

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 21, 1952

FIVE CENTS

EISENHOWER: A SOCIAL PROFILE

... page 6

German Reparations and the Jews

... page 3

To Russia—With Both Eyes Shut

... page 8

Bolivia's Tin War with the U.S.

... page 2

U.S. Plans to Pressure Spanish Underground And European Anti-Fascists for Franco Deal

By GORDON HASKELL

New American government's plans for the support and rehabilitation of the Franco regime in Spain were revealed in a dispatch by C. L. Sulzberger which appeared in the *New York Times* for January 11. It is clear that the information contained in this dispatch can only have been obtained from the highest American sources in Paris, and that its publication at this time is planned to serve as a trial balloon to test the reaction of labor and other forces to America's policy.

The dispatch states, first, that the United States government plans to sign two agreements with Franco by March 1. Planned for signing at the same time, one agreement will cover economic aid to Franco, and the other the military program.

The former will provide for "considerably less than \$150,000,000" over a three or four year period. It would provide for work to improve the railroads and increase the mining of strategic materials, as well as for some wheat and other consumer-goods commodities. The latter will provide for air and naval bases, along the lines of the agreements mapped out earlier by the American military mission in Spain.

Although it appears that

the American government is fully determined to go ahead with these plans, they are uneasy about the repercussions such open support for Franco on a grand scale will have among the peoples of Europe.

The coming to power of the British Tories is favorable in this respect, as they are not expected to put up the kind of opposition to bolstering Franco that was shown by the Labor government.

And it will be United States long-term policy, ac-

ording to Sulzberger, to encourage "public opinion in such strongly anti-Franco lands to drop some of their grudges against the regime in Madrid."

"Grudge"?

That sentence really is worth thinking about. Now that the powers-that-be in America have decided to make Franco part of the "democratic" camp just as quickly as possible, the hatred of the people of France, and even more of Spain, for the fascist regime is talked of as a "grudge," as if what were involved were some minor irritation stemming from a past era of history.

But there is more to come, and it is equally ominous.

"One worry of the United States," writes Sulzberger, "is that the aid program may be vigorously attacked by underground Spanish opposition, which represents a powerful body of public opinion. It is hoped that as trade-union organizations

abroad become acquainted with the long-term American objectives, they may pass the word on to their connections in Spain that the program will be beneficial to the populace."

If the opposition to Franco in Spain is to change its position on American support to the hated regime, this will no doubt have to be brought about by foreign assurances that this will be "beneficial to the populace," as the underground will certainly not be able to find this out by observing internal conditions!

Besides, there have been indications that even the more conservative anti-Franco opposition forces are not fooled by the pretext of aid "beneficial to the populace." Last March, when the U. S. moved to help Franco out with wheat grants they opposed this as support to the fascist regime. On March 27, in a dispatch obviously referring to the middle-class and bourgeois opposition to



Franco ("moderate elements among the Opposition"), the *N. Y. Times* correspondent in Madrid reported that they "see the U. S. loan [to buy wheat] as support to the regime in its present condition, rather than a move to help relieve them," and that they opposed even such aid to fascism.

It is to be ardently hoped, and even more ardently advocated, that no labor organization will lend its name to this American plot to make the Franco regime "acceptable."

(Continued on page 2)

HO CHI MINH'S TERROR IN INDO-CHINA A Firsthand Account of Stalinist Murder and Reaction

By N. VAN

In August 1945 Ho Chi Minh's advent into Viet-Nam was favored by the special conjuncture of circumstances that the country faced: the absence of the French imperialist state apparatus, which had been dislodged by the Japanese troops since March 9, 1945, followed by the surrender of Japan on August 15, 1945.

At the head of his guerrilla bands from the upper regions of Tonkin, Ho Chi Minh seized power in Hanoi. He was able to impose his rule on the insurgent masses not only through his reactionary nationalist demagoguery but above all through force of arms and the assassinations of his GPU, the Ty Cong An.

While the old mandarins, bourgeois, landowners, peasants and workers were invited to participate in the Stalinist front of Viet-Minh, Ho Chi Minh asked Bao Dai to abdicate in favor of the "republic" and accept the position of supreme councilor of the "democratic" government. At the same time, his assassination committees did away with the typographical worker Luong Duc Thiep, leader of the Socialist Workers Youth, as well as Nguyen Te My and many other internationalist militants, including Tiep, Luong, Vinh, and Sam. Nguyen Te My had been the organizer of the Viet-dan-tuyen (Autonomous People's Front) in the region of Hai Duong. The teacher Tran Tien Chinh was

arrested and died following torture in the Viet-Minh prison at Bao Kan.

When Ho Chi Minh occupied Hanoi, the miners of Hon Gay Camepha (comprising 300,000 souls) rose up, formed workers' committees, and on this basis set up a real proletarian government. The workers took over the mines, tramways, railroads and telegraph, arrested the managers and the police, and smashed the whole of the former local imperialist state apparatus. The Japanese troops, who had surrendered, remained indifferent in the situation. All the organs of production were put under the direct control of a management committee elected by the workers themselves and strictly controlled by them. The principle of wage-equality on all levels of manual and intellectual work was put into effect. Armed workers acted as the police.

During its three months of existence (end of August to December 1945), this first proletarian government made it possible for mining production to proceed normally, ensured the economic life of the whole region, conducted an intensive struggle against illiteracy, and instituted a social-security system.

Isolated by the turn of events, this movement was not able to expand and shake the other workers' centers of the country.

After Ho Chi Minh had established himself in Hanoi

(Continued on page 5)

The accompanying firsthand account of the terror regime under Ho Chi Minh in the Stalinist sections of Indo-China (under his Viet-Minh government) was written by an Indo-Chinese socialist who himself participated in the revolutionary struggles in his country. N. Van is at present residing in Europe. The importance of this document need not be emphasized, in particular its evidence of the counter-revolutionary role of Stalinism—in this case, in Indo-China, but, as the author stresses, also in Southeast Asia, as in the rest of the world. We honor the martyrs of the working-class struggle who fell in the fight against both the Stalinist murder bands and Western imperialism.—Ed.

Bolivian Mine Interests Win Round In Tin War against U.S. Squeeze

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, Jan. 8—Economic conflicts and economic wars are very important in our era of monopoly capitalism, and the economic policy of the American monopolies in Europe and Latin America is a basis of action for the State Department. This is as true of the "good neighbor" policy of the U. S., which is a cover for the imperialistic penetration of Latin America, as it is of the Schuman Plan in Europe.

South America's raw materials today play a big role in the war and rearmament policies of the U. S. In the last war, rubber and mineral production in Brazil, Bolivia, Peru and Chile was also very important, and U. S.-imposed contracts with these countries regulated their low prices.

But after the war, as prices fell, the U. S. declared for a return to "free trade" practices. When the Korean war raised the prices of minerals, the American RFC stepped in to bring them down again, in spite of the official "free trade" doctrine.

The most typical case of this conflict between the "free trade" theory and the practice of imposed prices involves Bolivia's tin. Free trade raised the price of this tin to \$1.80 a pound, but tin prices fell to \$1.03 as a result of the monopolistic pressure of the RFC.

PATINO WINS

Part of the U. S. capitalist press began a campaign of lies directed against "extortion" by the Bolivian producers. The Truman-appointed president of the RFC, Symington, tried to put on the pressure. But the position of the American monopolies was more difficult than Symington had thought.

While this gentleman was able

to get the price of tin down from \$1.80 to \$1.03, the Bolivian producers refused to sell at so low a price. A tin war began between the producers in Bolivia and the U. S. capitalists.

By Bolivian producers is meant, in the first place, the powerful Patino mines, organized in a world tin monopoly, with interests not only in Bolivia but also in Malaya, and with very good connections in Great Britain. Pushed by the Patino mining interest, the Bolivian government refused to accept even the \$1.12 price of the RFC, and Bolivian diplomacy began on a course of political action all over Latin America, and also through propaganda in the U. S. press, against the RFC's dictates.

After Peron's recent victory in Argentina, Patino's position was still stronger, and U. S. strategic reserves of tin declined. The position taken by the RFC and the Washington administration became more and more difficult, and led to a meeting between Bolivian Ambassador Martinez and Truman. It is believed here that Symington's departure from the RFC had something to do with this Bolivian protest movement. It is reported now that a new price of \$1.25 has been proposed to the Bolivians.

It looks then as if Bolivia was able to win a battle against the powerful U. S. monopolies; that is, this weak little country could gain a point against the strongest capitalism in the world, in this "nice world of democracy." But in reality it is a victory for the very strong tin monopoly of Patino against the RFC, because the international situation has been favorable to the former's position. Washington urgently needs tin for its war industry and could

not wait for the eventual success of Symington's stubborn policy; and in addition there were Patino's international connections which we have already mentioned, which caused even Churchill to take up the problem of the tin business with Truman. That is in the first place.

SETBACK FOR U. S.

In the second place, the new "Keenleyside plan" for Bolivia, under UN auspices [see Dec. 31 issue], aims at "free trade" for Bolivia and the abolition of foreign trade control, that is, the further devaluation of the Bolivian currency with respect to the dollar and the raising of prices for necessities which Bolivia imports from the U. S. Thus the major portion of the tin revenue which the U. S. pays to Bolivia returns to the U. S. in payment for Bolivian imports.

The sole winner in this war is the Patino mining monopoly, because the costs of the war will be paid for by the Bolivian peoples in the form of higher prices for imported necessities and manufactured goods from the north.

But in any case, the setback for U. S. policy in Latin America shows the way for the fight of the Latin American countries. Of course, the Latin American workers—the Bolivian mine workers in particular—cannot identify their interests with those of Patino and the other international capitalist monopolies, because the struggle of the former is directed against their own native "Creole" employers as well as against foreign imperialism. The Latin American working class is the "third factor" in this fight among the capitalists, and its fight is for the complete and social liberation of the continent—For socialism.

ON THE HOME FRONT—

'Brotherly Love' Is Being Sold Short in Philadelphia

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 13—Liberal, labor and socialist forces here have a full pattern of work cut out for them in 1952 if they wish to preserve and extend civil rights and liberties and racial equality. A few recent developments illustrate the point.

An agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has approached the faculty sponsor of the Temple University Socialist Club and requested that he compile a list of "subversive" members of the club. The agent, we are glad to report, was told to go back to his office.

The American Civil Liberties Union reports that the management of Crystal swimming pool at Woodside Park appears to be willing to open next year on a non-segregated basis. This change of heart was forced, after the ACLU brought suit charging that this public pool was discriminating against dark-skinned citizens under the hoax that admission was by "club" membership cards only. Throughout the past summer the ACLU had collected evidence from many teams of observers to substantiate their claim.

Similar action is to be taken against other privately owned public pools in the area. Fellowship House, a member agency with ACLU in the Fellowship Commission, will undertake the organization of a number of interracial activities at Crystal Pool when it opens this summer in order to prevent any racial incident.

JIM CROW PRINCIPAL

A few weeks ago the state organizer of the Pennsylvania Youth Council of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was fired from his job at the Presbyterian Hospital for being a trouble-maker. On this side of Heaven it is evi-

dently Godlike to have segregated dining rooms in a church hospital and a misdemeanor for a white employee to eat at the same table with his Negro brethren. This incident certainly will not help the Presbyterian church in its drive to obtain a large colored church membership on a non-segregated basis.

A white principal of a West Philadelphia high school has blamed his colored pupils only for certain misbehaviors of members of their race. This remark has touched off a reaction headed by the Educational Equality League, the NAACP, and the ACLU against continued segregation and discrimination by the Board of Education against Negro pupils and teachers alike. Certain very objectionable rules and practices can be remedied in short order, even though at the root of much of the trouble lies the crowded and segregated housing and the obsolete and overcrowded schools.

A leader of an American Veterans Committee chapter is threatened by the American Legion for his opposition to the state loyalty oath law. A colored member of an AFL union is forced out of work by a walkout of members of a Jim Crow local of the same union. Blue Star Mothers become strangely attentive to speakers opposing universal military training.

All this on top of the Mussmanno "Communist Control" law adopted recently by the state legislature outlawing the Communist Party by name and "all other organizations" . . . whose object or purpose is to overthrow the federal or state government by force and violence.

These are the incidents that never make the headlines of the daily press but show the courage and the misery of people struggling for equality, justice and freedom for all.

Franco Deal — —

(Continued from page 1)

In this connection we would like to refer to the report submitted to the Executive Council of the American Federation last summer by Irving Brown, its European representative. (See LABOR ACTION, July 9, 1951.) In this report Brown stated that the disaffection in Spain reaches from the extreme right to the left, and even includes part of the Falange itself. He stated that the leaders of the underground were anxious to find out the intentions of the American government with respect to Franco after the Barcelona and other mass strikes and demonstrations of last year. He implied that the whole anti-Franco opposition was

opposed to American aid to the dictator, and felt that this could only play into the hands of the Russians now, and even more so in the event of a war breaking out in Europe.

It would be a really first-class disaster if the American labor movement, or the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, were to lend itself in any way to Washington's scheme. Socialists and all real democrats must exert every effort to see to it that the labor movement both here and abroad maintains its firm position against any aid to the Franco regime. This would be the greatest service we can render the hard-pressed people of Spain.

Books for Germany: Help Build Socialism!

From many parts of Western Germany we have received requests for Marxist literature IN ENGLISH. Books and pamphlets by Trotsky, Lenin, Marx, etc., are in urgent demand, but any Marxist works are needed. Almost none of this literature is available at present. All books and pamphlets contributed will be widely circulated.

Help rebuild Germany's socialist movement! Send us your unused or duplicate copies of any and all Marxist literature, or any you can spare. They will be forwarded immediately to those who will make good use of them.

Send them to: LABOR ACTION, 114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

"TRAINING FOR CITIZENSHIP"

"Military society is rigidly stratified into two closed hierarchies. The officer-enlisted-man relationship often causes status dilemmas: when a line officer has an enlisted man of civilian acquaintance under him; when an officer and enlisted man meet on social terms (I know of one case where two former buddies walked around an Army camp for three hours, as there was no place on the post where they could go together). . . ."—Characteristics of Military Society, by Howard Brotz and Everett Wilson.

THE MEDIEVAL TRADITION

"The social structure of the American army is determined by three traditions: (1) the modern American tradition of business efficiency, self-interest, individualism, democracy, and equalitarianism; (2) the medieval tradition of rigid separation of castes, of hierarchical control, of absence of accountability for the upper social strata, of regarding the privileges of the lower strata as a matter of the whim of the upper strata; and (3) the changing body of military doctrine that goes into the formal body of rules known as Army Regulations. While the Army Regulations (and subsequent orders, circulars, letters, etc.) theoretically govern the army, the basic structure of the army's organization is set by the medieval tradition. . . . Proof that the medieval tradition is pre-eminent is seen whenever there is a clash between any two of the traditions. Army officers will almost invariably violate Army Regulations and even disobey direct orders when these go against the tradition of caste. . . . Practically all officers will give up their standards of civilian efficiency—developed either in a business office, on a construction job, or in college—for the archaic way of getting things accomplished in the army way."—The Social Structure of the Army, by Arnold Rose.

BARRACKS "EDUCATION"

"The treatment of the teachers (at a preflight pilot training school) appeared . . . a calculated insult and degradation of the profession. The Cadet Center was presumably an educational institution . . . and much of the training was concerned with the acquisition of academic knowledge. Nevertheless, not only was the actual direction of policy not entrusted to anyone with experience as an educator, but also pains were apparently taken to pre-

vent teachers from working their way into any position where they might have exerted influence. . . . To the newcomer the feature of the system that ranked most was the nature of classroom inspections. The emphasis in these inspections was not on teaching but on what is known as "military discipline" and on the physical condition of the room. Some inspectors made it a practice to sight down the window shades to see whether they were drawn evenly. . . . Great emphasis was also placed on whether or not the cadets stood rigidly at attention and sandwiched enough "sirs" into their recitations. There was almost no emphasis on the ability of the students to pass examinations or on any other phase of teaching. The instructors were judged, not as teachers, but as drill sergeants. . . . Most of the instructors gradually built up a philosophy of resignation and hopelessness, taking things as they came, complaining, and watching for the opportunity to escape."—Teachers in the Army Air Forces, by Alfred R. Lindesmith.

ARMY MORALITY

"From the day a man enters the army, he learns—sometimes painfully—that he must look out for himself. Officers, of course, are in a much better position to do this than are enlisted men. With them it takes the form of the absence of moral accountability and of the suspension of rules out of respect for the status of 'gentlemen.' . . . Practically every officer knows that he can 'get around' almost any army rule if he can see the right people. He also comes to regard army property as his own: seldom did officers hesitate, when overseas, to use army vehicles and gasoline for taking out 'dates' or going sightseeing, and officers in small units regularly took clothing out of enlisted men's supply rooms when they were supposed to purchase it at reduced rates at the P-X."—The Social Structure of the Army, by Dr. Arnold Rose.

German Reparation and 'Blood-Responsibility': Israeli and Jewish Circles Adopt a Theory

By HAL DRAPER

The current uproar in Jewish circles here and in Israel over the question of German reparations to Jews offers a disturbing picture. It should at least be disturbing not only to socialists but also to genuine liberals, Jewish liberals first of all.

To get perfectly clear about it, a general comment on approach has to be made first.

The excesses and mistakes of the victims of an outrage are by no means to be equated, or even discussed on the same level, with the barbarity of the perpetrators of the outrage themselves. We have at times had to make that point in a different but somewhat similar connection: the reaction of some among the Negro people to Jim Crow brutality.

There is the white chauvinism of the white-supremacy hoodlums and racists; and there is the "black chauvinism" of some misguided (and fortunately very few) Negro elements who react by becoming anti-white, instead of looking for allies among the white enemies of Jim Crow. This is no major problem for the Negro fight today, we are glad to say, and we recall it only for the lesson it teaches.

Such "black chauvinism" has been combated energetically by the best fighters for the Negro people, and it has to be, but this fight is on an entirely different plane from the fight against Jim Crow itself. The latter is the fight against the enemy camp; the former is a struggle against mistakes in that fight by people who ought to be in our camp. But unless those mistakes are set right, the enemy will not be beaten, but will be built up to greater strength.

Just as the "black chauvinist" reaction is understandable, in view of the horrible wrongs inflicted upon the Negro people by dominant elements of the white race, so also do we understand the emotional drives behind the attitudes being expressed in Jewish circles about German reparations. But these attitudes are wrong, self-defeating, and harmful to the Jewish people, and so it is not enough merely to sympathize with their motivation.

THEORY OF RACIAL GUILT

The question arose when the West German government, assuming responsibility for repairing the crimes against the Jewish people committed by the Nazi German regime, offered to pay reparations in order to help the surviving victims. A good part of such reparations would go to Israel.

The proposal has been greeted in the most prominent Jewish circles with an outburst of anti-German hatred. No, not anti-Nazi hatred—anti-German hatred.

The article by a Jewish liberal journalist which we reprint on this page describes the anti-German tempest in the American Jewish press. Along the same lines, on January 8 the N. Y. Herald Tribune reported a speech by the vice-president of the Zionist Organization of America, Jacques Torczyner, who denounced any acceptance of such payment as on a par with taking blood-money. "We shouldn't even sit down at the same table with murderers of 6 million Jews," he said.

The Israeli government is for accepting the reparations, because the money will help solve Israel's financial problems, but its leaders and spokesmen are making doubly sure that their vituperations against the German people as a whole are somewhere near as violent as those of the Israeli fascist and semi-fascist chauvinists, whose hysteria is being whipped up by Menachem Begin of the Herut party. Prime Minister Ben-Gurion argued that reparations should be taken because "the murderer shall not keep his loot."

On both of these sides the first principle is that the German people as such, and their leaders as such, are to be considered as murderers, Nazi exterminationists and on a par with the Hitlerites. They accept Hitler's theory of racial guilt and national guilt. They merely turn it inside-out, just as the "black chauvinists" turn inside-out the racism of their oppressors. And they apply their racist theory to those who were the first victims of the Nazi criminals—the masses of the German people who fought and were conquered by Hitler, whose best elements suffered in Hitler's concentration camps and whose survivors are not being recompensed.

Such a theory is a "natural," for the Revisionists like Begin. It is, as we said, only too "understandable" on the part of others. What is disturbing is that so many Jewish liberals and socialists, who ought to know better, do not raise their voice, or, what is worse, go along with the anti-German hysteria.

A NATION OF MURDERERS?

How deep this hysteria may be seen in the following contrast:

Last year, when the socialist parties of various countries came together in Frankfurt, Germany, to re-create the Socialist International, the socialist Jewish Bund entered a protest—against the fact that the conference was being held on German soil! Behind this protest was the same kind of thinking that has burst out so virulently now.

Contrast this with even the notorious issue published by the editors of Collier's magazine on how Russia was defeated in an atomic war. We deliberately refer to this horrific production because (as we sought to show in our article on it) there have been few more blatant examples of American chauvinism. Yet, even in this product of chauvinistic thinking, we find, as the editors of the magazine envisaged it, that following Stalin's defeat and overthrow the world Olympic games are held in Moscow—as a demonstration of goodwill to the Russian people!

But is the German nation a nation of murderers, and the Russian nation is not? Were Hitler's crimes (including the numbers murdered) greater than are Stalin's? Did Hitler have that much more mass support or toleration or passive acceptance than Stalin? Or will Russia too become a nation of murderers if his mass holocausts extend to the Jews specifically as fully as they have blanketed the Russians—not to speak of the non-Russian subject nations within his empire?

It is to be hoped that this chauvinist poison will pass—not "forgiveness" for the crimes against the Jews, not "forgetfulness of the ordeal of a people, but this chauvinist poison. Let the anger and hatred of the Jewish people, and for that matter of anyone who (say) has read The Wall—turn not against the German people in an inverted racist frenzy, but against the friends and heirs of Hitlerism still of large. Let them give support and encouragement to the most intransigent enemies of Hitlerism in Germany, the Social-Democratic Party, and remain less silent about the rehabilitation of former Nazi activists by the Adenauer with the toleration and even encouragement of U. S. officials! (That is, less silent about American responsibility for this development!)

There are still fascist elements in Germany, who are worming their way back; there are such in France and other Western countries, who have not yet built their gas chambers; anti-Semitism is blooming even more strongly in the Stalinist totalitarian world. It is not a question of races or nations, but of the totalitarian forces spawned by a decaying capitalist and Stalinist world. Not forgiveness and not racism—but a socialist fight against reaction is the answer.

A Liberal Jewish View of the Issue

From the Jewish Newsletter, published by William Zukerman, Jan. 7, a liberal review "of events and opinion of Jewish interest":

The Yiddish press is at present in the throes of one of those heated and interminable debates which are so typical of it. The newspapers are literally flooded with letters from readers, long, passionate, repetitious letters in which the writers wallow in emotionalism caused by memories which are so painful that any attempt to touch them arouses deep feeling and loud outcries. The subject of the debate is the so-called German reparation to be paid to Jewish Nazi victims, their heirs and to Israel, a subject recently raised at a conference of the leading Jewish organizations called last month in New York, following Chancellor Adenauer's declaration on Germany's guilt.

Generally speaking, the writers can be divided into two groups. One is opposed to any kind of negotiations with the Germans on the ground that all Germans are murderers, criminals and beasts in human image and that it is immoral and dishonorable for any Jewish organization to have dealings of any kind with Germany now and to all eternity. Another group, while sharing the views of the first writers about the criminality and beastliness of all Germans, nevertheless believes that there is nothing immoral or dishonorable in making robbers, and murderers restore part of the loot that they robbed from the Jewish victims. The latter group consists mostly of Israelis and their representatives who want Israel to be the chief beneficiary of whatever payments or reparations that Germany would make.

One curious thing stands out in this debate: There is practically no discussion at all about the guilt of the entire German people for the crimes of the Nazis. The premise that the entire German nation is a people of murderers and criminals is accepted almost by all participants in the debate without exception. Writers of both groups vie with each other in their denunciation of the criminality of the Germans and in their expressions of hatred of everything and everyone German. The only distinction between the various disputants is that some claim that it is permissible to talk to criminals long enough to take some money from them, while others would not have even that much dealings with a nation of criminals.

Abraham and Sodom

A single exception to this rule is to be recorded. One prominent Yiddish writer, Mr. S. Charney-Niger, famous literary critic, essayist, profound scholar and a man of rare intellectual honesty and courage, has written several articles in the New York Tog in which he raises another side of the issue: Are all Germans responsible for the terrible crimes committed by the Nazis against the Jews? Is it morally right to treat the entire German people as a nation of murderers and criminals because of the atrocities that the Nazis committed? he asks, and proceeds to demolish the thesis.

Apart from the undeniable fact, that there were millions of Germans who were anti-Nazis and non-Nazis in Germany even during the Nazi regime, it is also known that there were thousands of Germans who risked their lives, and some who also gave their lives, to save Jews from the Nazi terror. The number of these people is growing from year to year and the stories of their remarkable heroism are forming the brightest spot in the darkest night of human bestiality. Are Jews, who are urged to simmer in hate in order not to forget the atrocities committed against them, to forget those other Germans and other decent non-Jewish people who helped them?

And does not this theory of group responsibility go back to tribalism? Is it possible to condemn an entire nation of nearly seventy million people for the crimes of some of its members? This is exactly what Hitler preached about the Jews. The chief tenet of his ideology was that Jews as a people are a criminal lot and must be treated as such. Are we to swallow this Hitlerian theory now that Hitler is dead and his theory has collapsed? Or is it wrong to say that Jews are a criminal people and right to hold the same view about the Germans?

Niger recalls the Biblical story of Abraham who pleaded with God not to destroy the entire city of Sodom if only ten righteous men could be found in it. Germany had more than ten thousand and ten million men and women who fought the Nazi evil as heroically as any other people, and many have risked their lives to help Jews and other innocent victims of Nazism. Are all these righteous men to be forgotten, and be classified as criminals and murderers? Does not this line of thinking follow Hitlerian theory, if not in practice? Is not this anti-Semitism in reverse?

These are serious and profound questions which rise above reparations and politics and so far, Niger is the only one who has raised them. DIARIST

DON'T MISS THE
SYL's Big Book Bazaar
 Phenomenal Bargains on Books of All Kinds!
 Note That Date: Friday Evening, FEBRUARY 1
 At Labor Action Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

N. Y. Socialist Youth League Class—Sunday Evenings at 8 p.m.
The Politics of Independent Socialism
 Remaining Sessions: NOTE CHANGES IN SCHEDULE
 January 20 DEMOCRACY AND THE NEW SOCIETY Hal Draper
 January 27 WHERE TO BEGIN Jack Maxwell
 At LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

"THE CASE OF
COMRADE TULAYEV"
 A Novel of
 Modern Russia
 \$3.00 Order from:
 LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE
 114 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

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

I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.

I want to join the ISL.

Name
Address
City Zone
State Tel.

YOU and SCIENCE

LOYALTY PURGES DISCUSSED AT AAAS

By CARL DARTON

At the recent conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Philadelphia there was a session on "National Security and Freedom of Thought." Though often presented in obscure and detached scientific terminology, the facts shed considerable light on the increasing effect of loyalty investigations on our way of life. The program was sponsored jointly by the section on Social and Economic Sciences of the AAAS and the Research Center for Human Relations of New York University.

The discussion centered around a preliminary survey of the effects of the federal security and loyalty program on government employees. Many of the observations and comments, however, were applicable to the broader aspects of security and freedom. The main speaker was Dr. Marie Jahoda of the NYU Center, the others being Harold Lasswell, Gardner Murphy and Hans Speirs.

To understand the nature and scope of the survey it is necessary for the reader to place himself in a hypothetical situation. You are a federal employee. What advice would you give a fellow worker if the latter thinks that his loyalty is being questioned because of association with a "Communist" neighbor? Would you advise him to get another job on the outside, remain in federal employment as though nothing was happening, or go to the security officials of his agency to report the threatening situation? Would you take your own advice if your own loyalty were questioned?

This is the problem that Dr. Jahoda and her associates at the NYU Center have presented to about 100 respondents, most of them in federal employ. Their replies to this problem and some allied questions constitute the basic data which the center is compiling but has not yet released.

Three case studies were reported in some detail. Case A expressed himself as "hardly affected" by the loyalty and security programs. He would advise his fellow worker to stay on the job and fight his case. He regards security measures as necessary but adds that spies are not caught by the federal programs. Anti-Communist oaths are "silly." Politically "A" is a "moderate social-democrat." Case B, a Republican, would advise his friend to go to the security officials because "it would look good." He believes that the programs are fine; "it keeps people on their toes." One should not be extreme in viewpoints or conversations, nor over inquisitive, nor ask "too many questions." He believes that the American people have great confidence in their government.

Case C is a Democrat. He advises his fellow worker to take an outside job for, even if cleared, people around you "would be anxious about themselves." He qualified his advice by saying that the victim should fight the case if he has lots of dough. He would expect no help from his supervisors. He takes certain precautions himself—does not say and do all of the things that he would like to. He believes that the loyalty program should be limited to defense agencies.

A Study of Reactions

The federal employees have adjusted themselves to the program in many ways ranging from that of "no special precautions" to "If Communists like apple pie, then I would give up eating it." Many reported that they are cautious of petitions, of reading habits, and of associating with members of organizations with a social purpose. It is taboo to talk sympathetically about Russia in any respect, about atomic energy, about religion, and about equal rights for Negroes.

Harold Lasswell, author of the recent book *National Security and Individual Freedom*, said that a more comprehensive study would be necessary to determine "the intended effects and policy consequences of the loyalty program." Speaking in an objective manner, though seemingly with tongue in cheek, he listed four apparently official objectives of the program: prevention of employment of enemy agents, restriction of flow of information to the enemy, promotion of national unity, carrying out of the program with the least sacrifice of other values.

On the other hand, he stated that additional investigation would be necessary to answer the following questions relative to the effect of the program: Has spying been made more difficult? Has blackmail been aided? Has public confidence in government been lessened? Isn't it possible that government efficiency has been impaired by loss of capable personnel, non-application and non-acceptance of the best workers? Hasn't civic participation declined due to withdrawal from activity, unwillingness to criticize, and cutting down of discussion? Other results would be the following of the conservative or "safe" course.

Hans Speirs, Social Science Director of the Rand Corporation, concerned himself mostly with comments on the technical aspects of the survey, though he indicated the data presented indicated the degree



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 3

January 21, 1952

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIKS

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

JAMAICA: THE COLONIAL DILEMMA, by Harvey O'Connor.—Monthly Review, January.

This is the first part of a study of what British imperialism has meant for one of its small colonies, in the magazine edited by Sweezy and Huberman. While Americans may not be intensely interested in Jamaica (except possibly as tourists admiring the landscape) the picture has similarities with the conditions all over the West Indies, including Washington's Puerto Rico.

In this "tropical paradise of breath-taking beauty" a people are being left to go to ruin. "Now that the Caribbean is no longer the lush profit-producer of slavery days, the British are willing to abandon the teeming islands with their insoluble problems to the natives to do with as best they can under 'self-government,' while keeping ultimate authority in their own hands so that the empire may continue to get cheap sugar, rum, and bananas." (A version of this statement would go for Puerto Rico also.)

Poverty: According to the leader of the Jamaican People's National Party, a third of the people in Kingston are starving, as well as a third of the school children all over the island. The prison system is medieval. (Two and a half years at hard labor for stealing a pair of pants.)

Education: Only half the children of school age are in regular attendance. Some schools are housed in open sheds. The secondary schools charge tuition beyond the reach of 95 per cent of the people.

Health: One doctor for every 10,000 persons. In the hills medical service is practically nonexistent. The health budget runs to only \$2 per capita.

Behind all this, of course, is the distortion and squeezing of the island's economy by 300 years of imperialist domination. "The story of agriculture is that of the Caribbean—the best land, owned by absentee corporations, is devoted to export crops such as sugar and bananas; what's left, of minor value, the small farmers and peasants may hold. . . ."

"Of sugar, the curse of the Caribbean, *Public Opinion*, the People's National Party weekly, observes: 'We part with the wherewithal we need to live, cheaply, in the hope that we may be able to buy dearly from those who have too much. A one-crop economy means hardships and poverty for the many, wealth and position for a few.'

"Sugar illustrates the economics of colonialism. The British Ministry of Food buys the entire crop for \$89.50 a ton, soft sterling, but pays Puerto Rico \$123.20 a ton in hard dollars. The differential against Jamaica's sugar amounted last year to more than \$4 million."

"British colonial policy is described by the Jamaica Manufacturers Association as designed to make it easy to export finished consumers' goods to the colony and to import raw materials. The island manufacturer often pays a higher duty on raw materials than is charged on the imported finished product. But he can expect no protection for his products from world competition.

"As in most colonial lands, the bulk of government revenues comes from duties and excises borne by the consumer. . . ."

"Idle is talk of equality when little Jamaica deals with the empire. On major trade policies, Jamaica lacks representation in London and sometimes even a voice. The prices paid for empire imports are clearly beyond her control; the prices paid for her exports, and especially for her main crop, sugar, are clearly below the world level."

On the credit side (no credit to imperialism) is the fact that the Jamaicans are better organized in a trade-union movement than other British West Indians. Political leaders look with envy on Haiti's independence, in spite of Haitian difficulties. As one PNP leader put it: "Their mistakes are their own and they are free to make them. We are not. If there is turbulence, it is their own, and not the violence visited upon them by aliens."

LONDON LETTER —

Britain's Little War in Malaya

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Jan. 10—A subject which has been hovering around the front pages of newspapers for a long time is the question of Malaya.

This country has been wracked by revolts and civil war since 1947, and an estimated 4,000 Stalinist "guerrillas" have been pinning down 150,000 police and soldiers. As far as the British government has been concerned it is their main "anti-Communist" front in the Far East.

Malaya is a country with a population of 5,100,000, of whom nearly 2,000,000 are Chinese. Together with West Africa, its exports (of tin and rubber) have

earned the greatest part of the sterling area's dollar receipts.

It is for this reason that both Labor and Conservative governments have been particularly sensitive to danger there.

If the British got out, it is of course possible that within a few weeks Chinese Stalinists would overrun the country. If they stay there, they must face the "guerrillas," and either defeat them or wipe them out.

Though it is true to say that a handover of government followed by withdrawal would diminish the effectiveness of the Stalinists propaganda, this would take a long time to be efficacious. The Chinese Stalinists pay and

morally support the guerrillas, who are practically all of the Chinese minority. About half a million of these are squatters on land for which they pay no rent, and the government's attempts to make them do so have produced in them a very favorable attitude toward the Stalinists.

The British administration has come to the conclusion that resettlement of these people is necessary. They are prepared to give the Malaysians a few crumbs; as it is Malaya has one of the highest standards of living of the Far East.

But the British imperialists are not prepared to accede any political power, as yet, knowing as they do that it is one of the first steps to their own expulsion from the country. Thus they have strained the friendship of Dato Onn, head of the independence for Malaya Party, who has been trying to be a bridge between the extreme Right local government and his own social-democratic views.

In the foreseeable future, however, more power must be given to the Malaysians, although the government knows that this is just another tile falling out of the mosaic of British 19th century imperialism. The Malayan people want national freedom, and Britain stands in the way. That is the source of Stalinism's appeal.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from the New American Library, publishers of Signet and Mentor pocket books, published Jan. 30:

THE PRINCE, by Niccolò Machiavelli. A Mentor book, 144 pages, 35 cents.

THE DELICATE PREY, and Other Stories, by Paul Bowles. A Signet book, 192 pages, 25 cents.

PLACE CALLED ESTHERVILLE, by Erskine Caldwell. A Signet book, 192 pages, 25 cents.

MISSION: INTERPLANETARY, by A. E. von Vogt. A Signet book, 176 pages, 25 cents.

Ho Chi Minh's Terror —

(Continued from page 1)

and assassinated the revolutionary proletarians of the city, he sent his armed bands from the Delta (led by Nguyen Binh, the future commander in chief of the Cochinchina guerrillas) to encircle the revolutionary mine district and demand that the workers' government dissolve. The workers' militia had only a few rifles and small arms. A compromise was made; Nguyen Binh's troops penetrated into the district, promising to respect the status quo.

Then, by sly police maneuvers, the militants S., Lan, Bien, Hien, Le and others, elected by the workers, were ousted and put under arrest and taken to Hai Phong; some were released when the miners threatened to boil over. Finally, the whole region was occupied and put under the military and police control of Ho Chi Minh's government.

In Cochinchina (South Viet-Nam), on September 14, 1945 this same Viet-Nam government arrested the popular revolutionary committee at 9 Rue Duclos, which had been formed under the inspiration of the League of Internationalist Communists. This embryonic soviet had spread through the region of Saigon-Cholon, Gia Dinh and Bien Hoa. It had put forward slogans for the arming of the people (forbidden by the headquarters of General Gracey of the English occupation troops as well as by the Stalinist clique Tran Van Giau at the head of the Viet-Minh government), for the expropriation of the landowners and the seizure of the land by the peasants, and for the occupation of the factories by the workers. The minister of the interior, the Stalinist Nguyen Van Tao, sent his soldiers to cool off the peasants of Go Don with machine-gun fire—they had under their own steam expropriated the landowners, as had also the peasants of the Plaine des Jones.

From Assassinations to Frameups

Since Ho Chi Minh and his myrmidons had proclaimed themselves supporters of the "democratic Allies (the Russo-Anglo-American imperialists) against Japanese fascism," while the popular revolutionary committee called the masses to an armed uprising against all the imperialisms (democratic or fascist), Tran Van Giau sent his police (the same gang of cops who up to yesterday had been in the service of French, and then Japanese, imperialism) to dissolve the committee, and the militants were locked up in the central prison of Saigon to be shot.

The English troops—just before welcomed by the Viet-Minh government with cries of "Hurrah for the Allied forces!"—helped the French to reoccupy Saigon. Tran Van Giau and his band fled to Cho Dem, leaving the revolutionists in the hands of the French police and intelligence service. At the same time, unlike the flight of these runaways, the popular insurrection broke out against the French-English troops during the night of September 23.

In their flight, the Viet-Minh GPU continued to hunt down the worker-revolutionists on its blacklist. The leaders of the Workers Party of Viet-Nam (whose leader Ta Thy Thau was assassinated in September 1945 at Quang Ngai, by personal order of Ho Chi Minh), including Tran Van Thach, Nguyen Van So, Nguyen Van Tien, and many other workers, were massacred on October 23, 1945 at Kien An (Thu Dau Mot); Phan Van Hum and Phan Van Chanh ("disappeared") somewhere in the maquis in the north of Cochinchina. Le Ngoc and Nguyen Van Dy, members of the League of Internationalist Communists, were tortured to death by the Viet-Minh GPU in the region of Hoc Mon, at the beginning of 1946.

Thus the period of pure-and-simple assassination, the period of the "execution of the traitors," came to an end, and there opened the period of the "Moscow trials."

Having escaped from Ho Chi Minh's GPU in 1945, Nguyen Van Linh (known as René) and Truong Khanh Thinh, two worker-militants from Saigon, fell into a Viet-Minh trap in May 1950. Nguyen Van Linh had participated in the European working-class movement since 1930, as a militant in the circles of the Left Opposition in France. In Indo-China from the beginning of the war, he was a member of the League of Internationalist Communists at the time of the Saigon insurrection of September 1945. He had been one of the organizers of the workers' militia of the tramway workers of Go Vap (whose leader Tran Dinh Minh, known as Nguyen Hai Au, had met his death in a battle against the French troops on the Cao Oanh front.)

Arrested by the Viet-Minh GPU in 1946, he had escaped from Soctrang and returned to Saigon. The preceding year he had been invited by the Bien Hoa maquis fighters to come to discuss a proposal for a so-called "united front"; through treachery Nguyen Van Linh and two other comrades were arrested.

His wife, who had gone to look for him, was in turn held by the GPU. She was hung up by her feet and hoisted to the beams; then they made knife cuts in her limbs, in

This article by N. Van is translated from the French. Spellings of names and places have been retained as in the original.—Ed.

these cuts inserted cotton wicks soaked in oil, and lit them, in order to force her husband to sign a so-called statement.

According to this statement Nguyen Van Linh would be "confessing" to be an agent for the French "Second Bureau," and to have taken 30,000 piastres from Bazin, the security commissioner, to fight against the "Resistance." His wife, separately held, saw him but scarcely recognized him: he was now on more than a human tatter. There is no use dwelling on the fate which is in store for him, if indeed he has not already been shot. The other two comrades had already been killed.

Nguyen Van Linh's wife succeeded in escaping from her torturers in the midst of a battle between the latter and French troops.

In methods of torture and massacre Ho Chi Minh and his GPU are on an equal footing with Bao Dai's regime and the French expeditionary corps. The sole victims are the oppressed and exploited vanguard and their revolutionary vanguard elements.

While the American imperialist bloc, along with Mao Tse-tung, bathes Korea in blood and fire and makes intensive preparations for the total destruction of humanity with its A-bombs and H-bombs—Russian imperialism, through its assassins in all the corners of the world, in China, in Central Europe and in the Southeast Asian maquis, by inquisitorial methods which put all the medieval Torquemadas in the shade, proceeds to the total annihilation of all remaining class-conscious elements who are faithful to the world proletarian revolution, to the general movement of human liberation.

The case of Viet-Nam demonstrates that the Stalinists of the Asian maquis are the equal of their masters in Moscow in their monstrous crimes against the revolutionary working class.

The class-conscious workers of all countries must keep that in mind.

Joe Louis Picks a Fight

By PHILIP COBEN

Joe Louis' current fight has got us rooting for him again, just as he announces that he isn't going to fight any more. He meant—in the ring. Maybe yes and maybe no, but he's sure starting a fight in San Diego.

The best of it is, to our way of thinking, that he went looking for it. We think that's worth an extra word, even though LABOR ACTION doesn't run a sports section.

Briefly, it's this way: the sponsors of the San Diego Open Golf Tournament invited Louis, as an amateur, to participate. They also have a contract with the Professional Golfers Association for the tournament. On January 12 they learned from the head of the PGA, Horton Smith, that Louis could not be in because of the Jim Crow rules of the association.

The ex-champ immediately denounced the PGA's rule as "un-American" and tagged Smith "another Hitler." It was the first time, he said, that he personally had run into race discrimination in sports. At one point, if the lily-white ban went through, he offered to personally give the tournament committee double their expected take to call it off, as a demonstration to the PGA that there shouldn't be any color line on the green. Golf was the last sport with a color line, he said.

So even before the tourney opens, Joe has hit a long hard one right down the fairway; and at this writing Horton Smith (who "believes in the white race like Hitler believed in the super-race," says Louis) is chasing the ball all over the sand traps. "I do not know the exact situation . . ." says Smith, hiding behind a bunker.

But what we started to say was that Louis went looking for this fight. He told the press that he had long been aware of the PGA ruling, that "it's been causing Negro players trouble for three years," and that he had come to San Diego intending to "bring it into the open." And he brought it out in the San Diego Open, for certain.

The reason we think this is worth an extra cheer is that, according to some "friends of the Negro people," Negroes are supposed to buck discrimination, sure, but only if they blunder into it by accident. But never never never are they supposed to "make trouble."

We're thinking specifically of some of the repercussions of the Josephine Baker-Stork Club affair. Now in this case, to be sure, it is perfectly true that Baker ran into Jim Crow Billingsley unawares. To her credit she didn't take it lying down. Then the inoffensive Walter Winchell opened up his mud-howitz campaign to defend his pal Billingsley's snob-emporium. Among his rabbit-punches was the one charging that Baker had gone into the Stork Club looking for trouble. That's bad. Negroes should know where they're not wanted. Etc.

Well, the PGA doesn't want Joe Louis (and two other Negro golfers from Los Angeles) but Louis is in there with his niblick to open the sport up for others of his race.

Now personally we don't see why anyone wants to hit a defenseless ball around countryside that would look better with a forest growing on it [LABOR ACTION formally dissociates itself from this position.—Ed.] but as Jimmy Cannon of the N. Y. Post put it, speaking of PGA Jim Crow:

"It's no lynching and they're not blowing up a guy's house and murdering him. But it's just as bad and maybe worse, because mobs and degenerates commit crimes like that and they got to be crazy. But these guys are supposed to be sportsmen and they sat down and deliberately made this law and argued about it and put it through and had attorneys around to advise them."

DON'T MISS A SINGLE ISSUE OF LABOR ACTION!
SUBSCRIPTION FOR ONE YEAR IS ONLY \$2.00

Eisenhower: A Portrait in Brass

Events Leading Up to a Candidate—A Social Profile

Now that General Eisenhower looms large as a presidential candidate, and speculation is rife about his ideas and opinions, it is timely to present to LABOR ACTION readers what we think is the best social portrait of the general yet published. It appeared in the New Internationalist for March 1949 as "Eisenhower: Portrait in Brass," by James M. Fenwick. It makes even more interesting reading now.

Omitted are the sections dealing specifically with Eisenhower as a military figure. "Eisenhower and Columbia University" will be the subject of an article next week by Fenwick, comprising the passage on this subject published in the NI plus a longer section which was not published at that time.—Ed.

By JAMES M. FENWICK

In our secular age it is not often that we are given the opportunity to observe the birth, growth and nurturing of a god. In the career of Eisenhower, however, we are witness to just such a phenomenon. The legend began seven years ago and has steadily grown.

It has survived even the publication of his collected speeches and the circulation of over a half million copies of *Crusade in Europe*.

The quantity of literature in the United States critical of Eisenhower is extraordinarily small. Only Ralph Ingersoll has dared raise a really profane voice. But his *Top Secret* is a book based on the provincial thesis that the United States was and is the innocent victim of British diplomacy. It is a concept which necessarily vitiates his evaluation of Eisenhower.

A critical appraisal of this public figure has been long overdue.

Five-Star Executive

Contrary to popular opinion, Eisenhower's main contribution in World War II was not in the military field. Though his military intervention in the European campaigns was constant, it was circumscribed.

Strategic aims were set by the American and British governmental heads in conjunction with the combined chiefs of staff. Tactical problems were resolved by the combined chiefs of staff and lower echelons. Almost all important steps—and many trifling ones—were taken by Eisenhower in consultation with the combined chiefs of staff, to whom he frequently referred as "my bosses."

Only a very few pressing decisions were made by Eisenhower alone: one was the decision to postpone D-Day for the Normandy assault; another concerned the exploitation of the Remagen bridgehead. There were few others. None required a high order of genius.

The English press was correct (if a bit . . . unsporting) in referring to Eisenhower as "the chairman of the board." In an age of total industrial mobilization, mass armies, world fronts, and unprecedentedly massive coalitions, battles can no longer be directed by one man from a carriage pulled up on commanding ground. Modern war is a corporate effort.

"The atmosphere in his quarters," says Kay Summersby in *My Boss Eisenhower*, "was that of a business executive, not a five-star general." That catches it.

His primary role was that of a top-level spot coordinator of the Allied forces in Western Europe. He was a mediator, not a messianic personality. As was the case in military matters, all important political and social policies were worked out on the governmental level. The basic decisions were made at multinational conferences such as took place at Casablanca or Yalta. Other decisions were made by Roosevelt, the State Department, the Treasury Department, and even, on occasion, Congress itself.

Eisenhower did not initiate policy. He lubricated the Allied machinery when friction developed, or threatened to develop, in actualizing these plans.

He absorbed the Churchill pressure for further diversions in the Mediterranean after cross-channel commitments had already been made—and also mollified English and United States Red Cross girls who were squabbling over uniforms. He mediated British inter-service feuds—and also answered crank letters from empire patriots. He worked at getting arms away from the Belgian Forces of the Interior—and also took an honorary degree from the University of Louvain. He overruled air-force opposition, ordering United States strategic bombing units to be used tactically—and also decided how captured liquor should be divided between officers and enlisted men. He took special measures to secure more landing craft from United States shipyards—and also worked to get more home-front publicity for his generals.

Eisenhower was perfectly cognizant of what was expected of him. He was deliberately picked out by Chief of Staff Marshall—who was himself a type similar to Eisenhower—over the heads of many senior officers whose nicknames themselves suggest their incapacity for this particular job: Ben (Yoo-Hoo!) Lear, J. C. H. (Jesus Christ Himself) Lee, George S. Patton Jr. (Old Blood and Guts).

It must be admitted that Eisenhower turned in a first-rate performance. His work was no small factor in achieving the Allied cooperation which was so strikingly genuine, especially when compared with the jungle law which governed inter-Axis relations and relations within the German army itself.

That Eisenhower was able to achieve this was due to a happy conjunction of personal qualities which are uncommon enough in civilian life—and so rare in the military one as normally to be construed as a weakness by the professional army officer. Eisenhower's social pres-

ence is composed of the following: modesty, courtesy, sociability, democratic behavior, tactfulness, a trim figure, and a photogenic smile. Charm.

This is backed up by an alert but not profound mind, a good memory, self-confidence, a variegated peacetime military experience at home and abroad, a very competent understanding of his trade, and an ability to speak coherently—this latter in an occupation where speaking ability can normally be registered in decibels only.

On the organizational plane he possesses four prime requisites: the ability to choose able associates, delegate responsibility, back up subordinates, and act decisively. . . .

For the Political Record

Where does Eisenhower stand politically? Like most professional soldiers, Eisenhower has an aversion for politics, which is regarded as a disturbing element in the classic unrolling of military operations. In Eisenhower's case this aversion is compounded by the traditional American lack of feel for international diplomacy.

Throughout the war Eisenhower merely followed the State Department line. This was true even in North Africa, where Roosevelt urbanely and publicly placed the responsibility for the Darlan deal on Eisenhower. This is not to say that Eisenhower disagreed with the pro-Vichy policy. He did, in fact, agree with it, basing himself on the practical grounds (which in the end proved not so practical) of military expediency.

He had no specific ideas of his own—just a conservative military bias so ingrained that he simply could not even understand the point of view of the liberal opposition to the North Africa policy. ("The liberals crucified me in North Africa.") It was many a month before he could establish even reasonable working relations with De Gaulle and the Committee of National Liberation which represented the French resistance movement.

Nor is there any evidence in Harry C. Butcher's semi-official diary *My Three Years with Eisenhower* that until the outraged roar from the United States reached Africa Eisenhower was at all sensitive to the existence of the Vichy concentration camps maintained in Africa and to the operative anti-Semitic laws. As it was, not until five months after the African invasion were the infamous Nuremberg laws repealed!

Butcher reveals the atmosphere at SHAEF at that time: "In England we were harassed on the Negro question by liberty-loving provocateurs. In Africa we, apparently, are supposed by these same gentlemen to have a general election of Arabs, Jews and French to elect a congress and president, and then go on with the war."

In Italy, likewise, Eisenhower betrayed no democratic tremors in dealing with the Fascist general Badoglio (the Duke of Addis Ababa!) and the House of Savoy, which had propped up the shaky Mussolini regime over the years.

Politically, Eisenhower is simply a primitive. He led a hand-to-mouth existence, depending for sustenance on the Allied policy of any given time. He foresaw nothing. To the politically sophisticated Churchill, who insisted that the Anglo-American forces drive on to Berlin, Eisenhower stubbornly replied that it was not militarily necessary. He could not appreciate the political implications motivating Churchill's proposals.

His opposition to the army's running of military governments was not based upon democratic principles but upon military exclusiveness and contempt for civilian activities. His analysis of the Russian problem—after he finally got around to seeing one—went no deeper than thinking that everything would turn out all right if the Russians and Americans could sit down and talk things over.

Eisenhower has not committed himself on any non-military domestic issue, a fact of symptomatic importance. But it is not difficult to deduce the conservative nature of his politics.

Here we have to speak of an orientation, for it is doubtful if Eisenhower has ever formulated a concrete political program. His typically mealy-mouthed statement on Roosevelt in *Crusade in Europe* affords a clue: "With some of Mr. Roosevelt's political acts I could never possibly agree. But I knew him solely in his capacity as a leader of a nation at war—and in that capacity he seemed to me to fulfill all that could possibly be expected of him." The deprecatory counterposition of the New Deal president to the war president is obvious.

[This judgment has been fully confirmed by Eisenhower's few statements on political and social questions since this article was written; see last week's issue.—Ed.]

His whole life has been within one of the most conservative milieus in society—that of the regular army. And Patton, the authoritarian prototype, was one of his best friends in that army. That Eisenhower is considered "safe" by business has been demonstrated by his post-war career. To become president of Columbia University he had to pass inspection by a board of trustees whose Republican conservatism is irreproachable.

Eisenhower's own economic position is not calculated to make him a subverter of society. His salary as president of Columbia is reported to be around \$25,000 a year; his army pension is \$15,000. The sum paid Eisenhower for *Crusade in Europe* has been rumored to be somewhere between \$100,000 and a million dollars.

His handling of the publication deal indicates a real flair for survival in a chancy civilian world. According to the *New Yorker*, "The manuscript was finished on March 24th and sold to Doubleday early this month [October

1948]. . . . The reason for the hiatus, and for the outright sale rather than the usual royalties deal, was a ruling by the IRS that a twenty-five per cent capital-gains tax on the transaction, instead of being subject to the graduated income-tax people that in this way Eisenhower would pay only in the case of so-called capital assets held at least six months, and apparently writers can get in under it when they are non-professionals."

It is difficult not to believe the rumor that places him in the Republican Party. There is, however, more explicit evidence.

On the basis of conversations with Eisenhower in Europe in 1945, Harry Hopkins stated that Eisenhower "and his family had voted against Roosevelt every time up until 1944; but that he did vote Roosevelt this last time." Robert Sherwood, Hopkins' biographer, states in *Roosevelt and Hopkins*: "Eisenhower once told me (it was in London in March 1944) that his family had always been Kansas Republicans but that he himself had never voted in his life. He felt that since an army officer must serve his government with full loyalty and devotion regardless of its political coloration, he should avoid all considerations of political partisanship."

Sherwood's view, which coincides more closely with Eisenhower's expressed attitude toward politics than does the Hopkins statement, is in any event not in direct opposition to it, since the general Republican atmosphere is accepted in both cases.

[On becoming a candidate for the Republican nomination, Eisenhower has now revealed that he voted for Dewey in 1948 and has been a Republican right along.—Ed.]

That several labor leaders panted after Eisenhower is a measure not of Eisenhower's pro-labor sentiments but of the desperation induced by their self-confinement in the two-party system.

Army-Type Democrat

"As late as the summer of 1944," notes his biographer Kenneth S. Davis in *Soldier of Democracy*, "he said repeatedly in private conversation: 'The liberals crucified me in North Africa. All this talk about my "betraying the common people"—it's absurd. I am a common man myself, more so than most of those people who are always talking about the "proletariat." I've worked with my hands at about every kind of job there is.'"

But Eisenhower is hardly a "common man." His whole life from the age of twenty-one has been spent in the army. For two years prior to that he worked full time in a creamery, not "at about every kind of job there is." He was never a member of a labor union. He has never made an explicit statement of any sort which might be construed as indicating sympathy for organized labor. In his talk to the CIO convention in 1946 he stressed "cooperation," his post-war stock in trade.

Fundamentally, this field, like so many others, is alien ground for Eisenhower. "During the war period when I drove the general and worked in his office," Summersby notes, "I never once heard him discuss such questions as racial segregation, capital vs. labor, international politics, or any other of the usual signposts to political conviction. He was too busy directing the war . . . to put a conversational toe into such dangerous waters."

But Eisenhower has been portrayed as a democratic military type. Isn't he?

His democratic attitudes are genuine. On the personal plane they probably derive from Mennonite forebears, Kansas equalitarianism, and personal inclination—nurtured in the socializing climate of a large, working-class family. On the national plane they reflect the traditional democracy of American life, the absence of a feudal military tradition, and the disciplinary latitude which a tremendous industrial potential permits.

But this democratic spirit of Eisenhower's is limited. It is, after all, synchronized with army norms.

He can visit his enlisted-man driver when he is hospitalized—and also rake his "naval aide" Butcher over the coals for eating with the same driver. He can intervene to retain Mauldin's cartoons and the B-Bag (letters to the editor) in the army daily *Stars and Stripes*—and also keep the Patton slapping incident out of the press. He can order supply troops out of Paris—and also take a vacation on the Riviera himself during the final phases of the battle for the Rhine. He can order priorities on supplies for front-line troops—and also maintain a private armored train, complete when en route with billiard table, record player, movie screen and projector, portable generator, jeeps, several dogs, a cat, two cows, and a large entourage including a tailor and a driver used also, on occasion, for retrieving golf balls. He can, without revulsion, have champagne with his meals and dine on oysters sent by air from the United States.

On the Negro question—a real democratic touchstone—Eisenhower is Jim Crow. His typical, ambiguously formulated position is caught by Butcher in a diary entry dated July 14, 1942, describing an early press conference which took up the question of policy toward Negro troops in England: ". . . he told them his policy for handling colored troops would be absolute equality of treatment, but there would be segregation where facilities afforded. The colored troops are to have everything as good as the white." Neither during the war itself nor after did Eisenhower evince even a desire to abrogate the Jim Crow system in the army.

His democratic role (carefully photographed and recorded in all its phases) served as a front for the benefit of the people back home. In the European Theater of Operations his example—such as it was—was not catching.

(Continued from page 7)

To Russia: Both Eyes Shut

(Continued from last page, STUDENT SOCIALIST)

comes completely indifferent the minute he steps across the Russian border? How is it that this zeal for social justice which inspires his indignation about American injustices does not motivate him to examine allegations of far greater human injustice within Russia?

Charges of slave labor against the Stalinist regime he ignores. Why is he not concerned enough to ask the Russian government about these charges? If they were untrue they could easily be disproved. But, as the years go by, more and more evidence piles up which points toward only one conclusion—that the Stalinist regime has created the most dehumanizing, brutal system of forced labor the world has ever known. Repeated demands on the part of the American and European labor movements, European intellectuals, and even the very timid UN, for a mixed commission to visit the alleged locales of such camps have met with repeated slanders and rebuffs on the part of the Russian government.

EDUCATION AND STRATIFICATION

Kimmel's tales about Russian education unfortunately tell only half the story. He neglects to point out how the privileges of education serve to reinforce the tremendous inequality of the rigidly stratified Russian society.

On the one hand exists a bureaucracy of a few million who enjoy all the privileges which the mass of the Russian people, on the other hand, have little or no access to. This stratification is best indicated by the wage differentials which are far greater than even in capitalist society. The salaries of administrative personnel, top engineers, and the like are often over 100 times those of the worker; and this differential, instead of becoming less marked, has steadily grown greater. In the army the private's pay to the colonel's is in the ratio of 1:240 compared to the ratio in the American army of 1:5 (*The Economist*, July 3, 1943).

Furthermore inheritance, the traditional means of passing inequality on from generation to generation—which had been abolished by the Bolsheviks—has been reintroduced (Soviet Constitution, 1936, Article 10). Thus the Stalinist bureaucrat can anticipate with some security that as long as he remains in good graces his privileges can be passed on to his heirs.

But what of the upward mobility of the worker's son and daughter? Since education is the ladder by which the young worker can climb into the bureaucracy, it is interesting to note that the guarantees of education for children of the lower classes have long since been abolished. For 14 years no figures have been published concerning the percentage of working-class children enjoying higher education and the last released figures showed a sharp downward trend (*Management in Russian Industry and Agriculture*).

Kimmel's pride over the number of scholarships for the students at Moscow University becomes particularly ludicrous in light of the fact that since 1940 tuition has been charged in all secondary schools! Russian law further provides that there shall be four years' compulsory labor service for all students leaving secondary school (decree of Oct. 2, 1940).

The result of all this is exactly what one would expect: close to a million children whose parents cannot afford the tuition are conscripted annually without ever having the chance to finish secondary and qualify for a university education (Inkeles, *Stratification and Mobility in the Soviet Union*, cited by Lewis Coser in the current *Annals and Student Partisan*.) It is only the sons and daughters of the relatively well-off who complete secondary school. Thus those who do not need scholarships are the only ones who can qualify for them.

CULTURE IN UNIFORM

Much more can be said of Russian education which would give further indication of the inequality and class nature of the Russian regime. Since our space is limited, suffice it to say that the liberating qualities and the idealism which characterizes experimentation in progressive education, which once existed in Russia, are long since gone. Coeducation has been abolished above the age of 12, strict discipline has been introduced, preparation for military training permeates the whole school system, and the possibility for a worker's son to climb into the bureaucracy are not very great.

The type of philosophy that guides the Russian school system is indicated by the following statements:

"Practical experience of the best teachers long ago refuted all the talk that compulsion or punishment were harmful. Reasonable severity is more effective than persuasion."

"Persuasion . . . only hinders the training of disciplined people . . . the corrupting and nihilistic influences of schools which pay insufficient attention to the training of the patriotic spirit. . . ." (*Pravda*, Aug. 2, 1943).

"The Headmaster is the sole master of the school. . . the teacher shall not be afraid to give orders to the pupils and where necessary punish them." (Minister for Education Potemkin at the All-Russian Educational Conference, August 1943, quoted in *Uchitel'skaya Gazeta*, Aug. 7, 1943.)

Kimmel would probably be very upset if some American branch library destroyed one of the pamphlets of Eugene Dennis or if some American university removed the *Communist Manifesto* from a suggested reading list. Yet he can marvel over the immensity of Moscow's Lenin Library without uttering one word of protest or indignation over the fact that within the walls of that library hundreds of crimes have been committed against history and a free intellectual life. Nowhere any longer in the Lenin Library could Kimmel find the works of many of the Marxist founders of the Russian state—Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev, etc. Even much of Lenin has been hidden. Nor for that matter could he find the works of leading Western intellectuals who were once hailed in Russia and whose works were extensively published there at one time—André Gide, John Dewey, Sigmund Freud, and many others.

Anything that Kimmel may say regarding intellectual life in Russia means little when we realize that standards and tastes in music and art, in biology and literature, can be and have been changed from day to day by a single order from the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Kimmel mentions that "Soviet musicians and com-

posers were the main participants in recent music criticism." He neglects to point out that their "participation" was limited to breast-beating, confessions of their past sins, and promises to behave better in the future.

One final word on Kimmel's journey. In his first article Kimmel states that he went to Germany as an American and as a Jew. It is therefore not at all surprising that he should concern himself with the Jewish problem in Eastern Germany. But once again his faculties fail him when he reaches Russia, for there is not one word from him about the vigorous anti-Semitic activities of the Russian government in the years since the end of World War II.

Not a word from Kimmel about the summary suppression of the Yiddish language press, the dissolution without explanation of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee which was the only Jewish organization in Russia, the arrest of the leaders of that organization, and the sudden arrest of the six leading Yiddish writers, Pfeffer, Markish, Mistor, Halkin, Broderzon, and Bergelson, with the accusation that they had "aligned themselves with the Wall Street magnates" (*Morning Freiheit*, June 2, 1949).

Nor is there any comment about the vicious campaign of the Russian press using the age-old jargon of the notoriously anti-Semitic pan-Slav movement: "rootless," "homeless," "alien," "traitors," to characterize the "cosmopolitans" with obvious Jewish names. And isn't it odd that the secretary of the Byelo-Russian Communist Party should say, "Only one theatre in the Byelo-Russian Republic—a Jewish one—put on an unpatriotic play in which life in America is praised" (Feb. 17, 1949, quoted by S. Schwartz in *Commentary* for June 1949, "The New Anti-Semitism of the Soviet Union.")

Investigate this growing anti-Semitism? Heavens no! Kimmel prefers to repeat pious phrases about peace and freedom and warmly shake hands with a rabbi in a Moscow synagogue who is about as free to protest this deplorable situation as a man bound and gagged on the gallows.

The shallowness and dishonesty of Kimmel's articles is really insulting to the intelligence of the students at the University of Chicago. But for a person with his political position a thorough, critical, and honest approach seems to be impossible. For all his posing as an honest reporter, his purpose, only thinly disguised, is actually to defend the barbarous regime that exists today in Russia. And in spite of Kimmel's demagogic about peace and brotherhood, the fact still remains that Russia is a vast imperialist power whose imperialist policies, together with those of the United States, are leading the world toward a catastrophe the immensity of which no one can predict.

As socialists, we believe that the only hope for the oppressed peoples of the world is to reject both war camps, Russian and American, and to band together in a fight for socialism, democracy, and a peace based on justice and equality instead of a peace based on an imperialist deal between two gigantic powers seeking to exploit the rest of the world.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE
University of Chicago

Readers Take the Floor . . .

ON BURMA

To the Editor:

I wish to comment on Comrade Alexander's article on Burma which appeared in LABOR ACTION on Nov. 26, 1951. Comrade Magnus recently wrote in a letter in which he denounced Comrade Alexander for giving apparent support to what he termed the "socialist government of Burma," a government which admittedly put down the various peasant uprisings with foreign aid. The editor replied to Magnus by saying that his remarks were scant and that his remarks or assumptions that the Burmese government really represents the national bourgeoisie (as say, the Nehru government in India) has not yet been proven.

I do not have any new or secret information about the Burmese political line-up, but I do know enough about the economy and social conditions obtaining in Burma to be able to make a class analysis of the situation. The British never industrialized Burma, for one thing. They exploited the country primarily by underpaying peasants for their products and by creating estates for the production of teakwood and rubber. Burma has not, and never has had, a "middle class." Foreign moneylenders, such as the Chi-

nese and the Indian chettyar, ruthlessly exploit the peasant. The native bourgeois elements thus have always existed on a very narrow base (as in Indonesia). It was this handful of Burmese bourgeois intellectuals who were educated in British schools and helped govern under the British that took over Burma after the British got out.

Regardless of the various political hues of the peasant movements (Stalinist, Trotskyist, Separatist) one thing is clear: they all represent, in one way or another, the strivings of the people for national independence, for freedom from foreign exploitation. Although Burma gained formal political independence from Britain after World War II, the social conditions prevailing in the country remained virtually the same. The peasants revolted against their government because it did nothing to improve their lot, and because it appeared to them as the preserver of the interests of foreign imperialism. Is it small wonder, then, that the British and American imperialists helped the "socialist" government of Burma to put down the insurgent peasants? The "socialist" government of Burma is not based on Burmese trade unions (there are none), and is not supported by the Burmese workers. The Burmese government is a bourgeois government—a miserable lackey of imperialism. For anyone who calls himself a Trotskyist, there should be no argument on this point.

William STANLEY

You're Invited

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

A Note on the Zagreb Conference

Our attention has been called from Europe to the article in LABOR ACTION (Nov. 12, last) on the October "Conference for Peace and International Cooperation" held in Zagreb, Yugoslavia. The article is severely criticized for what is regarded as the distorted and unfair picture it gives of the conference and the narrow-minded approach it takes to the event as a whole.

Upon rereading the article in the light of more detailed information about the conference that has since become available, some corrections are required, and also a comment on the criticism.

The article suggested, referring to a statement by the *New Leader* that the idea of the conference was "projected here," that the State Department had a finger in the conference's preparation. While Washington was not unaware of the conference, it seems quite clear that the entire responsibility for initiating and directing the conference belongs to the Tito regime, which is concerned exclusively with protecting its own interests and with the interests of American imperialism only insofar as they serve its own. Accordingly, the Titoists are concerned, in conferences such as these, with mobilizing the largest possible movement of friendship for itself, and for Washington only insofar as it feels the need for its support in the present world situation. It is a fact, however, that the Titoists' line in foreign policy, and their line at the Zagreb conference, is to whitewash the Western camp in the cold-war.

A disparaging reference to the composition of the delegations to the conference was unwarranted. Whatever disagreements we may have with the views of most of the delegates, we do not in the least wish to deny their sincerity and, what is more important, the earnestness of their desire to find a road to real peace and democracy, and not to act as apologists for Stalinist or American imperialism. It is with such men and women, among others, that we ourselves seek a means of friendly discussion looking toward friendly cooperation toward a common objective.

That being said, we must nonetheless add that we find no ground for altering our general appraisal of the Zagreb conference as a failure, and even worse. That so many persons deeply devoted to the goal of peace should gather together from many countries to exchange views is a good thing. But this good was limited and even negated by what the conference did and by what it failed to do.

It was silent on the exclusion from the conference of the revolutionary socialist POUM of Spain, even though the POUM while critical of Titoism is not hostile toward it. It was silent on the totalitarian regime of its hosts and sponsors, and this silence became an outrage to decency when most of the delegates voted, with the Titoists, for a statement of principles which demanded "human rights and fundamental individual freedoms" without a word about the cold denial of these rights and freedoms in the coun-

try where the voting occurred.

It was silent on the concrete, continuing assault on peace, democracy and national sovereignty which is being conducted by both war camps in Korea at this very moment. From all the reports we have read, Korea did not figure in the conference's decisions. The conference's muteness about a real, if small, war nullifies, in our view 95 per cent of its claim to constituting a peace movement worthy of the name, and entitles everyone to the greatest reserve toward its position with regard to the real big war. It also confirms our view that to think of launching and building a genuinely democratic movement for peace under the auspices of a totalitarian regime whose "delicate" political position must always "be taken into consideration" is absurd, futile, and, at best, a waste of good intentions.—Ed.

EISENHOWER —

(Continued from page 6)

In fact it didn't affect even his chief of staff and close friend, Walter Bedell Smith, of whom Summersby writes: "Most of the headquarters staff, especially the junior officers, regarded General Smith as a complete Prussian. He could be, too—tough, humorless, driving, with all the sentiment of an SS general. As Beetle himself often put it, 'Someone around the top has to be an absolute S. O. B. and Ike's not in a position to do it all the time. So that's my job.' There's the real ETO atmosphere!"

STUDENT SOCIALIST

JANUARY 21, 1952

STUDENT-YOUTH SECTION of LABOR ACTION

FIVE CENTS

A Reply to Kimmel's Whitewash of Stalinland in the 'Maroon' — To Russia: with Both Eyes Shut

Alan Kimmel's report on his trip to Eastern Europe is, to put it mildly, a very surprising piece of work. In a series of five articles written by a former editor of the Chicago *Maroon* one would expect some considered analysis and some real grappling with the issues involved. Instead Kimmel's articles are so naive that it is hard to believe they were written by a University of Chicago student.

Kimmel attended the Third World Festival of Youth and Students for Peace in Berlin last August. This rally was supposedly devoted to the cause of world peace. If this were really its purpose one would think that it would have contributed something to Kimmel's understanding of the problem of building a permanent peace. Whether Kimmel or the peace conference is at fault is hard to say but this expectation is certainly not fulfilled.

He says, "Each participant could see that if we could find such friendship and brotherhood in Berlin for two weeks we could do the same in the whole world and establish the basis for a lasting peace." Such an idea can certainly not be based on a thoroughgoing analysis of the contemporary world situation. Any attempt to get at the basis of the problem of peace is completely lacking in Kimmel's articles.

But for the sake of argument, let us accept Kimmel's premise that all that is needed for a lasting peace is brotherhood and friendship. How is that brotherhood and friendship to be created? Obviously we cannot all go to Berlin for two weeks in the summertime. It is simply physically impossible for world brotherhood to be achieved through personal contact. Therefore we must accept the next best thing which is to attain the fullest possible understanding of the other peoples of the world. Kimmel had an excellent opportunity to contribute to this understanding, but failed miserably.

EMBARRASSING QUESTIONS

His discussion of what he saw in Russia is the best example of this failure. He evidently was so overpowered by his desire to be "brotherly" that he refrained from asking any questions that might embarrass the Russians and thereby weaken the ties of brotherhood that he was building up.

He thus achieved brotherhood at the price of keeping his mouth shut, and that type of brotherhood we can have with the Russians any time we want it. For socialists, brotherhood on that market is not worth the price.

Kimmel tells us that he went to Russia not as a tourist but as a "responsible reporter." He explains that he and others were able to draw up their own itinerary and see and ask what they wanted. It is therefore not unwarranted for us to expect that in justifying his belief "that peaceable coexistence between our two countries was both possible and necessary" he would discuss some of the questions whose answers would lead to that desired peace.

For students a real understanding of that "mysterious" land of Russia is a necessary starting point in building a firm and just peace. It is therefore incumbent upon a student editor visiting Russia to answer the many questions which generate distrust and hostility in American students.

Do the Russian people enjoy political democracy with its civil liberties, free press, and independent inquiry? What are the functions of the trade unions and the conditions of the Russian working masses? What is the nature of Russian education and who attends schools in Russia? What are the real conditions and standard of living of the Russian people? These are some of the questions that require answers.

Kimmel, however, prefers to touch upon one or two of these questions only tangentially and devote the remainder of the extensive space generously granted him by the editors of the *Maroon* to extolling the deep desire for peace in the hearts of the Russian people. His road to brotherhood is to accept all Stalinist claims at face value. This is easy enough for him, but the result of it is that he tells us only those things which will confirm his beliefs.

Nowhere in the two articles devoted entirely to Rus-

The article featured on this page was originally submitted to the University of Chicago newspaper, the *Maroon*, as the SYL's reply to a series of articles by Maroon ex-editor Alan Kimmel. Kimmel was ostensibly reporting on a trip to Eastern Europe and Russia; his series was mainly a paean to Stalinism and an uncritical defense of Kremlin policy.

The SYL of the University of Chicago, which supported the protest of U. of C. students against the university's undemocratic dismissal of Kimmel from his elected post as *Maroon* editor, believes that the views he represents can best be fought and defeated by political means, including answering his "facts" with the truth, without recourse to witchhunting or loyalty purges. It therefore submitted the accompanying article to the *Maroon*. However, the *Maroon*, which had published Kimmel's long series, was unwilling to grant more than 500 words to any reply. That is why the SYL's answer appears here.—Ed.

sia did Kimmel make one reference to the complete absence of even the most elementary forms of political democracy. He did not tell us, nor did he deny, that the Russian people have the unrestricted right to read the official Stalinist press and no other; to attend official Stalinist meetings, and no others; to echo official Stalinist opinion, and no other; to listen to official Stalinist broadcasts, and no others; to vote, whenever called upon, for the official Stalinist ticket, and no other.

Perhaps Kimmel felt that by ignoring this problem he could make us forget it. But we can no more overlook this lack of democratic rights in Stalinist Russia that we did in Hitler's Germany.

Kimmel's picture of the Russian working people is idyllic and evasive. No mention is made by him of the Russian worker's rights or his working conditions; and what is said of his living standard can easily be refuted.

All traces of the workers' rule or workers' control which existed in the early days of the Bolshevik regime have been wiped out by the Stalinist bureaucracy. The so-called "trade unions" are officially excluded from a determining voice in such matters as hiring, firing, production standards, working conditions, length of the working day and wages. The central trade-union committees are composed entirely of appointed officials (*Izvestia*, May 16, 1937). A member of the Political Committee tells us that "the wage scale must be left entirely in the hands of the heads of industry. They must establish the norms." (*Pravda*, Dec. 9, 1935.)

"The proper determination of wages and the regulation of labor demand that the industrial heads and the technical directors be immediately charged with responsibility in this matter. This is also dictated by the necessity of establishing a single authority and ensuring economy in the management of concerns. . . . [The workers] must not defend themselves against their government. That is absolutely wrong. That is supplanting the administrative organs. That is left opportunistic perversion, the annihilation of individual authority and interference in the administrative department." (Weinberg in *Trud* 8, vii, 1933.)

PARALLELED ONLY BY FASCISM

It is no wonder that the unions hold no conventions and leaders are appointed by the state.

But what of the working conditions of the individual worker? The Russian worker must accept work wherever he is told to go (Decree of Oct. 11, 1930, renewed during the war) and he is not permitted to leave the factory without the permission of the employer, the boss or the director; and a violation of this regulation is punishable by up to ten years imprisonment.

Absence from work without justification can be punished by dismissal; three latenesses totaling 20 minutes per month are equal to an absence (decree of Dec. 16, 1932, reaffirmed June 26, 1940). For idling or "unsatisfactory output"—and remember who sets the norms!—a worker can be dismissed and his ration card withdrawn (decree of Dec. 29, 1939).

Needless to say, the Russian workers have not the right to strike for redress of grievances. Unauthorized quitting of the job is punishable by forced labor (decrees of June 26 and July 24, 1940).

Every Russian worker must carry a labor book. It is a criminal offense to hire a man who does not have his book and in the book are listed all fines assessed against the man, all his dismissals and the reasons thereof, all his insubordinations, etc. A compulsory home passport system is in existence which requires absence from home for more than 24 hours to be reported to the police and permission to travel must be obtained from the authorities (decree of Dec. 27, 1932, code o.l.1932, 84-516). Such laws as these find their only parallel in the recent history of fascist states.

Any Russian worker who becomes dissatisfied with his lot and decides to flee the country will be well taken care of. Flight abroad without permission is punishable by death (decree of June 26, 1934). Permission, of course,

is virtually never granted and, in view of the probable consequences, is probably seldom requested.

This drastic regulation, however, applies only to the civilian population. For the military, a more ruthless law exists. Paragraph 3 of the decree of June 8, 1934 (published in *Izvestia*, June 9, 1934, and quoted in Arthur Koestler's book, *The Yogi and the Commissar*) states:

"In the event of flight or escape abroad of a military person, the adult members of his family, if they have in any way assisted the preparations or the commitment of the act of treason, or even if they have known about it without bringing it to the knowledge of the authorities, will be punished with five or ten years of imprisonment and with confiscation of their property.

"The other adult members of the traitor's family, living with him or being his dependents at the time of treason, are deprived of their electoral rights and deported for five years to the remote regions of Siberia." [Italics ours.]

In other words, people who have no knowledge of the "crime" but are merely related to the "criminal" are held responsible.

JUSTICE ENDS AT THE BORDER

As for the actual living conditions of the Russian working class there is no evidence either from friends or critics of the Russian regime to support Kimmel's claim that wages are rising and prices going down. For a detailed analysis of this question we refer the interested reader to the recently published *Russia's Soviet Economy* by Harry Schwartz.

This book shows graphically (page 461) that, using 1928 as a base, prices have risen almost steadily in 20 years to almost 30 times what they were. Earnings in the same period have increased only slightly more than tenfold. Thus, according to Schwartz, the average Russian worker in 1948 earned only a little more than a third of the buying power he earned 20 years previously.

The absence of any statistical claims from Russia for many years now, let alone free discussion and interchange of materials on such important questions, only heightens the credibility of Schwartz's analysis. The recent price reductions in consumers' goods undoubtedly affect the figures from 1948 on (Salisbury, N. Y. *Times*, Dec. 30, '51), but even assuming the validity of these recent claims, the effect is almost negligible in face of the tremendous disparity already mentioned.

In his second article, Kimmel waxes quite indignant over the charges by the North Korean government of American atrocities against the civilian Korean population. With the wrath common only to the most righteous, he explains that "we should ask our government about them."

This, it is true, is an admirable attitude and we certainly would go along with Kimmel in his desire to see a genuine investigation of these accusations. But why is it, we ask, that Kimmel can only see one side of the coin?

Why is it that Kimmel, a supposedly honest reporter concerned with social problems, loses all concern and becomes (Continued on page 7)

STUDENT SOCIALIST
Student-Youth Section of LABOR ACTION
No. 4 January 21, 1952
Section Editor: SAM FELIKS
Next month:
A four-page STUDENT SOCIALIST section.

The U. of Chicago Chapter
SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE
presents its Winter Forum Series

Fri., Jan. 25—8 p.m. (Admission 25 cents)
"SNOBS: IS THERE AN OVERSUPPLY IN POPULAR CULTURE?"—a critical appraisal of the New Yorker, Luce publications, etc.
REUEL DENNEY, Assoc. Prof. Social Sciences; former ed. *Time* and *Fortune*; author of "The Lonely Crowd."

Sun., Jan. 27—4 p.m.
"TEN YEARS OF THE SMITH ACT"
LEON DESPRES, of the ACLU; prominent Chicago attorney.

Sun., Feb. 10—4 p.m.
"FREEDOM UNDER PLANNING"
ABBA LERNER, Prof. Economics, Roosevelt College; author of "The Economics of Control."

Sun., Feb. 17—4 p.m.
"BUREAUCRACY IN THE CIO"
KERMIT EBY, Prof. Social Sciences; former Nat'l Educ. Director, CIO.

Tues., Feb. 19—8 p.m.
"BERNARD SHAW AND THE COMEDY OF SOCIETY"
MORTON D. ZABEL, Prof. Humanities; literary critic; editor of *Viking Portable "Conrad."*

All meetings at East Lounge, Ida Noyes.