-Truman pitch."

All this was pretty much in the cards not only for labor in New Hampshire but for labor on a national scale. The whole political line-up in the country is so unsure that even the traditional Fair Deal orientation of most of the labor movement is at loose ends.

Today the administration is better known for its corruption How did labor fare in this in- than for a crusade in the cause

by merely substitute one kind of

crisis for another. And apparently

behind the U.S. position are those

which would, if and when possible,

against "reaction," any ally, even

-a reactionary one, and any meth-

the forces in Greece now rallying

New York Post of March 17. He any other sphere of specifically "labor" politics. Its foreign policy is in a mess, and in any event can't be distinguished from Eisenhower's. The only "labor" people Taft can get behind him are those he puts on his payroll. (For instance, his Wisconsin "Labor Committee for Taft.") Kefauver is a "new face" made famous by television, but it is likely to get quite tiresome when the campaign brings out the fact that there is nothing behind it that labor wants.

> As the New Hampshire primary really proves nothing, we can't even claim that it "proves" that labor is in a political blind alley from which it can emerge only by forming its own political movement and running its own candidates. That idea had occurred to us long before the ballots were cast in the Granite State. But one thing is certain. Nothing that happened there points in any other direction.

### **'Labor's Friends' & Political Bums**

From the Midwest Labor World (St. Louis), February 27:

The Fresno, Calif., Labor Council recently conducted a spot check and learned that only 37 per cent of the members in affiliated unions are registered to vote.

We hope the labor movement in most cities can show a better record, but are confident that nowhere will you find an overwhelming majority registered.

The answer to this condition lies in registration drives and education to show lagging members how politics affects their lives and their pocketbooks. But we suspect that's not the complete answer.

There are some stupid workers, but nobody can tell us that all but 37 per cent of the union members of Fresno, Calif., are stupid. The fact probably is that many of these unregistered voters know the score very well, but see no use in choosing between two nogood candidates, neither of whom stands for anything in particular. They have seen too many political bums ballyhooed as "labor's friends

Registration drives are a necessary step. Education on po litical issues is a necessary step. The next step-and one that has been too often forgotten-is for union political committees

to make sure they aren't trying to beat something with nothing. Ballyhoo can sell all the seats of a theater, but if the show isn't any good, the seats will be empty on the second night. The same is true in politics.



(Continued from page 1) Ed Cote and Joe McCusker, and also Emil Mazey, secretarytreasurer of the international union.

The size of the problem is reflected in this new precedent-a six-man board of administrators. It also makes responsibility shared by all top leaders. There'll be no Brutus, if Reuther finds himself in trouble over this one.

The four top officials of Ford Local 600 bowed quietly to the edict. They are placing their hopes in the next local union election, which is only sixty days away. The first heated and bitter reactions in Ford Local 600 were changed into a calm and calculated attitude by the anti-Reuther forces out there.

### WHY NOW?

One may ask why an administrator is put over the local now, when elections are so close anyhow? There are some obvious reasons. Reuther felt the pressure of the daily newspapers and the conaressional committee hearings. This is his demonstration of "anti-Communism."

Secondly, by taking over the local, the Reuther leadership has silenced the one major anti-Reuther newspaper in the UAW, Ford Facts. This certainly will be a handicap to the Stellato forces.

Thirdly, there is a strong possibility that now the UAW top leaders will bring some Ford Local 600 officials to trial, and keep them so occupied with that problem that electioneering will be far more difficult. Besides, these officials might be ruled off the ballot if they are standing trial at the time.

Two major witnesses against Ford local officials at the hearings are on the staff of the UAW. They were Lee Romano, former vice-president of Local 600, and Shelton Tappes, for years the most bitter critic of Reuther.

The third witness was Dave Averill, until three days ago the editor of Ford Facts. He told the committee what was obvious to every UAW activist, namely that the Stalinists had free run of the paper, and that he was merely the "copy boy," not the real editor.

Interestingly enough, Romano in his testimony swore under oath that he knew that neither Stellato nor Rice nor Hood nor Grant were members of the Communist Party.

The reaction in the rest of the UAW in the Detroit area is difficult to judge. Reuther foresaw the possible disturbing effect of this action on UAW secondary leaders. In another unprecedented move, 34 local union presdients were invited to sit in on the hearings, which they did. Two major caucus meetings of the Reuther faction have been called for this coming week at which Reuther

is expected to make a full report on the Ford local situation.

What happens in the future months depends on many factors, not precisely definable. The tack taken by the Stellato forces is to present themselves as martyrs who are fighting for the democracy of their own local union. As against this-and the Stalinists should be quite effective demagogically - Reuther will bear down on the crimes of Stalinism.

No one knows if the congressional committee is returning to Detroit. An appearance just before Ford Local 600 elections might be just the thing needed to defeat the Stellato forces.

A major role might be played by the Ford company. The local union, like every other part of the UAW, has a plague of unsolved problems. Suppose the administrators obtain some concessions not now attainable-will that influence the election? Or will the Ford company decide to do as many electrical industry corporations do: play both ends against the middle, in the hope of keeping the Ford 600 situation in turmoil?

### **REUTHER'S STAKES**

The stakes for Walter P. Reuther are high. A defeat for his faction in the Ford Local 600 elections, after these drastic measures to win control of the local, would be a major blow to his reputation and influence in the UAW as well as nationally. Reuther is now in a position where he must have a victory at any cost!

Time presses in another direction. Unless the UAW has settled this problem satisfactorily by next fall, the whole PAC activity, including the drive to re-elect Governor Williams and Senator Blair Moody, might be sidetracked. This would hardly do the Reuther leadership much good, for they are strongly committed in this field.

In our own estimate, the situation in the UAW has deteriorated so much that in the vital field of political action, the UAW is going to repeat the experience of recent elections, namely, to demonstrate that it lacks the political influence over the ranks to elect its endorsed candidates. The crisis at Ford Local 600 adds to the confusion and uncertainty already prevailing in the minds of many auto workers.

A monopoly of leadership does not necessarily signify a monopoly in influence. This the Reuther leadership does not seem to grasp.

There is a dangerous implication within the UAW over the action of the top leadership of the UAW which should be mentioned. For the first time, the power of the union has been used directly against a political opposition as such. In the future, more than one regional director, plagued by the demands of a militant local, might

find it expedient to place that local under an administrator. It's such an easier method than fighting democratically in a contest of ideas with any opponents.

And where does it all end? Surely, if failure to defeat-the Stalinists is Stellato's crime, or working with them in a bloc is an act of treason against the union, that shoe fits more and bigger feet than Stellato's.

### You're Invited

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



СІТҮ	•••
ZONE APT	
STATE	
🗆 Bill me.	÷
D Payment enclosed.	

dispense with all elections. In order to "strengthen the forces of democracy" in the shaping struggle against "totalitarianism" the U. S. has again assisted reactionary forces by reactionary means. In the fight

The strongest of governments are those of the totalitarians, who "eliminate instability" by stifling all dissenting opinion, and there-

### Choice Stoolie – –

informers about Stalinist infiltration into professional groups in the metropolis occupied the editorials, columns, and news reports. There are signs that people want a change in diet, that they are losing interest in local

trial began the "revelations" of

But mere apathy may be as dangerous for democracy as public hysteria, for the real nature of Stalinism is obscured and, perhaps even more important, the ment drive, its charges, the ac-

### The FIGHT for SOCIALISM

### by Max Shachtman

A basic primer in the principles and program of Independent Socialism

> Cloth-bound \$2.00 INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST PRESS

14th St.	New	York	11.	N.	Y.
1411 31.			201		- 77