

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

JANUARY 1, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**COLD WAR ON THE CAMPUS:
ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN 1950**

... page 6

Poland: New Wave of Repression

... page 3

Parliamentary Decay in France

... page 3

How the FBI Got Started—Illegally

... page 5

One-Man Anti-Red Drive

Don't forget Admiral William H. Standley (U. S. Navy, retired) among the staunch defenders of the American way of life against the Russian menace. The admiral lets nothing get by him.

On December 15 he demanded of the city manager of San Diego, Calif., that the city take down its Christmas stars on top of the civic center because they reminded him of the red star of Russia. San Diego's Christmas stars were red too.

The City manager informed the wide-awake defender of democracy that the decorations were under the supervision of the Chamber of Commerce.

But Standley, besides knowing port from starboard, is also a former ambassador to Russia, and he knows a red star when he sees one.

This wasn't Standley's first blow for freedom. Earlier in the year, as the San Francisco Chronicle reported on February 17:

"The city council of San Diego . . . rejecting President Roosevelt's listing of the 'Four Freedoms' as a war memorial inscription after Admiral William H. Standley, USN, retired, objected to the ideology involved . . . Explaining the representations he made to several council members, Standley, Mr. Roosevelt's appointee as ambassador to Russia in 1942 . . . said: 'Two of the four freedoms on President Roosevelt's list are highly inappropriate for such a plaque. Freedom from want is a Russian, communistic slogan. A fellow who is free from want is dead. Freedom from fear is a political slogan. Our American pioneers did not have to apologize for their fear of the Indians.'"

Looking Backward At 1950 Headlines

By GORDON HASKELL

The war in Korea marked such a sharp turning-point in the year 1950, as well as in the history of the world, that it is fairly easy even for thinking persons to forget that the general trends which have been intensified and speeded up by the war were with us long before it began.

The turn of the year seems as good a time as any to take a full look at the last twelve months. Perhaps such a glance at the past will help us to remember that the present plight of the world is not a product of the decisions made by a few powerful government figures in the past few months but rather of the social forces for which these individuals are but the most powerful temporary spokesmen.

The main headline in LABOR ACTION for January 9, 1950 reads:

"Truman Message Sees Fair Deal in Year 2000—What Does He Propose for Today?"

The article deals with the president's annual State of the Union message. At that time, it should be recalled, the country was still in a state of economic stagnation which had set in several months before. The president was urging businessmen to invest and workers to work harder. And he predicted that, if the full effort of the nation were put forth, by the year 2000 we will all be able to live in security and comfort, if not even in luxury.

Today, with the country approaching full mobilization for war, the prospects of plenty for all under capitalism by 2000 are, to put it politely, very dim. In fact, the whole trend of events has been such that Truman's speech seems to come from a different historic era. And that was just one year ago.

Battle over Formosa Ignores Formosa's Right to Freedom (January 16)

The article under this heading ends: "Socialists should defend the rights of the Free Formosans. Its people have a right to peace and this is possible only through independence. Socialists should oppose the Stalinist invasion as much as the Chinese dictatorship [of Chiang]. This program for a Free Formosa also applies to other areas such as Tibet. Let the people decide their own future! That is the only democratic road."

Could more have happened during one year to confirm the correctness of a political proposal?

U. S. Reverses Anti-Franco Line; Move Will Aid Spanish Fascists (January 30)

The policy of Washington to seek any military ally against Russia—regardless of the effect on the anti-Stalinist, democratic, and social-

(Continued on page 4)

THE HARD LESSON OF THE DEFEAT IN KOREA

By BEN HALL

When its troops were driven back from the Manchurian border in headlong retreat, the United States began to lose faith in its magical powers.

Up to that moment, full confidence prevailed that no power or group of powers could defy the United States, at least not successfully. From the founding of the republic, every wartime foe went down to an inevitable humiliating and crushing defeat. America's preponderant industrial might, easily and quickly transformable into invincible military superiority, would paralyze any other enemy with fear.

Paul Hoffman, former ECA director, expressed this wishful thought most succinctly when he reassured an uneasy nation that our powerful modern productive equipment and unmatched instruments of warfare could ward off all the "hordes" of Asia despite our inferiority in population and in military manpower.

Canned public opinion saw danger only in our own easy-going and tolerant nature. If a potential aggressor erroneously suspected that the United States, grown sleek and fat and dull, would tolerate an encroachment on its interests anywhere, then we might be plunged into an unexpected and unnecessary war to put the presumptuous power back in its place. But if we made clear that the United States would fight if provoked, its enemies would quail before aroused American righteousness and slink back into sullen passivity.

It was this simple-minded faith in the power of bellicosity that finally explains U. S. intervention, even after every responsible public figure had drawn the limits of America's sphere of influence outside the borders of Korea.

But now the U. S. is being defeated in Korea and this ill-founded confidence is gone.

The shock has been all the more staggering, all the more incomprehensible because the defeat has been inflicted by armies of Orientals. If popular American prejudice ranges all other nations in a descending scale of contempt, a special place under the very bottom of the last rung was reserved for the peoples of the East and beneath them all, the Chinese! Immigrants might enter our sacred shores from any country, but not the yellow races. They were locked beyond the pale of human decency, stripped of every civilized attribute.

END OF A MYTH

All these quaint ideological eccentricities which once ornamented American world policy now go in the waste basket with worn-out Christmas tinsel. Fitted out with modern weapons, even second-hand equipment captured from the Japanese or Kuomintang—inspired with slogans and ideas, even the false and misleading ideology of Stalinism—they have been able to inflict a decisive setback on the armies of the most powerful industrial nation in history.

The Chinese form a nation of perhaps 400,000,000 people. But the Koreans number less than 30,000,000. Even before the entry of the Chinese into the war, when only North Koreans fought on the Stalinist side, a vast mobilization of men and material proved necessary to drive them

(Turn to last page)

Rousset Trial Exposes Slave Labor in Russia

By HENRY JUDD

PARIS, Dec. 25—After a slow start marked by numerous legal and extra-legal efforts on the part of the Stalinists to block the proceedings, the trial of David Rousset, French author and a leading anti-Stalinist, against *Les Lettres Françaises*, a weekly published by and for French Stalinist intellectuals, has moved rapidly to a leading position in the political life of France. The furor and storm kicked up by the trial promise to outdo that created by the now famous Kravchenko affair of last year.

In fact, there is a strong possibility that the Stalinists, openly attacked in their weakest spot—the existence of slave labor camps in Russia—may receive a much severer propagandist blow during these proceedings than last year.

For one thing, the issue is clearer and more concrete: Do or do not concentration camps exist to which citizens, or non-citizens of Russia may be sent by a mere administrative declaration of the NKVD, without charge or hearing? And the trial seems to have been better prepared and conducted than that around the highly controversial figure of Kravchenko.

For another thing, whatever his present political opinions may be, the career and history of David Rousset as a socialist and

revolutionist who has earned the right by his work and writings (he is a former inmate of a Nazi concentration camp) to speak about and against concentration camps, cannot easily be slandered, despite the almost hysterical efforts of the Stalinists.

After spending several lengthy sessions in attempting to prevent a hearing of the many witnesses summoned, and finding this path blocked, the Stalinists have finally begun a defense. This will constitute the final phase of the trial which is expected to end before New Years, at which time the judges (no jury exists in France during trials for slander and defamation) must decide whether Rousset told the truth or not when he stated the existence of a huge "Stalinist universe of concentration camps," holding perhaps 10 millions of human beings.

PROVED TO THE HILT

Needless to say, the problem is a highly delicate one for the French government and its foreign relations, but no effort has yet been made to hinder or prevent the conclusion of the trial. Perhaps most scandalous of all has been the hostile attitude of the coterie of French intellectuals, headed by Jean-Paul Sartre, who denounced the trial and refused to lend it their support for fear of antagonizing the Stalinists to

(Continued on page 2)

Anti-Stalinists Win in Philly NAACP Election

By FRANK HARPER

PHILADELPHIA, December 13—Last night, an anti-Stalinist caucus in the local branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People won a close election contest at the annual meeting.

Dr. Harry Green took the presidency by a margin of only twelve votes over the "Unity" slate candidate, A. William Hill. Green's running mates, who were all elected by narrow margins over the Stalinists' candidates, are: The Rev. Leon Moore, first vice-president; Kenneth Burnham, second vice-president; C. W. Maxwell, treasurer; and Mrs. Bette Smith Marshall, recording secretary. The anti-Stalinists also won 26 of the 30 Executive Board posts.

The margin of victory of the slate headed by Dr. Green was smaller than expected. Just one month ago the same forces had won their first major victory in over five years by electing all nine members of the nominating committee by more than a 3 to 2 edge. According to NAACP rules, the nominating committee draws up an official slate of candidates for the general elections to be held at the annual meeting one month later.

Last night, the anti-Stalinists therefore held the considerable mechanical advantage of having the names of their handpicked candidates printed on the official ballot. The Stalinists were forced to nominate their candidates from the floor by nominating petitions and to ask the voters to write in these additional names in the blanks provided on the ballot.

NEW BLOOD IN On the other hand, the Stalinists also had assets which they used to good advantage. As incumbents in office they had a better acquaintance with the active branch membership or rather with the remnants surviving their purges. They were able to use the facilities of the offices. Most important they had sole possession of the membership files. There is no doubt that quite a few voting credentials were tailor-made for last night's meeting.

Only 260 people of a membership of over 3800 attended the election meeting. This indicated that neither group was able to generate any tremendous enthusiasm in the Negro community. It appears that the Stalinists underestimated their chances of taking the elections and the opposition was a bit too complacent, after having swept the nominating committee contest. The rebuilding of wide support, interest, and participation in the branch will be the number one task in the period ahead.

Last night's elections did mark some substantial gains. The inept and inadequate nominal leadership of The Rev. E. Theodore Lewis was replaced. The personalities most closely associated with the Communist Party no longer hold positions of control in the branch. There are many new faces on the

Opinion Dr. George Gallup, the pollster, has come up with an opinion which sounds better than his predictions. He says the present foreign-propaganda program of the State Department is like trying "to convert people to our point of view by sending out postcards of the Brooklyn Bridge."

WEEK by WEEK... LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism. A sub is only \$2 a year!

Executive Board since two-thirds of the old board were wholly inactive. Various vital sections of the community are well represented, particularly the organized labor movement by three prominent local leaders plus some rank and filers.

SWP MANEUVER

The elections marked a defeat not only for the Communist Party but also for the Socialist Workers Party. For the last several years the SWP followers were supporters (and none too critical ones) of the Stalinist leadership. Recently they were treated so shabbily by the administration that they made a fast realignment with the anti-Stalinist caucus. Their conversion was accepted in good faith, which proved to be most undesired.

After the nominating committee had prepared a slate which met caucus approval, the recent SWP candidate for Senator, Mrs. Clyde Turner, reported that a mass movement to draft Mrs. Goldie

Geldman to the executive board was under way. The caucus attempted to persuade Mrs. Turner and Goldman not to heed the siren's call but to no avail.

Evidently the masses were somewhat wiser for only eight turned out to vote for the Goldman candidacy. No one knows just whom the Goldman forces cut from the caucus slate but one loyal, hard-working, competent caucus candidate found himself with eight votes less than the rest of the ticket and four votes too few to secure a seat on the board.

The new officers take office in January. The branch must literally be rebuilt. Assistance from the national office will be given in the person and financial support of an executive secretary but the backbone of the branch will have to be the stalwarts of the anti-Stalinist "Friends of the NAACP" caucus which has just wrested control of the branch from the Stalinist incumbents.

The Crisis in the SWP Group Highlighted by Recent Convention Discussion

[Comrade Larry Foster recently resigned from the Socialist Workers Party to join the Independent Socialist League.—Ed.]

By LARRY FOSTER

Since leaving the Socialist Workers Party (Cannon's "official Trotskyists") over a month and a half ago, I have had to draw a balance sheet on the SWP and the present crisis within that organization, on the meaning of its political position and the direction in which it leads.

While the socialist left today finds itself weak in the face of the two big war camps, the official-Trotskyist section of the Marxist movement is impotent and incapable of giving the working class correct leadership because of its bankrupt program. The heart of the matter is the Russian question. We cannot get away from it: that question is the basis of our policies as far as they concern the Stalinist movement here in this country and in the west of the world.

In April 1948 the second congress of the Fourth International met and decided that, while Russia is still a "workers' state," its satellite countries in East Europe were capitalist states, moving toward "structural assimilation" into the USSR. At that time, Haston, of the British section of the International supported the thesis, that these countries were also "degenerated workers' states." His position was a logical extension of that held for Russia by Trotsky and the Fourth International; if Russia is still a "workers' state" primarily because of the nationalization of economy, even though no other conquests of the Russian Revolution remained, then the new Stalinist satellites must also be "workers' states," since there too industry had been predominantly nationalized.

At the congress, Haston's position was voted down. He was accused of "capitulation to Stalinism," and for quite a while the British group was the whipping boy of the International. Today we find that Haston's position on the nature of the East Europe satellites is being defended by leading comrades, such as Pablo in the Fourth International and E. R. Frank, Bartell and Hansen in the SWP. They argue that property has been nationalized, the capitalist class has been expro-

riated politically and economically, and, since their economy is therefore the same as Russia's, they too are "degenerated workers' states."

DODGING THE ISSUE

The second position held in the SWP, by a majority of its leadership (defended by Stein, Wright, Warde, et al.), is essentially the one officially adopted by the 1948 world congress: the East Europe satellites are capitalist states moving toward "structural assimilation" with Russia. They consider that Stalinism acts as a "capitalist state," as are the satellite and pillaging this satellite zone.

The third position, put forward by the Johnson group, challenges both, but does so on the basis of the view that Russia itself is a "capitalist state," as are the satellites. I disagree with this view, but there is no doubt that—given the character of the other two positions—it has enabled Johnson to point strongly to the dangers of the official-Trotskyist policy (both majority and minority) and to warn where it will lead.

A few months ago, the Johnson group put out an 80-page discussion bulletin which caused quite a bit of conversation in the party. (See LABOR ACTION, Nov. 6, "The End of an Experience," for a discussion of this bulletin in relation to the SWP—Ed.) This was the first time in three years that the Johnson group had opened their mouths to say anything on the main issues of the day since they left the Workers Party to join the SWP.

Some time in September, an SWP membership meeting was held at which George Clark (for the majority) gave the party's views on Yugoslavia, followed by John G. Wright and Johnson presenting their own. After this, there was a few weeks' discussion in the youth branch. On October 16, after the publication of the Johnson bulletin, another membership meeting was held at which Warde debated Johnson. In this debate, Warde's line was to charge Johnson with not understanding and using scientific Marxism, with being an "idealist" and an "unconscious Christian" [?]. He did not even take up the real issues involved.

NO VOTE TAKEN

Johnson was able to make a devastating attack on the SWP position. He stressed the point: if

Rousset Trial—

(Continued from page 1)

whom they have offered another illustration of political capitulation. The miserable official-Trotskyist sect in France has joined hands with the Stalinists in denouncing this effort to turn the light of public opinion on the fate of Russia's millions of slave laborers.

Fortunately, the trial continues and becomes each day more devastating to the Stalinists who have perhaps never received such damaging publicity in this country. From observing one session in the crowded courtroom and following the details in the press, it is our opinion that the trial brought by Rousset has been completely justified and conducted in a manner which cannot be criticized.

Rousset, basing his case upon official Russian documents and declarations, plus the testimony of innumerable witnesses who experienced Russian "justice" at first hand, has proved to the hilt the existence of an enormous slave-labor system within Russian territory, and has justified his demand that a committee of former prisoners and deportees in Nazi concentration camps should be per-

mitted to make an on-the-spot investigation. A dozen witnesses—Poles, Russian and Jewish refugees, Germans, Spaniards, etc.—have drawn a full and detailed picture of the life and administration of the concentration camp system.

The reply of the Stalinists has been denial, abuse, threats and defamation. A leaflet, entitled "David Rousset and the 5th Column," was circulated by the Paris section of the party and contained an attack upon Rousset and the Spanish POUM which could only be considered as a call to and justification of any possible provocative act. Evidently, Stalinism is touched at a sore spot by the trial and its reaction is a part of its now systematic plan throughout Europe to throw terror and fear into its opponents.

SPARKS FLY

The courtroom is jammed to capacity, and the audience listens attentively. Part of the audience is Stalinist, but a majority is non-Stalinist, representing diverse political groups. All the witnesses of Rousset have been heard, and it is now the turn of the Stalinist witnesses who, without letup, repeat the same monotonous dialogue.

The procedure and atmosphere of the trial are entirely different from an American courtroom. There is no jury—only three judges who conduct the hearings and will later give their verdict. There is much more leeway in questioning and debating the issues; thus, the trial assumes the character of a running debate between the accuser (Rousset) and the two accused (editors of *Lettres Francaises*), and their respective lawyers.

When the proceedings become too heated and violent (a not infrequent event!) the president of the court simply suspends the proceedings for a few moments until all have cooled off. Gardemars scattered throughout the hall attempt to restrain the spontaneous reactions of the audience. The atmosphere is sharp, bitter and often close to violence.

The Wilna region has been torn off Poland and annexed to Russia, but it still remains dear to all Poles. The intent of the trial was to slander the Home Army and the Wilna Poles as part of the Russian masters preparation for the coming war.

WAVE OF REPRESSION Military sentences have also been handed out to the leadership of the underground organization WIN (*Wolność i Niepodległość*—Liberty and Independence) for "espionage and hatred against the Soviet Union." Seven members of WIN were sentenced to death, one to life imprisonment, and two women to 15 and 12 years respectively. Recipients of the death sentences were: Batory, Blazej, Chmiel, Cieplinski, Kowalec, Lazarewicz, Rzepka; of the life sentence: Kubik.

Thus Stalinist "justice" cynically makes clear its preventive and terrorist character aimed at "discouraging opposition activity." The court also tried to prove collaboration between WIN and foreign (especially American) diplomats.

Also put to death in the Warsaw prison was Casimir Puzak, general secretary of the Polish Socialist Party. Puzak was a president of the underground parliament and vice prime minister in the Home Government. He had spent 16 years of his life in czarist prisons and has now ended his heroic life in Stalin's prisons. During his trial he defied the Stalinist hangmen, declaring that he would not change the views for which he had fought all his life. He was probably murdered by UB executioners. We honor his memory.

Against the witnesses of Rousset, for the most part people who lived through the Russian slave-labor society, the Stalinists find no tactic too vicious for employment. An Austrian physician, for example, could only testify in German. The Stalinist lawyer wanted to know if the court had sunk so low that it would hear testimony in a French court in "the language of Hitler!"

A Spanish refugee, when slandered as an "agent of Franco," dared the accused to repeat that remark outside the courtroom. Accuser and accused participate actively and energetically in the hearing which takes on a fire-and-color unknown in American trials. One aspect of Stalinism is on trial before public opinion and definitely getting the worst of it.

In the SWP itself as in the Fourth International, there is no hope. That is why I have joined the Independent Socialist League.

New Wave of Repression Shows Polish Resistance

By A. RUDZIENSKI

Police terror has been sharpened in occupied Poland. The oppression of the UB (the Polish GPU) is growing in proportion to the misery of the Polish masses, who are exploited by Russia's imperialist war policy, and in proportion to the danger of war.

An ex-Home Office minister, Wolski, has fallen in disgrace under the suspicion of being a "nationalist" and "Titoist." This wave of repression is probably preparatory to a Stalinist offensive in the country, especially for intensified collectivization among the peasants.

HOSTILE TO REGIME The terror policy likewise proves that the resistance in Poland continues as an organized political force. According to reports of some American newspapermen who had been in Poland from 1947 till recently (published in the London *Dziennik Polski*), the atmosphere in Poland is strained and hostile to the regime. In the cities it is very difficult for foreigners to speak to the people but on the countryside the peasants will speak relatively easily, and they hate the regime.

The Poles, say the American correspondents, hope that the coming war will bring them liberation, because they believe that Russia will lose. They also hope that the war will take place far from Poland—in Asia or in Russia—and that this time Poland will not suffer as heavily as in past wars.

When the wife of one of the correspondents asked her Polish maid what the people were saying about the Korean war, at a time when the Stalinists were being defeated there, the maid answered: "Madam, there will be many drunken men in Warsaw tonight!" She meant that they would be drinking in joyous celebration.

The Poles have their own post-

war chronology. The man in the street does not say: "This happened in 1947—or in 1950." He says: "This happened at the time of the Osubka government—or the Cyrankiewicz government." The names represent the periods of lesser Russian control or greater Russian control.

CAN'T WIN YOUTH Now this mode of reckoning has been superseded. Now they say: "before Rokossovsky" or "after Rokossovsky." They mean: before Poland was transformed completely into a Russian province or after this. It is similar to the older "in the time of Czar Alexander." (Incidentally, no one says "in Bierut's time": Bierut, the ex-chief of the Polish GPU, is a nonentity; he cannot serve as a measure of time.)

While the older people in their great majority oppose the regime and hope for liberation through the coming world war, the government devotes all its efforts to conquer the youth. The youth are not only systematically indoctrinated; they are also corrupted economically through scholarships, junkets to Russia, state-paid study, and so on. Qualified technical workers are sent to Russia and paid higher rates.

The American correspondent we have quoted above fears that the Polish youth may become pro-Stalinist. But according to our own information, they remain in opposition to the regime in spite of the regime's policy of bribery—especially the student youth.

The Stalinist conquest of the youth is made next to impossible by the Kremlin's economic exploitation and political oppression of the country and by the anti-Russian tradition of the Polish people.

FRANCE Parliamentary Decay Goes On Apace The Farce at the French Assembly

By HENRY JUDD

PARIS, December—If the American Congress may be cited as evidence of the decline in vitality and intellectual level of the institution of parliamentary democracy, the French National Assembly—which meets at the historic Chamber of Deputies—offers further evidence, but of an entirely different nature. In American we have a circus, irresponsible and ignorant; in France, we are presented with a farce, both comic and tragic.

The Assembly, now in regular session, represents a weak government trying to remain in power with a feeble, coalition majority of Radical Socialists, MRP (Popular Republican) members and the Socialist Party. As in all parliamentary assemblies today, the real issues are decided in committees or corridors, while the public debates cover only required formalities. The particular session we attended provided fireworks to illustrate the division and impotence of the body, which nonetheless, it would seem, still represents the current political divisions of the population as a whole.

The opening of the session in the historic hall—a semi-circular amphitheater whose tiers are divided according to political party from left to right—was announced by the traditional roll of drums. Shortly, a handful of deputies entered, together with the aged, enormously heavy and sick Edouard Herriot, who acts as president of the Assembly. Half-pushed, half-pulled, Herriot mounted to his place and began the session. From that moment on, he appeared to pay no atten-

tion to the proceedings and, despite the fireworks from time to time, did nothing. He seemed to be half dozing and quite accustomed to the spectacle presented by the Stalinists.

Perhaps half of the delegates were not present; those present either talked, read or answered newspaper questions, or some supporter would state his viewpoint. Finally, the Stalinist would summarize and the resolution would be tabled and thrust aside. The Assembly then would proceed to the next interpellation, and so on throughout the afternoon for about three hours!

And the heckling! American gangster—pack of scoundrels—Nazis—fascist—criminal—Russian bandit—agent of Washington—these represent but a small sampling of the steady barrage from all sides. These interventions are not uttered in any spirit of humorous criticism, but are full of malice and spite, indicating a line of blood between the Stalinist deputies and the rest of the body.

LINE OF BLOOD The three questions related to the firing of workers from a munitions plant for staging a demonstration against inspecting American and Italian officers; the removal of a group of Stalinist mayors from office by the government on grounds of using their posts for propagandist purposes; and the current *cause celebre* for slander by *Lettres Francaises*, a Stalinist literary review.

It is hardly necessary to give an account of each separate interpellation since each followed precisely the same pattern. A Stalinist spokesman would mount the tribunal, launch into his attack and present—with gusto—the characteristic Stalinist line. The word "American," with suitable Stalinist adjectives attached to it, appeared frequently in every speech. The tone of each speech

Gov't Moves to Deport Carl Skoglund of Mpls.

NEW YORK—Carl Skoglund, 67-year-old Minnesota union leader, was ordered deported at the conclusion of a hearing before the U. S. Immigration Service held in New York City on December 15. Skoglund was the second person to be found liable to deportation under the terms of the recently enacted McCarran Law.

Skoglund was charged with belonging to the Communist Party in the 1920s. No other evidence was submitted against him by immigration officials except the mere fact of membership in an organization allegedly advocating violent overthrow of the government.

Skoglund was expelled from the Communist Party in 1929 and has long been known as an uncompromising opponent of its policies and ideas. He has been denounced many times over the past twenty years by the CP press and leadership for his activities within the union movement of the Northwest.

Skoglund was born in Sweden and has been in the United States for 40 years. His record of service to the cause of labor is a long and honorable one. Skoglund has been a delegate from the Railway Car-men and the AFL Teamsters to the Minneapolis AFL Central Labor Union. During the '30s, in the organization drives spearheaded by the Minneapolis Truckdrivers, he helped build a powerful union movement in the Northwest. He was twice elected as Central Labor Union delegate to conventions of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor and was president of Local 544 at the time of the first deportation action against him.

FIGHTING THE CASE He was first arrested in 1941 in connection with the prosecutions of 18 officers of Teamsters Local 544 and leaders of the Socialist Workers Party under the Smith "Gag" Act. Shortly before the ar-

rests, the FBI, through an intermediary, offered Skoglund American citizenship and immunity from deportation if he would testify against his union and political associates. Skoglund rejected this deal and subsequently served a 16-month sentence in federal prison as one of the first victims of the thought-control Smith Act.

Now he has become one of the first victims of the no less undemocratic and unconstitutional McCarran Act. In its latest move the Immigration Department dropped its original charges against Skoglund of belonging to the Socialist Workers Party and is proceeding against him under the McCarran Act solely on the ground of his former admitted membership in the Communist Party.

Skoglund's deportation order is now subject to review by the higher U. S. immigration authorities.

George Novack, secretary of the Civil Rights Defense Committee which is handling Skoglund's defense, said today: "What an appalling commentary it is on the condition of civil liberties in the United States that the anniversary of the Bill of Rights should be marked by invoking an unconstitutional law to deport a labor leader for his political beliefs and his union activities. It is equally ironic that the government should try to expel him for membership in a party which expelled him 22 years ago for disagreement with its policies and ideas."

"This case should open the eyes of many people to the viciousness of the immigration provisions of the McCarran Act. We regard it as a decisive test of the democratic rights of foreign-born Americans violated by that act and intend to carry Skoglund's fight to remain in this country through all administrative and legal channels, up to the U. S. Supreme Court, if necessary."

Watching the Stalinists in action was a lesson in itself. An absolute contempt for their opponents and normal parliamentary democratic procedures; an arrogance and self-assurance which flows from their conviction that power will soon be theirs; a monotonous discipline (applause and heckling by the numbers) and a demonstrable acquaintance with the fact that they are momentarily participating in a necessary farce.

The Socialists, it must be remarked, are the only vigorous government supporters and defended energetically every bureaucratic measure which the government had taken. These are Menshevik types, narrow-minded and bureaucratic, with a violent hatred of "communism" and ready to support any repressive action against the Stalinists as a party. The members of the real government and ruling parties displayed little interest in the debates, and were content to have their socialist "alikes" make all the explanations and soil their hands.

Was this the Assembly of the Great French Revolution or of 1848? Was this the same hall when Jean Jaures had spoken so often? It was hard to believe that it was anything but a miserable and pathetic farce, ignored by the majority of Frenchmen and reflecting, on a low enough level, the absolute divisions and hostilities which have paralyzed a nation and given it a government incapable of anything beyond the immediate reflexes which its bureaucratic body can have in reaction to the Stalinist needlings.

The BEST recent book on the labor movement— "The UAW and Walter Reuther" by Irving Howe and B. J. Widick \$3.00 Random House Order from: Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y. Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Get ALL your books from Labor Action Book Service 114 West 14 Street New York 11, N. Y. We can supply you!

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 has 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—

4 Court Square Long Island City 1 New York

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. _____

Looking Backward at 1950 Headlines —

(Continued from page 1)

ist forces which would be weakened in the process—is more than a year old. But the application of this policy to Franco started just one year ago. This week, the New York Times reports that Washington has felt out the Spanish government on the acceptability of Stanton Griffis, former ambassador to Argentina, for the same post in Madrid. Also, Jose Felix Lequerica, Spanish Ambassador at Large is already in this country just awaiting clearance to be placed in his post as Franco's ambassador to the United States.

The labor movement has officially proclaimed itself against the establishment of full diplomatic and economic relations with Spain which can only bolster the Franco regime. But the opposition of the labor leaders to the policy of the government on this question is as weak and timid as their opposition to measures which affect them much more immediately and directly.

Truman Clubs Miners with T-H in Fair Deal's 8th Use of the Law (February 13)

The club didn't work that time, and the miners stayed out till they won. But before the year was over the railroad workers had been forced back to work under government "seizure" of the railroads. They did not have the solidarity and determination of the miners. Yet despite repeated experiences with the Fair Deal's policy in major strikes and the blasting of their hope that the Taft-Hartley Act would be repealed by the Democratic majority in Congress, the labor leaders keep clinging to their alliance with the Democratic Party.

Ruhr Industrialists Riding Back to Power on Allied Policies (April 3)

The article demonstrates what the headline states. And the present policy for the rearmament of Germany is directly related to the whole policy of the American occupation authority in Germany. The German people want nothing to do with rearming a Germany which is dominated by those who are bringing their ancient political enemies and oppressors back into the saddle.

Marshall Plan: Guns or Butter? (May 22)

The answer was: guns!

Times' Chief Says U. S. Hated by Europe, Asia (June 5)

This headline, in various forms, was destined to be repeated not only in LABOR ACTION, but in every serious discussion of the cold war throughout 1950. How could the United States win masses of people to its political banners when everywhere in the world it appears as the champion of a hated economic and social system? Stalin's brutal totalitarian system is hated too by those who have lived under it, and by those who understand what it represents. But all over the world Stalin's representatives, the Communist Parties, appear as enemies of the oppressors and exploiters of the people. They promise them land, an end to extortionate rents and taxes, a new social order. The United States promises them some Marshall Plan or Point Four aid, as long as they will consent to keep their present oppressors in power... and to fight in order that they may be kept in power.

WHOSE WAR IS IT? It Will Not Stop Stalinism—It Will Not Guarantee Peace—It Will Not Free Korea (July 10)

Under this headline appeared a statement by the Political Committee of the Independent Socialist League, including: "It is not our war, either, the war of the people of this or any other country. The responsibility for it falls entirely upon the shoulders of the two big powers in whose interests it is being fought. It is these two powers, the United States and Russia, with their allies and satellites as accomplices, which committed the great crime against the Korean people at the Yalta and subsequent conferences...."

"Unless the powerful labor movement adopts an independent policy of its own, based upon militant opposition to all imperialism and an aggressive championing of a genuinely democratic policy all over the world, peace will remain the precarious interlude that it is today, and the Third World War, with all its horrors and barbarism, will prove to be inevitable.

"If it does adopt and pursue such a policy, it can become the rallying center of all the peace-loving peoples of the world and a powerful guarantee of that peace which we must have in order to solve the problems that face us all."

The same issue of LABOR ACTION carried a headline: "It's War by Presidential Decree; Truman By-Passes Both Constitution and UN Action." Since then over 200,000 U. S. troops have been engaged in the "police action" in Korea, all without a declaration of war by Congress, and certainly without any consultation of the American people.

Another headline in the same issue: "Has the Kremlin Already Won Political Victory over Korea?" appeared over an article which ended: "The fact is that America cannot play a progressive role in the colonial world, and the illusions of Acheson proved to be precisely

that. Let those who think that the decisive steps of Truman have prevented a still greater disaster reflect on the matter a bit longer, in terms of consequences which are yet to be revealed fully to us."

Six months later—and the consequences have not yet fully developed. But we have seen enough in these six months....

Truman Holds Back Price Control As War Profiteering Soaks Labor (August 7)

That was at the beginning of the economic mobilization. Now, six months later, the mobilization is going into second gear, but the car is still traveling along the same road. The article concluded:

"But a labor movement as powerful as this one can yet do much to lighten the burden on the common people, and to shift it to the shoulders of the rich who can bear it best.

"A policy designed to do this requires a realization of what lies ahead and a bold determination to turn the 'equality of sacrifice' slogan from a soothing catchword in the mouths of capitalists and politicians into a reality. Such a policy will bring the labor movement into head-on collision with the capitalists, and with many of those whom it has labeled its 'friends' in politics. Yet anything short of it will mean that instead of defending the interests of the workers and the people as a whole, the labor movement and the labor leaders will simply become an instrument whereby the economic burdens of militarization and war will be borne completely by the workers."

UAW Heads Hit Vigilante Attacks on Alleged CPers (August 14)

A number of violent expulsions of alleged supporters of the Communist Party from various factories started shortly after the beginning of the war in Korea. The United Auto Workers leadership came out sharply against the use of violence in handling Stalinists or alleged Stalinists. However, it coupled this warning with a reminder that the FBI can be counted on to take care of these people, and that in any event the UAW constitution provides for legal ways of "taking care of" people who are detrimental to the union.

Thus back-handed encouragement was given to instituting a "legal" purge of political dissidents in the union. Since then Ford Local 600 has forced a loyalty oath on all its officers, and has brought some up on charges of being Communists despite the fact that they signed the oath. Other locals have taken up the loyalty-oath practice, but in at least one instance the membership overwhelmingly rejected this introduction of the witchhunt technique into the union.

Equal Sacrifice? Senate Bill Soaks Labor and People (August 28)

This was at the beginning of the partial economic mobilization of the country for war. Everything that has happened since then demonstrates the hypocrisy of any "equality of sacrifice" in an economic system which prides itself on the fact that it is based on inequality. With shortages in consumers' goods beginning to appear, and prices rising with increasing speed, the demand for stiffer taxation on the mass of the people is increasing in intensity under the slogan: Siphon off their money—to prevent inflation.

SED Convention Bares Economic Crisis in East Zone, Worker Resistance to Stalinism (September 4)

Where Stalinism rules, there is resistance by the people. Throughout the year LABOR ACTION carried articles on the UPA, the Ukrainian Liberation Army and its active underground in Russia. Through the chinks in the Iron Curtain stories leak out constantly of resistance of the workers to the speedup and bad conditions in industry. The Stalinists in the satellite countries are beset with the constant menace of national-Stalinism, the most extreme form of which is symbolized by Tito's Yugoslavia. Purge after purge takes place in all the Stalinist parties.

The lesson: Stalinism is not politically invincible. It can be undermined and defeated politically. But this can only be accomplished by a force which offers a new social order to the people, even if it be only national-Stalinism rather than Stalinism ruled by and in the interests of the masters of Russia. It cannot be accomplished if the only alternative is a return of capitalism through the victory of American arms.

Fair Deal Senators Join Reactionaries to Pass "Concentration Camp" McCarran Bill (September 18)

Thus a blow to political liberty in America was delivered from which we shall not soon recover. And the labor leaders who formally opposed the McCarran Act did not let their opposition go so far as to refuse to support the Fair Dealers who voted for it in the elections.

Reading from Left to Right

RELIGION AS CAMOUFLAGE. (East Europe, Nov. 9.)

East Europe points to the afflux of Stalinist demagoguery in sprinkling holy water over their "peace" projects:

"In Czechoslovakia, the minister of church affairs has set up a special working committee to comb the Bible for extracts" to justify their regime.

"In Sheffield [England], the organizers of the communist-sponsored World Peace Congress have issued a statement that at least five hundred Roman Catholics would attend as delegates...."

"On October 31 the [London] Daily Worker proudly stated that delegates to the World Peace Congress who were members of the Greek and the Russian Orthodox Churches would be able to worship in a Sheffield church...."

"The Daily Worker has suddenly become so church-minded that, in every article on the Sheffield Congress, it quotes a bishop, a Reverend Father, a 'noted ecclesiastical scholar,' and so on. This 'Christian fervor' of the British

Communist Party is going so far that, when describing foreign delegations, the representatives of foreign Communist Parties are not even mentioned. But it has been announced that in the Rumanian delegation, 'The Church will be represented by Father A. Jonescu, priest of the Grivitsa-Rose district of Bucharest'; that 'In the Soviet delegation, the Church will be represented by Nikolai, Metropolitan of Krutitsky and Kolomea....'

"When dealing with the Moscow Peace Congress, not only the Daily Worker but the entire Soviet press and radio abound with the titles of religious dignitaries. The Moscow Congress is said to have been attended not merely by the above-mentioned Orthodox high priests but by Bishop Gabriel of Allaverdy and Nikolai Magadzde of the Georgian Orthodox Church; the Supreme Patriarch Catholics of all Armenians, Georgius VI; and the Armenian Archbishop Vagan Kostanyan. From Asia will come Ul-Islam Ali Zade, sheikh of Transcaucasia"—etc., etc., etc.

Gott mit uns, as the Kaiser used to say.

U. S. Military Intelligence Bars Jewish DPs on "Red" Charges (October 2)

And foreigners of all nationalities are being barred as a result of the McCarran Act, from prominent musicians to humble folk who had to join a Nazi or a Stalinist trade union in order to make a living. This comes under the heading of preserving the American Way of Life, combating Stalinism, and in general of having holes in one's head.

Stalinists Meet a Setback in UAW Local (October 9)

One of the few sources of political pleasure which we can derive from the headlines of 1950 is the fact that something like above appeared dozens of times with reference to the UAW, the IUE, and other unions. And where the Stalinists were defeated decisively it was usually done not by red-baiting and flag waving but by a political attack coupled with a more progressive and militant union program. We hope for more of same in 1951.

Have They Lost Their Nerve? West Europe's Capitalists Sit on Their Suitcases for Quick Getaway (October 16)

If the capitalists won't defend their own system, is it reasonable to expect that the workers will die to defend it for them?

Labor's Bloc with Dems Gets it Nowhere as GOP Makes Hay on "Red" Issue (November 13)

The memory of labor's big flop in the elections is so recent that little comment is necessary. The labor leaders are still trying to explain the election away, but no amount of "explanation" can cover up the fact that as long as labor has no policy of its own to offer, and does not offer it independently, in its own name, its intervention in the political life of the nation is doomed to sterility.

This takes us down to Stalinist China's entry into the war in Korea. And as 1950 ends with increasing pressure by both Washington and Moscow to line up the peoples of the world in their respective war camps, the outstanding political fact of the beginning of 1951 is the reluctance, the outright resistance of the peoples of the world to the attempt to drag them into World War III. This reluctance and resistance is reflected in the efforts of the various governments to cling to some formula for preserving the peace, and in some instances to try to work out for themselves a formula for neutrality in the war.

The resistance will not, in the long run, prove successful unless it becomes organized, and even more, unless it adopts for itself a political and social program with a positive anti-Stalinist, anti-capitalist constant. It will be the purpose of LABOR ACTION in 1951 to contribute to the political organization and, even more, to the programmatic orientation of this Third Camp of the peoples of the world who want to fight neither for Washington nor for Moscow, but for peace through socialist democracy.

Not in the Headlines

On Church Finances

that they are better informed on business matters."

So he urged "practical-minded men of business" to go to church more often and "point out the facts" to the "idealistic" preachers.

"Writing a check" and sending it to a church is not enough to do the job, he warned his fellow businessmen.

Presumably, the preacher might just assume he was getting a donation out of Christian charity.

Child Labor Up

Child labor is on the increase, warns the National Child Labor Committee. One of the chief causes is the plight of the migrant farm workers.

The committee's report points out that the families of migrants also are largely excluded from a new federal law which bars the employment of children under 16 from farm work during school hours. The difficulty is that many communities, particularly in the Southwest, close their schools during the harvest season.

Since the migrant workers move from place to place with their families to follow the harvest, their children miss out on schooling all along the line.

The report says employment of children has increased through the last decade, due to high levels of employment during the war and the present armaments program.

Thousands more, even younger ones, are working on commercial farms, although the exact number is not known. Many of the children of migrant workers are quitting school at an earlier age than did their parents, the report declares, in direct contrast with the generally rising level of education throughout the country.

BOOKS and Ideas The New Book on the FBI—2 How the FBI Started—Illegally

By SAM ADAMS

In our first article on Lowenthal's new book *The Federal Bureau of Investigation* [issue of Dec. 18] we dealt briefly with the reception of this important book. I believe at least one point was made clear: the negative comments were based, not on an impartial examination of the facts contained in the book, but either on a professed admiration of the FBI and its police methods, a recognition and acceptance of the special social political role of J. Edgar Hoover's organization, or a "liberal" point of view which seems to paralyze certain individuals carrying that designation and prevent their adopting a clear and unmistakable position even where the facts argue for it.

Those who really reviewed the book naturally dealt with its voluminous documentation and accepted the facts as facts. The discussion of the reviewers and critics of the book followed a kind of pattern which runs roughly as follows: The criticism of the FBI, its illegal and unconstitutional activities, is largely true for its early years, particularly in the years when A. Mitchell Palmer and Barry M. Daugherty were successive attorneys general. But since J. Edgar Hoover became director of the bureau, things had changed and the FBI was the zealous guardian of all civil and democratic rights, constitutional violations disappeared, and minority movements of social protest, especially the movements of socialism, were no longer harassed, persecuted or prosecuted by it.

CONGRESS'S FEARS

The record of the FBI, however, does not sustain such an opinion. We shall endeavor to establish this by an examination of the book's material and by a special investigation of Hoover's particular role and activities.

One general comment about the book is, however, necessary before we treat with its contents. One of the adverse comments made of it is that it is written like a lawyer's brief, and that from the point of view of style, it is a dull book. A lawyer's brief it is, but the material is so important that one cannot leave it until the reading is finished. For how can one be indifferent to an agency of government that deals with the fundamental problem of the democratic process?

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (originally the Bureau of Investigation) is a modern phenomenon, coming into existence when the stratification of the classes and the monopolization of economic life was certain. Tradition had stood as a barrier to the establishment of a central or federal police agency. True, the Department of Labor and the Treasury Department had their police agents to deal with their specific problems, and the tasks of these agents were spelled out by Congress. Congress had an understandable horror of a central police body and it reacted violently when the proposal for such a police force was made by Attorney General Charles J. Bonaparte of the Theodore Roosevelt administration.

FORBIDDEN

In writing of this event, Lowenthal reveals that the FBI "had a somewhat unorthodox beginning." Bonaparte first made his proposal in 1907. But the 60th Congress withheld authorization for the establishment of such a division of the Department of Justice. Debate in the Senate and House was bitter. Outstanding senators and representatives openly expressed their grave fears of such a "spy organization" and called up visions of the secret police and Fouché, Napole-

on's police minister. The latter allusion was quite pointed, since Bonaparte was a descendant of the Little Corporal.

The congressional disturbance was great enough to cause an investigation of the activities of all federal police since other federal departments had developed the habit of borrowing such police, especially the Treasury's Secret Service, for their own use. The Department of Justice was one of the worst offenders in this practice, and Congress decided that this was thenceforth to be forbidden at the same time that it refused to sanction the establishment of the police agency of the Justice Department.

BEHIND THEIR BACKS

Attorney General Bonaparte, despite congressional admonition to the contrary, went ahead with his plan and on July 1, 1908, about a month after the adjournment of Congress, established his Bureau of Investigation (changed in 1935 to the Federal Bureau of Investigation) and thus this federal police agency was created. Illegally and without authorization!

No wonder Congress demanded an explanation of Bonaparte for his insolent conduct. But it was quick in coming. The attorney general pointed out that it was only a small police force and really an "innovation." Moreover, his act was "involuntary." Why involuntary? Because Congress had refused to accept his proposal and had forbidden his use of other federal police. What else could he do with crime rampant? We shall hear more of rampant crime repeatedly from Hoover.

President Theodore Roosevelt joined this fight in behalf of his attorney general, for the President was obviously the strongest supporter Bonaparte had. A heated election campaign was going on. The President, according to press reports of the time, had collected dossiers on the private affairs of some of his congressional opponents and threatened to disclose the material contained in these dossiers if they did not desist from their opposition to the plan to create this bureau. The man with the Big Stick took the fight to the public, charging Congress with aiding and abetting crime in its refusal to sanction this central police body.

BLACKMAIL

The threat of the president to disclose the material in the dossiers collected by his attorney general's police showed that the fears held by congressmen that such a bureau would engage in spy work on elected representatives in government were not idle ones. Congressmen charged that they had been shadowed and that their mail had been rifled. The president denied this and asserted that detectives charged with ferreting out criminals would not themselves violate the law by opening other people's mail (we hear this charge again in Hoover's administration). "But sometimes," the president added, "through the accidental breaking of such (a) package the contents are exposed."

Having made that explanation, the president proceeded to publish the private correspondence of Senator Tillman of South Carolina, an administrative opponent!

No wonder then that Congress worried about the type of man who would be employed as a detective by the government. This is no mere interesting aside. Police detection work in our society tends to be particularly degrading work because its premise is that all citizens are criminals or potential criminals and that the office of a policeman occupies a peculiar and particular high social plane. Their ways are devilish, their activities, developing a tradition and logic of their own, always border on the illegal when

they do not actually cross that boundary. And they are never really removed from the danger of corruption. Defenders of the law, they rarely if ever understand the law and its conflicting meanings. As "defenders" of the law, they are only too often apart and above the law.

Discussing the type of men to be employed by his new bureau, Bonaparte stated: "The class of men who do that work as a profession [detective] is one you have to employ with a good deal of caution."

FINDING WORK

In trying to defend the attorney general, Congressman Driscoll only emphasized the point of the critics: "I admit that a man who is a detective... cannot be a man of high moral ideals.... Of necessity they must and do live lives of deception.... There is an old saying, which is true today as it was when it originated, that 'it takes a thief to catch a thief.'"

Secretary of Interior James A. Garfield gave his opinion of the detective in general, stating: "Without in any way reflecting upon the work of good detectives, I find that the moment a man has perfected himself as a detective, he approaches nearly every case with a desire to prove that the person against whom a charge is made is guilty."

Congress, however, was having its own difficulties and it did nothing about Bonaparte's action in creating his department's federal police. What was this police body to do? Congressman Smith thought a law should be passed limiting its activities "to investigate crimes against the United States and frauds upon the government, and anybody who chose to use it for any purpose beyond that should go to the penitentiary." Stanley W. Finch, chosen to head the new police bureau under President Taft's new attorney general, George W. Wickersham, had to find the field of work for his body, since all criminal work up to the time of Bonaparte's action had been handled on a local and federal basis by other agencies. Finch admitted that the portion of crime detection work for his bureau would have to be that left over by all other local and federal agencies.

HOOVER'S START

In the beginning the bureau's crime work was "of a somewhat makeshift character." It investigated crimes on Indian and other government reservations; handled some District of Columbia cases of false purchases and sales of securities and a few peonage and bankruptcy fraud cases. The clause of the Constitution giving Congress power to regulate interstate commerce was interpreted to give the federal government jurisdiction over crimes "associated with the crossing of state boundaries...." Congress therefore passed a number of laws giving the bureau the task of working on such crimes. Laws forbade interstate shipment of "stolen goods, contraceptives, obscene books, prizefight films, and of liquor into dry states."

But, as Lowenthal points out, these were only odds and ends. And two years later, when Congress passed the Mann Act, the bureau received its great opportunity and that marked the beginning of its tremendous rise.

From that time on the bureau went through the First World War and began its own war against ideas and opinions, the first stage of which culminated in the formation of the General Intelligence Division. In this, J. Edgar Hoover played a most significant role, giving the "Radical Division" and "Anti-Radical Division" the above name.

(Continued next week.)

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 1 January 1, 1951

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 and L. G. SMITH
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

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.

Cold War on the Campus: Academic Freedom in 1950

By BOB MARTINSON

During the last few years the peaceful reversion of American university life has been interrupted by an unprecedented series of attacks.

Three professors were fired from the University of Washington for holding Communist views. A chemistry teacher was summarily dismissed from the University of Oregon for publishing a mild defense of the Russian biologist, Lysenko. The Illinois State legislature stepped up its attacks on the University of Chicago. University administrations throughout the country arbitrarily discharged professors who publicly supported the Progressive Party. A student strike at Olivet College failed to prevent the forced departure of an entire section of the faculty. Students at the University of Wisconsin were placed on probation for demonstrating against ROTC. The imposition of a loyalty oath on the professors of the University of California created chaos for over eighteen months and today threatens the university with academic dismemberment. President Gideonse of Brooklyn College currently imposes a reign of terror on his students by shutting down the college newspaper. These are but some of the high lights of the reactionary attack.

Under the Garrison State

Such cases only describe part of the damage, however, for this invasion penetrates every recess of university life. The daily fare of legislative investigations, lurid headlines, loyalty checks and irresponsible witchhunting produces an atmosphere of fear and hysteria. Professors are frightened into silence by social ostracism and economic pressure; the administration simply refuses to renew certain contracts. Students with unpopular opinions find it impossible to obtain economic aid or scholarships. The curriculum is changed ever so slightly.

The tremendous growth of modern industry and the increasing importance of the state bureaucracy produce a huge demand for administrators, trained technicians and semi-skilled specialists of many varieties. The university is no longer a cloistered playhouse for the sons and daughters of the idle rich. It is a necessary component of the advance of modern technology.

As the campus comes of age, the struggle to reduce its independence and to control its intellectual production becomes more acute. With the American nation attaining the status of a world power the isolated character of the university is increasingly viewed with alarm. Attempts to reduce or to modify academic freedom become more frequent.

Coming in the midst of a war scare, the present campaign is no more nor less than an effort to reduce the campus to an impotent defender of the status quo. Far from serving the real needs of scientific endeavor, their crude intervention merely expresses the insatiable demands of the Garrison State.

Organized Hysteria

In spite of its intellectual prestige, the university community meets the bewildering attack in a disorganized, almost instinctive manner. The time has come for an assessment of damages, a critical analysis of mistakes in strategy, and firm and realistic measures to combat this dangerous trend. Passivity or cynicism will not help, for it is impossible to dodge the issue by withdrawing into the deceptive security of academic life.

The attack on the university is an inevitable response to the cold war. No one worried about the danger of Stalinism to the university while America and Russia were allies. Liberal apologists for scientific objectivity like Sidney Hook are strangely mute concerning the circumstances under which the "cleansing" of the educational profession is taking place. To consider academic freedom in the abstract is to proceed with eyes closed, but then this is, perhaps, the only method left to those who consider the war to be the overriding consideration.

The general atmosphere produced by the cold war can most aptly be described as "organized hysteria." Star chamber proceedings, juicy spy trials and loyalty investigations provide a backdrop to the introduction of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Ober and Feinberg Laws and the McCarran Bill. The arbitrary hand of the FBI touches more

Following is a condensation (about half) of a new pamphlet published by the Berkeley (Calif.) Socialist Youth League. The author, Bob Martinson, was a key participant in the recent struggle over loyalty oaths at the University of California.

and more citizens with its semi-legal police measures. War in the name of democracy increasingly provides the rationale for the liquidation of democracy.

The preparation for imperialist war proceeds as usual under the slogan of strengthening the peace. But the tenuous nature of this peace smokescreen permits preventive war advocates to arise in the highest echelons of the government and the military. Wars for the partial revision of the earth are over; the coming war will decide whether Russia or the United States is to control and exploit the entire world. The enormity of this conflict demands unprecedented military and economic expenditures and presupposes a servile and obedient citizenry. But in this the Russians have a twenty-year head start!

The absence of a Pearl Harbor and the failure of American foreign policy to contain Stalinism breeds panic and uncertainty among the war-makers. To fight Stalinism they are forced to rely on odious and backward regimes hated by the people. The names Chiang Kai-shek, Bao Dai, Syngman Rhee, Quirino, spell oppression and misery to the Asiatics and thus, as in Germany, Japan, Austria, Korea, American military might is everywhere . . . and is nowhere effective.

Twofold Response

Every step taken by American imperialism leads new support to Stalinism; this is the lesson of five years of cold war. When ideas appear useless, force decides; this is the lesson of history. American armed intervention into Korea is the admission that the stage of argument has passed.

But an unpopular war lends itself to criticism, doubts and finally, anti-war activity. The student meets American military moves with an implacable passivity. Fired with no enthusiasm to give up his life in the farthest reaches of Asia, his faith in the ability of capitalism runs thin as soon as he is offered a uniform.

Since serious problems admit bold solutions the student expresses his dissatisfaction by turning to pacifism, World Federalism or socialism. Even Stalinism, which can gain few adherents in its own name, attracts many students with its demagogic peace appeals.

But a critical, thinking student body becomes more and more dangerous to the progress of the war. In a war to "get the Gooks" cannon-fodder, not intelligence, is mandatory. To "save the world" MacArthur must have at his command millions of America's youth, armed to the teeth and ready to fight. Thus the preparation for the war with Russia calls forth a twofold response; anti-war activity and the draft. The purpose of the prolonged assault on civil liberties and academic freedom is the repression of this contradiction by a forceful invasion of the American campus.

To Defeat Ideas . . .

"Oust the Communists from our universities." This is the slogan which covers the drive for thought control. Many students and professors embrace this formula without examining its real function, for on first glance it might appear reasonable.

"The Stalinists are totalitarians; to allow them to teach in our free universities is to subvert democracy." It is true that the reactionary social aims and totalitarian methods of Stalinism present serious dangers to the democratic process, but it does not follow from this that Stalinists should be expelled from the universities.

The CPers cannot be defined as espionage agents of Russia. The Communist Party is a political organization, based on certain ideas no matter how odious they may be and supported by thousands of ordinary Americans.

To defeat ideas requires better ideas. Repression may drive the Stalinists underground, but it will never defeat Stalinism as a social movement. The detectives of subversion fear critical discussion and the open, democratic com-

petition of ideas and turn in desperation to loyalty oaths, expulsions and purges. Those who have failed so miserably to defeat Stalinism abroad are making it impossible for the students to combat democratically the ideas and power of Stalinism in the university.

All supporters of the present virtual illegalization of the Communist Party start from the same false assumption: that the CP is a "clear and present danger" to American democracy. Such is the justification for the McCarran Bill, the trial of the eleven Communist leaders and a whole raft of dangerous and reactionary legislation.

Clear and Present Danger

But one look at the facts and the assumption tumbles to the ground. Before Murray decided bureaucratically to expel them from the CIO, the Stalinists suffered a wave of defeats in the labor movement. They lost the huge UAW in a prolonged, democratic trade union fight. They had begun to lose the UE before the expulsion and were thrown out of power in the NMU. Generally, the more open and democratic the fight, the more complete the defeat of the CP.

In any case the Communist Party today is underground. Its leaders are in jail, its power has been broken and its members are threatened with arrest and detention. It is a small, disorganized, pariah group. Why, then, does the holy crusade against civil liberties and freedom of thought continue?

In order to silence honest and justified opinion, the bogey of Communism is evoked. To win an election, Communism is made the issue. To prepare the population for war, Communist spies are discovered. Under the banner of fighting Communism the illegal "subversive" list is compiled, government workers are terrified, and the McCarran "concentration camp" bill is shoved through Congress.

The conclusion is unmistakable. The gentlemen are hysterical, and in their frenzied attempt to force the American people into the strait jacket of the Garrison State, they are undermining and subverting the long-established freedoms and liberties in whose name they speak. They, not the Stalinists, are the clear and present danger to American democracy!

Liberal Apologia

Enemies of academic freedom justify their actions, of course, by a long series of intricate and subtle arguments taken mostly from the liberal lexicon. Moves against democracy must be embellished with democratic phraseology.

The most imposing arguments for removing Stalinists from the schools come from Sidney Hook, teacher of philosophy at New York University. He should be happy to discover that his name was invoked time and again to justify the Regents' political test at the University of California.

Professor Hook's viewpoint can be paraphrased as follows: "A teacher, by joining the Communist Party, commits an act which destroys his ability to function as a free intellectual. He cannot honestly consider ideas opposed to the party line which is laid down in every area of thought from art to zoology" but must turn the classroom into a forum for propagating the ideas and program of Stalinism. As a dangerous opponent of democracy and the scientific method, he should be dismissed from his post." Hook discards the argument that teachers should be judged by their performance in the classroom alone, on the doubtful ground that a system of spying might be set up, and insists on applying a political criterion for hiring and firing. Finally he proposes that action against Stalinist teachers be decided by faculties and not administrations or regents.

Hook merely offers an up-to-date, "liberal" version of the paternalistic theme. With the witchhunters (not the Stalinists) subverting freedom of thought, Hook calmly proposes certain "safeguards" while virtually supporting by his silence the general implications of the attack.

The pundits of American education are not the paragons of impartiality assumed by his arguments. Nor are all Stalinists cloak-and-dagger defilers of the Truth. A university is an intellectualized mirror of the outside world and would

become a dead, useless institution if "one-sidedness" (different viewpoints) were suppressed. Hook's arguments are ex post facto rationalizations for the attack on academic freedom, not proposals for the strengthening of academic objectivity.

The new infamous case of the long, bitter struggle between the professors and the Regents of the University of California over the imposition of a special non-Communist loyalty oath, presents the most striking example of the damage produced by the invasion of the campus.

In fear of an attack on the university by the California Legislature's Tenney Committee, President Sproul proposed that all university employees sign a special non-Communist oath. The Regents passed the oath measure on June 24, 1949, and immediately imposed it on the unprepared faculty.

The Faculty Hedges

The intervention of summer vacation cut short any effective opposition, and many faculty members, either through fear for their jobs or through lack of information, signed the oath. A large minority (the non-signers) refused to be coerced, and the key to the entire subsequent fight lay in an adamant refusal to comply. This stalwart band of scholars was whittled down by a series of betrayals and compromises from hundreds to a tiny group of ten, who are today fighting the issue in the courts.

The struggle opened quietly enough, for at first the area of agreement was so great that the official faculty negotiating committee accepted the oath on principle, but demanded that it be *reworded* so as not to "insult" the "loyal and patriotic" faculty. Thus a lack of clarity was introduced from the very start. The faculty implicitly agreed that Communists should not be allowed to teach, but disliked the oath as a method of removing Communists. The non-signers, meanwhile, vociferously demanded the complete revocation of the Regents' action.

The Regents' ultimatum of February 24, 1950, finally cut short the futile and endless negotiations between them and the faculty committee (with its compromiser majority). Sign the oath or get out! The deadline for signing was set for April 30.

The ultimatum immediately sprang into national prominence. The campus rocked with charges and countercharges as university after university sent messages of support and prom-

ises of financial aid. Classroom activity somehow continued amid denunciations, resolutions and faculty and student meetings. The faculty, not daring to make a real fight, passed resolutions endorsing the Regents' anti-Communist policy in the hope that the oath would be removed, but the Regents refused to budge although the dismissal of the hundreds of non-signers threatened, the university with virtual dismemberment.

Results of a Compromise

The temperature of the campus reached white heat as April 30 approached. Student groups, led by the Berkeley Socialist Youth League, organized into a committee and held a series of demonstrations and meetings in preparation for a possible student walkout in support of the faculty. The academic world, finally aroused to the danger, deluged the university with protests, resolutions of support and promises of financial aid to the non-signers.

The "compromise" of April 21, proposed by the Alumni Association, and accepted by the faculty committee and the Regents, cut short all activity. The special oath was replaced by its equivalent in the professors' employment contract while the faculty committee on tenure was given the power to investigate the political beliefs of the non-signers and to make recommendations to the Regents. The faculty committee traded academic freedom for the right of the faculty to police its own members within the rules set down by the Regents.

Thinking the issue was over, the faculty set up a committee and rather sheepishly examined the "loyalty" of the non-signers. But even this abject capitulation failed, for the Regents refused to accept the recommendations of the tenure committee and after surveying the wreckage, reintroduced the ultimatum. By this time, the long series of betrayals and equivocations had cut the non-signers down to a small impotent group and the fight was over. The Regents disrupted University life for over eighteen months, forced every employee to sign the oath, and finally even removed tenure decisions from the hands of the faculty.

The results have been disastrous. More than eighty teaching assistants and lecturers resigned or were fired. Twenty-one faculty non-signers (many with over twenty years of service) cannot teach forty-three scheduled courses during the fall semester. The psychology department is dismembered, graduate students are leaving en

masse, and various professional associations have blacklisted the university.

The issue of Communism proved to be a smokescreen, for only two persons were ever dismissed for membership in the Communist Party. The success of the invasion of the campus is complete, for a free university has been reduced to an academic shambles.

Democracy on the Campus

What can be done at other universities to hinder the spreading inquisition?

In the first place, the mistakes made during previous fights must not be repeated! The student body must actively intervene in defending the campus from its enemies, for their right to an education lies in the balance. The faculty will attempt to convert the issue of academic freedom into a power struggle over tenure, and it will hesitate to stand squarely for the right of Stalinists and other political dissidents to teach. At the University of California, this led to the sacrifice of teaching assistants and non-signers as a compromise measure which in turn produced complete collapse.

The following program, distilled from the many struggles which have already taken place, is essential to a successful defense of academic freedom today: (1) no political tests for teachers, (2) the only test for hiring and firing should be individual competency in the classroom, and (3) the right to judge competency must rest with the faculty, not the regents, administration or legislature.

By combining these principles with a determined mass effort of faculty and students, the voice of free thought can be raised against the witchhunters. Timidity and compromise have already failed! Faculty reticence should not tie the hands of the students who should step forward and take open and decisive action. Meetings, demonstrations and protests can provide support to the faculty and can convince them that any compromise is a death blow to both academic freedom and tenure.

In the last analysis, only general hints are possible. A convinced and conscious student body will discover its own tactics in the heat of the struggle, as proved by the magnificent efforts of the students of Olivet, the University of California and Brooklyn College. What is important is a firm determination to defend the university from its enemies . . . to drive the cold war off the campus.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor . . .

On Withdrawal of Troops from Korea

To the Editor:

I regret that LABOR ACTION adds its small honest voice to the hypocritical howl of the Stalinists for the withdrawal of all troops from Korea. It is so very obvious that this Stalinist slogan is camouflage for the real objective, namely, to leave Korea to the tender mercy of Stalin-Mao.

Plainly the immediate situation calls for a cease-fire as the first step towards a possible negotiated peace. If it be said that a "negotiated peace," even if possible, still will not bring the peace that the world wants and that socialists advocate, I will agree. But surely the withdrawal of the troops will not bring such peace or any peace, and this latter course will definitely result in a Stalinist Korea. If that comes anyway, at least LABOR ACTION need not help it along. LABOR ACTION might make its own contribution to the cease-fire demand as the first step for a negotiated peace, by specifying who should set the terms of the cease fire and who should negotiate the peace.

I want to ask how the concepts which form the main theme of the lead article in the December 11 issue—the article raising the demand to withdraw all troops from Korea—would be hurt if the cease-

fire were called for rather than the withdrawal of the troops. Contrariwise, how are those fundamental concepts helped by demanding the withdrawal of the troops? Are not those principles, in fact, hurt by associating them with the same slogan used by the Stalinists for their own barbaric purposes?

Susan GREEN

We are for the withdrawal of American troops from Korea because, as Comrade Max Shachtman put it in the issue before last, the Korean war, which began as an "irresponsible adventure" by American imperialism, is now fast becoming a "criminal adventure" in the face of recent events. We are not for more American soldiers dying in an enterprise which has only pushed, and can only push, the Asian people more firmly into the snare of Stalinist demagogy.

Even if the U. S. succeeded militarily in taking all of Korea, the political victory has still been won by Stalinist totalitarianism. American imperialism cannot defeat Stalinism there, with its policies, whatever the immediate military outcome. This we have said many times. It is triply important to say so today.

The idea of a "negotiated peace," which sounds very nice, takes on different meaning with different contents. In the mouths of what we used to call the Wallaceite types, it meant making concessions to and appeasing Russia. This is a meaningful, if abhorrent, viewpoint: in any negotiations, one has to be prepared to give as well as to get. An advocate of "negotiated peace" has to decide what to give Russia in exchange for peace (or a temporary lull). That is the Wallaceite "negotiated peace."

What it may mean to Comrade Green, we cannot say, and it is possible that she does not feel called upon to work it out. A responsible political movement, however, cannot for long limit itself to the slogan of "negotiated peace" without also saying something about the basis of negotiation. A "negotiated peace" on a socialist basis would be a fine thing, and such terms could be worked out, but it would not add up to a "practical" program for the consideration of either Western or Eastern imperialism but to an appeal to the peoples against both. Perhaps this is what Comrade Green has in mind in her phrase "specifying who should set the terms of the cease-fire and who should negotiate the peace."

Both the U. S. and Russia-China may, indeed, enter into negotia-

tions over the Korean war before long, since it is likely that neither is at present prepared for full-scale world war. Their negotiations will be on their usual diplomatic level—with the realities of military power behind it. We cannot and do not take an iota of responsibility for any of the results of such diplomatic power deals ("negotiations").

Comrade Green lays great stress (twice) on the fact that the Stalinists also call for the withdrawal of troops from Korea. It is not a method of discussion useful for straight thinking. The Stalinists also attack the McCarran Law and yell for academic freedom, etc., as "camouflage for their real objective" and "for their own barbaric purposes." We expose them, their objectives and purposes; but surely Comrade Green would not have us abandon any of these views (including the withdrawal of troops) simply because the Stalinists are for this or that aspect of those views. The policy has to be judged on its own merits (including its own merits as a part of a whole and rounded policy to fight Stalinism), and not on the principle that "we must be agin' anything they're for."

There are too many people who operate on that system now, and we certainly do not intend to add our "small honest voice" to their

howls, either.

Our view on the withdrawal of troops from Korea follows from everything we have said about the Korean war, and as such it is a part of our total position on it, one plank in our view of how to defeat Stalinism in the world. To isolate it from our whole policy, then match it up against something the Stalinists say, and proceed to raise the fear of "association" with the Stalinists is an exceedingly unenlightening procedure. LABOR ACTION is, in fact the most effective socialist instrument of anti-Stalinist education precisely because we are also uncompromisingly anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist.—Ed.

Subscribers — Attention!
Check your NAME — ADDRESS — CITY — ZONE — STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one.
If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

15-1

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.
RENEW NOW!

The Hard Lesson of Korea --

(Continued from page 1)

back: six aircraft carriers, six cruisers, the battleship Missouri, packs of destroyers, swarms of auxiliary vessels, and uncounted numbers of aircraft to give the United States unchecked control over air and sea. Nevertheless, it was necessary to dispatch 125,000 American troops, fully equipped (more than six divisions), to utilize 80,000 troops of the reactionary Rhee, and assorted UN token forces. U. S. casualties alone, up to the time of the Chinese offensive, were reported close to the 30,000 mark. All this, to fight a war in a small corner of the globe against a "backward satellite of Russia."

This marks the dissolution of the myth of unlimited American superiority and invincibility. But more: it is a terrible portent of the wealth, the labor, the blood that the American people will be forced to pour onto the battlefields of the world if they permit a third world war to begin under the same policies, under the same capitalist-class leadership that have dominated up to now.

Every maneuver in the Korean war has been guided by this blustering faith in the power of American saber-rattling and contempt for the powers of resistance of the peoples of the East. Truman announced not a war but a police action in Korea. Hitler hated to dignify the uprising of the Warsaw Jews by sending regular German troops against them. It would not do for superior "Aryans" to admit that contemptible Jews could rise to the level of warriors.

THE REAL QUESTION

Similarly, the North Koreans could not be permitted the dignity of making war. Americans were to land on the peninsula simply as uniformed policemen to impose law and order on ruffians. When U. S. troops neared the 38th parallel, India warned that the Chinese would intervene if the par-

allel were crossed. But American strategists, gamblers and adventurers all, ignored all such admonitions. Bluff! How could the contemptible Chinese dare to stand up against the United States?

The crushing counter-offensive which hurled back the "final" American victory march, was accompanied by that most futile and inane discussion: "Why weren't we warned?" was the insistent question. "Why couldn't our information services detect the mobilization of 600,000 Chinese troops on the Manchurian borders? How could they swoop down so unexpectedly?" As though it were a matter of military intelligence and spying and not a matter of political judgment and social wisdom!

The question that looms so large for America—as it did before the Korean war, before the Chinese intervention—is this: Do you not see the billions of peoples of Asia who hate imperialism and who want national freedom? Victory or defeat—and now it is defeat—the intervention in Korea and the blockade of Formosa could have only one effect, to drive these Asiatic peoples into the arms of Russian Stalinism.

That was the reality; that remains the reality. But American policy up to the Chinese intervention was expressed most honestly and most succinctly by the words of one high-ranking American officer in Korea: "We honestly believed that all we had to do was stand up and show our American uniform and the gooks would turn and go back across the 38th parallel."

ASIA ON WORLD STAGE

Now we know that this naive contempt, this wistful reliance on the power of the American uniform to frighten away all evil, is suicidal. In Asia, hundreds of millions of colonial and semi-colonial peoples who for centuries have served as beasts of burden for powerful imperialist masters now show that they intend to fight, in one way or another, for their freedom. They seek to rise out of their age-old feudalism, and their entry onto the stage of history as powerful fighting forces is one of the most profound facts of modern times.

Today Western Germany is that these most progressive yearnings are manipulated and perverted to serve a new monstrous totalitarianism. Every act

You're Invited

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

The Handy Way

To Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription:

- NEW RENEWAL
 6 months at \$1.00
 1 year at \$2.00

NAME
(please print)

ADDRESS

ZONE APT.

CITY

STATE

- Bill me.
 Payment enclosed.

of the American capitalist class in Asia serves to deepen the influence of Stalinism.

Nothing and no one offers any reasonable alternative policies to those that have led to the Korean debacle, except the still weak and uninfluential voice of Independent Socialism.

One congressional genius demanded the opening of a "second front" on the Chinese mainland; and since American troops were hard pressed to maintain the several fronts into which their forces were splintered, he insisted that we mobilize the idle troops of Chiang Kai-shek to make a landing. A quarter-century experience with this same Chiang led the Chinese masses to tear him from the pinnacle of power and reduce him to an island satrap propped up by American naval power. Chiang who drove the Chinese into the arms of Stalinism, Chiang the semi-fascist discredited dictator, is to carry the ideals of freedom into Asia!

HOOVER'S QUACK REMEDY

A mode of action better calculated to strengthen the hold of Stalinism over the Asiatic peoples would be hard to find, but American politicians and commentators can find them! In the ludicrous scramble for a policy, absurdity and absurdity follow upon stupidity: Arm Japan!

Socialist Arms for Germany

To the Editor:

It is considered inevitable that Western Germany will be one of the first major European countries invaded from the east as soon as World War II "really" begins. It is equally clear that the military occupation of this partitioned country by Russian or satellite troops will mark the death of any bona-fide German trade-union movement and the enslavement of the workers, not to mention the physical destruction of any socialist or social-democratic parties.

Today Western Germany is an occupied country, and its people are being offered the chance to furnish themselves as cannon fodder for the very armies that occupy it, so that another imperialist nation might not substitute its armies and its government in place of the present regime. There is certainly nothing to be gained by the German people in furnishing such puppet troops. At the same time a real outside threat does menace them.

Here is where the Third Camp position can be applied with the maximum results. Such a program as will be outlined can certainly meet the needs of the situation. Not only that, but it will diminish any fifth-column activities as well. Naturally it will be unacceptable to the reactionary imperialist governments now occupying Germany. As revolutionary socialists, however, we do not appeal to reactionary governments relying upon such appeals alone, but to the masses of the people themselves, and especially to the labor movement.

(1) Immediate distribution of arms by the trade-union movement in Germany together with Socialist Party supervision, to the workers for their individual possession.

(2) A workers' militia, under trade-union auspices, to elect its own officers, to drill in units ranging down to "cells" of resistance, in case the country became occupied. All workers to be allowed to participate democratically in such organizations, and to be active politically off-duty. (Certainly such an organization could engender more of a will to fight than all the Sam Browne belts

Bomb Manchuria! All-out support for the French puppet regime in Indo-China! Intermittent bombings of selected areas in China!

Even the ghosts of an almost forgotten past drone out their advice. The man whose incisive social vision and rugged individualism guided a stricken nation into its most bitter days of misery, Herbert Hoover, masters courage. Every quack has his day when no one can find a remedy. His solution for America's isolation from the world is to quit Europe and Asia and throw a barricade around the Western Hemisphere based on England and Japan.

The success of this policy requires only that two minor aspects be worked out. First: How is the United States to win popular support even for its second-french defense when it has failed so utterly up to now? Second: How to do what the adversaries of Joe Louis, in his prime, couldn't do: they could run but they couldn't hide.

In all the muddle and turmoil only one idea pushes out clearly enough so that all schools of capitalist opinion can grab hold. "We must arm. We must summon more millions for the armed forces. We must get ready to sacrifice, to fight. . . ." But what will be the final cost of such a war? Will this spilling of blood be a

necessary cost of the struggle for liberty, or the futile price of maintaining capitalism in the United States? How to fight Stalinism? What are the lessons of Korea? Instead of answers, we hear only a bedlam.

What is urgently, even desperately, required now is a new policy, one which relies not primarily upon military force but one which aims to win millions of people all over the world away from Stalinism, to undermine their attachment to Russia, to win them to the struggle for national freedom and democracy.

In its state of utter confusion and world political disorientation, when the ravings of every madman and adventurer in Congress or out receive a respectful and serious audience from press and public, only one possible turn in policy is ignored, exactly the only sane world course which could possibly bring the American people out of their isolation from the peoples of the rest of the world. This is: to appeal not to dictators, capitalists, landlords, and oppressors, but to the peoples who want land, jobs, democracy, national dignity; to organize against all exploiters in a common, world-wide fight for freedom.

This is exactly what a capitalist United States cannot do. This is what an Independent Socialist policy could do.

Readers Take the Floor . . .

looking toward national planning the solution to the people's problems.

(c) A call for the rest of Europe to unite behind such a program, pooling resources and manpower to face their problems together.

(3) Such a national organization to call for aid from other similar national organizations in France, the Benelux countries, and the Scandinavian countries. Naturally the Stalinists will be unable to support such a program and will be shown up for what they are: agents of Russia.

(4) Immediate withdrawal of all occupying troops, so that foreign domination might be avoided. Foreign arms will be accepted, but no troops outside of volunteers who place themselves under the leadership of the German union and socialist movements.

(5) A declaration of principles and organization:

(a) Rejecting all foreign domination, whether Western Capitalism or Eastern totalitarianism.

(b) A Third Camp statement

Oakland, Dec. 22 J. WALKER

Correspondents, Contributors, Readers:

PLEASE NOTE!
LABOR ACTION
and the
INDEPENDENT
SOCIALIST
LEAGUE
(National Office)

HAVE MOVED
from their offices at
4 Court Square,
Long Island City, N. Y.
to—

New address:
114 West 14 St.
New York 11, N. Y.

The national office will now be housed together with the New York local of the ISL, which has been located at 114 West 14 Street throughout.

As we reported a few months ago, the building at 4 Court Square was damaged by fire. We wish to thank our friends for donations received in answer to our request for help to defray the expenses which resulted.

The above change of address also applies to all other Independent Socialist institutions previously at 4 Court Square, including:

Labor Action Book Service.
The New International.
Socialist Youth League (national office).
Independent Socialist Press.

N. Y. ROUND-TABLE SYMPOSIUM

on
The Meaning of the
British Labor Government

by

Max Shachtman
National Chairman, ISL

Gordon Haskell
Writer for Labor Action

Emanuel Garrett
Managing Editor, New International

THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 8:30 p.m.

Labor Action Hall
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Admission 50 cents