

THE BOLIVIAN REVOLUTION **GOES LEFT** 

... page 6

... page 5

Middle-East Unity: Israel's **Opportunity and Israel's Fate** 

**Thought-Control for Teachers** ... STUDENT SOCIALIST, page 8

Victory in Kutcher Case Strikes Blow at Gov't 'Loyalty' Witchhunt

Party, the Communist Political As- The fact that a man's livelihood sociation, the Young Communist and a family's support are at League, the Workers Party (predecessor of the Independent Socialist League), and the Socialist Workers

The doctrine of guilt-by-association has suffered a setback, and a personal finding must now be made in each individual case. Also, whatever evidence is now brought forward by the government in such cases will be subject to court review. Kutcher's suspension from his job was upheld by the court until such time as the Veterans Administration loyalty boards and the VA administrator come to a decision on his lovalty. Another limitation in the court's ruling is its insistence that such proceedings "are purely administrative in character, in no sense criminal, and do not require the constitutional and traditional safeguards of a judicial trial."

stake does not require the safeguards of a judicial trial, such as the right to know the accusers and the right to cross-examine the witnesses! Federal employees have been held "disloyal" on the basis of secret evidence and on the basis of unknown informants -unknown even to the judges in the case. These star-chamber methods will continue.

In addition, the Circuit Court rejected the argument of Kutcher's lawyers that the listing of the Socialist Workers Party as "subversive" by the attorney general without a hearing was unlawful, citing the Supreme Court decision in the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee case. The Circuit Court held that the attorney general's listing of the SWP as "subversive" was "competent evi-(Continued on page 4)

# What 1952 Shows: Both Parties Swung Right

# Stevenson: Fair-Dealer **On the Half-Shell**

#### By PHILIP COBEN

Looking at the present presidential election campaign in the way it is likely to appear in its historical setting, apart from the dramatic by-plays which naturally feature a partisan battle which will not go down as the cleanest of recent times, the outstanding feature of the period is quite clear regardless of who is elected. This is the fact that the Democratic-Republican debate which it embodies is taking place in an area well to the right of all previous presidential elections since 1932.

The outstanding fact is not that the extent of political differences between the two capitalist parties, between Fair Deal and GOP, has narrowed, but that BOTH have shifted to the right. There is still the "greater evil" of Republican reaction and the "lesser evil" of Fair Deal social demogogy plus social reform, and there is still the same type of choice to be made between them; but both "areater evil" and "lesser evil" are now measurably more "evil," if we may so express it.

And this fact far overshadows in importance everything else bearing on an interpretation of the campaign. For this reason we beg advance indulgence for not discussing such "burning issues" as Stevenson's partiality for quips and quotations.

In an accompanying article, the swing to the right of the Eisenhower campaign is discussed. This is true, even more notably, not only of the Eisenhower of October as compared with the Eisenhower of the anti-Taft crusade in July, but of the Republican campaign of 1952 as compared with the Republican campaign of 1948 and before. The latter (Dewey, Willkie, for example) were justifiably regarded by the GOP Old Guard as "me too" campaigns, and the growing Taft ascendancy in the present campaign has meant the soft-pedaling of metooism. In political terms, it means that the Republican strategy is to aim its appeal further to the right than before.

The same thing is true of the Stevenson-Democratic. Party campaign. It would be very far from true to proclaim, (Continued on page 2)

# **Stevenson as Fair Dealer**

#### (Continued from page 1)

as our contemporary The Socialist Call did in one issue, that the nomination of Stevenson represented the end of Fair-Dealism in some sense that had not been true already. On the contrary, the nomination of Stevenson was an authentic continuation of the Fair Deal of today precisely because it authentically reflected the continuing rightward movement of today's Fair-Dealism.

This fact was most openly acted out at the Democratic Party convention in Chicago, as we showed in our August 4 issue. There, after a timid attempt by the liberal-labor bloc to get a showdown with the Dixiecrat wing, the line that was adopted-and swallowed by the lib-labs-was to give concessions to the right and not further gains to the unreconstructed Fair-Dealers. It was the South that the convention wooed, not labor or the Northern liberals. The latter got some advances in platform verbiage. The former got Sparkman, and the emasculation of the "loyalty oath" offensive which had been started.

It is or ought to be impossible for clearheaded liberals to deplore (as they do) the nomination of Sparkman as a setback and simultaneously to hail the platform as a victory against that wing which is behind Sparkman. For the well-known fact is that (by something of a coincidence) it was Sparkman who engineered and shaped the verbiage in the platform. (It is Sparkman, for that matter, whom we are literally quoting in calling it "verbiage.") It was Sparkman who smoothed the platform language into a form which the Northern Democrats read to spell out FEPC and which he himself, with perhaps better authority, insists is ambiguous on FEPC as well as on anti-filibuster.

And Sparkman was Governor Stevenson's personal choice.

#### Whittling Down

But it is not just a matter of what happened in Chicago. Nor of the civil-rights issue, which earlier engendered some of the most virulent discontent in Democratic ranks.

So "naturally" does the Democratic shift fit into the picture, perhaps, that it has not even occasioned much comment that Stevenson has so far carefully refrained from coming out for a Fair Deal proposal of Truman's which was once most eagerly hailed by the liberal-labor wing. This is the health-insurance plan. There was not a hint of it in the speech which Stevenson specifically devoted to the medical question. Instead the governor has vigorously attacked "socialized medicine," which is what Truman's health-insurance plan has been called, although quite wrongly.

The Brannan plan for farmers is no longer on the shelf; it has obviously been totally dumped. In many features this plan was easily the most "leftish" proposal of the Fair Deal in this field.

On Taft-Hartley, Stevenson's first speech in Detroit was a flop in popular terms in spite of the fact that it came out for repeal, or "replacement," of the act. This was not just because of Stevenson's public opposition to repeal up to the time he became a candidate. For in that Detroit speech-for those who heard or read it and have not merely limited themselves to the headlines-Stevenson left himself plenty of room to do no more in "replacing" the T-H Act than he was previously in favor of doing when he was merely for amending it.

Stevenson cannot really be charged with deceit in this regard. He carefully explained in the speech, in effect, that in coming out for "repeal" or "replacement" he was not actually changing his views, but merely adopting a different form. The generalities which he presented for positive adoption make it impossible for any man to say just what kind of labor bill he will support if elected president.

endorsed the Trumanite loyalty purge and witc hunt hook-line-and-sinker. Anyone who still wants to quote his Illinois veto of the Broyles bill has a legal right to do so, but little more.

Completely in the spirit of the "subversive list," he has denounced McCarthy for amateur witchhunting whereas, he says, the job should be done by "professionals"-the FBI, the attorney general, the Immigration Service and other agencies of the Fair Deal administration, which have been redhunting at large while Mc-Carthy has been concentrating on finding reds under Truman's wing.

There was a time when liberals knew how to react when statesmen talked of America's mission in the world as her manifest "destiny." They translated it into "imperialism." Stevenson, however, can speechify and has speechified about this "destiny" which is extending Washington's rule over the world without rebuff from them, who are only too glad that he sticks by the Truman war doctrine of "containment" of Russia as against the Eisenhower-Dulles version of "liberation" (i.e., restoration of the old regimes in the Stalinist world).

#### Stevenson's Pitch

It is in this context and because of this context that the issues on which Stevenson has not retreated from Truman's stand are strangely disproportionate causes of rejoicing among the labor-liberals. Such a one is the tidelands oil issue.

The point is not to derogate Stevenson's stand on this

question. It is rather to wonder how people who have made clear that they are fed up with the difference between Truman's words and Truman's deeds can get so euphorically enthusiastic on those occasions when Stevenson measures up to Truman's words!

Compare the Stevenson campaign, and its speeches, with the Truman campaign of 1948, and the big meaning of the present leaps to the eye. In 1948 the Dixiecrats had split and Truman knew that he must not only win the endorsements of the labor leaders but that he must win labor-the workingmen and the little people. He then made the most radical election campaign that any presidential candidate has ever put on in this country.

In contrast, the Stevenson campaign is keyed to appeal to the "middle-of-the-roader," which in current American political parlance means the voter somewhere between Taft and Truman. While more newspaper columns have been written about the "literacy" which Stevenson displays-as the first candidate-intellectual since Woodrow Wilson-his political pitch is far more interesting.

For that matter, even the Truman campaign of 1952which is, in fact, a kind of carry-over from 1948—casts a backlight on Stevenson. It is superficial to sum it up, as so " many of the columnists do, as a "visceral" appeal (to the bowels and other lower centers of the 'anatomy) as contrasted with Stevenson's "intellectual" appeal (to the mind). This is snobbism, and as superficial as snobbism usually is.



In his characteristically vigorous style of social demagogy, Truman has been aiming powerful political blows powered by the basic economic needs and aspirations of the people. He has been far more relevant to politics and the social issues of the day than Stevenson, however one admires Stevenson's literary style.

The same kind of mind sneers at such a campaign "visceral" as condemns socialism as "materialistic" in the derogatory sense because socialists believe that the fundamental economic problems of bread and butter must first be solved before the "good life" is possible, and that the "good life" is not going to come as a result of moral exhortations or homilies.

In fact, if Truman fails to win the election for Stevenson it will not be because of the direction of his campaign but, for one thing, because this appeal is coming from a man who has had seven years in the White House to show whether his words have a nodding acquaintance with his deeds.

#### Paradox on the Left

And yet, strangely enough, in certain labor and liberal circles it seems there is even more enthusiasm about Stevenson than for Truman. I do not think this is true in the rank-and-file following of either the labor or liberal leaders; but I think it is a visible phenomenon among the top circles and the articulate ones. There is not, from anyone's point of view, the slightest reason for it to exist, logically, and yet (I think) it is there.

Perhaps even more paradoxically, it shows up more obviously in the "lefter" circles of Fair Deal supporters. It shows up rather pointedly in the trend which we discussed two weeks ago under the head of "Stalinoids for Stevenson," as I. F. Stone and the N. Y. Daily Compass come out for the Democrat. Norman Thomas was never as complimentary about Truman as he has been of Stevenson. The liberal organs are practically effusive about the governor.

This may be explainable as a form of snobbism toothe snobbism of intellectuals who feel Stevenson as a kindred spirit, apart from realistic politics. This was perhaps best reflected in an early column of Max Lerner's, in which he expressed some mild doubts about Stevenson's political views but wound up by consoling himself with the thought that, anyway, the governor was unprecedentedly "literate" for a presidential candidate.

But I doubt whether this is the heart of the reason. It is rather more closely connected with the phenomenon with which this discussion began.

Max Shachtman has already pointed out (in the cur-

rent New International) how this applies to the movement of the labor leadership toward greater involvement in the Democratic Party, especially at the Chicago convention:

"The labor leaders know better than most people that the Democratic Party, the party of the New and Fair Deals, has been moving to the right, not to the left." They want to preserve the concessions that they have gained in the decades of the two Deals. "To preserve these gains, and all they mean to the labor movement AND its officialdom, they feel themselves obliged to enter the Democratic Party in order to save the New Deal from. extinction!

Looked at in this way, it is not paradoxical that the official labor leadership has turned, at this time, to greater involvement in the Fair Deal machine precisely because of its shift to the right, and the threat of worse steps to come that this implies.

#### Dynamics of the 'Lesser Evil'

It is also not really paradoxical that, as the whole political atmosphere in the country lowers more and more with reactionary shadows, the liberal-labor leadership clings to Stevenson with even more willingness—and more fright, and more desperation—than they did to Trumon.

One begins to suspect that some of them are even a bit glad that Stevenson is on the more conservative side -he is so much the better man to stave off The Worst in these times. This, after all, is probably the only country in the world where labor leaders can be found who will cheer a man for proclaiming that he is not "labor's candidate"...

For the politics of the "lesser evil" has no meaning at all unless it means that we must support the least evil among those candidates who can win, right now, this year, regardless of future consequences. And if, to win, the lesser evil must get progressively closer to the greater evil, while still leaving a visible gap between the two (if only because the greater evil is shifting right at the same time also), then so be it-this must be done, rationalized, then applauded, and perhaps finally even planned.

Supporters of the "lesser-evil" policy in politics may glory in being free from baggage like principles or principledness, but the politics of the "lesser evil" has a principle nevertheless. It is: The bolder becomes reaction, the more you are willing to go along in its direction.

For the argument over whether it is proper to vote for the "lesser evil" is somewhat academic when it is simply pursued statically: like this-"There is still a big difference between even a rightward-moving Fair Deal and the reaction represented by the Macs and the generals. Stevenson isn't exactly what we want but he's a lot better than a Taft-dominated White House. Therefore vote for Stevenson right now and let us hope that some other time we can get something still better."

But this is a political course which has its own dynamics. It means inevitably that the political choices presented become progressively worse, and not better in some gradualistic fashion.

### The Slippery Road

It is reaction that is encouraged as the drift continues; it is the Right which feels its oats, which gets more 🦩 demanding, while the clever politicians of the lesser evil become more frightened, more desperate, more compliant, more compromising and more compromised. There is no easy stopping place on this slippery road, which in Gerany led straight to Hitler, as the labor and social-democratic movement supported at each step a more reactionary lesser evil than before, up to and including the man who handed the power over to the Nazis.

The present reactionary political climate can be changed, but everything that is necessary to change it points away from support to the 1952 model of a Fair Deal candidate. As long as labor, or at least its organized sections, can be counted on to go along, the sinister drift will continue, not out of devilish scheming or nefarious plotting by the parties but because that is the dynamic of this system in these times-the "logic of politics" today.

A full-stop will be put to the drift only when a real left wing is created in American mass politics, in relation to the right-wing of capitalism represented by the GOP dinosaurs. This can come into being only with the creation by labor of its own independent labor party, its own mass political instrument.

As was true also in the early days of the British Labor Party, it will immediately be able to wrest more concessions by the very fact of its existence (even though most of its candidates, to be sure, may not be elected) than by years of attempting to infiltrate the Democratic Party machine, where the weight of labor's strength cannot be exerted.

There is not as yet an American labor party to vote for today, but the reasons are just as powerful for refusing to go along with the suicidal strategy of the pro-Democratic labor leadership. The labor votes which are not cast for Stevenson or Eisenhower will be a powerful rebuke to the course of the labor politicians which has led to the present pass.

It would be regrettable if this takes the form simply of abstention from voting, in a year when the registratio of the sentiment of the people is so important. That is why LABOR ACTION, along with the Independent Socialist League, strongly recommends that workers VOTE SO-CIALIST-specifically, as the ISL proposes, vote for the candidates of the Socialist Party for president and vicepresident, Darlington Hoopes and Samuel Friedman.



convention.-Ed.

### By GERRY MCDERMOTT

steel workers a "lesson."

In current negotiations, he first the IUE.)

#### a contract. LOCALS FOLD

and thus regain some of its lost locals.

ment.

terms.

# **General Electric's Union-Busting** Hung Over the IUE-CIO Convention

For a report on the Pittsburgh convention of the CIO electrical workers (IUE-CIO), held during the week of October 6, see the article by John Williams in last week's LABOR ACTION. Following is additional discussion on the problems which face the union and which were disputed at the

PITTSBURGH-The main issue before the convention of the IUE-CIO was how to meet the threat of the General Electric Company's union-busting campaign. GE, the largest employer in the industry, has the drive well under way, from its own point of view, and it is seriously pursuing it. It also enjoys the support of the Stalinist-dominated union, the independent UE, which has already signed on the company's terms.

The background of GE negotiations throws light on the problems of the convention. GE, under the leadership of its Vice-President Lemuel Boulware, is conducting a laboratory experiment in unionbusting for the benefit of all of big basiness. Boulware is the man who, in the interests of big business as a whole, publicly urged the steel companies to reject the demands of the steel union last spring so as to force a strike and teach the

Now he is trying this out on

his own workers. His strategy is the old one of pitting worker against worker.

signed up the tiny groups of craft unions within the corporation. (Although there are a large number of these craft groups, which broke away from industrial unionism under the encouragement of the Taft-Hartley Act, their total membership is very tiny-less than one big local in

Boulware then turned to the two major unions, the IUE and the UE. To them he offered, in effect, only the meager crumbs given to the craft unions, despite the fact that GE wages are behind those of comparable employers, and despite the fact that GE profits ran to at least 17 per cent last year and over 25 per cent the year before! The IUE refused this offer-really an ultimatum! -and IUE President James Carey announced that he would resign before he would sign such

On the day before IUE workers were to vote on the company's offer, the UE accepted it! The timleaves no doubt that the UE is working hand-in-glove with the corporation. Out of the deal the UE hopes to weaken the IUE-CIO

The corporation is perfectly willing to see this happen because it knows that the UE leadership has a weaker union and is interested not in fighting the companies and building a democratic union but in strengthening Stalinist influence in the labor move-

The other half of this one-two punch was a barrage of company special-delivery letters and fullpage newspaper ads urging workers to accept on the company

Carey and most of the IUE-CIO leadership accepted the challenge. They understood that it is necessary to force a better contract out of GE. This must be done, not only to protect GE workers, but also to stop Boulwarism in its tracks before it encourages a general offensive on the part of capital. At the same time, a victory over this arrogant corporation will give organizing

a tremendous boost and at the same time expose the UE as the phony outfit it is.

At this critical point, several IUE-CIO locals in the GE chain caved in, at least temporarily. The leaders of several locals, notably 201 in Lvnn, Mass., rejected strike votes. That is where the issue stood as the convention opened.

#### In the face of the ferociousness of the company's drive, such disunity is unusual in the CIO. It points up a grave problem which has plagued the IUE-CIO from its first days.

The IUE-CIO was formed in 1949 as a split from the former CIO union in the electrical field, the Stalinist-controlled UE. It was formed from both the most conservative elements in the old UE and the most militant. The conservative elements, often under the leadership of ACTU elements (Association of Catholic Trade-Unionists), or, much worse, company-minded people, broke from the UE largely on the issue red-baiting. They really believed that the UE was as radicalas it talked (but never acted) and split on that basis.

The militants in the old UE left for contrary reasons. They left because it was undemocratic, because it was actually far less militant than other CIO unions, and because they had learned that the "progressive" talk of its leaders was a cover for their slavish support to the Kremlin's fifthcolumn in the labor movement.

#### CAREY'S TACTICS

The CIO leadership which launched the IUE tried to slant its appeal to both of these groups within UE. Its appeal to the conservatives was stressed the most. Now, in crisis, the conservatives have caved in. The militants in IUE, who have objected from the start to simple red-baiting and superpatriotism as a means of building the union, are in a position to say " told you so" if they so desired.

Only the silent pressure of these weak elements may have forced Carey into some of his expedients to retrieve the GE situation.

The demands on GE have been twice whittled down. Carey offered to let a panel of former GE executives arbitrate the dispute. (The company rejected even this.) When Westinghouse unexpectedly signed a somewhat better contract than the one GE is offering, Carey invited Westinghouse's president, Gwilym Price, to address the convention.

This was meant, of course, to put Boulware in an unfavorable light by comparison-"Why can't Boulware be reasonable like Price?"-but it didn't set very well with the delegates. Price accepted the invitation a vapid speech.

It can be predicted with accuracy that this episode will be regretted in time to come. For that matter, Westinghouse has been doing a little extra-curricular union-busting on its own, between its president's speaking engagements, as witness its lockout of workers in Bowling Green, Ky., which Carey correctly characterized as "arrogant and inhumane."

#### 'LICENSE' PLAN

Another tactic in the fight against GE has been to publicize GE's collusion with the Stalinists -that is, with the UE. In itself, this is all to the good; it needs to be done. For one thing, it shows better than anything else the class nature of McCarthvism.

Not only LABOR ACTION but the entire labor movement has long charged that McCarthyism and reactionary red-baiting is aimed not really at "Communists" but at the labor movement and anyone else who dares to challenge the present social order of big business in any way. When a corporation with billions in war orders works hand-in-

slavish editorial writers and radio commentators say not a word, the point is pretty well proved.

Republican candidate Richard Nixon was in Pittsburgh during the IUE convention, and Carey publicly invited this stalwart "anti-communist" to say a few words about GE. Nixon did not, of course.

Carey's proposals in his campaign, however, are another matter. Several months ago, he came up with a proposal that the Defense Department in effect "license" unions, and that GE be denied contracts so long as it dealt with the UE. At the convention, Carey resigned from three government boards in protest because the government still placed war orders with GE. There are at least three things wrong with this tactic.

First, it is downright undemocratic. Carey is asking the government to throw out a union, the UE, which was chosen as bargaining agent by some GE workers, no matter how misguided they might have been. When the government starts dictating to workers what unions they can join, the IUE itself will be in danger.

Secondly, by calling on the government to force GE into line, Carey is just stirring up false hopes among. GE workers and making it harder for them to go out on the inevitable picket line. GE deals with the UE because GE finds this profitable, and the government in Washington is basically more concerned with GE than it is with the IUE, and Carey ought to know it.

Thirdly, in the unlikely event that the government should (in effect) "hand over" the UE to the IUE, perhaps complete with the UE's secondary leadership if not its top officers, the Stalinists may all but make a shambles of the IUE. The UE rank-and-file must be WON over to the IUE, not kidnapped and delivered by some government agency.

#### CONFIDENCE VOTE

The main debate at the convention came over an administration proposal to increase per-capita payments to the international union by 25 cents a month. As so often happens in the union movement, a fight against a per-capita increase or dues increase really involves a much broader question. This was the case here. Nothing else could explain the fact that a seemingly important resolution like the one on PAC was passed in fifteen minutes without debate, while the per-capita resolution precipitated a three-day fight.

Votes on per-capita or dues increases in the union movement are like votes of "confidence" or "no Europe. They give opposing points of view the chance to criticize or defend administration policy.

The opposition to the increase came from the militant wing, led by District Four (New York and Northern New Jersey). Of course, not all of the opponents were motivated by militant considerations -there are some delegates who, for good or bad reasons, are always opposed to any dues increase.

But the leadership of the opposition was concerned with more than 25 cents a month, and without that leadership there would have been little real opposition.

Few denied the need for addi tional revenue for the international union-the present percapita is low, the union has tremendous tasks ahead, and the international is now operating slightly in the red financially. The opposition was concerned with presenting broad policies to the convention.

First, the opposition advocated putting the increases up to a referendum of the members, who had not been, adequately informed of

the problem. This would provide chance to educate them on the need for the increase and on the problems of the union generally. In a referendum, the opposition promised to support the increases.

Second, the opposition proposed economies in the staff through-replacing "dead wood" among organizers and officials. Such "dead wood" dates from the formation of the union when certain staff jobs were passed out to win over wavering locals. If such staff members had proved competent, would be one thing; some of them haven't, and their incompetence cripples the union.

Third, the opposition proposed that the financial situation could be solved by a militant and aggressive program of signing up 'free riders"-there are over 100,000 in IUE shops-and organizing new shops.

Fourth, the opposition delegates (almost all of them from locals with paid-up per-capita) wanted to force some action on several conservative locals which are over \$100,000 behind in percapita payments. (The locals most in arrears in their per-capita under the old rate voted to increase the per-capita!)

On a rollcall vote, the administration was defeated by a narrow margin and the increase was rejected. The following day, a 15cent increase was carried.

Correctly understood, the whole battle was a credit to the IUE. For one thing, the fact that the top officers were voted down on a measure is a tribute to the democ-

### **Socialist Vets Form** Comm. for Hoopes

With "Veterans for Eisenhower" already in the field, a rival veterans' political group has been organized - "Veterans for Hoopes.'

The organization is made up of World War II veterans who are supporting Darlington Hoopes and Samuel H. Friedman, Socialist Party candidates for President and Vice President.

LeRoy B. Jones, Wilmington, is national chairman. Joseph J. Swartz, Reading, formerly of Philadelphia, is national secretary-treasurer.

Jones, an overseas army veteran, is active in both the American Legion and the American Veterans Committee. Swartz, also an Army ex-GI, is a former organizer for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (AFL) and former executive secretary of the South Philadelphia Civic League.

"As veterans of the worst war in world history, we are naturally opposed to World War III," a statement of the group said. "We therefore urge our fellow veterans and fellow Americans to repudiate the Truman-Acheson foreign policy by voting for Darlington Hoopes."

racy of the union, in glaring contrast to the UE-and several other unions which could be mentioned. The large vote against the increase was really a vote for a more militant policy.

The debate was not of an organizational or factional naturethat is, it was not a question of opposing groups struggling for office-but was a debate on policy. It could serve to strengthen and unite the union in the coming showdown with GE. if taken by both sides in the proper spirit.

## **Postscript: ISL's Stand on Election**

The National Committee of the Independent Socialist League presented its position on the presidential election in a statement published in LABOR ACTION of October 6, in which it recommended to all class-conscious workers and socialists that they "Vote Socialist!" by casting their ballot in the 1952 elections for the candidates of the Socialist Party, Darlington Hoopes and Samuel Friedman. This position we reiterate.

However, there are quite a number of states where, for various reasons, the Socialist Party does not appear on the ballot. In some of these states, either the Socialist Labor Party or the Socialist Workers Party or both of them do appear on the ballot; in a few instances, the Socialist Labor Party appears, for technical reasons, under the name of the Industrial Government Party.

The Independent Socialist League cannot and does not endorse the theories and program of the Socialist Labor Party, which it regards as a fruitless sect hostile to the organized labor movement. Nevertheless, the Socialist Labor Party formally and rightly takes an internationalist stand against supporting either capitalist or Stalinist imperialism in wars or between wars. Despite its dogmatic rigidity, a vote cast for it will be counted as an internationalist socialist vote, above all on the most important problem of the day.

For this reason, the Independent Socialist League recommends that in those states where it is not possible to vote for the candidates of Party, your vote Socialist Labor Party if it is on the ballot.

The Independent Socialist League regrets that it cannot, as it did in 1948, place the Socialist Workers Party in the same category with regard to voting in the presidential elections of 1952.

Flouting its entire old tradition of combating Stalinism as "the syphilis of the working class," it has in recent times moved at high speed toward a complete capitulation to Stalinism. Stalinism, which it once branded as counter-revolutionary, it now proclaims as head of the camp of the world revolution. It now proclaims that it is working to bring to power in the capitalist world that same Stalinism which it once stamped as the assassin and oppressor of peoples. After all that has happened to show the consequences to the masses of a war victory of Stalinism, the Socialist Workers Party declares its solidarity with Stalinism in the coming world war and its intention to work for the victory of this monstrously reactionary regime.

The Independent Socialist League states that with this outrageous course imposed upon the Socialist Workers Party, the latter has forfeited all claim to the vote of a socialist in the 1952 election. The Independent Socialist League calls, instead, upon the sincere and devoted socialists who make up the membership of the Socialist Workers Party to repudiate its capitulation to Stalinism from start to finish and to assert their uncompromising independence from the twin monsters of reaction who live one upon the other, capitalist and Stalinist imperialism, and their unwavering confidence in socialist peace and freedom. Vote Socialist in 1952!

Vote for the candidates of the Socialist Partu!

Onward to the formation of the independent labor party of the American working class!

NATIONAL COMMITTEE of the INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE Max Shachtman, National Chairman Albert Gates, National Secretary

uge Four

## 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.

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

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

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

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now-such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join tegether 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 social-Ism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED?	1 - 224 and 20 - 23 - 23
Get Acquainted-	<u> </u>
Independent Socialist Leag 114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York	jue
□ I want more information ab ideas of Independent Sociali the ISL.	out the sm and
□ I want to join the ISL.	- 187 (s. - 1
ADDRESS	
CITY ZON	5
STATE TEL	

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE	
LABOR ACTION	
114 West 14 Street New York 11, New York	
Please enter my subscription: Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00	1 4 (1)
□ NEW □ RENEWAL □ Bill me. □ Payment enclosed.	ng ta ang d
NAME	
CITY	States (1)

# Kutcher Case——

(Continued from page 1) dence" even though no hearing

has ever been held. In a public statement, James Kutcher, the "Legless Veteran," said of the court's decision: "The Circuit Court decision was a victory for our fight—an important victory. But the first thing I want to say about it is that I still haven't got back my job."

He went on to say that it was not the job itself which was important but the bigger issues which it symbolized, and which the court's stand still leaves unresolved or at the old stand

Despite all the limitations of the court's ruling, an obstacle has been placed in the path of the curiae.

witchhunters and their anti-democratic crusade will be somewhat held up. They will now have to prove their cases, at least to some extent, and their evidence will be available for court review.

Kutcher's case has been vigorously publicized and supported by the Kutcher Defense Committee which is supported also by Independent Socialists, and has won wide endorsement in liberal and labor circles. The appeal to the Circuit Court was handled by Joseph L. Rauh Jr., a leader of Americans for Democratic Action, with the aid of Herbert Levy, of the American Civil Liberties Union, appearing as amicus

# Readers Take the Gloor.

#### To the Editor:

I would suggest that Mr. Draper find some more suitable word than "hillbilly" to describe the type prejudice or group attitude of mind he is trying to illustrate in his Chaplin article (Sept.

I am convinced that the use of the word is both derogatory and in bad taste. I hope LABOR ACTION will take the opportunity to apologize to its readers for this usage. W. B. KALKHOF

Hillbilly is not in itself a deinterested, I could cite the evidence on this score, if that is necjust as (in European terms) the expression "peasant prejudices" or "peasant mentality" is accur-

# 'Creeping Socialism'

socialism.

attorney.

of

playrooms.

Marches On

Free lunch (without beer).

a member of the Board of Educa-

tion of the District of Columbia,

Robert H. Faulkner, a railroad

ton, D. C., he thinks, is "going

socialistic"-as evidenced by the

fact that the school lunch pro-

gram assures at least one decent

meal a day for even the poorest

kid. Further proof is the teaching

should be left to parents, and such

Incidentally, the people of the

city have nothing to say about

what dinosaurs get on their school

board. That is determined for

them by the appropriate congres-

sional committee, which is con-

trolled by the party now running

Vote

Socialist

Adlai Stevenson for president.

frills as health checkups and

physical education, which

The school system of Washing-

That seems to be the thesis of

## Labor Daily

CHARLESTON, W. Va., Sept. 17 -History was made here this week, "Labor's Daily' was launched on Monday by the International Typographical Union. . An eight-page tabloid newspaper, it's the only daily labor paper in

America. To begin with, the paper is being circulated in West Virginia but later may be made national in scope, the I.T.U. explained. Carrying news, columns, cartoons and other features, the paper is also seeking circulation among general readers.

The "Typos" are also publishing 11 dailies of general interest in cities where existing monopolyowned papers are strikebound. -Labor (Sept. 20)

#### **Canterbury Tale**

We nominate for prize understatement of the decade:

"I am glad to learn that about 6 million signatures for peace have been collected in Bulgaria. This is a great success, especially bearing in mind that Bulgaria's ulation is only million." — Dean of Canterbury Hewlett Johnson, in the Bulgarian Rabotnichesko Delo, August 1951.





### Italian Socialists—France and Morocco—Ullstein By LUIS ALONSO him up and told him not to under estimate them, particularly since PARIS, Oct. 10-The Italian So-

cial-Democratic Party (PSDI) has just concluded its national convention. Led by Saragat and Romita, the "mild" right wing consolidated its control of the party, and will continue the line of collaborating with DeGasperi and his conservative Christian-Democratic government.

One-fifth of the delegates supported the extreme right-wing position of Simonini, who feels that the others are not sufficiently enthusiastic about DeGasperi, while three-fifths supported the Saragat-Romita position which does allow socialists at least to occasionally criticize the government. The remaining fifth voted for the leftist position of no support for the conservatives, put forward by Codignola.

The left wing of the PSDI has been steadily losing strength during the past year and a half because more and more of its followers have simply left the party.

The well-known author langzio Silone was never able to stand the pro-government deals of Saragat and Romita. Then in the last municipal elections part of the left wing under Dr. Carlo Andreoni refused to follow the discipline of voting with and for the candidates f the Catholic government bloc. Andreoni instead joined forces with the "Titoist" Cucchi-Magnani group to run an independent socialist campaign in many towns and villages. Andreoni was then expelled from the PSDI, thus further weakening the left wing in that party.

The Italian press has published an interesting commentary on the Cucchi-Magnani group. It seems their actions are closely followed by one J. V. Stalin. When' the Italian pro-Stalinist "socialist" leader Nenni recently spoke with Stalin in the Kremlin, the latter inquired about the Cucchi-Magnani group, Nenni tried to shrug them off, with a pat Stalinist answer about their being just "imperialist riffraff." Stalin caught

(Continued from page 1)

There is no doubt that the per-

sonal and political character of

the military leader has had its

effect on the nature of the cam-

paign, contributing to the naiveté,

the know-nothing approach, the

ple, the chameleon transforma-

tions, the willingness to embrace

all elements, the reliance on the

smile and the hero-symbolism.

Whether the desperate ambitions

are personal or party, we cannot

measure, nor do we care to. The

effects of the kind of campaign

which led the candidate to en-

dorse McCarthy in Wisconsin, to

parade as a Vandenberg Republi-

can in Michigan, to parrot the

Dirksen demagogy in Illinois, are

The general's handling of the

Nixon Fund incident has been

weighed and found wanting. It.

has been widely noted that Eisen-

hower's ethical appraisal of

Nixon was a trial by TV soap

something else again.

CHAMELEON

they had refused to support the government coalition and had run an independent campaign. Nenni was unable to hide his surprise at Stalin's awareness of the matter. So goes the report in the press.

### Sultan Talks Back

The rulers of France, so dis turbed about Tunisia's fight for independence-which is about to drag the French imperialists be fore the bar of United Nations and public opinion-are getting more and more worried about their other North African "protectorate." Morocco.

The sultan of Morocco, acting under the pressure of the widespread movement for freedom headed by the Istiqual party, is making public exchanges of letters between himself and the French government in Paris. These letters are getting progressively stronger in tone. While the sultan insists on French recognition of Morocco's right to have at least some form of cabinet government, the French reply that such a cabinet is unnecessary since the sultan does have a grand vizier. True—there is a grand vizier: Of course, he is slightly over a hundred years old, and does shuffle about mumbling to himself a bit, but what does the sultan want, utopia?

Besides, say the French, more important than allowing Morocco to have its own government (even within the control of the rebaptized French empire, now called the "French Union") is the setting up of municipal councilswith a powerful French say in each of them, of course. To the French rulers this is far more interesting than any of the sultan's demands, including such things as the right for Moroccan work-

Thus the 250,000 Moorish inhabitants of Fes cannot join unions, but the 25,000 French inhabitants of the city must be insured a preponderant voice in

Germany in 1953.

opera and GOP-encouraged Western Union response.

aries who do the hard campaigning-Jenner, Kem, McCarthy, etc. -and who are now advising the general. Nixon, in his second TV performance, revealed himself as a slick, sweetly reasonable Mc-Carthy, attempting to blame Stevenson for the Hiss affair. It is ontirely true, as has been pointed out, that John Foster Dulles, who gave Hiss a character reference and who could become Eisenhower's secretary of state, is equally liable or not liable. Nixon's is a witchhunt mentality, attempting to put across the doctrine of quiltuntil-innocence-is-proved and aviit by association.

#### promise of all things to all peo-LET PAPA DO IT

Capitalizing on a natural handicap of their candidate, the Republican supporters have tried to make a virtue of necessity by becoming "anti-intellectual." Stevenson has been attacked by the Republican supporters for "talking above the masses." On the Republican side, this is a pure de-New York Times' James Reston tries to maintain the Times' support of a candidate it has had to criticize several times editorially in the course of the campaign:

"The general has lost the Shakespeare vote but there is still a powerful 'let papa worry about it' feeling working for him among the

attention to politics." Stevenson's rhetoric has led one commentator to remark that he is casting his ballot for "the English sentence." But the Times' cynical attitude by and large has been the hope that the inarticulate backward masses will "let papa do it." This latter is a sentiment that demagogues and dictators pander

The Times' continued support of the candidate it has had to at anything that has to do with chastise editorially for support to McCarthy and other breaches of its brand of liberalism, has led a group of liberals including Max Ascoli, Reinhold Niebuhr, Richard Hofstadter, John Hersey and many others-to protest publicly. The Times considered it necessary to justify editorially the continuation of its support to Eisenhower after his surrender to Taft.

However, in justice to the Times, it prints the following comments of W. H. Lawrence a few columns away from Reston's: "When this reporter first began to travel with him, the general fense mechanism at work. The used to say publicly that he agreed with Mr. Truman's decision to send American troops to fight in Korea, but he doesn't talk about that any more since he became convinced that the Korean casualty lists were making Republican votes.

"And the advertising agency boys have taken over the preliminaries of his broadcasts. Whenever

There is no question but that if It is the Republican reactionthe Taftites lost the convention. they have won in the campaign. Eisenhower not only made his peace with Taft but embraced the nost reactionary elements in the Republican Party, including Mc-Carthy, in whose interest he omit-

ted a defense of Marshall, one of the victims of the McCarthy ool of falsification in Wiscon-

ers to organize in trade unions. local affairs.







# backward ideology .- H. D. Not in the Headlines

The people of Morocco are getting more and more impatient with this state of affairs. It is now forty years since the French imperialist Marshal Lyautey by armed force imposed the "protectorate" upon the Moroccans (Treaty of Fes. March 30, 1912). The Moroccans see no reason why

## Ullstein Again

the unwanted "protectors" should

stay forever.

evening editions.

September 28 saw the reappearance of the Berliner Morgenpost, organ of the re-established Ullstein newspaper trust. This paper, famous in pre-Hitler Berin as one of the leading conservative newspapers in Germany, was taken over by Hitler and then went out of business when the Russian troops arrived in 1945.

\* The emergence of the Morgenpost at this itme is particularly mportant. It is interpreted as part of the drive to reduce the strength of the Social-Democratic Party. While that party's Telegraf and the other Berlin newspapers are still coming out in only 6-page editions, the Morgenpost has 28 pages. Furthermore 400,000 copies of the Margenpost are said to be given away free every day. At the same time the Ullsteins are known to be arranging for afternoon and

All this costs tremendous sums of money, and in Berlin it is said that Ullstein-though itself a big trust-has gotten the financial backing of the big-business group led by Ugo Stinnes and the Ruhr banking group led by the Baron Pferdmenges. Both these men are known to be powerful supporters of Chancellor Adenauer and his Christian Democratic Union Par-

The launching of the Morgenpost is therefore one of the important steps taken by powerful business interests to increase the chances of Adenauer's party to defeat the Social-Democrats in the general elections coming in

# Middle East Unity: Israel's Opportunity and Its Fate

We have received a mimeographed pamphlet entitled Principles and Aims of "The Third Force" Movement in Israel, consisting of two articles by Mordecai Stein reprinted from the latter's Democratic Journal. This is the newspaper which recently (see LABOR ACTION for Oct. 6) became the first Yiddish daily in the country, only to have its license later revoked by the Israeli government on trumped-up grounds.

One of the two articles has already appeared in LABOR ACTION (for May 26). The second is on the general theme, the need for Israel's participation in a unified Middle East in friendly collaboration with the Arab peoples. It begins with a discussion of the Middle East Command which the U.S. bloc is attempting to set up:

"The attitude of the Israeli government toward the Middle East Command," writes Stein, "may be summed up as follows:

"The most desirable solution would be for Israeli to participate in the Command while the Arab states do not do so. But even if the Arab states should participate in the Middle East Command, and perhaps even particularly in that case, Israeli should also participate, on condition that the Command grant the Arab states no advantages over Israel and in order to prevent the granting of such advantages. In any case Israel should maintain its connections with the 'West,' for the breaking off of those connections would lead to Israel's downfall.

"This attitude of the government has been supported by a large majority of the Knesset and by most Israeli newspapers. But this attitude is mistaken and harmful. . . .

The first reason adduced is by way of a discussion of the relative military strength of the Stalinist bloc versus the NATO powers. Stein's purpose seems to be to argue that in all probability the former is militarily stronger, or at least is likely to have military superiority at the outset of a war, and that this is the reason why reliance on the West offers Israel no protection. It is a doubtful enough thesisnot made stronger by formulations which seem to imply that "democracies" per se are necessarily weaker in war than totalitarian countries-but it would appear to be an attempt to counter a much falser viewpoint current among pro-Western Israelis: that military alliance of Israel with the Western bloc is its best protection against the ravages of war.

This illusion Stein also combats with less categorical arguments seeking to show how impossible it will be for even a benevolent U.S. -and he points out that the U. S. cannot be expected to be very benevolently concerned about the fate of a small country on the Mediterranean coastline-to keep Russian power from overruning Israel. Moreover he points out that the conditions created by war, on top of the already visible consequences of the Israeli government's policy, will make the land extremely vulnerable to pro-Stalinist fifthcolumnism

He rejects the illusion of "neutralism," that is, the view that "If Israel does not join any of the rival parties, neither of them will harm her and in the coming war she will maintain her peace and integrity, as Switzerland and other small countries did in the last war." To it he counterposes a positive program for a "third force" in the Middle East. his section follows.

### Unity with Arab States Is Possible

"If Israel continues in her present situation, she will remain isolated, surrounded by enemies and politically and economically dependent on overseas countries. Whether she joins the Middle East Command or not, she cannot escape the terrible fate which awaits her. "There is only one way out for Israel: to cease being a foreign



#### large mass of voters who pay little

#### KOREA DOUBLETALK

the Republicans buy nation-wide radio or television time, the first thing the listeners at home hear is a continuing chant of 'I Like Ike,' and the general makes his appearance to a tremendous roar. The crowd has been rehearsed for about five minutes in advance so its members will chant in unison at a signal from the platform."

The Reporter of October 28 editorializes: "The great 'anti movement is aimed particularly reason or with the mind. Indeed for some people, 'intellectual' and 'un-American' have become interchangeable words. The general himself, it is said, has come to realize that the more 'visceral' he makes his appeal to the voters, the better it gets across."

#### SWITCHEROO

Eisenhower has rung and rerung the few changes that are possible in his "visceral" appeal with the talk of "fearmongers, quack doctors, and barefaced looters." He went so far in Champaign, Illinois, as to say that if the United States had been better prepared, it might not have become involved in World War I, and if it had taken greater precautions in '39. it might not have gone to war against Hitler. This is a little difficult to square with his party's record on voting for less war expenditures and his own promises in that regard-but an election speech is an election

speech, depending on what part of the country you're in.

In the entire field of foreign policy, it was anticipated that little debate would occur, since Eisenhower was nominated by that segment which by and large agreed with the Administration on foreign policy. The Taffites, who did have a recognizable difference in this field, were defeated. But that deteat has turned into victory.

Despite the identification of Eisenhower with administration foreign policy and his active participation in much of it, he has essayed the Taft line here, too. He has blamed Secretary of State Acheson for setting limits to the U.S. defense perimter in the East. He has tried to answer the Democrat's cry that he, too, was for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Korea by asserting that this position was only "military.

The Times and the liberals who support Eisenhower piously hope that, now that all the reactionary concessions have been made, in cluding those to the oil interests and the Dixiecrats, the Republican candidate will have time during the remainder of his cam paign to dwell on issues which will capture the liberals and independents. It will be recalled that Eisenhower was selected as the man best suited to take these votes from the Democrats.

enemy body between the Middle East countries, and to become their friend and ally.

"Israel is as interested in peace in the Middle East as all the other countries of the region: more so, for she faces worse dangers. So it is vitally essential for her to do everything possible to remove the partitions which separate her from her neighbors. Here, next door, there is plenty of cheap food. Here there are markets for her produce. Here-and not overseas-are those as interested as she in the integrity and welfare of the Middle East. The peoples of the neighboring countries can and must be our allies in the hard times to come. With them we must conclude a Middle East pact. Them we can join.

"It is not true that this is impossible because the Arab states do not want it, do not want peace with Israel. The facts are different. The Arab masses are by no means interested in the continuation of the conflict with Israel; on the contrary, this quarrel is a never-ceasing source of suffering in their own countries. It is a hotbed of corruption, tyranny and oppression, and the Arab public desires its cessation. The fact can be clearly seen in the change which the contents of the declarations of its official spokesmen have undergone. Israel can make peace with her neighbors, if her desire to do so is sincere and not mere lip service.

"There is a reliable sign of preparedness to make peace: the will to pay for it. Peace must be paid for, and should be paid for. Who wants peace without paying the price, does not really want it. If our attitude is that territorial concessions cannot be considered, the return of the Arab refugees is out of the question, and the only subject for discussion is the question of reparations-which will result in the Arab states' having to pay reparations to Israel-if that is our attitude, it gives no evidence of a true desire for peace. Peace with the Arab nations is a vital and urgent need for Israel, and a serious effort should be made to achieve it.

"The main condition of the Arab states for peace with Israel is at present the repatriation of the Arab refugees. It is the principalpractically the only—demand; and it is a just demand, which should be fulfilled. The Arab refugees should be repatriated—not a hundred thousand or any other number of them but every Arab refugee should be given the opportunity to return home. Firstly, because that is his right, because it is his home. And secondly, for the sake of peace. If the Israeli government performs this act of justice out of its own free will. Jewish-Arab peace will become a fact, even if some powerful groups in the various Arab states should not desire it.

#### Step to Asian Federation

"The repatriation of the Arab refugees does not mean that the new immigrants should be expelled from their houses and deprived of all shelter. Israel will be able to apply large sums to the reconstruction of the country, to the building of houses fit for human use for the immigrants. Also, the international funds allocated for the Arab refugees, which are at present squandered to so large an extent, can be of considerable and effective help in the rehabilitation of those refugees in Israel. Moreover, it is to be hoped that other international factors can be found who, in order to assist in the establishment of peace in the Middle East, will support the rehabilitation of both the Arab refugees and the Jewish immigrants. And if after all this any difficulties in the rehabilitation of the Arab refugees should arise. there are grounds to assume that it will be possible-for then it will be possible—to solve them by consultation and common action with the Arab states.

"Let there only be the will to this great and humane step, and it will be possible to carry it out systematically and decently, with no detriment to anyone and advantage to all.

"The repatriation of the Arab refugees will not weaken Israel. They will become no 'fifth column.' They have had a very bitter experience, and if the state of Israel returns them to their homes of its own free will, they will not be any less loyal than other citizens.

"More than that: an Israel which maintains peace and friendship with the other nations of the Middle East, which cooperates with them to defend the region against the world-wide storm which approaches its borders, will be no fertile ground for the growth of an Arab 'fifth column,' and there will be no such column.

"The fate of Israel is bound up with the fate of the Middle East, and the Middle East will have some grounds to hope for salvation only if it unites into one bloc which will and can guard its own peace and independence. WHAT THE MIDDLE EAST NEEDS TODAY IS NO COM-MAND, BUT UNITY. A united Middle East bloc, which will soon be joined by the great power near it in a geographical and spiritual sense, India, will not be regarded as no-man's-land by the two rival powers; its peoples will not become their guinea pigs; such a great and united bloc can do much to counter the dangers which threaten it in the coming war. It may even be a stage in the consolidation of all Asia into a third power which would change the present balance of forces and might prevent the world war.

Without peace between the Jews and the Arabs, without the cooperation of Israel, the unity of the Middle East will not come about. and if this region remains divided against itself, as it is now, it will become a victim of the horrors of the war to come; and the country within it which will suffer most is the Jewish state. Then the state of Israel will be a passing shadow, not blessed but cursed by memory, because it has gathered-in the remains of European Eastern Jewry, only to lead them to more certain destruction.

"But another way is still open to Israel: to cooperate with the other Middle East countries for the peace and security of the whole region.

"This is the only way which leads to salvation for Israel; and it s the way in which Israel may bring blessing to the whole world."



#### LABOR ACTION

# THE BOLIVIAN REVOLUTION GOES LEFT The Transformation of Parties and Classes Under Fire

LABOR ACTION has been glad to publish Juan Rey's well-informed and interesting articles on Bolivia, although the views expressed in them are not necessarily our own; and in the following three dispatches Comrade Rey stresses important changes in the picture which he has been presenting to our readers.-Ed.

## Workers Press for Socialist Change

#### By JUAN REY

Fage Six

SANTIAGO, Sept .-- Under the pressure of the workers and Indian peasants of Bolivia, the victorious Nationalist Party (MNR) has promised to nationalize the mines, and to carry through agrarian reforms and changes in the social-economic structure of the country, as the basic objectives of the "national revolution. The workers and peasants are therefore supporting the Nationalist Party in power under President Paz Estenssoro and waiting for the realization of the prom-

But the social content of this program is understood in different ways by the Nationalists on the one hand and by the workers on the other. By the nationalization of the mines the MNR Nationalists mean a simple bureaucratic reform, the intervention of the state in the administration of the mines. But by the nationalization of the mines the workers mean their confiscation without compensation and their administration by the workers themselves. This is the basic class difference between the workers and the petty bourgeoisie, between socialism and capitalism.

President Pax has promised nationalization, but he does not really think that it will be necessary to carry it through. It is true that at the last meeting of the Central Obrerg Boliviana (the Bolivian Federation of Labor) he said, under the visible pressure of the masses: "I see now that the nationalization of the mines is indispensable and I promise to do it." But in a conversation with the writer Diez de Medina, Pax said "that he thinks the nationalization of the mines will mean bankruptcy but nevertheless he must do it."

And he really must do it, because the great mine corporations have begun to lay off workers and close the mines, as in the case of the Compania Unificada in Potosi and the American Smelting Company in Corocoro. In this situation the has to appoint its own managers for the mines in order to avoid the stoppage of production.

#### REVOLUTIONARY METHOD

And so the objective situation is imposing revolutionary methods on the government. With the growth in strength of the workers' movement, the power of the big mine owners is declining and losing its former weight. As things stand now, the big bourgeoisie cannot engage the workers and the Nationalist government in battle. The government managers took over their posts without any resistance. Now the people are waiting for the decree nationalizing the mines, as a result of the "study" presented by the government commission which was appointed for that purpose.

Opposition to the government's policy of mine statification is even from Nationalist workers who are members and supporters of the governing MNR National-

ploit and squeeze the workers even more than the present mine owners.

Therefore the workers organized in the Central Obrera are demanding the nationalization of the mines without compensation, under workers' control. This means that the workers are demanding revolutionary expropriation—they want the mines to pass over into their own hands and be operated under the control of workers' committees, not government bureaucrats who dream of imposing their own economic and political power over iabor.

For the Nationalist Party and government, the nationalization of the mines means a state-capitalist reform; the appropriation of the mines by the government party; the creation of a new bourgeoisie, a new Rosca (mine barons); the monopolization of the nation's wealth by a new privileged class, with economic and political power over the workers and the workers' trade unions. over the state machine and the whole Bolivian people.

#### LATENT CONFLICT

The workers instinctively fear this danger which has been created by the situation which they brought into being, and they fear giving dangerous powers to their "own" party, which they have pushed into power and supported. The Central Obrera Boliviana, which was formed by Juan Lechin, the government minister of mines, is now the sole opposition capable of exerting pressure on the government and compelling it to change its policy.

Thus the objective historical process, the need for changes in the social-economic structure of the country, has created a new political situation in Bolivia and brought out the latent social conflict between the Nationalist petty bourgeoisie and the working class, between the governing Nationalist Party and the workers' unions which are still officially backing the former. This social conflict is the motive force of the mminent social and political changes which loom ahead in the land

## Unions Adopt Marxist Position By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Oct .-- On my last trip to Bolivia and its capital La country. By destroying the political machine of the Right, including its military organizations, the workers have now become the only real political and social force, which, if it so wishes, can immediately conquer political power and introduce social and political reforms in accordance with its own program.

The victorious and armed working class is the decisive social, political and military force in the Altiplano (the Bolivian plateau). The government of the MNR, the Nationalist Party, is holding on through the support of the armed working class, not through the strength of its own party.

The workers-that is, the workers' unions-are united in the Central Obrera Boliviana which was organized by Lechin as a supporter of the Nationalist Party. This Bolivian workers' center strong not from the right but looks like an imitation of Peronist from the working-class left wing, policy and the basis for a new nationalist regime.

But si duo facinut idem non est idem-though both may do the workers do not agree with its bu- thing: In Peronist Argentina the reaucratic methods of managing workers' unions are subordinated

the mines. They fear lest the to the regime as its obedient instatification of the mines create a strument, because Argentina capnew bureaucracy which might ex- italism is stronger than Bolivian capitalism, the Peronist government party machine is stronger than the Bolivian MNR and its military machine is also much stronger.

> In Bolivia the workers' unions were, to be sure, founded and dominated by the MNR and raised up as the MNR's road to power and as the base of its regime. But now, because of the weakness of Bolivian capitalism and the weakness of the Nationalist Party, the unions are in reality the unconscious masters of the situation.

The "labor ministers" in the cabinet, Lechin and Butrón, who are both members of the MNR and leaders of trade unions, have to give their reports to the leading committee of the Central Obrero -so that this leading committee of the Central is virtually a dual government, an embryonic workers' government.

As we have previously reported, when the government delayed the nationalization of the mines the workers' unions adopted a resolution calling on the "labor ministers" to leave the cabinet. The government of Paz Estenssoro then solemnly promised to nationalize the mines, and the Central Obrera authorized the "labor ministers" to stay in the cabinet. It also demanded increased "workers' representation" in the government, a demand which has not been satisfied up to now.

The official organ of the Central Obrera Boliviana Rebelión has published a very interesting and important document entitled "The Ideological Position of the Bolivian Working' Class." The most important part of this document concerns the character of the Bolivian revolution.

"The Bolivian revolution," says Rebelión, "must have the character of a combined revolutionbourgeois-democratic in its immediate objectives and socialist in its uninterrupted results. It is quite impossible to separate the two phases of the revolution; that means that the workers in power must not halt at bourgeois-democratic limits but must strike ever more deeply at the rights of private property, going over to socialist methods and in this way giving the revolution a permanent character.'

#### STEP FORWARD

This passage signifies a most important theoretical advance for revolutionary Marxist thinking in Bolivia. For years we have been fighting against the theory of "democratic revolution" in Bo-Paz, I found that great political livia-that is, of bourgeois-demochanges have taken place in the cratic revolution which stops short of socialist change. This theory has been supported not only by the Stalinists but also by the "Trotskyist" POR, especially B.-G. Lora, as the basis for political action by the workers. This outlived theory was the basis of the opportunist policy of the Stalinist party (the PIR) after 1946 and also the reason for its bankruptcy-therefore indirectly the reason for the victory of the MNR in 1952.

Now, finally, the most important workers' organization in the country has overcome this false theory and accepted the correct position, in effect the theory of the "permanent revolution"-that is, the socialist theory developed by Trotsky. The Bolivian working class has taken a great step forward and has proved that it is really taking the road to revolu-

In this situation only a different appraisal of the international situation divides, in my view, revolutionary Marxist thought from the most important workers' orist Party. This is so because the same thing, it is not the same ganization. [Comrade Rey is here referring to his views on the relation between the Bolivian revolu-

tion and the international situation, which he expressed in his article in the Sept. 22 issue of LABOR ACTION .- Ed.]

The publication of Rebelión provoked consternation and fright within the MNR, especially in its right-wing circles. A group of ministers and Nationalist leaders countered by publishing a "manifesto", against "communism." But President Paz. aware of his own weakness and his own party's weakness, declared that no one had the right to publish a political statement for the MNR except its political committee (which consists of Paz himself plus Siles and Alvarez Plata). In this diplomatic form the "anti-communist manifesto" directed against the Central Obrera was repudiated.

This was done by the same Paz Estenssoro who has always himself aggressively attacked "communism": but this time he would be attacking the entire organized working class, which is backing his own regime. He was prudent enough to refrain from doing so.

But through his offices Juan Lechin was led to make the statement that "The Ideological Position of the Bolivian Working Class" is only a private draft and not a definitive program and that such a definitive program would be adopted by the workers' congress in January. Thus the conflict between the government and the Central Obrera was smoothed over this time.

#### PUSHED TO LEFT

But the conflict is latent and the problem of nationalization is renewing it right along; because nationalization the Central group within it, the POR.

**Transformed POR Leads Workers** 

begin this dispatch by putting re- scure colonel who was a member cent Bolivian events in the setting of Radepa, and with Paz Estenof the country's political development

For nearly the first 20 years of this century, Bolivia was governed by the Liberal Party, as the champion of capitalist development in the Altiplano. But capitalism came to Bolivia very late, and the country's colonial conditions could not open up the normal possibilities for its development. The Liberal Party was replaced by the Republicans of Saavedra, and then by the genuine Republican Party, socialists and nationalists.

With the Russiah Revolution, the modern working-class movement also began, and with it the organization of the modern Left. The Bolivian Socialist Workers Party (PSOB) arose, and later the Stalinist and Trotskyist groups.

After the defeat by Paraguay in the Gran Chaco war, the military dictatorships of Toro and Busch (the last with "socialistic" tendencies) took over. Then the traditional parties were restored, after Busch's "assassination, under the governments of Quintanilla and Peñaranda. The reaction against the murder of Busch and the restoration of the traditional Rightist parties led to the formation of the nationalist tendency of the MNR (Revolutionary Nationalist Movement), led by Paz Estenssoro.

This was a time of thriving success for nationalism in a world shadowed by Hitler's victories and Stalin's expansion. The influence of Nazism was powerful in Bolivia.

#### MNR'S PAST

The 1943 coup d'état against the Peñaranda government was · made by the semi-fascist military logia which called itself Razón de la Patria, for short "Radepa"; it was politically backed by the MNR. The first Nationalist regime was a coalition between Radepa and the MNR, under the

Obrera means the handing over of the mines to the workers and not to the state. There is much dis cussion about this problem right now and the next session of the Central Obrera is scheduled to take up and ratify an Open Letter to President Paz about the modus operandi of nationalization.

It is very characteristic of the political composition of the Central Obrera's committee. The largfraction is that of the POR; est next comes the group of Lechin and Torres, that is, the Nationalist wing of the unions; and the Stalinists are in third place with scarcely 5 votes. Though it is true that the POR is organizationally and ideologically very weak, and that Lechin and Torres are retreating and vacillating, it is also true that the spontaneous workers' movement is very strong and is pushing the Central Obrera forward.

The objective historical and so cial process in Bolivia is pushing the social forces to revolutionary solutions, and the counter-revolutionary camp is disorganized, weak and incapable of any resistance It depends only on the workers to understand their own power and to grasp the fact that only a workers' and peasants' government can realize the program of Bolivian revolution; that it must be a working-class revolution. even though it has to solve immediate bourgeois-democratic tasks.

The Nationalist regime, which is hanging on to power only because of the workers' support, will fall if this support is withdrawn. Therefore an enormous responsibility rests on the Central Obrera and on the strongest

SANTIAGO, October - Let me presidency of Villaroel, an obssoro as finance minister.

Backed by Hitler and Perón this regime vigorously fought both the Right and the Left, both the great mine barons (the Rosca) and the independent workers' movement as represented by the PSOB and the Stalinists (PIR) and by the independent trade unions. It was under Villaroel's regime that some leaders of the bourgeois opposition were murdered-the famous "crime of November"; the tin magnate Hochschild was kidnaped and some millions in ransom demanded; and the leader of the Stalinists also barely escaped with his

In 1946 a coalition of the Rightist bloc and the Stalinist PIR defeated the Villaroel regime, jexploiting the difference between the MNR and the military clique and utilizing the crisis of the regime and the country and the defeat of Hitler in the war. Villaroel was hanged from a lamppost together with his closest collaborators.

#### **BIG CHANGES**

In spite of the fact that this revolution had a big popular base. including not only the bourgeoisdemocratic parties but also the middle class and working class, the resulting coalition between the traditional Rightist parties and the Stalinist PIR remained absolutely sterile, incapable of any revolutionary reforms - stupid and reactionary.

The masses waited for a new revolutionary policy, the heralded "anti-fascist" and "progressive" 🛶 policy, for a change in the social, economic and political structure of the country, now that the "Nazi" government was out. But they saw only the old reactionary "democratic" policy, corruption, robbery of the public treasury, persecution of the workers' movement, all the old sins and delin-(Continued on page 7)

refuse to "sing."

regime. tion of the government, traditional in Bolivia, and the lack of the social and political reforms which the working class looked for, brought about the regeneration of the MNR as a mass movement. The MNR absorbed not only the middle-class supporters of the

class to consciousness and activity.

The trade unions which had been dominated by Villaroel were now transformed into the main organizations of popular opposition to the Hertzog-Urriolagoitia regime. But in the course of this opposition struggle and civil war, the character of the MNR changed-from a party based on the middle classes to one with its mass base among the workers, although its program remained a nationalist one.

This process of ideological and political polarization within the MNR-between the old leaders and cadres and the new workingclass masses that had flowed into it-came to light after the coup d'état of April of this year, when the workers transformed it into an armed insurrection against the hated Rosca, the mining-capitalist power.

### POR'S EVOLUTON

smashed, and the new political machine of the MNR, seeking to supplant it, is running into the spontaneous but stubborn opposi-

What is especially interesting is the ideological development and political role of the POR, the Trotskyist party affiliated with the Fourth International, in the course of this general process of political

Modern Russia

A Novel of

\$3.00

# October 27, 1952 **Thought-Control for Teachers** —

(Continued from last page)

have to pursue the matter independently in the courts. What is particularly sinister about the McCarran hearings in New York is the way in which it has EXTENDED the principles on which the educational witchhunt is based. It was a sufficiently dangerous break with the traditions of academic freedom when government and educators began acting on the principle that membership in the Communist Party made a teacher ineligible to hold a job. Now wholesale dismissals have been transferred also to any who invoke the constitutional right to refuse to answer an inquisition into their political beliefs and connections.

There is no consolation for liberals in the belief that many of the teachers hit were actually Stalinists at one time or another. The new witchhunt principle equally penalizes those who have broken with the CP but who

Most important, in no case has there been an attempt to show that in their actual teaching activities any of the victimized teachers have shown unacademic bias or distortion. This is presumably the "theory" behind the drive to purge pro-Stalinist teachers, but it has cut no

Thus Professor George S. Counts, the liberal Columbia professor, has now also come out in favor of the abovementioned "theory." but press reports of his statement do not show any acknowledgment on his part of what is really happening.

In a talk at Queens College, Counts, who is the candidate of the Liberal Party for Senator, repeated the rationalization that CP members must follow the party line and "This means the Communist is not protected by academic freedom. He has forfeited his right by subservience to exterior authority." (N. Y. Post, Oct. 21.)

Even on the basis of this basic concession to the witch hunt climate, it would be incumbent on Professor Counts, and other liberals who go along the same distance, to say at least a word about the conformist and intimidated teachers whose "subservience to exterior authority" takes the form of subservience to the official "American party line" (as Justice William O. Douglas once called it).

LABOR ACTION defends the principles of academic freedom not out of concern primarily for the Stalinists cr fellow-travelers who may be caught up (and whose own ideology, insofar as they are consistent Stalinists in their political allegiance, leaves no room for academic freedom for their own opponents under conditions of Stalinist control) but because the whittling away of democratic liberties is a danger to all dissident thought. This has been amply proved in the course of the latest stepped-up drive.

# The Bolivian Revolution -

(Continued from page 6) quencies of the feudal-bourgeois

The big mine-owners' dominatraditional bourgeois parties but also of the Left, the PSOB and the Stalinist PIR, and it awakened new sections of the working

The ensuing civil war not only destroyed the old bourgeois government and military machine but also changed the character of the MNR. The fighting nationalist workers not only changed themselves in the process of struggle but also transformed the whole political structure of the country.

Now the old feudal-bourgeois apparatus of the Bolivian state is tion of its "own" workers' organizations, above all the trade unions which it had controlled.

#### change in the country. Founded as a breakaway from

the PSOB, the POR has not played any big political role. though active in the periphery of the workers' movement against the Stalinists. In composition it has been middle-class and this is related to its display of a certain amount of sympathy with the MNR and close relations with it. The people who fought in the MNR and POR came from the same social layers, and they came to a mutual understanding in spite of their different political language: the MNR talked about the "national revolution" and the POR about the "bourgeoisdemocratic revolution": the MNR talked in totalitarian Peronist-Hitlerite terms, and the POR's jargon was half-"Trotskvist." half-Stalinist "anti-imperialism."

Both fought against the "plutocracy," against the "Rosca,' against imperialism, against the bourgeois Right and the Stalinist "Left," and so formed a political alliance whose personal expression was the friendship between the Nationalist leader of the mine workers, Lechin, and G. Lora, the leading militant and writer of the POR. Lora's "Pulacayo thesis," based on the concept of bourgeoisdemocratic revolution, was the theoretical expression of this period as the program for a coalition government between the POR and the MNR to carry through the revolution.

#### NEW ROLE

"THE CASE OF

COMRADE TULAYEV"

by VICTOR SERGE

Order from:

After the armed workers conguered power for the MNR in April, the situation changed, as a result of the pressure of the working class masses on both the MNR and the POR.

The workers took very seriously the promises of the MNR to nationalize the mines, to institute agrarian reforms and to change the economic-social character of the country. But the two forces understood these slogans differently: the Nationalists looked to state-capitalist reforms à la Perón, while the workers fough for socialist change, i.e., workers' control of the mines, the land to the peasants, and socialist transformations in the economy.

The POR, closer to the workers than the MNR, could not be deaf to these demands of the working class.

In the latent social and politica split between the MNR and the nationalist workers, between the Nationalist party and the workers' trade-unions, the POR is growing into the role of spokesman of the workers.

This is especially shown within the Central Obrera Boliviana, where the POR group has won ideological leadership and has put out the important political document on "The Ideological Position of the Bolivian Working Class," in which it has abandoned the Lora concept of the "national" or "bourgeois-democratic revolution,"

as we discussed in our last article. The relations between the POR and MNR are different now from what they were before April. The new leadership of the POR looks very critically at the actions of the MNR and especially at its "left wing" of Lechin, Butrón, Torres, etc. The spell of the POR-MNR alliance has been broken by the real political role which the MNR is playing, by the reactionary line of the government and the vacillating retreat of Lechin & Company.

At the big demonstration of the Central in September, Lechin and Butron absented themselves completely, having been taken "ill." In the present conflict over the modus operandi of mine nationalization, Lechin and his group act as mouthpieces of the government within the Central's leading committee. They try to gain time for the government and postpone is-

#### CONFLICT AHEAD

These healthy developments shown by the POR reflect the growing and spontaneous workers' movement and its pressure. The of Lora and his palship with Lechin.

POR militants and perhaps as a sign of his own rep

The new leaders of the POR are authentic leaders of the unions and the Central. With the publication of the new theoretical line on the Bolivian revolution, the "Lorist" period has been put behind, and now begins a stubborn ideological fight between the MNR and the POR for leadership over the workers.

livian situation that the thesis published by the Central was better and more radical than the resolutions of the 9th conference of the POR, which were very much the old "Fourthist" ballast. ment in Bolivia lies in the freeing of the workers from their hypnosis by the MNR. This process began with the conflict between the the nationalization of the mines, etc. In this process the POR can play a big and responsible political role

In spite of the fact that for years I have been a stubborn critic of the POR, it is with the greatest satisfaction that I testify to its rogress and healthy evolution.

## Haskell Tour on Last Lap

The nation-wide speaking and organization tour of Gordon Haskell, National Committee member the Independent Socialist League and assistant editor of. LABOR ACTION, is now in its windup week.

After a successful tour of the West Coast centering around Los Angeles. Oakland, Berkeley and the Seattle area, speaking at public meetings of the ISL and Socialist Youth League, Haskell began his trip through the Middle West covering the Chicago, Detroit and Cleveland areas, speak-

ing at public meetings of the ISL and on the campuses of the Universities of Chicago and Michigan.

The well-attended meetings have dealt largely with the presidential election campaign, and the position of the ISL on the national elections. They produced lively discussions everywhere.

Three stops remain on the tour. Haskell will close his trin with meetings in Philadelphia. Pittsburgh and Reading. A final meeting will take place in Newark after his return to New York.

## **Un-Americaneers in L. A.**

LOS ANGELES, Oct. 13-The House Un-American Activities Committee, conducting five days of hearings here, failed to obtain admissions from nearly a score of witnesses that they ever belonged to the Communist Party. But the probers left the impression with even the most conservative observers that in attempting to get such confessions they are more inclined to practice "un-American activites" than to investigate them.

Relying on the testimony of "friendly witnesses" who "sang" about alleged former comrades the investigators pointed the fing er without allowing cross-examination

They heaped praise on the "singers" but lashed out at the accused. They beamed at spectators who applauded committee actions, but ordered deputy marshals to eject from the fifth-floor hearing room in the Federal building those who booed their actions

All of the witnesses who had been subpenaed refused to admit or denv affiliation on constitutional grounds. Many of them fought back with a vigor that gave the probers some bad moments. A few of them attempted to reason with nise me havoc resulting from unproved accusations and the consequent character assassinations that ruin reputations and undermine prospects of future livelihood.

Dr. Milton Lester, a 33-year-old psychiatrist, threw one session of the hearing into an uproar when he began a lengthy and technical analysis of what he called the "damnable" effects of the committee's work on American minds.

He declared the committee had helped to create "fantasies and a series of symbols" which are being substituted for "reality and fact." Representative John S. Woods (Dem., Ga.), chairman, exploded and intimated he might ask "Congress to cite him for contempt.'

### NOT IN THE HEADLINES . .

In another session Dr. Alexander E. Pennes, a physician kicked out of two hospitals, tried to reason with committeeman Clyde Dovle (Calif.) He said that the committee has "destroyed" those who have refused to testify. "How are they going to feed their families when they have no jobs?" he

Woods answered, "Well, they can come here and give us the information."

demanded. "Tell me that?"

"You have taken two-thirds of my income away during the past year," the doctor continued.

The chairman told him, "You can change all that and get the twothirds back."

"No, you can take the other third before I'll become a stoolpigeon," the witness asserted.

Earlier in the hearings Attorney Robert W. Kenney, appearing for a group of lawyers who had been called before the committee, argued unsuccessfully that in attempting to question them, the probers were forcing them to violate the legal right to secrecy in client relationships.

Following the testimony of a friendly witness who had named names, another attorney, William E. Esterman leaped up and demanded that he be allowed to cross-examine the witness. Woods ordered the attorney thrown out. Three federal guards grabbed him and dragged him shouting and protesting from the room.

On the fourth day of the hearings the probers disclosed they would question some of the attorneys behind closed doors. But the announcement drew such vehement opposition from an attorney representing witnesses that the committee backed down and said all sessions would be conducted in the open.

The committee disclosed it will return here on November 17 to resume hearings. There are indications that some labor officials may get a going-over at that time.

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, socialism, minority groups, national and world politics — \$2 a year.

### leadership of the POR has also changed, passing over the period Lora, the creator of the POR-MNR alliance, probably frightened by his own work, has retired from the POR, and is publishing Trotsky's Permanent Revolution, presumably for the education of

It is characteristic of the Bo-The future of political develop-Central and the government on

