

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MAY 19, 1952

FIVE CENTS

Bolivia Revolution Faces Crisis

... page 2

South Africa: Racial Dictatorship

... page 3

In this issue:

STUDENT SOCIALIST

Three Page Student-Youth Section

Statement of the Social Democratic Party of Japan

Why Do We Oppose JAPAN'S REARMAMENT?

The following article was sent last April to the Japan News, the only English language paper run by foreigners in Japan, at its request. It was written by Mosaburo Suzuki, chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Japan, who also sent a copy to LABOR ACTION.

We are glad to print it for the information of our readers. We are sure that they will be interested in this statement of the position of the Japanese socialists. Some comments on the article appear in an adjoining column.—Ed.

By MOSABURO SUZUKI

Let me frankly state our views opposing Japan's rearmament.

The first reason for our opposition is the constitution given by General MacArthur which pledges to the world that Japan will never rearm or participate in wars but will maintain neutrality and peace. Later, the Korean conflict arose to change the situation in Asia, and because of this change in the situation it is now often argued by foreigners that Japan should carry out her obligations by perpetuating the occupation of Japan by the United States garrison and by setting out to rearm even in disregard of the constitution given by General MacArthur.

Such an argument reveals a serious miscalculation on their part as to the outlook on the world situation, and no fault of occupied Japan. The Korean conflict and the consequent change in the situation was brought about chiefly by the United States and the Soviet Union, who were attempting to include Korea, and then Japan, in their spheres of influence, and, therefore, presumably they will be able to ease the present critical situation by taking steps to guarantee substantially Japan's neutrality instead of tampering with the affairs of Korea and Japan. We should try to set our course in this direction.

Secondly, the capitalists in defeated Japan or Germany must have realized that "wars are not paying," but we are aware that there are in the victor countries a number of capitalists who have found through their own experience that wars are profitable. Japanese and German militarism, that is the domination of the government and the Diet by the military, has gone out of existence. But we must know that elsewhere there may be a danger of parliamentary government being controlled by soldiers or military cliques.

Aware of Horrors of War

The present critical world situation was not brought about by the Communist side alone. In this civilized world no militarists or war profiteers will say that they advocate armament to fight wars, but they will say that they favor arm-

ament for peace, hiding their real intent under the robe of peace.

We are fully aware of the sins and horrors of war, and we must not overlook the above trend in the recent world situation.

Thirdly, some contend that as proved by history an independent nation will require her own armed forces. The contention is plausible enough, but basically it will be a mistake to think or say that Japan will regain her independence and freedom as a nation after the coming into effect of the Peace Treaty.

Even after the Peace Treaty has taken effect, Japan will have neither independence nor freedom. We must bear in mind this fact. Defending the argument the contenders say that British sovereignty is unimpaired by the presence of foreign troops stationed in England, but defeated Japan cannot justly be compared with Britain.

That Japan will neither have independence or freedom is well known to the Japanese government if not to others. The troops kept by a nation which has no sovereignty nor freedom will necessarily become mercenaries of foreign powers.

Furthermore, modern history of the world shows that many nations went down under the economic pressure of unduly heavy armament or through wars brought about by stepping up armament.

Fourthly, with her economic power destroyed by atom bombs, and her power for production of munitions taken away, Japan is now denuded of all war potential.

Neutrality Against Both Sides

What nation historically has ever been placed under such a condition? If Japan is to be re-armed, what armed forces or equipment should she have to maintain her neutrality against the influence of the United States and the Soviet Union? How can she ever hope to maintain her neutrality anyway?

Fifthly, there are questions of the people's living and Communism. For rearmament will necessarily bring about the deterioration in the people's standard of living.

Nations in Europe have fully realized this fact through actual experience. With Japan, her isolation, both political and economic, from continental Asia—Communist China and the south-east Asian nations—will make it increasingly difficult for her to attain economic autonomy.

The suppression of Japan's trade with continental Asia by the United States is tantamount to an attempt to starve the Japanese people to death as it will deprive her of her ability to achieve a self-supporting economy which is essential to her independence.

Such a measure will breed Communism among the working masses of the Japanese people.

The United States should justly recognize the

fact that the only party which is fighting Communism in all earnest is the left wing group of the Japan Social Democratic Party.

Rearmament Aids Reaction

Lastly, the sixth reason is the most important one. The problem of rearmament is now being capitalized on by the fascistic nationalists and militarists of the type that flourished in the days of the Tojo regime. Since rearmament has been made an issue, the purges and ex-soldiers have come to command a stronger voice, and some of them have even styled themselves as the exponents of a new Nazism.

I hope the United States will realize that the best way to win over the majority of the Japanese people to western democracy is to have the Allied Powers pay kind consideration to the special conditions governing present-day Japan. I hope that the United States will recognize the fact that in upholding the world's peace and international justice, the most sincere cooperation will be offered not by those who represent the conservative influence in Japan, but by the exponents of the progressive influence who stand on true democracy.

Comment on JSPD Statement

By GORDON HASKELL

It should be borne in mind, in the first place, that Comrade Suzuki's article was written for an English language newspaper. Presumably the vast majority of the readers of such a paper in Japan are Americans, and further, the particular kind of Americans who have come to the country as part of the occupation. It would appear that the tone of the article as a whole, and particularly its last paragraph can only be accounted for on the basis of the author's desire to appeal to this particular group of readers.

Without attempting an exhaustive analysis or critique of the article, we think that a few comments are in order.

The strength of the article lies in its insistence that under present circumstances the rearmament of Japan cannot be a contribution either to the welfare or safety of the country, or to world peace. Further, the argument that Japan, even after the peace treaty has gone into effect, cannot be considered a completely independent and free country, seems to us unassailable. This treaty was granted only in return for the assumption by Japan of certain obligations (acceptance of the continued garrisoning of the country by American troops is one example) which are inconsistent with true sovereignty.

Americans and others who may question this contention need consider only one possibility. What would be the American attitude, and action, if tomorrow or next year the Social Democratic Party of Japan were to gain an electoral majority, and thereupon decide that the best

Turn to last page)

Crisis Lies Ahead in Bolivian Revolution As Armed Workers Face Nationalist "Allies"

In the following article Juan Rey presents his analysis of the present situation in Bolivia as well as a program for the workers of that country. We believe that both will prove of exceptional interest to our readers.

Information on the course of events in Bolivia and on the exact character of the political movements in that country is extremely limited in New York. Yet we feel constrained to point out that if the Bolivian Stalinist movement is similar to its counterparts in other lands, it is very doubtful whether it would be either possible or desirable for the left wing workers there to form a government in alliance with the Stalinists.

By Juan Rey

The nationalist coup d'etat in Bolivia acquired the backing of the workers when the reactionary militarists began to bombard the city of La Paz, and primarily its workers' quarters. The armed nationalist workers defeated eight regiments, and destroyed the army intierly, thus transforming themselves into the sole armed and organized force in the country, a force which is also powerful politically.

The watchword of the workers is: nationalization of the mines, and agrarian reform. But even though the Nationalist Party has also promised nationalization of the mines and agrarian reform, there is a wide difference on these questions between the workers and the nationalist leadership. Bolivia's President Paz Estenssoro has also promised nationalization of the mines, but his minister, Guevara, has declared that this nationalization does not mean the confiscation of the properties, but only control over the income of the mines and its investment in the industrialization of the country. Paz Estenssoro has declared: "we are not an anti-capitalist government." The official leadership of the MNR (Nationalist) party wants to "study" the problem of appeasing the workers. The minister of "Indian affairs," Nuffo Chavez, has limited the agrarian reform to the division of unproductive estates. But the masses demand the re-division of the soil among all peasants. They demand "nationalization of the mines under workers' control."

President Paz' declaration differs from the wishes of the workers, and from the declarations of John J. Lechin, minister of Petroleum and Mines, and representative of the nationalist mine workers. The conflict between the right wing of the MNR, represented by Paz Estenssoro, and the left wing directed by Lechin, Burton and other leaders of the nationalist workers is inevitable. In the present situation, the workers are the decisive force in the country.

GREAT DEMONSTRATION

The Bolivian Workers Center (Central Obrera Boliviana) has been organized, backed by the most important unions headed by the mine workers, industrial workers and railway workers. Minister Lechin is also the general secretary of this Bolivian Workers Center. If the organizational forms are inspired by Argentine Peronism, the spirit of the Bolivian workers is different due to the circumstances in the country in which the armed workers are the decisive armed and political force. Today, on the first of May, a great demonstration of the workers' militia took place in

La Paz. Though the displaying of "foreign flags" was prohibited, and only the Bolivian national tricolor was permitted to appear, the spirit of the workers' demonstration was frankly revolutionary and directed against the right wing of the MNR, that is, against President of the Republic Paz Estenssoro.

At this demonstration Juan Lechin said: "The revolution has begun now. We must and we will nationalize the mines and give the soil to the peasants, to the Indians. If the government wants to stay in power, it must carry out the basic wishes of the workers. Some opportunists and bureaucrats who have arrived at the government palace suppose that the revolution is completed. But they are mistaken. We are here, the armed workers, to demand the fulfillment of the revolutionary program."

Even if Lechin also said that Villaroel is the workers' hero, even if his speech was a mixture of nationalism and spontaneous revolutionarism, he reflected the revolutionary sentiments of the workers. He invited the right wing of the party to realize the wishes of the workers, he called on it to do so.

REVOLUTIONARY FEELINGS

Lechin's speech was backed by other labor leaders, including Moller, secretary of the bank employees, and San Jines, secretary of the railway union and former militant of the PIR (Stalinists). They reflect the revolutionary feelings of the workers who, while supporting nationalism, demand the nationalization of the mines and agrarian reforms with the hope that this will better their situation.

But the right wing of the MNR will not proceed immediately to nationalization, neither does it have the power to resist the workers. The situation is very peculiar, and reminds one somewhat of the situation in Russia in 1905. There is the government of Paz Estenssoro, a nationalist government backed by the workers and with union representatives participating in the cabinet. But there is also the powerful Bolivian Workers' Center (COB) and the workers' militia.

If the workers' wing of the MNR led by Lechin, or even better, if the COB were to take all the power into their own hands and arrest the nationalist government now, they could do it. But, I think, they will not do it, and so will lose the opportunity to drive the revolution forward.

At this moment Bolivia is the most revolutionary country in South America and it could precipitate the social revolution. But clear revolutionary consciousness is lacking. The POR ("Trotskyists")

will not issue the watchword: "All power to the workers' unions," because it does not want to break with the nationalists. If the workers' unions do not present an ultimatum to the government, they will miss the revolutionary situation, and they will then be defeated. Only a workers' government, representing the whole working class, including the nationalists, Stalinists and Trotskyists could realize the bourgeois-democratic postulates of the revolution, that is, agrarian reform and the economic liberation of the country. But that would be a socialist revolution.

Nationalization of the mines under a capitalist government is, for the workers, an illusion. It may be a "socialist" illusion, but an illusion it remains nevertheless. The central problem of the social revolution is that of power.

The workers must take the power, even if they are nationalist and Stalinist workers, and then proceed to the realization of the revolutionary program. There is not and cannot be a dividing line between the bourgeois and socialist revolutions, because the revolution is a single, undivided historical process. The social revolution of our time, even in Bolivia, must be a workers' revolution because only the workers can accomplish it. That is, it must go forward under a workers' government, not under a coalition between the workers and the nationalists. But the situation is so peculiar that the nationalist party and its government is now backed by the workers' unions.

They will have to come to a break, and the workers' wing of the "national revolution" will have to free itself from the na-

tionalist influence. The POR party could have a tremendous influence in this process, but it will not do so because it believes that the bourgeois-democratic revolution must be directed by the nationalists, after which will come "our turn."

The situation in the country is very tense, and the alternatives are: either a workers' government which will go beyond nationalism, or the stabilization of the present nationalist government, the inevitable defeat of the workers' wing of the "national revolution" followed by a terrible reaction, new massacres of the workers, and the persecution of all left parties.

The events in which these alternatives will be played out will take place in the immediate future. We will not prejudge the development of the situation.

LONDON LETTER

British LP Steps Up Attack on Tories; Bevanites Gain Strength in Unions

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, May 6—On Sunday, the Labor Party marched for the first time since 1939 to celebrate May Day. Unfortunately the weather was terrible, and the speakers as well as the crowds of supporters in Trafalgar Square were drenched through and through.

Arthur Deakin, president of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress was the only speaker who ran into any violent opposition. The other speakers, such as Percy Daines of the Co-operative Party, Edith Summerskill, and Roy Jackson of the Labor Party League of Youth were cheered by all present. Percy Daines called on the labor movement to recapture the pioneering spirit of the old days. He also warned the movement of the dangers of what he termed "industrial action," a phrase that is frequently used these days without its meaning being clearly understood. Roy Jackson made a stirring appeal for international cooperation with the backward and undeveloped countries, but was unable to suggest anything more useful than United Nations action to affect such cooperation.

During the weekend, Labor speakers all over the country have dwelt upon the incompetence and bungling of the Tory government. The system in the Cabinet where the "overlords" supervise and coordinate the actions of ministers responsible to Parliament has been severely criticized as unconstitutional by Herbert Morrison at Cardiff. In fact, the Tory government is believed to be in such a state of disorganization that the Labor Opposition expects a few resignations in the near future, and a reshuffling of the Cabinet.

The results of the elections in the Borough and Rural Councils are just coming in as this letter is being written. Undoubtedly they will serve to still further undermine Tory self-confidence. Mr. Atlee said recently at Glasgow that he did not think the Tories would last three or four years, as Churchill has stated. And Mr. Stanley Evans, M. P. for Blyth, said: "We shall go back in power twelve months next October."

WORKERS WILL DECIDE

However, it will not be Stanley Evans or Winston Churchill who will decide the date of the election. It will be the working class organized in formidable array in the great unions who will both

decide the date for dissolution of Parliament, and the character of Labor's next policy.

This week the 796,000 strong Amalgamated Engineering Union has begun to align itself with Aneurin Bevan and all that he stands for . . . reduction of armaments and the repair and extension of the recently breached social services. It is even possible that the 678,000 strong National Union of Mine Workers will shift in Bevan's direction at their annual conference in July. In this case the Bevan wing of the Labor Party would triumph even if the bloc votes of the Transport Workers (835,000) and the National Union of General and Municipal Workers (400,000) stacked itself against the Left. This would mean a Bevan Labor Party at the October conference, which would almost certainly bring the Tory government down within a few months.

It is not generally known that the 7,000,000 odd Cooperators at their Easter party conference in Glasgow carried overwhelmingly the draft policy for "people's industry" submitted by their National Committee. This means in effect that the powerful Cooperative Party is committed to a policy of nationalization of chemicals, shipbuilding, certain branches of engineering, and the manufacture of some building materials. If the Labor Party were to adopt this policy statement as its own, the possibility of a transformation of the British economy into an essentially planned economy would exist. The explosive effect of such a basic transformation of British society would be such as to lay the foundations for a United Europe on a planned, socialist basis.

Our comrades in the Belgian Socialist Party have already pointed the way for the British Labor Party. The recent opposition to a West German rearmament program carried through without the consent of the German workers announced by Hugh Dalton and Aneurin Bevan is now almost certain to become one of the planks in Labor's new platform. It seems quite probable that a European left opposition to reaction on the one hand and Stalinism on the other will form itself as a result of the recent drift to the right in Europe (Adenauer, Pinay, Churchill). In Norway and Sweden last year, the finance

minister and the minister of social services respectively came into conflict with the American-inspired rearmament program. That Bevanism will breathe new life into European social democracy and encourage the national liberatory movements in Africa, Asia and South America is certain.

NEW YORK, May 13—Reports in the American newspapers on the conventions of the Amalgamated Engineering Union and a branch of the railway workers received in New York as LABOR ACTION goes to press do not indicate the attitude taken by these unions toward all the ideas of "Bevanism."

However, Raymond Daniell reports in the New York Times that these unions have taken a stand on nationalization which may very well wreck the Tory plan to denationalize certain sectors of British industry.

According to Daniell "The Amalgamated Engineering Union consisting of some 850,000 factory workers committed itself to strive at the next Labor Party conference to commit the party to a policy of confiscation of all nationalized industries that the Conservative government might restore to private ownership."

As these industries can be returned to private hands only by means of selling their securities to private individuals or concerns, this threat may torpedo the whole scheme. Since almost everyone in Britain expects the Labor Party to return to power sooner or later, it is doubtful whether private investors will be willing to risk their capital in buying stocks of the presently nationalized industries.

The British labor movement is not making this threat of outright confiscation of industries which might need to be nationalized a second time just out of political spite. The Tory government has already, in the words of the Times "accepted the probability that it would pay to sell back to private capital the trucks taken over by the government when road transport was nationalized at some 20,000,000, pounds less than the taxpayers paid for them." In other words, re-privatization is proposed in a manner which would be enormously profitable to the private concerns, and would lay an additional burden on the common people. The threat of confiscation is a simple measure of defense against those who would raid the public treasury for private gain.—Ed.

Have you read . . .

Next — A Labor Party!
by JACK RANGER

25 cents

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street

New York 11, New York

South Africa

A RACIAL DICTATORSHIP

By MARY BELL

If one were to focus one's attention on the constitutional, legal and parliamentary phases of the present struggle rending South Africa, it would be impossible to understand what is taking place there, even though the constitutional issue is presented as paramount in many of the news accounts which appear.

The current precipitating cause of the flare-up in the Union of South Africa, sovereign and independent of British control since 1931, was the passage by the Nationalist party (Afrikaner) of Dr. Daniel F. Malan, through its slim government majority, of the Separate Representation of Voters Act, which removed 50,000 Colored voters—the last non-Europeans—from the common roll and gave them four separately elected European members in compensation.

This act was vigorously opposed by the United (English speaking) Labor and Torch Commando parties, the latter composed largely of ex-servicemen who had observed the Nationalists' Fascist sympathies during the last war.

When on March 20 of this year the Supreme Court of South Africa declared that the act contravened the South Africa Act, the parliamentary crisis ensued.

Majority Are Disfranchised

The parliamentary debate takes place on the political summits in a country where the majority of the people are disfranchised, and hence any analysis such as might be made in a western democratic country sheds little light on the matter.

The position of the Supreme Court of South Africa, which would retain the abridged rights of the Colored to elect European members to represent them, would check a little the rampant nationalistic aim of the Malan government toward complete totalitarian rule. The court has invoked what are known as the "entrenched clauses," which were originally established after the Boer War by the British Liberal government.

The "entrenched clauses" are two: one preserving the equality of both the English and Afrikaans languages and the other the "liberal" franchise laws of the Cape Province. The liberal franchise, which originally did not discriminate in politics on the grounds of color, was "entrenched" in the sense that it could only be altered by a two-thirds majority of both Houses of Parliament in a joint sitting. After independence, the militarily defeated Boers gradually achieved ideological and social supremacy and the franchise rights were steadily chipped away. However, in 1931, when the Statute of Westminster established the complete independence of the Dominions, the South African Parliament unanimously passed an amendment continuing the entrenched clauses.

The aforementioned clauses, while vestiges of previous direct imperialist domination by Britain, appear as "progressive" in the present context. Malan is able to stir up considerable feeling by appealing to the bitterly reactionary nationalist strivings of the Afrikaners against the British and to make a demagogically "democratic" argument for the sovereignty of a parliamentary majority over the ruling of a Supreme Court.

Actually, the unitary constitution on the British model, which leaves parliament almost unchecked in its power, is more democratic in form than the American, which divides the power into legislative, executive and judicial, with an elaborate system of checks and balances, which more often represent hindrances than means to the direct expression of popular opinion. However, forms lose their meaning if they are considered abstractly. The parliamentary system of South Africa is democracy "for whites only" in a popu-

lation which comprises 8.3 million Native Africans, 2.6 million Europeans, over a million Colored (of mixed descent) and 320,000 Indians.

A Racial Dictatorship

The eight million native Africans are treated not as citizens, but as a subject people. A white minority exercises racial dictatorship over a black majority. It is truly a country of "colonial fascism," the label applied by George Padmore in his recent book, "Africa—Britain's Third Empire." There is scarcely a social or personal indignity, any inhuman or bestial act performed under modern totalitarian governments which does not have its counterpart—and on a more universal scale—in South Africa.

We can quote only a few of the facts taken at random from Padmore's book on the situation of the native and colored peoples in South Africa, which will, nevertheless provide the necessary setting for viewing the present government crisis.

- "Of 472,347 square miles comprising the Union, about 88 per cent has been allotted to just over 2,000,000 Europeans, while 8,000,000 Africans and other non-Europeans occupy land only in the remaining 12 per cent."
- "The 1932 Act governed the relations between 'master' and 'servant,' fixing penalties for breach by the black agricultural worker of contractual agreement, which became a criminal offense. Punishment was by flogging and imprisonment."
- "Under the Native Service Contract Act every African living on a European farm is obliged to give 180 days' work to his master each year."
- "Any breach of this act makes the African liable to criminal prosecution and imprisonment. Those under eighteen can be punished by flogging. The worst feature of the act is that no African may leave his job without permission of his employer. Should he run away he can be arrested, sentenced to a term of imprisonment and then returned to his master."
- "On the sale of a farm the African workers attached to the property pass over to the owner along with the livestock and agricultural implements and other fixtures."
- "In South Africa every native has to pay school fees, although no white child needs to do so."
- "Every male African between the age of 18 and 65, whether employed or not, is obliged to pay a poll tax of 20 shillings and a hut tax of 10 shillings a year. . . . This represents almost a 50 per cent income tax, while 'poor whites' are exempt from any form of direct taxation, and before the war, Europeans with incomes of 500 pounds or less paid practically nothing."
- "The poll tax receipt is regarded as the African's official passport. Failure to produce it whenever called upon by the police to do so, is a penal offense. . . . Anyone found without a receipt, either because he has not paid or is unable to find it at that moment, is beaten, kicked about, thrown into a police wagon and taken to the police station. It is not unusual after such raids for thousands of Africans to be marched before a magistrate and collectively fined."
- "In addition to their poll and hut tax receipts, which act as passes, there are ten other passes which, at one time or another, the Africans are obliged to carry."
- ". . . according to the latest official statistics, over 1,000,000 Africans were prosecuted in 1948, 892,076 being convicted and sentenced to terms of imprisonment."
- "Scarcely a single family exists in which at least one member is not suffering or dying from tuberculosis. . . . About 65 per cent of the native children die before reaching two years."

These are some of the aspects and consequences of "Apartheid," the herrenvolk policy of racial segregation and discrimination in South Africa. It is a heritage of Dutch colonialism and the "white man's burden."

The Fruits of "Apartheid"

The Malan government is defensively trying to turn the clock back. The effect of its legislative efforts in removing the last section of non-Europeans from the common polls would leave 2 1/2 million Europeans represented by 150 members of Parliament, one million colored represented by four European members, the Cape Natives represented by three European members, 8 1/2 million Natives represented by four senators, and one million colored represented by one senator. The Indians would have no representation.

In the rapidly declining British Empire, South Africa is being looked to as an El Dorado for British capital. U. S. business also has its eye on South Africa. Industrialization has grown rapidly. After World War I, the gross industrial output of the country was only \$276,000,000. In 1939, it was \$592,000,000. But today it is \$1,746,000,000. One of the effects of this hothouse industrial growth has been, despite the opposition of the white labor unions, a constant influx of colored labor into the mines and factories in a country which has been primarily agricultural and pastoral for both white and colored. The white trade unions could not possibly stem the movement of the colored and black peoples into industry. There has resulted an inevitable need for increased education of the blacks. And with the increased education and urbanization has come more and more virile political organization among the disfranchised.

Non-Europeans on the March

As the parliamentary parties in South Africa conduct their political battles, with both sides having the common aim of white supremacy of 2 1/4 million whites over 10 million non-whites, the non-Europeans are on the move. The African National Congress and the Indian National Congress have held mass meetings, joined in a program of passive resistance and are embarking upon a more brilliant course of tearing up the passes, refusing to pay taxes, disobeying segregation laws, etc.

How far and how rapidly the movement of the non-European national democracy will go at this juncture remains to be seen. It is on the march, however, and the long-term trend of its struggle can only be forward. There is little question of its revolutionary intent to mold a new life for Africans. Such a stolid conservative as John Foster Dulles stated in 1950 that "There is danger in the Union of South Africa that its policy may touch off an explosion that will spread the fire of revolution throughout Africa."

John Hatch, the Glasgow University specialist in South African affairs, wrote in the *Crisis*:

"... even on this occasion the opposition forces, including the United party and the Torch Commando, have appealed to the non-Europeans to drop their campaign of law-breaking. But it has always been an axiom of liberal democracy that the last resort of the people against the tyranny of laws made and applied against the wishes of the majority, is revolution. It is on this principle that the non-Europeans take their stand, and they are beginning their struggle in the knowledge that they are faced by a white community more deeply divided than at any time during the century."

Fishing in Troubled Waters

As always, the Stalinists fish successfully in the troubled waters of western imperialism. In 1948, for example, the Bantus elected the first Stalinist, Mr. Sam Kahn, to Parliament as a protest against the Malan government's racial policy. It can only be anticipated that they will make the most of the weaknesses of the western bloc in Africa, the last remaining great colonial domain of the European powers.

The Atlantic Charter, the UN Charter and the Charter of Human Rights guaranteed to all human beings, no matter what the color of their skin or racial origin, fundamental rights. With Jim Crow in its own back yard, with its inability to pass FEPC legislation, the United States has been the leading power in the organizations espousing these doctrines of human rights. What impact it can make on Africa is dubious in the extreme.

**Read and subscribe to
THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
America's Leading Marxist Magazine**
35 cents \$2.00 a year

YOU and SCIENCE

TECHNOLOGY AND THE SPEED-UP

By CARL DARTON

In a recent issue of LABOR ACTION (February 25), Ben Hall opens a discussion on "Speed-up—An Unsolved Problem of Labor" pointing out that labor unions have only begun to orient themselves toward the problem. For fullest understanding, however, "speed-up" must also be considered in its aspect as part of the impact of technological change, the application of science to industry.

The impact of science and technology upon war and the gadgetry of every day life are fully recognized. Less publicized has been the effect of industrial research in producing labor saving devices, greater job productivity and increased profits. These changes press upon the working class daily, and ever in the background, provided the Third World War is averted, are the horrors of another depression, a repetition of the thirties.

The knowledge that a depression can happen again is in the back of the mind of most workers and trade unionists. Illustrative of this fear is an editorial which appeared in the CIO News a few months ago. Entitled "Automation," it reads in part:

"Here's what it [the newest production science in industry] means: By installing more automatic machines and taking full advantage of technological developments industry can reduce the number of workers and still increase production.

"Yep, that's 'automation' and the (New York) Times says it's sweeping industry.

"That, of course, isn't news to CIO unions whose members have become victims of 'automation.'

"They tell us that some of the newest gadgets are simply marvelous, from a technical standpoint, and some of them closely resemble 'mechanical brains.'

"That isn't any comfort, however, to the man who's been tossed out of a job by a machine. Try to tell him he's making a great contribution to the advancement of industry and he'll probably say 'Yeah! But what am I supposed to use for money?'"

The CIO editorial offers no solution. This conflict between new machinery and workers security is not a new one. As Marx pointed out nearly one hundred years ago, the contest between the capitalist and the wage laborer dates back to the very origin of capital and the modern industrial system. When machinery was first introduced the workers fought against the physical machinery itself and often destroyed by violence the new looms, shearers and cotton spinning equipment. Laws were passed against the use of new methods and the periodic destruction of machinery continued throughout the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. To quote Marx: "It took time and experience before the working people learned to distinguish between machinery, and its employment by capital, and to divert their attacks, not against the material instruments of production, but against the mode in which they are used."

MERE WAGE DEMANDS INADEQUATE

The economic and social gains of the trade union movement of the later 19th and 20th centuries are the result of labor's acceptance of, rather than rejection of machinery, and their struggle to obtain their share of its benefits. However, the present marked speed-up of the application of science to industry makes apparent to many trade unionists the inadequacy of mere wage demands and past methods of coping with the problem.

Nonetheless, socialists should not merely echo Marx, and standing apart, exhort the workers to change the ownership of the machine from its exploitation for profit to the social benefit of all. Rather, it is necessary to aid the workers in their daily struggle for their share of technological improvements. As Hall puts it, to help them "to demand at least an equal voice for the working class on the question of production rates, for another step forward toward greater working-class democracy, toward the control by labor over its own conditions of work."

Steel workers, associating wage rates with productivity, and their demand for an annual wage, are in the forefront of present day struggles for an equitable distribution of the benefits of the machine, technology, and science in industry.

Furthermore, it needs to be understood that mere "speed-up" and the use of stop-watch technicians are only a part of technological change and the onslaught of management on workers' security. Just as important is what science fails to do in industry. We have in mind its failure to consider the human factor in industry such as the elimination of excessive noise and other causes of nervous tension, and neglect of other health and safety factors. Rightly, of course, this neglect should not be charged to science but to capitalism itself.

To fully cope with these newer aspects of industrial conflict, there must be more attention given to a neglected part of workers' education, that is the technology of their particular industry, and the impact of science on industry as a whole. This is a must if there is to be an "extension of the basic rights of labor over production."

UAW Tail to Party Kite at Michigan Dem Convention

DETROIT, Mich., May 11—The state convention of the Democratic Party held in Grand Rapids this week end saw the development of a rank and file revolt among UAW delegates against the capitulation by its leaders to the personal dictation of Governor G. Mennen Williams, in relation to control of the party.

As one political observer put it, "The CIO back watered in Democratic politics here today for the first time in its history. Governor Williams assumed complete control of the party at the convention."

It took until 5 a.m. in the morning for CIO officials to whip into line their recalcitrant delegates who assumed that since they furnished the manpower, the money and the work—since they had rebuilt the Democratic Party from a ghost into a living being in Michigan—since they had taken a nobody, G. Mennen Williams, and elected him governor—they were entitled to run the party!

Here is the gist of the argument used to bring them into line. The speaker at the CIO caucus meetings was Gus Scholle, Michigan CIO president. His remarks speak for themselves:

"This talk of seizing control of the Democratic Party is wrong. It must not be the purpose of the CIO to capture the party. Power-politics drive tactics must be abandoned. It is time all of us learned a lesson.

"We offered Detroit the most able man ever to run for mayor—Judge George Edwards—and we boasted about an imagined ability to control the election. We were snowed under.

"It is time the CIO members begin realizing that we are not the people!

"If we attempt to capture the Democratic Party, do you know what we will capture? We will capture ourselves and nothing.

"Sure we are a big, powerful union. But we must profit by the past experience and operate within the framework of the Democratic Party as long as it subscribes to the principles for which we are fighting.

"We must give our trust to Gov. Williams, Senator Moody and State Chairman Staebler."

Scholle's speech came after Roy Reuther, UAW-PAC director, told the big CIO delegation—numbering from an estimated third to a majority of the dele-

gates at the convention—that Governor Williams had picked a national committeeman although he had promised to keep hands off!

One CIO official commented at this point: "We are cooperating with the Democratic Party alright, but it seems to me that there is a lack of cooperation from the top level of the party." This official, Al Barbour, secretary of the powerful Wayne County CIO council, obviously wasn't in on the private negotiations, for Reuther and Scholle then had to admit that on the previous day they had committed themselves to the Williams choice. It was rather embarrassing.

For some time critics of the UAW's official policy of working within the Democratic Party have charged that the UAW was merely a tail end of the party, that instead of capturing it, the UAW was allowing itself to be captured. The present trend of events sustains that charge. The role of the UAW in Michigan in the coming election appears destined to be that of the funkey for the newly-created Democratic Party bosses, who are NOT the UAW-CIO.

ISL FUND DRIVE

One Week to Go Over the Top

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

Only one more week to go! Can we raise \$838.75? That is all that is lacking for us to reach the total goal of \$12,500. The excellent response of the past several weeks has put the drive within striking distance of completing the campaign with a 100 per cent showing.

There was a let-down in the last week which brought in total contributions of only \$314, not quite up to the pace needed in the final two weeks of the drive. Even so, with \$11,660.25 raised, we should be able to make up the difference. We know this from the reports received from branches. But we are counting on these remittances coming in this coming week.

This week only several of the branches made contributions. New York led with \$150. Carrying the largest quota in the drive the branches there have reached 87.5 per cent of their goal.

The SYL continues to go beyond their quota. Contributions from Chicago, New York and Berkeley have raised its percentage point to 118.2. While the contributions of other units remained the same, remittances from the Chicago, New York and Berkeley units have raised their standings as follows: \$680, \$458 and \$244. The SYL promises that more money will come in from their units!

We can easily make the total

quota if those branches which are below the 93.2 per cent aggregate percentage reach and surpass that point. In their present standings, Seattle, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and Los Angeles can turn the trick.

We are counting heavily upon these areas to make up the little more than eight hundred dollars that we need to conclude a suc-

cessful fund drive campaign for this year. If we stress the aforementioned branches, this does not mean that the other branches are not invited to send additional sums in the drive. We know that there are some areas which have reached 100 per cent or more that have additional funds to collect. Let's show that we can put this campaign over 100 per cent.

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Percent
TOTAL	\$12,500	\$11,660.25	93.2
General	1,000	1308	130.8
Oregon	50	65	130
Streator	25	31	124
Socialist Youth League	1,500	1774	118.2
Newark	300	317	105.6
Oakland	500	516	103.2
Cleveland	200	206	103
Pittsburgh	150	151	100.6
Buffalo	650	650	100
Indiana	50	50	100
Reading	75	75	100
Boston	50	50	100
Seattle	300	275	91.6
New York	4,000	3503	87.5
Philadelphia	300	213	71
Chicago	1,800	1273	70.7
Los Angeles	600	364	60.6
Detroit	750	441	58.6
St. Louis	50	26	52
Baltimore	25	5	20
Akron	75	0	0

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1952 Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates.)

Marxism in the United States

By LEON TROTSKY

35 Cents Order from

Independent Socialist Press
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.



LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 20

May 19, 1952

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

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months, (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL

Business Manager: L. G. SMITH

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

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor . . .

FALSE CONSCIOUSNESS AND MARXISM

To the Editor:

Comrade Draper's discussion of Labor and Democracy (March 24, 1952) was very refreshing to us because it showed the fundamental Marxist assumptions which underlie the "shorthand formula that 'the working class is the bulwark of democracy.'" We think such analyses of Marxist slogans are healthy signs. They indicate a willingness to re-evaluate the Marxist system. And it appears to us obvious that the only way Marxism can remain a dynamic orientation and not degenerate into a sort of neo-scholasticism, as it already has done in some socialist sects, is through continual and serious re-evaluation.

Draper's article presents us with the opportunity to make a few preliminary remarks concerning the re-evaluation of a Marxist assumption made explicit in the article. Draper states the assumption as follows: "The decisive moving force of social mass movements is the material and economic interests of classes."

Marx, in his historical studies, shows how fruitful a tool this assumption can be. However, as stated here, the formulation is ambiguous. Did Marx mean that the decisive moving force of social movements is *always* the material and economic interests of classes? Or did he mean that the decisive moving force of social

movements *tends to be* the material and economic interests of classes?

Marx obviously could not have meant the former because he employs the concept of *false consciousness*. However, to Marx, this concept has always been a residual category. Events since Marx should certainly bring up the question of whether false consciousness doesn't play a more important role than he supposed.

What we are saying is this: It is about time socialists began to seriously specify *conditions under which* class interests play decisive roles in social movements. Marx, since he was a product of his time, does not supply us with the tools. Contemporary sociology and psychology may be *beginning* to do so.

We do not have the answers. We seriously doubt if anyone could give the answer offhand. What we are saying is that this is an important problem for socialists to study. The practical implications should be obvious. If we knew the conditions under which the working class will orient to class interests, we can work to bring them about. Socialists have always dreamed of the day when conditions would be "ripe." We wonder if socialists would recognize that day if it came.

Ray HARTELL
Buffalo

may be found in many other leading Marxist discussions of the subject.

(2) In Engels, as elsewhere, Hartell will find out why it is quite incorrect to say that "to Marx this concept [false consciousness] has always been a residual category." I take it Hartell means: *merely a residual category. On the contrary Marxists have pointed out that ideological factors do play a positive role in history, which is the resultant of many factors. Where the Marxist differs from the eclectic and vulgar "pluralist" is in his emphasis on the decisive role of the material and economic interests of classes (and the material factors more generally) in the long run and in determining the direction of development. What this*

leaves are important questions like the tempo and forms of social development and its zigzag (rather than straight-line) course.

Sociology and psychology can make contributions to a concrete study of historical change provided they understand the above relationship and use it as a guide, in our opinion. The reason why so much of contemporary sociology is quite useless for the purpose is its rejection of this method. Marx's historical writings are chockfull of analyses of "false consciousness" — but from the standpoint of social science, not that of individual psychology.

Re-evaluation of Marxism is a task of every generation, but my discussion of Labor and Democracy was no re-evaluation of the

Marxist ideas on the subject. In fact, it counterposed the Marxist ideas, properly understood, to crude versions of pseudo-Marxist formulas which are used as substitutes for the ideas by its opponents.

"The conditions under which the working class will orient to class interests" is not the mysterious and unanalyzed subject which our correspondent apparently thinks. A study of the *social forces* making for radicalization and transformation of workers' consciousness is indeed one of the most common objects of Marxist literature. And it is such a social investigation which is important, not psychological inquiries on a personal level.

Hal DRAPER

Slate Wins Chrysler Local 7 Election In Face of Vicious Campaign

DETROIT, May 11—The triumph of the independent Cundiff-Saurine slate in Chrysler Local 7, of the UAW-CIO, has had repercussions throughout UAW circles in this area because of two factors:

This victorious slate — which won by a two to one majority in almost every contest — was the object of a vicious whispering campaign marked by much red-baiting, Negro baiting, and some Jew-baiting against its supporters.

It saw the defeat of eight-time winner Ed Hill, financial secretary of Local 7, who was considered the strongest individual supporting ACTU in the East Side region of Detroit.

Jesse Cundiff, the newly elected president of Local 7, defeated Pat O'Keefe by 5,773 to 2,266. About

two weeks before the election (which saw the remarkable vote of 8,700 out of 11,000 members) Cundiff, as chairman of the shop committee, had protested personally against discrimination to Negroes at a restaurant near the plant. This was used to show that he was a "n---r lover!" It was a despicable whispering campaign.

However, the not-so-clever "brain trusters" of the Hill clique also used among Negroes the rumor that Cundiff was a member of the Ku Klux Klan. The "n---r lover" phrase was strictly for the large Southern worker segment in the plant. Evidently the two contradictory stories caught up with each other among the voters!

Martin Saurine, the new financial secretary, defeated Hill by

4,500 to 2,800 in a race which most observers thought would be very close at least!

The red-baiting and Jew-baiting took place against supporters of the Cundiff-Saurine slate. It failed to convince either the voters in the general election or in department elections involving the individuals.

The Cundiff-Saurine campaign was based on sound, constructive unionism, without any attention to the fancy or favors of the international union leaders. While generally pro-Reuther in a broad sense, the new Local 7 officials are not considered flunkies for anybody. They have earned a reputation for being hard-headed, and level headed union men, who call their shots as they see them!

THE SOCIAL BASIS OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Without entering into a lengthy discussion of the Marxist materialist conception of history, such as seems to be called for by the scope of the question, a couple of remarks may be useful.

(1) All "social laws," Marxist included, are properly statements about *tendencies*. I discussed this point at some length in an article

in the December 1947 *New Internationalist*, if correspondent Hartell wishes further elucidation.

This point, in effect if not in so many words, is also the subject of the brilliant discussion by Engels, in his *Ludwig Feuerbach*, of the relationship between the material basis of society and the "ideological superstructure." It

Japanese Rearmament — —

(Continued from page 1)

interests of the Japanese people would be served by recognizing the Stalinist government in China, seeking to open up trade with China on a broad scale, and nationalizing the basic industries of the country? And what if such a government should, rightly or wrongly, decide to demand that all American troops leave Japan?

Treaty Imposed on Japan

If the argument were made that some or all of these actions would be in violation of obligations solemnly assumed in international treaties, the reply would be obvious: these treaties were imposed on Japan at a time when she was occupied as a conquered nation by foreign troops. The scope of the obligations assumed, or to put it differently, of the limitations on the freedom of action of any Japanese government which were accepted in return for formal sovereignty are an index to the degree in which the country lacks true independence.

Under these circumstances the Japanese socialists are quite right in insisting that rearmament can only mean the direct and active involvement of their country in the American military camp. Of course, this is precisely what is wanted by the American government and its liberal as well as conservative supporters.

It is at this point that Comrade Suzuki's article ap-

pears to us to suffer either from an excess of politeness, or what could be much worse, from a misunderstanding of the objectives of the American government (and of the Russian government, to the extent to which it is dealt with).

In the second paragraph of his article, Suzuki seems to be saying that both of these governments have got themselves into a mess in Korea as a result of their desire to include that unhappy land, as well as Japan, in their spheres of influence. He then appears to be holding out the hope that they may now have seen the folly of their ways and that as a result they may, or they certainly should, seek to "ease the present critical situation by taking steps to guarantee substantially Japan's neutrality. . . ."

A Vain Hope

This is, indeed, a vain hope. The Russians, we are quite sure, would be very happy to have Japan's neutrality guaranteed, because in the present circumstances they have no way of getting her into their own camp. But their desires in this respect are no more governed by a true concern for the welfare of Japan, or for world peace, than would be the similar desires of the United States for a neutral China, or Poland.

It is specially necessary to emphasize this point because in his last paragraph Comrade Suzuki seems to be once more banking on the mistaken assumption that the United States is engaged in "upholding the world's peace and international justice." This is introduced in the form of an appeal to the United States to recognize the danger to Japanese democracy of the resurgence of the conservative and militarist elements in the country which is aided and stimulated by the prospects of rearmament.

We believe that the vast majority of Americans are concerned with world peace and international justice. To the extent that they support the foreign policy of the government, they do so in the belief that it is designed to further these goals.

But they are mistaken. The real purpose of the American government and the social groups who control its policies is to preserve capitalism in as much of the world as possible. That is why it does not support the just demands of the Tunisian people in the United Nations, why it props up Franco in Spain, and why it clearly favors the conservative parties in Germany, Britain and Japan.

The preservation of capitalism is the *basic* policy of the American government. World peace and international justice are taken into consideration only insofar as promoting them is consistent with the pursuit of this aim.

But how, then, can the socialists in Japan help to establish the true independence of their country, as well as to defeat the reactionary elements which are strengthened by the policies of the American government, including the policy of rearmament

An Asian Federation?

In the field of international policy it appears to us that the solution to this problem can best be approached by aligning Japan as closely as possible with the other countries of Asia who are seeking to resist involvement in either of the two war camps. The natural allies of the Japanese socialists are the working class and socialist movements everywhere, but particularly those of India, Burma and Indonesia.

The two great military blocs of Russian Stalinism and American capitalism seek to drive all countries into their respective camps. No country standing alone can indefinitely resist the pressure, and this applies specially to Japan. In this situation, the strength to resist can only be found in the unity of groups of countries which decide to stand together for their mutual protection.

Masses of the working people in many countries of the world are ardently seeking a way out of the dilemma. Would not the proclamation of a policy for the close alliance or even federation of the non-Stalinist peoples of Asia serve to rally these masses to the political movements which proclaim it?

World History—Year by Year!

The BOUND VOLUMES of LABOR ACTION

are an invaluable record of the social and political issues of our day, and a socialist education in themselves.

1945 to 1950 \$3 a volume

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.

"The CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV"

A Novel of Modern Russia

by VICTOR SERGE

\$3.00

Order from:

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, N. Y.

STUDENT SOCIALIST

MAY 19, 1952

STUDENT-YOUTH SECTION of LABOR ACTION

FIVE CENTS

AT QUEENS COLLEGE

Witch-hunt Grabs Liberal In Lenz Demotion Case

By ARTHUR HART

Another case of violation of academic freedom has given a new turn to the "cold war on the campus." It is difficult to perceive how even the *New Leader*, which up to now has been able to sense no threat to traditional American freedoms from the witch-hunt, will be able to ignore the dangers inherent in this new incident. For it involves neither a socialist (as at Olivet College) nor a teacher of suspected Stalinist sympathies (the University of Washington), nor even a non-signer of a loyalty oath as in the University of California case. The victim is this time a liberal, with more than a few "friends in high places" who was certainly entitled, if anyone could be, to consider himself "safe" from the direct blows of the anti-red witch-hunt.

It was announced last week that Dr. Harold Lenz, a teacher at Queens College (a division of the free City College of New York City) since 1938 and its dean of students, for the past five years, is soon to be demoted from his position as dean of students, and re-assigned to a regular teaching position on the faculty. Though higher education officials attempted to explain the action as having been motivated by purely "administrative considerations," no one knowing the background of facts can take this explanation seriously. There can be no doubt that Dr. Lenz was "gotten" because of his political views, and his specifically liberal views in particular.

Both Lenz's anti-Stalinist position and his "influential connections" are public knowledge. A vice chairman of the New York

State Liberal Party, an official of the American Civil Liberties Union and vice chairman of the New York City Americans for Democratic Action, Dr. Lenz is reported to have belonged to the same chapter of ADA as Senator Lehman, Representative F. D. Roosevelt Jr., a New York City Councilman, and the Manhattan Borough President. None of these connections seem to have prevented his dismissal, but they probably caused the circumlocutions reasons given for the official action. Presumably Dr. Lenz was "not the right person in the point of professional training" for his present position. It was hardly possible, under the circumstances, to charge the dean with being a "red."

REACTION "GOT" LENZ

Yet it was Lenz's views, and his courageous defense of them, which brought the enemies who have for years been demanding this very move. According to Lenz himself, he had been warned by the college president "not to associate with politics" because the college was under pressure, and might meet unnecessary difficulties in having its budget approved if Lenz continued his public political activity. The sources of the pressure, as it has been for several years, stemmed from the local American Legion and Catholic War Veterans.

The reasons for their enmity toward Lenz dates back to 1947 when the new dean defended the right of any student organization, and in particular that of the Stalinist American Youth for Democracy, to be granted a charter un-

(Continued on page 2-5)

Stalinist Plans Thwarted At Madison Student Meet

By GEORGE RAWLINGS and
DORA MILLER

What appears to be another attempt by the Stalinists to organize American students into a front organization to serve the interest of the Russian war bloc has apparently met with serious difficulties at its inception. The Conference on Peace, Equality and Academic Freedom held at Madison, Wisconsin, the weekend of April 25th was conceived of, organized by and executed by the Stalinists. They made serious attempts to get a few individual, organizationally affiliated, liberals to lend their names as sponsors (along with their organization "for identification purposes only"). But this attempt to interest liberals was sporadic and on the whole it was only the Stalinist groups who received any or ample notification of the meeting.

The conference itself was attended by varying grades of Stalinists from many different college campuses in the Midwest (such as Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Antioch, Chicago, etc.), East (Brooklyn, City College, MIT, Brandeis) and small contingents from the more western states. They ranged in political outlook from hard-core Stalinists (Labor Youth League and Young Progressives of America), the usual confused and well-meaning students who found themselves attracted to the strong emotional appeal which the Stalinist's peace, equality and freedom proposals carry, and a minority of mature liberals. (The latter consisted perhaps 30 or 50 out of an attendance of 175-200.)

The Chicago delegation was by far the most representative group, since a comparatively

large number of liberals and a few socialists (unaffiliated and Socialist Youth League) decided to attend. It was the hope of these students that the same type of representation might be present from other campuses.

But the meeting proved to be not much better than most other straight Stalinist fronts. The speakers (DuBois, Rev. Porter and the "unexpected and unannounced" Halstead Holeman, officer of the Stalinist-controlled International Union of Students) all presented either the Stalinist line itself or positions totally agreeable to the Stalinists.

THE CRY OF "UNITY"

In typical Stalinist fashion, the cry of "unity" was raised in an effort to submerge all political differences in a way acceptable only to the Stalinists. It became quite clear that the unity that was being talked about was that unity which would be solely on the Stalinists' terms. The Stalinists showed their hand early in the conference. When the chairman called for four volunteers to speak on "four different roads to peace" at a panel discussion to be held on Sunday afternoon, among the volunteers was someone who offered to espouse "socialism as the only road to peace" (this later turned out to be a Cannonite position) and someone who offered to defend the "Third Camp" position. Immediately the Stalinists brought up a resolution which excluded "all proposals which will endanger unity by offering not concrete plans for peace that we all can agree on but dissident world views and philosophical analysis." Despite the attempts on the part of a few to develop the point that unity could not be achieved by the submergence of basic differences or by the avoidance of concrete analysis, this resolution, aimed at excluding all anti-Stalinist speakers from the panel discussion was passed with only five dissenting votes.

The panel discussion consequently offered four speakers. One spoke on the American Friends Service Committee Proposals for Peace which are thoroughly acceptable to the Stalinists (as they are based on the slogan of "co-existence"), the second offered a "religious" approach to the problem which was essentially the same, the third supposedly defended the position of the United World Federalists (this speaker sounded much like the other two).

The fourth speaker held forth on the success of the Peaceful Alternatives groups, Peace Forums and the like on the campuses, making sure to include only a discussion of the Stalinist controlled groups, and of course making no mention of the activities of the student anti-war groups centered around the magazine *Anvil*. Thus the Stalinists avoided discussing any basic issues—and only granted space on the panel to those representing positions that essentially were the same as the current Stalinist line of "co-existence."

On Saturday afternoon, the conference broke up into three-workshops—on Peace, Equality, and Academic Freedom. The workshop on peace was the most significant and interesting, for most of the political elements at the conference participated in it. The tone of the workshop was set by the chairman appointed by the

sponsors' committee who began by making a long statement on the need for top-level Big Five negotiations, "co-existence" and the other Stalinist slogans. Aware of the existence of liberal and socialist elements in the workshop, the chairman attempted to rule out all discussion where it "was obvious to him that only a small minority opposed the resolution on the floor." This attempt at the denial of simple democratic rights failed, as it was so crude that even the Stalinoid liberals and Sweezyites present were unable to go along with it. However, after several hours of debate, marked by continuous attempts by the chairman to stifle discussion, and ended by a statement by a leading member of the Stalinist Labor Youth League that "there was obviously a well-organized group present who had come with the purpose of wrecking the conference," the complete set of proposals acceptable to the Stalinists and not to the anti-Stalinists were adopted.

SEVERAL RESOLUTIONS

A group of individuals representing liberal and non-communist viewpoints gathered together after the workshops and discussed late into the night their ideas in an attempt to evaluate their role in the conference. They finally came to the joint conclusion that if in the final plenary session to be held Sunday no resolutions were passed which would distinguish this group from a Stalinist front organization (i.e., any criticism of the USSR at all, or any deviations from the latest CP line) and if the continuations committee (i.e., executive committee) was not strictly limited in its powers and in its duration, they would be forced to walk out of the conference and present their reasons for doing so. In order to facilitate the possibility of a "compromise" the group drew up several resolutions which they thought presented their viewpoints in a mild manner and yet which carefully laid partial blame for the present world crisis on both the United States and the USSR.

This caucus negotiated with the sponsors' committee and received one important concession. The head of the Independent Students' League, a liberal, was appointed as chairman of Sunday's plenary session. The caucus also agreed to propose from the floor a number of resolutions which if passed would clearly indicate that the conference was not a mouthpiece of Soviet imperialism.

At Sunday's session, the anti-Stalinist caucus proposed a resolution calling for the support of the democratic movements among the colonial peoples, which at the same time accused both the United States and China of imperialism. This resolution was thoroughly emasculated when the statement concerning Chinese imperialism was deleted.

At the same session, a resolution which would have called for disarmament by all nations was defeated, and only after much parliamentary wrangling could a resolution be passed which called for the United States to propose a multilateral disarmaments treaty on terms acceptable to Russia. In addition other proposals to prevent the organization from being set up as a permanent organization which could go over the head of

(Continued on page 2-5)

Prepared by U. of C. Students Who Withdrew Statement on Madison Conference

The following was written by the group which withdrew from the Madison conference because its members could not agree, in many ways, with the resolutions of the conference, nor with the methods used in arriving at them. It is a brief account of what happened, what members of the group learned, and what they now suggest for the future.

WHAT HAPPENED

To begin with, the publicity for the conference was poor; large groups of liberal students (even on this campus) were notified of the conference only a short time before it was held—and apparently this campus was almost unique in sending liberal representatives to Madison. Tremendous technical botches occurred from the beginning—in meeting facilities, housing, group procedures, and general planning, most of which had to be done at the last minute. No real discussion of problems began until about 4 p.m., Saturday; the workshop lasted until about 11 p.m. that evening. In this period a vast range of controversial issues was to be covered. The workshops did not succeed in obtaining genuine consensus. In some cases the workshop process broke down in confusion and the problem of formulating resolutions was dumped in the lap of a small committee. (Some members of this committee were appointed, some elected by delegations Friday night, and some elected from each workshop during the last hectic minutes of their sessions.)

In the plenary Sunday, only 45 minutes were available for acting on each of four large sets of resolutions—peace, equality, academic freedom, and continuations. Consequently discussion had to be

severely limited, and the plenary became a mere show of voting strength.

CRITICISM OF USSR NULLED

Resolutions were passed to which we could not subscribe, and we witnessed the deletion from all resolutions of any criticisms or implication of criticism of the USSR whatsoever. Thus, in the plenary the proposed (and many adopted) resolutions were characterized by an extremist slant which we could not accept. For example, in the resolutions on peace, a statement which referred to mistakes and misunderstandings on the part of both the U. S. and USSR was deleted; attempts to alter portions of the Equality and Peace resolutions in a less partisan direction were defeated. Another case was the plank,

"We propose student pressure on college organizations to offer courses in Negro history and inter-racial problems as electives, throughout the nation."—which many of us felt to be itself discriminatory and a mere propaganda phrase. Again, a resolution recommending "support for the efforts of these nations to attain their national self-determination free from all foreign influences, such as France's in Tunisia, America's in Puerto Rico, and China's in Tibet" was struck.

When time ran out on the peace resolutions, action was pending on statements such as "the only topic to be discussed in the (Korean) truce should be the cessation of fighting, with no American (sic) restrictions on subsequent events."

It is difficult to describe compactly the tone of the resolutions as a whole. They would prove unmistakably biased to liberal non-communists. And it is our view that an effective conference of this

(Continued on page 2-5)

Lenz Demotion at Queens — —

(Continued from page 1-5)

der the Board of Education by-laws. The neighborhood and community papers featured the story under such headlines as "Dean Defends Campus Reds."

Undaunted, Lenz appeared before the Board of Higher Education to oppose a new by-law banning "subversive" groups from the campus. And again last summer, Lenz appeared as the official representative of the ACLU to testify against a new Board of Education rule depriving organizations deemed "subversive" from using school buildings as meeting places. In all of these actions, Lenz was moved not out of sympathy for Stalinism, which he frequently vociferously attacked, but from a basic civil libertarian position. On the campus and in the community he believed in the principle of defending the free market-place of ideas as a basic democratic and liberal institution.

Such ideas and actions, however, were not calculated to disarm the professional patriots in the community whose forces are exceptionally strong in Queens, organized in veterans, nationality (Irish) and professional groups. Normally the only Republican borough of N. Y. City, this suburban neighbor of wealthy Long Island contains a substantial number of old Christian Fronters, as well as its share of politicians seeking to capitalize on any popular prejudice. The current Republican representatives from Queens once described it as "an American, Godfearing community" and stated that "those who don't see

eye to eye with us have no place in our midst."

SPREAD DISAFFECTION

It is people such as this who for years have spread disaffection with the City's free college, and particularly with its educationally liberal administration. Undifferentiated charges of "red influence" were made with respect to faculty, administration and student body. The fact, of course, is that while extremely progressive in its over-all policy (emphasizing discussion classes rather than lectures, integrated curriculum and close faculty-student relations) it has never by any stretch of the imagination, been possible to charge the college administration with political radicalism. And while, as at all city colleges, Stalinism had been a strong organized movement during the thirties and forties it has practically disappeared today (together with politics of almost all kinds).

Nevertheless, in its tradition and general influence, Queens College still remains a target for the self-appointed protectors of this "God-fearing" community. In recent years they have sought to work quietly through exerting pressure on official bodies, in addition to carrying on their regular public campaigns. And it was apparently this kind of quiet work which finally resulted in the dismissal of Dr. Lenz.

Coming at this time, in the midst of an anti-red hysteria, Lenz' academic demotion, involving as it does public censure of a prominent liberal cannot be taken as an ordinary case of conservative in-

fluence. As Mark Starr, Queens County chairman of the Liberal Party stated, the act is a "part of a recent pattern of reactionary attacks on academic freedom." What is involved, indeed, is not the particular views of Lenz, but the very right of teachers and school administrators to hold, express and defend publicly any kind of political views at all. As LABOR ACTION argued when it was only Stalinists and socialists who were victims: this will eventually be extended to non-Stalinists as well. Unfortunately, while Dr. Lenz understood this clearly, some of his liberal colleagues did not. Perhaps they will learn from this experience.

There is, however, a necessary job to do now. Lenz' demotion has created a great deal more com-

munication than was probably expected. The New York Post, in addition to giving full news coverage, has editorially denounced the school officials responsible, and demanded the reinstatement of Lenz as dean. And it is reported that Queens College students are planning a post-card campaign demanding reconsideration of the action by the Board of Higher Education. The arousal of community sentiment in opposition to the force raised by the local bigots is necessary. Anything the students can do to stimulate this opposition will be useful, if not in restoring Dr. Lenz, perhaps in preventing a recurrence of this incident. The Liberal Party of Queens, as a significant force in the community, has a particular responsibility to mobilize what-

ever support it can behind Lenz.

But in addition to the purely local campaign, it is necessary to circularize student and faculty groups throughout the nation with the facts behind this case and attempt to elicit national support. The services of the Academic Freedom Committee of the National Students Association should most certainly be invoked. In addition, the new organization of American University Students for Academic Freedom should be informed of all facts so that it may undertake to report them to its affiliated bodies.

Queens College students have moved to the foreground of the academic freedom picture. If they acquit themselves well it will make it easier for their successors.

UC Madison Statement —

(Continued from page 1-5)

type must appeal to such elements of the U. S. student population.

Realizing the nature of the situation, the group withdrew, presenting statements of our reasons for doing so, and left the hall to deliberate on the proper course of action. Meanwhile proceedings in the hall degenerated into near-chaos. The withdrawing members then returned and communicated the ideas they had arrived at: basically, that the conference had failed to provide a satisfactory means of working out differences, and that a new conference should be called, and that the resolutions already passed should meanwhile have no official status. It proved impossible to obtain agreement on the basis of these proposals, and we therefore again withdrew.

WHAT WE LEARNED

1. The conference did not succeed in attracting a sizable proportion of liberal, non-communist students.

2. Student unity on basic issues is an exceedingly hard thing to achieve; if it is possible at all, it requires a thorough meeting of minds which is hardly achieved in two or three days, especially in a setting largely characterized by utter disorganization and gross mismanagement.

3. Certain practical steps can be decided on, if a true rather than verbal and superficial unity can be undertaken in cooperation with many of the people who attended the Madison conference. It should be noted that upon our final departure we stressed this point very strongly indeed. (See below.)

bers of the withdrawing "liberal caucus" who attend the University of Chicago met again to reiterate and amplify the reasons for their withdrawal. After much discussion they issued a statement which was published in the *Chicago Maroon*.

(The statement referred to is printed elsewhere on this page.—Ed.)

The conference has had several desirable results. It has shown many liberals what "unity" with Stalinism really means in practice. Since the conference some of the original sponsors, including the Unitarian and Methodist groups and the chairwomen of the Peace Forum on the University of Wisconsin campus, have publicly withdrawn their support from the conference. It is reported that similar action on the part of the non-Stalinist sponsors of the conference on other campuses has taken place as well.

Though the conference was disillusioning to some of the liberals there, it has had the beneficial result of bringing together on the Chicago campus those individuals who are honestly interested in the issues of peace, academic freedom and equality but who feel that these aims can only be furthered by a conference more truly democratic and representative than was the one at Madison. They recognized that in a sense they were responsible for the kind of debacle that occurred in Madison, not because they went there in bad faith, nor because they were "wreckers," but because they themselves have not before taken the initiative in gathering the American students together in this struggle. The most hopeful result of the weekend was the proposal emanating from this group for a broad and democratic conference to be called sometime this summer to discuss the issues of freedom, equality and peace. Such a conference, which would last a longer time, be better planned, and at which a more representative group of students would be present could more honestly and seriously discuss and thrash out both their differences and their common interests and goals.

SYL Co-Sponsors Summer School

Among all of the student anti-war clubs in the country, Focal Point of Yale has been one of the most successful. Now, under its initiative, four other anti-war organizations have joined together to sponsor a New England Anti-War Summer School.

In addition to the Socialist Youth League, the college section of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Peace Section, New England Region of the American Friends Service Committee, and the Young Socialists (formerly YPSL) have joined together in sponsoring this project.

An attractive brochure, which gives the complete schedule of lectures and discussions, is available by writing Focal Point at the address below. It is from this brochure that we select points of greatest interest to Student Socialist readers.

The regular faculty of the school includes A. J. Muste, executive secretary of the F.O.R., Dr. Eddy Asirvatham, prominent Indian pacifist, and Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION. Other possible faculty members are Dr. Mumford Sibley, Dr. William Neumann and Lewis Coser. A highly varied and interesting program of lectures, followed in each case by time for discussion cover a whole series of topics from "The Third Camp in Asia" to "War and Recent Christian Philosophy." Both theoretical questions (like the Economic Tensions of Capital-

ism) and practical political ones (Co-operation with Stalinists) are on the agenda. Finally, there is time assigned for an Organizational Institute, where future plans can be discussed for building a New England Anti-War Federation.

And in addition to everything else there will still be time for folk dancing, frivolity and fishing [anglers take note]. The surroundings will be rural but far from primitive, and will provide the ideal setting for a wonderful week's vacation.

The week of September 8th to 13th is the time set for the school,

which is scheduled to begin on a Monday morning, and end the following Saturday afternoon.

The first meal will be served at 5 p.m. Sunday, September 7th and everyone is urged to try and arrive before the beginning of classes the next morning. The cost, which includes tuition, room and board is only \$30, and it is announced that some scholarship aid is available from the A.F.S.C. But reservations, accompanied by a five dollar deposit, must be sent to Focal Point by June 5th. Any interested persons should fill out the blank below and mail it in as soon as possible.

FOCAL POINT, 1987 Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut

I want to register for the New England Anti-War Summer School.

Enclosed is my registration fee of five dollars (\$5.00).

Name

Present Address

Summer Address

Student Meeting — —

(Continued from page 1-5)

the National Students' Association in dealing with the International Union of Students were defeated.

When the Plenary session turned out to be no less Stalinist dominated than the workshops, the anti-Stalinist group decided it had no choice but to withdraw, since they could in no way subscribe either to many of the specific resolutions nor certainly to the general tone of the resolutions. One member of the group read a statement explaining briefly the reasons for the move, which was endorsed by one of the sponsoring groups—the unitarians. It read as follows:

"Having in good faith answered the appeal to co-operate in forming an organization which would enable individuals of different political and ideological orientations to function together to fight for the common goals of Peace, Academic Freedom and Equality, based on a minimal program acceptable to all and organized along the most democratic lines; we find ourselves faced with a tightly organized, unrepresentative body whose program is not acceptable to us and whose function will be, in our opinion, to subvert the genuine desire for Peace, Equality and Academic Freedom on the part of American college students into those channels which will best serve the interests of Soviet imperialism."

Following this action the withdrawing members met to discuss further action, and also to reply to questions by those wishing to find grounds for a reconciliation, as to the conditions upon which they would return. The group stated that they could not return unless: (1) All the resolutions passed were scrapped; (2) a new conference was called soon, and (3) that the continuations committee which was set up would have power ONLY to call this new conference and would have representatives on it of this withdrawing group. But after much confusion on the floor of the general session this plan and a compromise plan were both defeated and the group withdrew for the final time.

The following day those mem-

"Released Time" Decision: A Step Backward

By RALPH STILES

The changing relationships between religion, government, and the educational system in an American society under the pressure of the "cold war" are reflected in the Supreme Court decision upholding the constitutionality of the "released time" program. Highest legal sanction has been given, for the time being, to a plan which provides another indication of the type of struggle the U. S. will wage against Stalinism in the ideological sphere.

The New York City "released time" program is significant in that, according to *U. S. News and World Report* of May 9, it "is expected to be a model for similar programs elsewhere." Under the plan, pupils may be excused from classes one hour weekly for religious instruction away from school property. The pupil is released on written request of his parents. Those not released stay in the classrooms. The churches make weekly reports to the schools, sending a list of children who have been excused but who have not reported for religious instruction.

A majority of the Supreme Court, in an opinion written by Justice Douglas, now feels that "when the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions."

ARGUMENT DISPOSED OF

The three dissenting opinions of Justices Black, Jackson and Frankfurter easily dispose of the Douglas argument. The latter's case rests on the claim that "this 'released time' program involves neither religious instruction in public school classrooms nor the expenditure of public funds. . . . The case is therefore unlike *McCullum v. Board of Education*, which involved a 'released time' program from Illinois. In that case the classrooms were turned over to religious instructors."

In his dissenting remarks, Justice Black, who wrote the majority opinion in the *McCullum* case in 1948, points out that the court intended in the latter decision to make it "categorically clear" that "released time" was unconstitu-

tional even if the religious instruction were to be given off public school premises; that, on or off, the effect is to 'manipulate the compelled classroom hours of its [Illinois] compulsory school machinery so as to channel children into sectarian classes.'"

As the program now operates, the teacher receives attendance reports from the religious officials and the public school truant officer is used whenever necessary. Normal classroom activities cease while the released students are away; those who remain spend a purposeless hour so that the others will not fall behind in their work. According to the new interpretation of the court, the principle of the separation of church and state allows such practices.

RESPECT FOR AUTHORITY

This case is but one instance of a widely organized and long-standing campaign for the introduction of religion into the public schools and colleges. Late last year, for another example that will most likely set a national pattern in the coming years, the New York State Board of Re-

gents recommended that every school day begin with a non-denominational prayer.

The Regents said they "were convinced that the fundamental American belief in and dependence on God were the best security against the dangers of these difficult days." Furthermore, they felt that "our children will find all their studies brought into focus and accord [and], respect for lawful authority and obedience to law will be the natural concomitant of their growth."

On the college level the advocates of a religious revival run the gamut from such as William F. Buckley, Jr., ex-Yale student of note, to Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University. The former, in his book, *God and Man at Yale* (see LABOR ACTION, Jan. 14, 1952), crudely alleges that the atmosphere predominating in Yale's religion department implies that religion is "at best, a useful superstition," while many teachers look on it as "distinctly harmful benightedness." His Catholic viewpoint is to be compared with the recent Yale board report which stated that religious life on the campus was never more satisfactory.

Dr. Conant of Harvard, on April 7, 1952, made a commendable speech attacking the growth of private schools in this country, rightfully claiming that such a development is dangerous to a democratic society. Dr. Conant, however, is representative of those who favor more emphasis upon religion at the present time but desire to follow traditional American methods of bringing this about.

A MIGHTY BULWARK

To this end, he announced this past February a plan for "revitalizing" the Harvard Divinity School "for the general purpose of strengthening religious education in the United States." At a time when many liberal arts colleges are in dire financial straits, a Harvard alumni committee made up predominantly of Wall Street bankers and lawyers is organizing a five million dollars fund-raising drive for the Divinity School since, in their own words, "a strong ministry is one of the bulwarks of America."

The drive for increased religious education is an attempt, so its sponsors say, to recover "moral and spiritual values." Whatever their subjective intentions may be, one point has to be re-emphasized today when religion is on the rebound among certain intellectual circles: in the present historical epoch the main function of political significance of organized religion in a capitalist society is to support the status quo.

This objective consequence is brought about in two interconnected ways. First, the internationalization of religious ethics tends to produce a "respect for lawful authority." Secondly, and more important, religious philosophy tends to focus the individu-

al's search for the solution of social problems toward a supernatural realm instead of on the social structure of society.

It is important to note that the groups who are demanding the inclusion of religious courses in the regular curriculum of the public schools and colleges do not desire to have this material treated in the same fashion as all other such materials are handled: critical evaluation and analysis—open to possible rejection. To the contrary, indoctrination is desired. It is a plan, as Professor Sidney Hook has written, "to use the schools in order to reach those who cannot be drawn, by their own inner compulsion or by the promise of eternity, to ecclesiastical authority. . . ."

The increasing penetration of religion into the educational system marks one aspect of the ideological "adjustments" going on presently in American society. To return to the Supreme Court decision, the argument of the majority reveals a changing relationship between the state and church.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT

It was only four years ago that a majority of the judges could agree, in their opinion in the *McCullum* case, that the ban of the First Amendment meant that "neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions or prefer one religion over another."

If the present majority opinion is any portent of future decisions, then the belief that "only by wholly isolating the state from the religious sphere and compelling it to be completely neutral [so], that the freedom of each and every denomination and of all nonbelievers can be maintained" (Justice Black) appears ready to join several other principles of American liberalism which have fallen by the wayside under the pressures of the cold war.

In this instance, as in the civil liberties decisions which have been discussed in previous issues of LABOR ACTION, the Supreme Court shows itself not to be so "above" the basic forces and needs of the social system over which it augustly presides. "What decided the case," writes liberal columnist Max Lerner, "was not logic—or even social experience. What decided it was a climate of opinion which has witnessed a 'return to religion.'"

While there may be some revival of religious feeling among some sections of the population in reaction to the present political crisis, the actions and pressures of the government in this field only serve to reinforce such tendencies with religion coming more and more to the forefront as an instrument of social control. As Lerner remarks, "If you are looking for proof of coercion, you will not find it in the formal use of power, but in all the pressures that push for social conformism, for toying the line as everyone else does."

Success of Fund Drive in '52 Shows Right Way to Build SYL

By DON HARRIS

While final returns are not yet in, pending completion of this year's fund drive, it is apparent that the SYL has scored a real success in completing its quota of \$1500. Not only has it reached its goal, but as in previous years, it has already gone over the top by more than \$200, with possibly as much more in additional money still to come in from "deadline beaters."

Compared with the figures of previous years this is more than double the amount ever raised by the national SYL. Against this fact must be balanced two considerations detracting somewhat from this apparently remarkable accomplishment. The first is that about \$200 of this year's quota came from dual members of the ISL who in previous years gave smaller proportions of their fund drive pledges to the youth, and the second is related to the fact that a larger proportion of SYLers than previously are working youth, who can usually afford to give more generously than most students.

LOYALTY AND DEVOTION

Yet despite these favorable circumstances our fund drive showing remains a real achievement, a tribute to the loyalty and devotion to the socialist ideas of the SYL's entire membership. It represents also a measure of the hard work, energy and imagination of our local fund drive directors who were faced with the often difficult task of soliciting funds not only from members, but from the friends, sympathizers and contacts of the organization. The success with which these efforts were met varied, but when pursued persistently demonstrated that the SYL has a real circle of sympathizers

to whom appeals for money can be made successfully. Thus over \$80 of the Chicago SYL's quota came from friends and sympathizers.

Our accomplishment also reflects a distinctly different approach to the problem of finances than that held by almost every other youth organization in America. It is almost always characteristic of youth organizations, and particularly their "professional" leadership, to look for financial support to some other source—whether it be to the parent organization, or an independent foundation, institution or private donor. Young people tend to expect to have money spent on them, and because they are potential recruits to larger adult movements, these expectations are frequently fulfilled. Their officers' salaries are paid, their publications are subsidized, or their incidental expenses are met indirectly through the provision of free meeting places, offices, supplies, etc.

This is not necessarily in itself wrong, but it frequently has had results. Particularly in political or semi-political movements it makes the organization dependent upon outside, and very frequently more conservative direction. This in turn prevents the free development of political differences and their solution in a normal and democratic manner, unconfounded by "practical" considerations such as the necessity to bend one's political line in order to retain the all important "youth subsidy."

STAND ON OWN FEET

A socialist youth movement, and particularly our own, should establish patterns of behaviour which differ from these in two important respects. In the

first place, as an independent group, the SYL should try to rely on its own resources as much as possible in building its organization. It should develop self-reliance and self-initiative. Naturally, this does not mean "competing" with the adult movement in any respect; it does mean learning not to "lean on" or depend upon our parent organization the ISL when this is not necessary. This, not in the sense of "asserting our independence," but of "standing on our own feet." As a training ground for adult political life, it is the function of the SYL to develop its membership to the point of organizational as well as political maturity. The SYL has to develop its own speakers, writers and experienced organizers. It needs its own pamphlets, bulletins and literature. And for its institutions and activities it must raise the necessary money. This is what a dues system makes possible, and this is what our fund drive accomplishes: the financing of SYL activities by the SYL itself.

In the second place, our youth movement has to assume a different attitude toward the political movement of which we are a part. Particularly, as more of our members begin working, and receiving larger incomes, their financial responsibility toward maintaining the press and staff of the ISL increases proportionately. In principle the SYL has recognized this responsibility by sharing its receipts from the fund drive with the ISL. In this way also the present fund drive demonstrates the increased responsibility which we have accepted and tried to discharge.

It can be no secret that at the beginning, there were more than a few sceptics who could not believe that the SYL would complete its fund drive goal. Yet we have confounded the sceptics and amazed the disbelievers. Inasmuch as the SYL has sustained no rapid growth in the past year, there was, perhaps, little basis for believing in the possibility of success. Yet in actuality, our showing this year does reflect more or less accurately the strengthening we have experienced—the gain in maturity, vitality, and to a much lesser extent, in size. Our fund drive was in all respects a success, and by no means an unimportant one. With it behind us we have every reason to look toward the future with some modest degree of confidence in our forces.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

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

I want more information about the Socialist Youth League.
 I want to join the Socialist Youth League.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).....

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

Labor Action FORUM • New York

• Wednesday, May 21

Gordon Haskell

Aneurin Bevan's "In Place of Fear"

• Thursday, May 22

Margaret Bell

"Issues in the Steel Seizure"

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 W. 14th St.—Third Floor

New York 11, N. Y.