

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MAY 26, 1952

FIVE CENTS

**ISRAEL AND MIDDLE-EAST UNITY:
A Left-Wing Israeli View**

... page 6

Incident in the Lenz Case

... page 5

Monolithism in U.S. Foreign Policy

... page 7

Franco Terror Pounces Again In Catalonia

**AN APPEAL FOR WORLD LABOR'S AID
BY THE SPANISH SOCIALIST POUM**

**TO ALL WORKERS' ORGANIZATIONS
AGAINST THE FRANCO SUPPRESSION
IN CATALONIA:**

On the eve of the Eucharist Congress in Barcelona, the Franco government has unleashed a new wave of repressions.

The Falangist police of Barcelona, obeying instructions from Madrid, in the last few days have made a large number of arrests among the Catalan workers' resistance.

Some weeks ago its attack was directed against the CNT [syndicalist trade unions] and the Socialist Party. Now the Francoists have gone over to a brutal attack against the POUM, the revolutionary socialist organization of the Spanish workers.

Up to the present time 30 militants of our party have been arrested. But the repression continues mercilessly. And its victims, imprisoned in the jails of the Barcelona police department, have been subjected to barbarous tortures.

Among those arrested are our Comrades David Rey, Manuel Alberich, Francisco Claramunt and A. Ortega, old and devoted militants of the POUM and of the UGT [socialist trade unions]. David Rey, who is now 63 years old and who was condemned to death in 1939 by a Franco military tribunal, has spent 10 years in Falangist prisons and is one of the most representative figures in the Spanish labor movement.

A few days before, Franco's minister of justice had announced a wide amnesty, on the occasion of the Barcelona Eucharist Congress. Once again the Falangists' promises of "clemency" have been transformed into vicious attacks against the heroes of the underground struggle for the liberation of the Spanish people.

The POUM militants jailed in Barcelona, who are being held for a monstrous trial, are guilty of no crime

(Continued on page 3)

That Blessed Korean War!

The Korean war is a blessing. So, we now discover, said General James A. Van Fleet, commander of the Eighth Army in Korea, last January 19, to a group of visiting Filipino dignitaries.

The United Press, in a dispatch of that date published in the Los Angeles Daily News, quotes the general as boasting that his forces "will defeat anything that China, Russia and North Korea can bring here against them," and that he is "going to wipe them [the Communists], out." Then Van Fleet said:

"Korea has been a blessing. There had to be a Korea either here or some place in the world. We are glad it is not in your country [Philippines]. There had to be a Korea to put our defenses in good shape. Our factories now are turning out more arms again."

To this Korean blessing we may add another footnote. In an interview with the San Francisco Chronicle (issue of March 16), Korean consul general Young Han Choo insisted that Korea needs a strong man rather than democracy and that there is no room for democracy in Asia. Syngman Rhee is a blessing too!

McCARRAN RIDES AGAIN—

Racist Immigration Bill Unites Congress Reaction

By GORDON HASKELL

The McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill is being pushed through Congress by a majority which is out for the kill. The atmosphere in which the bill was debated in the House last month may be repeated in the Senate.

It was an atmosphere of open hostility to all human beings who have not had the luck to be born in the United States, and of hatred and contempt in an ascending scale for everyone who does not come from Northwestern Europe, for Negroes, for people of Asiatic origin, and for Jews. It was an atmosphere in which the civil liberties and legal rights of resident non-citizens and naturalized citizens were attacked with relative impunity.

In the House, the tiny band of representatives who attempted to stand against the tide were cowed into a timid and dispirited defense, while the majority rode high, wide and handsome to the passage of their bill.

The McCarran-Walter bill is designed to codify and combine the welter of existing legislation covering the conditions under which people may immigrate into the United States, their status once they have arrived here, and the grounds on which they may be deported, whether they have been naturalized or not. Though it does away with some of the contradictions and confusions in the old laws, and even with some generally reactionary provisions, the latter are reintroduced in concealed form in the new bill, and many additional reactionary measures are added which have not existed before.

As the House bill covers 162 pages in small type, it would obviously be impossible to summarize all its provisions here. The following is a selective summary of certain of the provisions which are the most restrictive, humiliating and obnoxious from the point of view of the democratic side of the American tradition. (The provisions of the bill introduced in the Senate by Pat McCarran, the Democrat from Nevada, and in the House by Walter, the Democrat from Pennsylvania, are not identical in all respects. In this summary no distinction is made between the two.)

CHAUVINISM RAMPANT

The bill would:

- Authorize the president to set up new restrictions, and even absolute bars, against immigration without legislative or judicial review in peacetime as well as in wartime.

- Change immigration quotas for Jamaica and other Caribbean colonies from the never-filled United Kingdom quota of over 65,000 to a special quota of 100 for each colony, thus drastically reducing Negro immigration from these areas.

- Continue the present allocation of national quotas which is based on the 1920 census, thus permit-



ting large (and almost never completely used) quotas for countries in Northwestern Europe, while drastically limiting the quotas for countries in Southern and Eastern Europe.

- For the first time authorize quotas for the countries of Asia which permit 100 nationals from each of these to enter the United States per year, the total number from this area not to exceed 2,000.
- Establish a special inferior status for any person "attributable by as much as one half of his ancestry" to Asiatic races, regardless of the citizenship or country of birth. These people must come in under the above 100 quota given the country of their ancestors, and

may not come in under the quota of the country of which they may be a native-born citizen. (This was included to virtually bar immigration of such persons from Canada and Latin America.)

- Exclude people from admission who have been convicted by foreign courts for any "non-political" cause, thus making convictions by Nazi or Stalinist courts a bar against entry into the country.
- Bar people who received any travel documents (even in Stalinist-ruled countries) by "misrepresentation."
- Bar immigrants (including quota-exempt immigrants from

(Turn to last page)

Passports, Proteins and Pauling

The unscientific man in the street may associate proteins only with schemes for reducing diets, but the U. S. State Department can't be fooled.

It has denied a passport to Dr. Linus Pauling, the famed scientist who heads the Chemistry Department of the California Institute of Technology, to prevent him from going to England to participate in a conference of the Royal Society of London on the structure of proteins. His travel "would not be in the best interests of the United States," is its illuminating reason. The president of Caltech says the university has not been informed of any other motivation; just in case, however, since he reads the papers, he adds that "Dr. Pauling has stated under oath that he is not, and never has been, a member of the Communist Party, and we have no reason to believe that he did not state the truth."

The connection between proteins and the Communist Party still remained unclear.

American Civil Liberties Union on the Smith Act: The Weapons of Tyranny—Against Tyranny

THE SMITH ACT AND THE SUPREME COURT. An American Civil Liberties Union Analysis, Opinion and Statement of Policy. Published by the American Civil Liberties Union, April.

By MARY BELL

The publication of the statement of views of the American Civil Liberties Union on the Smith Act of 1940, the chief federal sedition law, and the position of the Supreme Court on this law is to be welcomed. The ACLU opposed this law from the time of its enactment to the present "because we believe that it infringes upon the rights of freedom of speech and because we believe the law is dangerously unwise."

The ACLU statement points out that it attacked the law in 1941 when it was first used against the Socialist Workers Party (when the Communist Party approved of the prosecution); when it was used in the mass "sedition" trials of alleged Nazi sympathizers; and again in 1948 when it was applied against the Communist Party leaders.

In each case the concern of the ACLU, its pamphlet emphasizes, was to defend the "fundamental rights" given to the people by the Constitution. It is within the limits of this concern—adherence to a liberal interpretation of the Constitution and the doctrine of "wisdom"—that the ACLU speaks. Socialists have a much broader and socially founded opposition to such reactionary legislation, and the limitations of the constitutional approach of the ACLU are shown in the face of the varying interpretations of the Constitution, as in the case of the Smith Act itself.

Nevertheless, the ACLU opposition to the act, whose constitutionality was upheld in the Supreme Court opinion of June 1951 affirming the conviction of the 11 CP leaders, and its program of action are to be hailed as a part of the struggle to preserve civil liberties and freedom of speech and an attempt to repeal the act itself.

WORKS FOR REPEAL

The ACLU proposes to participate independently in further Smith Act cases when they reach the Supreme Court; to see that the limits of the court's constitutional approval are not overstepped in such matters as setting of bail or placing illegal restrictions upon the source from which bail may be obtained. They will uphold the view that "Bail is not fixed to keep a person in jail." The ACLU will further press for the right of the defendant under the law to present evidence on the "clear and present danger" theory, such evidence to be decided by the jury rather than by the judge. Repeal of the Smith Act and any similar state or local legislation is advocated as a threat to freedom. The ACLU finally proposes to undertake a vigorous program of public education with other non-Stalinist organizations to reach these goals.

In analyzing its opposition to the Supreme Court's upholding of the Smith Act, the Civil Liberties Union maintains that the distinction established between "discussion" and "advocacy" is "so vague . . . as to permit zealous prosecutors to suppress the freedom of democratic debate." The majority court ruling tries to find the distinction between discussion and advocacy in the "intent" of a statement. In the majority opinion rendered by Chief Justice Vinson:

" . . . there is a line beyond which [those who would advocate constitutionally prohibited conduct] may not go—a line which they, in full knowledge of what they intend and the circumstances

in which their activity takes place, will well appreciate and understand."

To inquire into the intent with which a statement is made is not merely difficult, if not impossible, in matters with which the act is concerned, but leads into the realm of the "dangerous thoughts" doctrine practiced in the Middle Ages, by witch-burners and latterly by the Japanese.

The ACLU also asks, "How will the conflict be resolved between the criminality of conspiratorial advocacy and the claims of a free press? Is it conspiratorial advocacy merely to teach at a Communist school? If not, why have later indictments under the Smith Act included such teaching as a charge?"

"PROBABLE" DANGER

In subscribing to the "clear and present danger" principle in limiting speech, the ACLU qualifies this to mean the proof of overt acts immediately arising from speech. It agrees with the remark of the court that the advocacy of the violation of any law is "reprehensible morally." But it does subscribe to the principle that what is "morally to be condemned is not therefore automatically" to be legally forbidden.

The ACLU statement shows that the "clear and present danger" principle, which was a kind of legal stopgap, has now been replaced by a "clear and probable danger" doctrine. They quote Vinson's decision which marked the change:

"Certainly an attempt to overthrow the government by force,

even though doomed from the outset because of inadequate numbers or power of the revolutionists, is sufficient evil for Congress to prevent."

WORTH THE RISK

As against this narrowing of the guarantees of free speech in the Bill of Rights, the ACLU supports the dissenting opinions of Justices Black and Douglas on the Smith Act:

"Undoubtedly governmental policy of unfettered communication of ideas does entail dangers. To the founders of this nation, however, the benefits derived from free expression were worth the risk. . . ." (Black.)

" . . . This does not mean, however, that the nation need hold its hand until it is in such weakened condition that there is no time to protect itself from incitement to revolution. Seditious conduct can always be punished. But the command of the First Amendment is so clear that we should not allow Congress to call a halt to free speech except in the extreme case of peril from the speech itself." (Douglas.)

Vinson for the court majority believes that it is the "conspiracy" which creates the "danger." But even he was unhappy about using the law of conspiracy to abridge the rights of free speech.

"I happen to think it is an awkward and inept remedy, but I find no constitutional authority for taking this weapon from the government."

Justice Douglas dissented: "To make a lawful speech unlawful because two men conceive it is to

raise the law of conspiracy to appalling proportions."

Justice Black also dissented: "The indictment is that they conspired to organize the Communist Party and to use speech or newspapers and other publications in the future to teach and advocate the forcible overthrow of the government. No matter how it is worded, this is a virulent form of prior censorship of speech and press, which I believe the First Amendment forbids."

In addition, the ACLU differs with the finding that the question of "clear and present danger" is a matter of law to be determined by the court and not by the jury.

THE VISHINSKY LINE

The ACLU attacks the unwisdom of the Smith Act as being based upon fear rather than upon confidence in the power of the people to debate rationally and determine their own future. Even the upholding Justice Jackson said:

"I have little faith in the long-range effectiveness of this conviction to stop the rise of the Communist movement. Communism will not go to jail with these Communists. . . . Many failures by fallen governments attest that no government can long prevent revolutions by outlawry."

Douglas in his dissent quoted Vishinsky in 1948: "In our state, naturally there can be no place for freedom of speech, press, and so on for the foes of socialism." Our concern should be that our people will never give support to these advocates of revolution, so long as we remain loyal to the purposes for which our nation was founded."

The ACLU recognizes that world Stalinist propaganda feeds on the weaknesses of Western democracy and is able to make much of the contradiction between the principles of freedom and the practices of restriction. The evidence continues to grow that in the world struggle that is shaping up, it which the United States purports to lead the forces of freedom against those of tyranny, there is a steady diminution of freedom in the United States. The weapons of tyranny are being used against tyranny.

JEFFERSON'S LINE

One wonders what the fate of some of the Founding Fathers, whose document is being invoked by so many so completely antithetic to the spirit of liberty and revolution which prevailed in those earlier times, would be today. And especially one like Jefferson, who opposed the Constitution without the amendments in the Bill of Rights. Would they not, for many of their utterances, be hailed into court today for conspiracy, sedition, dangerous statements and ideas?

What of Jefferson's famous words: "God forbid we should ever be twenty years without . . . a rebellion. . . . What country can preserve its liberties, if its rulers are not warned from time to time, that this people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. . . . What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure."

California's Booby Trap for Stoolpigeons

FBI'S INFORMERS STILL STUMBLING THROUGH LINES AT LOS ANGELES CP TRIAL

By DAVE BERN

LOS ANGELES, May 14—The California trial of 15 Stalinist leaders on charges of conspiracy to advocate violent revolution entered its 18th week without any substantial confirmation of the government's charges. Its unsavory array of stoolie witnesses have continued to make spectacles of themselves.

On May 5 the government presented a striking example of its strategy when witness Teresa M. Scagnell, described as an "attractive Bronx housewife," arrived by plane from New York to take the stand for three minutes! She simply testified that she had once heard defendant Rose Chernin Kuznitz speak on women's activities before a CP gathering in New York in April 1943. This event was supposed to have taken place one month after the witness joined the CP as part of her police work. The defense didn't bother to cross-examine. So the witness flies back to New York the same day, her expenses paid by the government for the announced purpose of "linking Mrs. Kuznitz to New York activities" of the Stalinist Party!

BOOBY IN TRAP

The following day Paul Estrada, Milwaukee policeman, returned to the stand. Estrada, who joined the CP in 1947 at the "request of the FBI," created his own sensation earlier when he testified that the Stalinist leaders passed out a top secret manual to members whose title he gave as "How to Make Bombs and Booby Traps."

The government attorneys admitted they didn't have the document, nor, apparently, had they even heard of it. Estrada's big "revelation" caught the government by surprise as the witness ad-libbed without prior notification. The defense demanded the

document be produced, so it was flown from Washington and turned out to be an old War Department field manual issued to countless GIs during the last war! And the actual title was just "Land Mines and Booby Traps"—not on how to make bombs.

Defense Attorney Margolis played up Estrada's misnaming of the manual, claiming that the significant difference between the alleged and real titles indicated that Estrada held a "psychological basis of animus toward the defendants." Although Estrada claimed he had made regular written reports to the FBI while acting as a stoolpigeon in CP ranks, the government, under pressure, conceded that no report had ever been received concerning the army manual. Thus, Estrada's verbal "bombshell" proved to be a "booby trap"—for the prosecution.

UNCLE TOM

Estrada, a Negro, indicated in part of his testimony that the Stalinists only pretended to be interested in Negro problems in order to further the CP's "revolutionary aims." He was cross-examined by Leo Branton Jr., also a Negro, and quizzed about his earlier statements that there was "no Negro problem" in Milwaukee until the Stalinists began their agitation among Negroes. Branton asked Estrada if he had belonged to a Negro cell in the Milwaukee CP. Estrada replied that "we have no Negro district in Milwaukee. Negroes live all over the city."

Then Branton read an official Milwaukee document, "Mayor's Commission on Human Rights, Report of January 1952" (for the year 1951). This report stated that housing discrimination and segregation of Negroes is more widely practiced in Milwaukee than in any

other Wisconsin city and was considered a chief problem of the metropolis. The report, a document written by a board appointed by socialist Mayor Frank Zeidler, also stated that only in rare instances a Negro got a house outside the "Negro ghetto." Estrada claimed, however, that a big interracial housing project had solved the Negroes' housing problem. Then Attorney Branton showed proof that of 540 units in the project only six were occupied by Negroes! Such juggling with facts should discredit a witness and the authorities he represents.

MIND WON'T WORK

Witness No. 17, Margaret Louise Ames, a clerk at McCord Air Force base at Tacoma, Washington, joined the CP in San Diego in 1941 at the "request of the FBI." (That old refrain!) On the stand she broke down after she mistakenly identified defendant Al Richmond by pointing to Attorney Norman Leonard. Later she put her hands over her eyes and exclaimed, "My mind won't work! It's gone blank." Then she denied that she had been briefed by government attorneys to identify Richmond by pointing to a man in a brown suit. Attorney Leonard also wore a brown suit. Said Mrs. Ames, "I couldn't decide because both men had on brown suits. I was pretty confused."

Back on the stand, Estrada said the army manual was given to him by James Hudson, who is alleged to have said, "It may be very useful to you in case of a revolution in this country." Then Estrada said he promptly turned the document over to the FBI. "Everybody was very excited. 'Boy, where in hell did you get this one?' the FBI agent named Al asked me. He went out and got the other agents and had

everybody running in to see it. 'Wow! Boy! Look at this!' they all said." Estrada smiled at the jury and said, "That was about the biggest piece of dynamite I ever had." A little later the prosecution confessed they had received no information on the manual from the FBI, nor was it entered in any of Estrada's reports.

RACE LABELS

Margolis, in the cross-examination, also wrung from Estrada the admission that whenever he named a Communist Party member in his "several hundreds" reports to the FBI, he "always designated whether the person was a Negro, Jewish or white [sic]." Vernon Sutherland, a carpenter at an Army arsenal, took the stand to report that he had joined the CP in 1943 at the instigation of the FBI and was expelled at Chicago in 1950 for "white chauvinism." He defined this charge as meaning a feeling of white superiority. He had been accused of cheating a Negro in a real-estate deal and also of paying substandard wages to a Negro worker. Sutherland drew FBI expense accounts of from \$25 to \$150 a month for seven years as a spy.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14th Street, N. Y. C.

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc., and can supply books of all publishers.

Send for our free book list.

Around the World, Labor Rallies Denounce Franco

Protest meetings and efforts to build up mass rallies against the Franco regime's terror trials and executions of trade unionists, socialists and militant anti-fascists have taken place throughout the world, as well as in the United States. The latter have already been reported in LABOR ACTION; to these we must add a statement made to the Spanish people by the CIO's representative in Europe.

Victor Reuther wrote, in *La Voz de los Obreros Americanos* (Voice of the American Workers), a "trade-union Spanish-language bulletin put out recently:

"The CIO presents its embarrassed excuses to the Spanish people for the growing and continued support by America to Franco. We see this as one of the greatest crimes committed in all time in the name of democracy. . . . But someone must assume responsibility for the betrayal committed against the Spanish people, even if only before the tribunal of history. No American can be left out of this responsibility. Not Mr. Truman, not General Eisenhower, not Secretary Acheson, not one of us." (As quoted in *La Batalla*, May 1.)

The vigor of the language is refreshing, and would be more so if it appeared in the English language in prominent display in CIO publications put out in the U. S. But it is not true that every American shares the responsibility with Truman, Acheson, Eisenhower and the other directors of U. S. policy. Nor is this responsibility shared by others abroad who have been, on the contrary, organizing movements of protest.

ENGLAND

"Last week [March 27] a remarkable meeting was held at the Memorial Hall, Faringdon Street, to protest against the persecution now being practised by the Franco dictatorship and the courtesies toward General Franco at the same time being indulged in by the Western powers.

"Speakers at the meeting included Augustus John [the famous painter], Henry Moore [well-known sculptor], H. N.

Brailsford [author and socialist journalist], Kingsley Martin [editor of the *New Statesman and Nation*], Fenner Brockway [Labor MP], and Herbert Read [author and critic]. The meeting was notable also since none of those participating in it could be accused of the modern vice of selectivity in attacking political tyranny. All those who spoke have at one time or another attacked political trials behind the Iron Curtain in the same terms which they now employed to denounce Franco's persecution."—*London Tribune* (Bevanite), April 4.

Other speakers at the London meeting, which was sponsored by the Freedom Press Association, included Michael Foot, an editor of the *Tribune*, and Professor J. Bronowsky. The hall was packed and enthusiastic. The speeches delivered have been published in an issue of the British periodical *Freedom*.

As in New York a continuing body to organize the movement has been formed in England. Called the Committee for Aid to the Victims of Franco, it was initiated by three Labor Party MPs, Fenner Brockway, D. L. Donnelly and H. J. Finch. Finch is from the National Federation of Miners, and other participants are Freda Laski, widow of the late Harold J. Laski; Walter Padley, an MP and secretary of the distribution workers; Bob Edwards, of the chemical workers union. It has issued a folder entitled "Save the victims of Franco!"

BELGIUM

The dance group of the Workman's Section of the Spanish Falange canceled its performance in Brussels out of fear of new and violent anti-Franco demonstrations.

FRANCE

March 25: the Association of Friends of the Spanish Republic held a big rally to protest the Barcelona executions. Among the speakers were a senator, Gaston Chazette; two deputies, Josep Dumas and Daniel Mayer; Guy Moncege and Georges Fontenis. April 1: the performance of the

Spanish Falange dance group at the Palace of Chaillot in Paris was disrupted when hundreds of people spread anti-Franco leaflets among the audience.

MEXICO

March 25: the Teatro Iris de Mejico was the scene of a large meeting of protest against the Franco terror, organized by the Spanish CNT (syndicalist organization), with speakers from various Latin American countries, including: Alejandro Sux, Argentine journalist; Prof. Ricardo D. Alduvin of Honduras; Prof. R. C. Amador of Mexico; Prof. Vicente Saenz of Costa Rica; Julio Ortiz Marquez of the Colombian Liberal Party; Concepcion Palacios of Nicaragua; Ricardo Turlan of Uruguay; Antonio Genit of Peru; Valentin Tejada, a Dominican Republic socialist; Diego Cordoba, Venezuelan writer; Jose G. Medina, secretary of the CGT of Mexico.

HOLLAND

The Autonomous Federation of Trade Unions issued an appeal to the Dutch workers to intensify their anti-Franco action.

ISRAEL

A Committee to Aid the Victims of Franco has been formed in Tel-Aviv. It has begun to publish a monthly information bulletin on Spanish problems. In connection with the Barcelona executions it distributed protest leaflets before the Franco consulate in Jerusalem.

URUGUAY

The Socialist Workers Group has appealed to all labor organizations in the country to plan widespread action against the Franco terror.

CEYLON

The Trotskyist parliamentary group has sent a telegram of protest against the Barcelona executions to the Franco government, reports *La Batalla*.

Chicago Picketers Protest Francoism



Franco Spain's consulate in Chicago was picketed on Saturday afternoon, May 3, in protest against the executions and trials of anti-fascist trade-unionists and socialists by the Falangist dictatorship in Madrid. Demonstrating against the new wave of terror which Franco has unleashed, encouraged by Washington's change of line in his favor, the picket line—over 30—chanted slogans and carried placards denouncing the murder of unionists, the U. S.'s pro-Franco policy and expressing opposition to both Franco's and Stalin's dictatorship. The Independent Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League participated together with the IWW, the Socialist Party and YPSL, student clubs, and Libertarian Socialist League. Thousands of leaflets were distributed to the passing crowds in the Loop explaining the aims of the demonstration and the record of the Franco totalitarian regime. This was the second anti-Franco picket line in Chicago, the first being last year's in support of the Barcelona general strike.

One of the heartening aspects of the action was the excellent cooperation of all the participating organizations in planning and carrying out the work. Once again all the organizations agreed on the necessity for a clear differentiation from the Stalinists. In the first meeting of the groups, the Socialist Workers Party (official-Trotskyist) representative attempted, as last year, to pass motions to include the Communist Party and to eliminate all anti-Stalinist slogans.

As it was, although some persons would call out "Communist" at the picketers and leaflet distributors, the majority were impressed by the fact that they were both anti-Stalinist and socialist. Few of the 3,000 leaflets were thrown away; in fact many stood on the spot and did not leave till they had read the entire leaflet.

Franco Pounces—

(Continued from page 1)

other than fighting under the banner of revolutionary socialism in defense of the interests of the Spanish working class and against the totalitarian tyranny of Franco.

The new wave of repression has very precise aims. The Franco government intends to convert the Eucharist Congress of Barcelona into a big Falangist propaganda demonstration. In order to ensure its full success it has begun with an attempt to destroy the resistance movement against the fascist dictatorship. But now, as on other occasions, the terror will not prevent the Barcelona working class from clearly demonstrating its rejection of the demagogic shams of the Falangist tyranny.

To denounce these moves before labor and liberal opinion in all countries, the POUM calls for immediate action on behalf of the Barcelona victims and against the outbreak of new anti-labor repressions in Spain.

Our appeal is an urgent summons to all workers' forces in the world, and especially to the great political and trade-union organizations of the working class, which possess considerable means of action.

The workers' resistance of Catalonia must be energetically defended and supported by the international solidarity of labor.

Against the monstrous Barcelona trial!
For the liberation of David Rey and his comrades!
Down with the Franco terror!

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the POUM

Paris, May 12.

ISL FUND DRIVE

Made It! Spurt Reaches Top Rung

By ALBERT GATES
Fund Drive Director

With final returns still to come in, this closing report on the ISL 1952 Fund Drive shows receipts of \$12,106.25, or 96.8 per cent of the quota of \$12,500. This rush closing guarantees that the total

quota will be reached since reports from cities like Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, etc., indicate that funds are still being collected.

The response of the last four weeks more than made up for the slow pace of the drive in the early

Fund Drive Box Score

	Quota	Paid	Percent
TOTAL	\$12,500	\$12,106.25	96.8
General	1,000	1318	131.8
Oregon	50	65	130
Streator	25	31	124
Socialist Youth League	1,500	1832	122.1
Newark	300	330	110
Oakland	500	516	103.2
Cleveland	200	206	103
Buffalo	650	650	100
Indiana	50	50	100
Reading	75	75	100
Boston	50	50	100
Los Angeles	600	576	96
Pittsburgh	150	141	94
New York	4,000	3545	88.6
Seattle	300	250	83.3
Philadelphia	300	232	77.3
Chicago	1,800	1338	74.3
St. Louis	50	26	52
Baltimore	25	5	20
Akron	75	0	0

The ISL Program in Brief

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERESTED?

Get acquainted with the Independent Socialist League—

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

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

I want to join the ISL.

Name
Address
City Zone
State Tel.

LABOR SCOPE

New Smith Act: Trend to a "Labor Front"

By BEN HALL

While the Supreme Court ponders the weighty constitutional issues posed by the government seizure of the steel mills, moves begin in Congress for the enactment of drastic curbs on labor's right to strike. Forgotten are the Fair Deal administration's promises for a mighty crusade for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law. What looms instead is a swifter drift toward state controls over unions.

The more "liberal" congressmen, if the term "liberal" is still apt and applicable, suggest laws which would spell out the right of the president to seize industry during so-called emergency strikes. If we recall the debates over the Taft-Hartley Law, we will remember that these liberals, Fair Dealers, and congressional "friends of labor" tacitly or explicitly grant the government the right to outlaw strikes in such industries taken over by the state. Their proposals, at best, are a more palatable method of curbing strikes.

HALF THE GAME

But they will never hold out even for their own meager best. All experience with these heroes prepares us for their inevitable decision to give away half the game to the more demanding reactionaries and conservatives.

It is the latter who set the tone and line for new anti-labor legislation. One proposal would flatly legalize strikes in any war industry whenever an emergency is declared, perhaps by Congress or perhaps by the president. Others call for compulsory arbitration, decisions to be enforced by the

government. Those who prefer a more roundabout approach, dear to the hearts of haggling lawyers, would declare big industrial unions to be "monopolies" and make industry-wide strikes illegal, presumably in restraint of trade. Basically the same, with somewhat different trimmings and decorations, are proposals to outlaw industry-wide bargaining, make big industrial unions ineffectual, or abolish industry-wide contracts. By a narrow margin, provisions to this effect were defeated at the time of the adoption of the original T-H Law.

HEIL SMITH!

But most sinister of all, and undoubtedly the plan most likely to win congressional popularity as a bargaining point, is the plan advanced by Representative Howard Smith of Virginia. (Smith is the author or co-author of many bills. Maybe he hopes to boast: this was a free country . . . until my bills were passed.) He wants nothing less than government seizure of industry and of the unions during big strikes and continued government controls over both union and company for an indefinite period if no settlement is reached during a strike emergency. This is a proposal for nothing less than the "temporary" liquidation of unions as free institutions of the working class and their transformation, momentarily, into a sort of state-controlled labor front.

Thus, in the name of defense of our "way of life" against Russian totalitarianism, the capitalist politicians of the United States move to restrict the rights of labor and undermine democracy.

Strong Language by ITU

CINCINNATI, May 4—The president of the International Typographical Union today called the government's labor policy "fascistic hooey."

Woodruff Randolph, the head of the I. T. U., one of the nation's oldest unions, made the statement at a dinner celebrating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the organization.

He asserted governmental interference with labor affairs has reached the danger point and he declared the government now is laying out restricted areas in which unions may organize, forbidding the workers the right to strike and arbitrarily fixing wages and prices.

"We are right on the verge of Italian Fascism under the guise of free enterprise," he declared.

"We have reached the point where the government sanctions maximum prices instead of competitive prices," he said, adding that government subsidies to large corporations, making possible profits at the taxpayers' expense, were among other governmental abuses of authority.

"We have not fallen for this government fascist hooey," he asserted.

The I. T. U., Randolph said, is asking the government to "take its iron hands off the rights of unions."

"We're asking them not to protect employers by restrictive laws which make union efforts fruitless," he continued.

"Members of the I. T. U. would like to free enterprise. It isn't free today."

DON'T MISS A SINGLE ISSUE OF LABOR ACTION!

SUBSCRIPTION FOR ONE YEAR IS ONLY \$2.00

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 16, No. 21 May 26, 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.

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

IN CLOUD-CUCKOO LAND, by William Worthy.—The Crisis, April 1952

In this article Mr. Worthy comments on a speech delivered in Copenhagen, Denmark on January 29 by a Mrs. Edith Sampson on the situation of the Negroes in America. Mrs. Sampson has been heralded by the American Embassy in Denmark as "an expert on the Negro problem," and her trip abroad is supposed to help dissipate the effects of Stalinist propaganda on the treatment of Negroes in the United States.

Mr. Worthy reports that in her whole speech, Mrs. Sampson at no time referred to the violence to which Negroes are exposed in America, and gave the impression that in all spheres of life, in employment, housing, and equal rights generally the Negroes are very rapidly achieving, if they have not yet quite achieved, full equality. As Worthy puts it: "In effect Mrs. Sampson

told the Danish people: Stop criticizing America. You have an out-dated picture of the race problem. We Negroes are emerging rapidly from the darkness of second-class citizenship into the brilliant sunshine of human brotherhood. Those best-selling books in Danish bookstores by Lillian Smith, Richard Wright, and others are hardly worth reading. (I myself have never read *Strange Fruit*, she informed the surprised audience, who had come out in a snowstorm to hear the 'expert' on the Negro problem.) Leave us and our good white friends alone and all will be well."

Worthy concludes with a quotation from the Prophet of Islam: "Restrain the oppressor from proceeding with the oppression." He adds: "Negroes, Europeans and other peoples of the world must save a race-conscious, dollar-conscious, atom bomb-conscious America from itself."

WHEN 107 MILLION PEOPLE WENT TO THE POLLS—

India's Election: A Factual Summary

By JOSEPH ROAN

The recently concluded national election in India represents a unique development on the Asian mainland. For the first time, on a meaningful scale, a section of that continent's oppressed peoples had an opportunity to express their needs through the medium of the free ballot.

The masses of the Indian subcontinent took full advantage of the occasion by their overwhelming rejection of Nehru's Congress Party. Despite its command of the state machinery, which it utilized to the full to press its advantage; despite its control of the press; and despite its four-year-long entrenchment in power, it received only 44 per cent of the total ballots cast. Well over half of the voters chose to cast their ballots against the Congress.

The Socialist Party of India was second in terms of popular vote, receiving over 10 per cent. The Communist Party and its allies registered about half of that, and was closely followed by the Kisan Mazdoor Praja (KMPP), of which more later.

	Per Cent	House Seats	State Assembly Seats
Congress	44.47	364	2477
SP	10.23	12	136
GP	5.44	27	196
KMPP	5.26	10	86

11 MILLION FOR SP

The various communist organizations, which functioned as a straw man for Nehru to pound in his electioneering, were decisively rejected in the election. Their chief party, the Hindu Mahasabha, received less than one per cent of the votes cast.

From the standpoint of statistics alone the election was a most impressive affair. It took about four months to poll the country. Out of an electorate of 175,000,000 qualified voters, over 107,500,000 people cast their ballots, a percentage that compares favorably with elections in the United States. The 11,000,000-vote cast for the Socialist Party is among the largest a socialist party has obtained in any election, anywhere in the world, in absolute figures.

Despite the fact that the Congress emerged with a minority of the votes, the division of its opposition enabled it to gain a tremendous majority in the House of the People (the lower house of the bicameral national parliament), and sizable majorities in most of the state assemblies.

CP's RANGE

The Communist Party, which ran in only 70 of the 489 election districts for the House of the People, emerged with 27 seats, since it concentrated its efforts in those areas where it had its greatest strength. Twenty-six of the 27 seats were filled by candidates from five states—Madras, Travancore-Cochin, West Bengal, Hyderabad and Tripura.

Running in 270 districts, the SP gained only 12 seats in the lower house, although it achieved sizable minority votes in many of its contested elections. The over-all score-board for the major parties is given in the accompanying table.

The remainder of the vote was scattered among a wide range of

parties and various independents. These include the Scheduled Castes Federation, headed by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, which received over 2 per cent of the popular vote and elected 2 members to parliament. In addition, a number of Marxist and quasi-Marxist groups such as the Forward Bloc, the Revolutionary Socialist Party and the Tamilnad Toolers Party elected one or more members to parliament and a number of candidates in the state assemblies.

A similar situation prevails in P.E.P.S.U., where the small CP bloc of 3 seats joined with the Akali party (Sikh nationalists) and a few dissident Congress members, to outvote and unseat the Congress ministry. As this is being written a new ministry is being formed with the CP scheduled to obtain some of the positions.

CITY vs. HINTERLAND

The unexpected showing of the Stalinists in the four Southern states of Hyderabad, Travancore-Cochin, Madras and Tripura was, in the opinion of the writer, due to the reputation they have gained as defenders of the peasantry, resulting from the victory of Mao Tse-tung and his purported agrarian reforms in China.

The areas in the four states where the CP rolled up its largest vote are among the most backward and depressed in all India, which is saying a good deal. In Hyderabad, for example, a state of semi-civil war has been going on for a long period, the peasants striving in a life-and-death struggle for some amelioration of their pitiable conditions. This movement has been largely under the leadership of the CP, and accrued to their benefit in the elections.

The degree to which their strength is limited to the peasantry cap best be illustrated by the results of the election in Madras Province. There they won 61 of the 375 contested seats for the state assembly. The Socialists gained only 13, but these 13 were entirely from Madras city, where the CP, by contrast, captured only a single seat. The Stalinists' remaining 60 seats were entirely from the hinterland.

In the minor state of Tripura, the Stalinists achieved an absolute majority of 10 seats against 7 for the Congress. The CP gained only 56. The SP, in an electoral agreement with the Scheduled Castes Federation, obtained 36 seats for itself, and 5 went to the SCF. The CP obtained only 4.

The strategic importance of the KMPP has increased since the elections of the *de facto* united front it has formed with the Stalinists in the state assemblies, notably Madras. There, Congress is in the minority in the assembly, holding only 152 of the 375 seats. The CP's 62 seats, plus the 35 of the KMPP, plus the votes of a number of minor parties and independents they have gathered, will prevent the formation of a stable ministry.

A similar situation prevails in P.E.P.S.U., where the small CP bloc of 3 seats joined with the Akali party (Sikh nationalists) and a few dissident Congress members, to outvote and unseat the Congress ministry. As this is being written a new ministry is being formed with the CP scheduled to obtain some of the positions.

Youth and Student Corner

Incident in the Lenz Case: The Self-Betrayal of Liberal Ideas

By ARTHUR HART

Last week's "Student Socialist" section of LABOR ACTION reported on the case of Dr. Harold Lenz, who was demoted by Queens College as a result of right-wing pressure against him on grounds of his liberal record. This week it is necessary to mention a side episode in this case, and it is not a pleasant one. It relates to the attempt by Socialist Youth League members to distribute last week's LABOR ACTION at a meeting arranged by a group of Queens

College students in support of Dr. Lenz.

Almost with the first appearance of the LABOR ACTION distributors, a spokesman for the arrangements committee came out to ask if the SYLERS "had a license to hand it out," referring to the paper. When informed that no such "license" is required, the advance guard retired for consultation.

He was shortly followed by two others who explained to the distributors that the sponsors of the meeting wished to avoid the impression that they might be connected with LABOR ACTION or its political ideas. The SYLERS, being presented with this polite argument, agreed to separate and move some distance down the block away from the church entrance which was located on a side street.

DISGRACE

Shortly afterwards, however, another set of "officials" came out and assumed a more violent attitude. They argued in loud and unyielding terms that the LABOR ACTION distributors were trespassing on private property (the public sidewalk), that the church officials desired that they not distribute, and finally, that they (the student leaders) wouldn't permit it. All of these arguments proving ineffective, the SYLERS pointing out that America still being a free country, everyone was entitled to his own opinion on the foregoing points, there followed one of the most unusual and disgraceful scenes recently enacted on the sidewalks of New York.

While the bulk of the delegation retired within (for a purpose which soon became apparent) one of its members stood on the sidewalk behind the distributors, and as people walked by with the paper in their hands, jerked it away from them with the explanation that "this has nothing to do with the meeting inside." Some people, their curiosity aroused by this unusual procedure, insisted on retaining their papers or secured replacement for copies which had been rudely grabbed away from them. Others just accepted as an adequate explanation the statement that LABOR ACTION had nothing to do with the meeting (an idea slightly more than obvious), and walked on. One student, seeing what was happening, stopped and explained to the would-be censor that "these people have a perfect right to pass out their paper" and that he should let them alone.

A new issue of *Forum*, the Independent Socialist League's discussion bulletin, is now out, with two articles discussing the war question. Saul Berg contributes "Socialists and World War III," commenting on the exchange between Max Shachtman and Gordon Haskell in the *New Internationalist*; and Jack Walker discusses "Who Can Wage a Democratic War?"

Forum is published in mimeographed form by the ISL as a channel for political discussion articles which are not carried in either LABOR ACTION or the *NI*. It sells for 15 cents a copy, for public sale; order from ISL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

'Forum' Is Out

A new issue of *Forum*, the Independent Socialist League's discussion bulletin, is now out, with two articles discussing the war question. Saul Berg contributes "Socialists and World War III," commenting on the exchange between Max Shachtman and Gordon Haskell in the *New Internationalist*; and Jack Walker discusses "Who Can Wage a Democratic War?"

Next —
A Labor Party!
by Jack Ranger
A Hard-Hitting, Meaty Presentation of the Need for an Independent Labor Party

25 cents Order from:
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

it justifies more than a factual report. Basic and prior to all other questions is that of the right to distribute the printed word without let or hindrance. This is such a fundamental tenet not only of liberals and socialists, but democratic ideology in general, that it would hardly need to be dwelt upon, were it not that the organizers of this meeting were moved by other considerations to violate this principle.

ABC OF DEMOCRACY

To give people (those who are willing to accept it, that is) printed material is another way of informing them of one's ideas and hence comes under the category of freedom of speech. There is no basis within the framework of democratic ideology for demanding that it be suppressed by the police power of the state. It may be possible to deplore the expression of a particular viewpoint, to believe it inimical to any particular purpose or cause, but failure to convince its advocates of this leaves no alternative for a democrat but to allow it to be disseminated and protect the rights of those who would do so. Anything less than this is not freedom of speech. For as has so many times been pointed out, freedom of speech is meaningful only with regard to ideas about which it is not possible to reach some common agreement.

It was precisely because Dr. Lenz believed in such principles that he became anathema to his reactionary enemies, and an "inconvenience" to the administration of Queens College. By his espousal of the rights of Stalinists (for whom he had no sympathies) to organize on campus and be recognized, to hold meetings on school property on the same basis as any other group, and in general to function freely and without discrimination, or intimidation, Dr. Lenz proved his devotion to liberal principles. He believed that the suppression of ideas always entails greater dangers, and leads to worse consequences, than could possibly result from their free expression. It would appear that some of his defenders have not yet learned these ideas and principles which he by his example courageously sought to further. Indeed, this incident would seem to raise some question as to either the motivations or intelligence of the student sponsors of the Queens meeting.

EMBARRASSED?

It certainly cannot be assumed that Queens students in general, or even all of the sponsors of this particular meeting would be in agreement with the kind of behavior exhibited by a few of their number. One or two of the leaders, who seemed to display a certain amount of embarrassment about what they were doing, attempted to bolster their argument by explaining that they were primarily concerned with preventing their cause from being "smeared" particularly by the local press. And they were also fearful of the "impression" which LABOR ACTION might create among the parents present either by its com-

ments on the Lenz case or by its other articles. This is, of course, a separate argument, and once the main question is settled, debatable on its own merits. But the use of this or any other reason as a justifiable excuse for attempting physically to prevent the distribution of any kind of material whatsoever, or for calling upon the police to do the same thing, cannot be condemned too strongly.

THE RIGHT TO DISTRIBUTE

For the right to distribute was won by too difficult a struggle to be violated with impunity. That it does not require a license to hand out printed matter, and that it is legal to do so on any public street in the city of New York, is a result of long years of effort by the labor, liberal and radical movements. And that this right is not easily gained can be shown by the fact that there are many cities in which this freedom is not recognized by the police department. Nor is it so securely established even in New York that the police need to be encouraged to transgress such rights of free speech as are still left to us.

What establishes this action as particularly dangerous is the fact that it was perpetrated by persons who themselves were seeking to invoke the moral authority of those very ideas about civil liberties which at the very same time they denied to others.

Here was a meeting, called in the name of defending the civil liberties of a liberal professor (who himself had gotten into difficulty by defending civil liberties and academic freedom for others), whose sponsors attempted to stop the distribution of literature, and when unsuccessful in their attempts, invoked the efforts of the police to accomplish their purpose.

There is more than one possible explanation for what took place, though none do credit to the spirit which moved these Queens students to come to the defense of Dr. Lenz. One, at any rate, is that the witchhunting atmosphere which produced the Lenz case has at the same time penetrated so deeply into the fiber of some students that even those who, on such an occasion, can be moved to protest some particularly vicious or stupid action have been frightened into accepting the basic premise of all witchhunters: namely, that civil liberties are all right for some people but not for others. Such would-be liberals have still a great deal to learn about the real meaning of democracy.

You're Invited

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

Get ALL your books

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

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.....
CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....
SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).....

Israel and Middle-East Unity: A Left-Wing Israeli View on the Need for Federation

The following article is a translation from the Israeli left-wing periodical Ha-Iton Ha-Democrati, edited by M. Stein. (The position of this group on the war question was published in LA in our issue of Dec. 10, 1951.) The present article is its election manifesto, drawn up at a time when it planned to run a "Third Camp list" of candidates. Because of government restrictions on access to Arab villages, it decided to boycott the elections instead, however. Regardless of the wisdom of the latter decision, the document itself is of great interest, we believe.—Translator.

TO THE PEOPLE—

BROTHERS AND SISTERS:

No one asks any more whether or not there will be a war. The question that is asked is when the Third World War will break out. When we open our morning papers we look to see if the war has already started.

Is this an imaginary fear? No.

The world has become too small to hold both the capitalist system and the "Soviet" system. Not because of the differences between the two systems, but rather because of their elements of similarity. In both societies the people are exploited and oppressed by a small privileged minority. Both are oppressive social orders which seek to entrench themselves and to expand. It is therefore very "natural" that each will block the other and that they will end up quarreling.

There is no basis for the hope that the Middle East will be able to stay out of the coming war. Quite the contrary. One of the belligerents lives on the doorsteps of the region; the gates are wide open and there is no one to stop him. The rulers will flee and the population will welcome the invaders with trumpeting and cheers. There is good reason why this neighboring belligerent will march. Our region is rich in goods needed for war, and it is the crossroads of the world. Is it at all possible that a belligerent power will fail to take advantage of the situation?

We Are "Expendable"

Of course, the opposing side will not "neglect its obligations." There will be no simple abandonment of this important strip of territory. The opponent will destroy all that can be destroyed, to prevent the enemy from enjoying the riches of the region. The valuable assets of the area will be consumed in the conflagration, and the opponent of the invader will not shrink from the most extreme scorched-earth policy; it will use all the methods of destruction. After all, this is not the U.S.A., nor is it Europe! Here the work of destruction can be done thoroughly. However, it will not be able to prevent the entry of the invaders, and it is doubtful whether a serious attempt will be made to prevent the conquest. The forces necessary will be heavily engaged elsewhere, in regions more important to them.

There is no doubt that, if the present relations in the political situation of the Middle East remain as they are today, the Middle East will be one of the worst sufferers in the coming war.

The situation can be entirely different if the countries of the Middle East unite and if their great neighbor India joins them.

Unification Needed

Such a unification can be achieved by the desires of its inhabitants if they realize: (1) that great dangers face them as a result of their geographic position and their weak political structures; that the Middle East will serve as an open road between the belligerents and a convenient battleground for the contenders; (2) that the differences that divide them are insignificant in comparison with the terrible slaughter and destruction that looms before them all.

If, as a result of these considerations, the peoples get together to defend themselves against both sides, a new and entirely different situation would prevail in this area. The doors would be closed to the invaders and the people would do

their best to prevent the entry of a foreign power. Each of the opposing blocs would then have to weigh seriously every act of theirs that affects this region. Our area would no longer be considered a virtual vacuum and its inhabitants would no longer be considered dirt to be trampled upon.

Unification of the Middle East will not only serve to lessen the sufferings of the area in the coming war but can give impetus—a great and powerful impetus—to the unification of the entire East, and help in keeping the world at peace.

Third Force in the East

A great social upheaval is now engulfing the East. Nations that for hundreds of years were exploited by the "lords of capital" and by the capitalist powers have risen and are fighting for their freedom. In their fight they are accepting the aid of the enemy of the capitalists—the new totalitarian ruling class. These people, who have been oppressed and exploited for centuries, do not want to exchange their present oppression for totalitarian slavery. The nations of the East are thirsty for freedom, they want to walk upright, they want to live as human beings. But they need help in their difficult struggle against their present overlords and they take it from whoever gives it. They find no other power outside of the two blocs that can give them substantial aid.

But—the East itself can and must become a force, a force separate from and independent of the existing two camps. In the East live a majority of the human race. Both sides draw much of their own war potential from the East. Even more than others, its people need a humane social order, a social order different from the two which are dominant. In addition, by rallying all those who desire freedom and progress for mankind, wherever they may be, the East will become a powerful third force in the world.

Israel Can Help

The emergence of the East as an independent force with its own policies will completely alter the relationship of forces in the world and may prevent a new world war. What the East needs to accomplish this task is, first, a recognition of its power, and, second, taking hold of and consolidating this power. Unification of the Middle East would serve as a basis for this consolidation.

Israel can contribute a great deal to the steps necessary to the process of unification of the Middle East and India.

The masses of Arabs do not want a "second round" [of war against Israel]. They are tired of the inefficiency and downright criminal deeds of their rulers as well as with their false promises. They want peace with Israel. The best proof of this is that the Arab rulers have given up most of their demands and are only insisting on one issue as a condition for peace with Israel, i.e., the return of the Arab refugees. They make this demand not because they are concerned about the fate of the refugees; the Arab rulers did nothing in all this time to ease the refugees' suffering. For them this suffering became a source of income with which to line their pockets, just as a section of the old Jewish population lives prosperously on the suffering of the new immigrants, by benefiting from the funds that are being raised to aid the latter. The Arab rulers too are lining their pockets with the money that comes from foreign lords to aid the Arab refugees. The only reason the Arab rulers demand the return of the refugees as a condition for peace with Israel is the pressure of the refugees themselves and of the peoples of the various Arab countries.

But can Israel accept this condition for peace? Can the state admit hundreds of thousands of

Labor Action Book Service

specializes in books and pamphlets on the Labor and Socialist movement, Marxism, etc. Send for our free book list.

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

"fifth columnists"? Can it turn out thousands of immigrants from their homes and occupations and return these to their previous owners—the Arabs? Can Israel afford to undertake the cost of resettling hundreds of thousands of Arabs at a time when it is working hard and hardly has enough for the settlement of the masses of Jewish immigrants that are streaming into Israel?

Many will ask these questions. They appear logical. But their superficial logic is quite deceptive.

If real peace were established between Israel and its neighbors this country would enjoy the greatest economic prosperity in its history.

We Need Each Other

The Arab countries need the manufactured goods and technical ability of Israel. The products of Israel need Arab markets. For an Israel which is at peace with its neighbors and has a solid economic base there will be available loans and funds that would dwarf the moneys now collected for the purpose. Then and only then will a real settlement program for new immigrants be possible. The return of the Arab refugees to their fields—a majority of which are not worked at present—will not hinder such settlement. On the contrary it will help. The new immigrants need not only housing; they also need a source of livelihood. They will be able to get this. Not the destroyed Arab "houses" or tents or quonset huts, but houses fit for human habitation; because they will then have the building materials and the immigrants will be able to afford them.

From the camps of the new immigrants there arises today a terrible cry of anguish, to which the ears of the old settlements are deaf. Their plight is horrible. Children die for lack of sufficient food and medical aid. The strength of the parents dwindles from day to day. These needs will not be satisfied by the \$40 million promised now, nor by a half billion, if that much were collected. As long as Israel is surrounded by enemies, all moneys will go down the drain.

There is no basis for the fear that the Arab refugees will become a "fifth column." These refugees are broken from the terrible load of difficulties which they carried and which they are still carrying. The main targets of their hatred are their own rulers who betrayed them. If they are given the right to return to their lands—if Israel were to give them this right not as a tactical move or as a result of foreign pressure but in recognition of their right to continue to live in the country where they and their children were born—if they were to return to being citizens with equal rights who could look forward to a pleasant future for themselves and their children, then there is no doubt that they will be surpassed by very few in their loyalty to the state of Israel.

Jews in a Trap

Giving the Arab refugees the chance to return is an act of justice that requires no special compensation. But the fact is that under the present circumstances such an act will bring Israel peace with the countries around it, real security and economic prosperity. In addition it will make possible the unification of the Middle East and will be an important factor in the preservation of world peace.

Furthermore, justice and democracy are not divisible. A country that conducts itself unjustly and with a lack of democracy toward outsiders is not the soil for the growth of justice and democracy internally.

And you, dear reader: do not say "The people will not accept this." For you are the "people." Do not say "The people will not understand this," for you are the people.

Brothers and sisters, the Western powers will not defend the Middle East. They will only help in its destruction. The Soviet Union will not liberate the Middle East but will enslave it in a totalitarian slavery. The greatest dangers of all are reserved for the Jews in the state of Israel.

(Continued bottom of next page)

Not in the Headlines

East and West

Why is Joe Stalin like Mae West? By HAL DRAPER

Answer: Books by both of these noted literary lights have been banned by the Canadian government. Mae West's *Diamond Lil* and *The Constant Sinner* may not be imported into that bastion of democracy, and the same is true for Stalin's *Questions on Leninism*. So notes a United Press dispatch from Ottawa for May 13.

Mr. Dooley On Corruption

Congressman E. J. McCarthy (D., Minn.) has reminded the House that Mr. Dooley already said it:

"I never knew a politician to go wrong until he's been contaminated by contact with a businessman."

Master Race

The London *Sunday Observer* (Feb. 24) records the following two facts about the life of British colonial ladies and gentlemen in Malaya, where the Stalinists do not have the same civilized attitude toward horse racing:

"A race meeting arranged for the Saturday after the late king's death was not canceled, as were most functions; it was 'held in mourning.' 'Jockeys,' said the official announcement, 'will wear black armbands.'"

"In Singapore last year it was discovered that race day and election day coincided; the government postponed the elections."

Israel —

(Continued from page 7)

They will be like rats in a trap. Those among them who will not lose their lives as a result of the "help" of the West will be shipped out of here by the "liberating" East.

Must we not do something to prevent this gruesome fate? Will our representatives be like the Polish ministers who, on the eve of the destruction of their country by the Nazi conquerors, engaged in "border conflicts" with their neighbors? Will we be like the people of Poland who, on the eve of their doom, applauded the acts of their ministers?

Brothers and sisters, let us do something together for the peace of this country and for world peace!

For the "Third Camp List"—

- Joseph GOLOMB
- Shalom ZAMIR
- Aryeh LIVNAH
- Mordecai MANI
- Zev WOLFGANG
- Mordecai STEIN

(Translated by Al Findley)

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

can help you build your own Labor and Socialist Library.

SEND FOR OUR FREE BOOK LIST.

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

The Monolithism of American Politics And the Third Camp in the U.S.

"Sometimes over here in Britain, I've felt like a Negro in the American South. American soldiers who I know personally to be fine characters, are deliberately insulted in the streets, dances and trains. Even with some Labor Party members I am apparently suspect and just not accepted, only, so far as I know, because I'm American. Why is this?"

This plaintive query appeared last month in the *South Wales Democrat*, a lively and militant Labor Party periodical. Its writer is an American trade-unionist who is on a Fulbright scholarship in Britain. He is sympathetic to the Labor Party and anxious to explain to his British readers that at least 90 per cent of Americans do not have the "selfish motives" for their foreign policies which Europeans suspect; that the trade-union movement is strong in the U.S. ("The government dare not step on their toes too frequently," as he rather naively puts it); that "trade-union leaders are influencing government policy"; and that "differences of opinion" over foreign policy should not make British workers regard their American brothers as pariahs; etc.

As a plea for tolerance of individuals it is well taken, of course. (The Labor newspaper headed the article "Americans Are Human," thus taking a forthright position on the question.) Nor need we comment on the well-known if unfortunate propensity of people to stereotype national characters, or make ordinary citizens responsible for the misdeeds of their governments, since on this there are more notes in American eyes than beams in British.

But there is more that underlies the Europeans' attitude toward visiting Americans than merely their disagreement with the American government's foreign policy. One of the factors deserves special stress, especially since it is usually considered an unalloyed virtue on this side of the ocean.

Is There a Basic Difference?

What often appalls the politically sensitive British or Continental observer is not merely the reactionary character of Washington's foreign policy, based as it is on the ancient imperialist theory that the way to "preserve peace" is to overawe the rest of the world with military might; it is, in addition, the fact that the American nation, to them, appears to be virtually monolithic in following this road to destruction.

They see no substantial force in the United States, no political tendency, which is fighting for a democratic foreign policy—not in the ranks of the liberals, not in the ranks of the labor movement, for both of the latter make a fetish of swearing allegiance and fealty to the Truman administration's international policies even though quietly (sometimes inaudibly) deploring certain "excesses."

They know there is congressional debate on foreign policy—but it is between the defenders of the Truman-Acheson line and the dinosaurian opponents of it who want to ferry Chiang Kai-shek over to the Chinese mainland, or who want to drop the bomb now, or who want to scuttle foreign aid and build a North American continental bastion, or who want to give Franco a few more billion to play with.

They know Taft attacks the Fair Deal's foreign policy but they do not see any basic difference between the two. And if this be considered dogmatic blindness on their part, we now have the testimony of an objective American to the same effect.

From a strictly American viewpoint, the same idea was expanded by James Reston, the ace correspondent of the *N. Y. Times*, in an article which seemed to be happy over the "national unity" thus evidenced. To judge by headlines and congressional speeches, says Reston (May 18), this is a very divided country but the impression is inaccurate.

"General Eisenhower and Senator Robert A. Taft, divided though they may be, or may seem at this point in the campaign, are probably closer together on the great issues of foreign policy than are Aneurin Bevan and Clement R. Attlee, the leaders of the two contending factions within the British Labor Party."

The difference between Taft and Harriman, he continues, "is certainly not as great as the difference between Gen. Charles de Gaulle and Foreign Minister Robert Schuman in France, or between Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and the Social-Democratic leader, Dr. Kurt Schumacher, in Germany."

The same day's press carried the important news that the German socialists, second largest party in West Germany, had formally adopted an official statement opposing their country's entrance, via a contractual agreement, into the Western war-bloc structure, counterposing "genuine equality" for Germany in world councils and also the need for national unification. Even the chancellor's own party deputies, while approving, had raised the condition that the West amend the emergency clause of the treaty which enables them to declare a state of siege on their own say-so.

Behind the Unity Facade

But—to return to Reston—in this country "None of the avowed candidates for the presidency is seeking office on the argument that the basis of our foreign policy should be changed, not even Senator Taft. The senator wants to reduce expenditures. . . . He is saying that he can do the job better and cheaper."

Now Reston has a point in emphasizing that the congressional disputations conceal the underlying unity of the basic line—the bipartisan nature of present U. S. foreign policy even as regards those Republicans who scorn bipartisanship for its own sake. In Democratic-Republican circles there is basic agreement behind the superficial divergences. But what is also true is this: in labor-liberal circles, there is divergence behind the superficial agreement.

Even in the case of the liberal Americans for Democratic Action, if one adds up the individual questions on which ADA, in public statements or resolutions, has expressed more or less polite disagreement with acts of the Truman administration, the total is not merely the sum of its parts. The individual disagreements mount up to a different orientation in world affairs, a different foreign policy—IF their implications were realized, if they were to be fought for and not merely used as occasions for deploring, if they were to be followed through. This, of course, our labor-liberals do not do.

What prevents them from doing so, in the first place, is the fixed idea that the operative policy is "fundamentally" liberal (being Fair-Deal) and that the unending series of deplorable measures are merely "mistakes." What prevents them, in the second place, is the very fear of breaking the "national front" which impresses Europe with American monolithism.

What prevents them, in the third place, is their type of reaction to the climate of the witchhunt. It is not McCarthyism which directly prevents many from speaking their minds even to the extent that they would like to; it is their way of opposing McCarthyism—that is, yielding to it in part in the hope that this will appease its drive.

Consider, for example, the following observation in a recent column by Dorothy Thompson:

"But one notices among intellectuals, and precisely in those fields that normally form the opinion-making groups—editors, publishers, teachers, professors, clergymen—a marked shyness, or even fear, of saying publicly what they do say privately. This does not mean that there is no public debate. . . . But many of the most thoughtful persons think it better to keep their thoughts largely to themselves. . . ."

"The chief reason for this is that opposition to or even fundamental discussion of possible alternatives to the prevailing policy have become associated with 'aiding Communism.' . . . There is only one respectable theory of the way to obtain peace, and that is by sufficient military force to deter the Soviets."

That hits off the United States, doesn't it? But Dorothy Thompson was not writing about the U. S.—her column was on the atmosphere in occupied West Germany.

Job for a Third-Camp Force

She senses the climate clearly as a tourist abroad, but it is in this country that it is thickest. For with regard to Germany, the second largest political movement in the country does speak out! Miss Thompson's generalizations are merely the result of spending overmuch time with editors, publishers, teachers, professors and clergymen.

The most immediate job before American liberals and radicals who keenly feel the disastrous success of Washington in alienating the peoples of the world is not the big one of decisively reversing U. S. foreign policy. There is a more elementary step which is easier and nearer. It is building a movement in this country whose very existence would tell those peoples that not every American goes along with the atom-bomb diplomacy of his government, that there is a political force here which stands for an anti-imperialist democratic foreign policy and which offers a political alternative to the nation.

That perspective, of course, is based upon a big scale with the emergence of a labor party on the American scene, and the development of the tendencies within it toward a break with imperialism, as the Bevan tendency has developed in the British Labor Party. There are few things which could give the European and Asian peoples more heart to resist the encroachments of Stalinism. It would be a much more minor consequence that fewer American tourists (identified by their shoes) would be openly spit upon by the people in the streets of the capitals of our "allies."

The basic foreign-policy monolithism of American organized politics, from the Taftites to the labor-liberals, is an uneasy unity, to be sure, but until it is broken it plays the same role as the apparent monolithism of the states on the other side of the Iron Curtain, in driving other peoples to passive and despairing acceptance of inevitable war between two colossi before whom they feel powerless.

By no means, therefore, is the question of building a Third Camp movement in this country merely a matter of "How soon can it reverse the policy of the government?" In the very process of growth, precisely because it arises in this country, it could be an inspiration and impetus to the anti-war forces of the whole world, the mobilization of which can, in turn, change the whole relationship of forces in an otherwise polarized world.

Stalin Censors Himself

A complete collection of Joseph Stalin's works is today being published in Moscow. In examining it, we find that the "founder" of the Communist ideology, the great leader who, as Soviet propaganda insists, never errs, is himself apparently not without his sins. It turns out that even in his writings there are "harmful" passages. And these passages are being eliminated in the "Complete Works."

In Stalin's speech before the 14th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (B), delivered on December 23, 1926, as printed in the old editions, we read the following words about the opposition:

"How are we to explain the continuing frenzied persecution of Comrade Bukharin? What, really, do they want of Comrade Bukharin? They demand his blood. This is precisely what is being demanded by Comrade Zinoviev in stressing the question in his closing speech on Bukharin. So you want Bukharin's blood? We shall not give you his blood, you may as well know it. (Applause. Cries: 'Correct!')

In the 7th volume of the new edition, this paragraph is reduced to the following two lines:

"How are we to explain the continuing frenzied persecution of Bukharin? What really do they want of Bukharin?"

On December 23, 1927, in his speech before the Plenum of the Central Committee, Stalin quoted a part of Lenin's Testament referring to him:

"Stalin is too rude, and this fault, entirely supportable in relation to us Communists, becomes insupportable in the office of General Secretary. Therefore, I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin from his position and appoint to it another man."

This excerpt was included in Stalin's speech as reprinted in the collected papers "On the Opposition." It has, however, been eliminated from the present "Complete Works."

—Challenge, Jan.-Feb.

Racist Immigration Bill — —

(Continued from page 1)
the Western Hemisphere) who are either skilled or unskilled laborers, unless rigid tests are met establishing the unavailability of domestic labor.

With regard to deportation, the broad grounds set up by the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950 and earlier laws are considerably widened by the new omnibus bill. The new provisions would:

- Abolish existing statutes of limitation in deportation cases, thus allowing deportation for alleged acts 50 years past, on which the victim can obtain neither witnesses or documents in his own defense.

- Make all grounds for deportation established in this act retroactive to cover all immigrants who have hitherto been admitted to the United States.

- Provide that any naturalized citizen can be deported if, within 10 years after getting his papers, he refuses to testify before a congressional committee investigating subversive activities.

- Make such a person deportable if he were to join any group on the attorney general's "subversive" list within five years.

- Curtail the attorney general's authority to make special arrangements favorable to aliens, such as his authority to suspend deportation in hardship cases, extend the time during which immigrants may make visits abroad without losing the right to return to the United States, etc.

- Deprive immigrants and native-born Americans alike of the pro-

tection of court review in many cases. In general, mistakes and abuse of discretion by consuls and immigration officials would be exempt from effective judicial review as most criteria for the right to remain in the country are made subject to "the satisfaction of the attorney general" or "the opinion of the attorney general," instead of to objective and verifiable standards.

STEAMROLLER

The above gives a heavy sampling of the McCarran-Walter bill's provisions. It has been attacked by both the AFL and CIO, and by virtually every liberal organization in the country. An alternative omnibus bill has been presented by fifteen liberal senators, led by Humphrey of Minnesota and Lehman of New York. But McCarran has refused to permit hearings to be held on the Humphrey-Lehman bill.

The Walter bill was passed in the House on April 25. Over 20 amendments were offered in the course of three days of debate, and all except two, which were accepted by Walter, were defeated by overwhelming majorities. The House refused even to permit a roll-call vote on the bill as a whole, which was passed by a standing vote of 206 to 68.

The vote itself was significant enough as a measurement of the strength of liberal sentiment in the House. But the debate was even more significant. Reports indicate that the opponents of this bill

were restrained, polite, and defensive in their attitude, almost without exception. Supporters of the bill from both parties, however, had a field day. Here are a few excerpts from the record.

HITLERITE TALK

Representative Wood (R., Idaho) rose to speak on "the question of racial origin." "... although I am not a follower of Hitler," he said, "... there is something to it. We cannot tie a stone around its neck and drop it into the middle of the Atlantic just because it worked to the contrary in Germany. . . . I believe that possibly statistics would show that the Western European races have made the best citizens in America and are most easily made into Americans." He might not object to new immigration if "there was some law that could make these people that you . . . wish to bring here and put them out on the prairies of the West. . . ." The trouble is that they remain "penned up among the people of their own kind in the large Eastern cities where they do not learn to talk English readily. They read their own newspapers."

Hoffman (R., Mich.) "agreed wholeheartedly with the views so logically expressed by the gentleman from Idaho." Further "every mother's son of them who lives abroad wants to come here not to contribute to this country but to better himself." Moreover, "as soon as they get here they want to change it, just like Anna Rosenberg who wants to take all the boys and girls and put them

into the armed services."

Rankin (D., Miss.) misinformed the House that "Nine out of every ten of the Communists who have been convicted of treason in this country were foreign-born."

Forrester (D., Ga.) also endorsed Wood's statements. He said that he has "come to the realization that the persons who are being discriminated against in America are the old-fashioned Yankee and the old-fashioned Southerner."

ANTI-SEMITISM

Hoffman, at another point in the debate, said that he "goes along with Representative Rankin in one thing." Over the years he has insisted that if there were any people in this country who needed protection from those who practise discrimination while condemning it, it was the white Gentiles.

Jenkins (R., Ohio) said that since 1880 our immigration has "shifted sharply to include millions of persons from Southern or Eastern Europe. Most of these people were less sympathetic to the ideals of the United States and a very large portion of them were non-Christians who had no intention whatever of accepting the ideals of Western Christian civilization but had purposes of their own. These purposes were accomplished by infiltration, propaganda, and electoral and financial pressures. The average American was not aware of what was going on and remained undisturbed." The anti-Semitic bias here is clear, with

overtones of the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion."

GIFT TO KREMLIN

There can be no question that this bill, and the arguments made for it, are a free ideological gift to Stalinism. And this result will not be achieved so much by the impact of Stalinist propaganda as by the living experience which hundreds of thousands of people in many countries will have with it over the years if it is enacted into law. In this respect the McCarran-Walter bill would operate more like a slow-acting poison than like a bomb.

Over the years, as active anti-Stalinists and just ordinary non-political people alike discover that the United States regards all foreigners as inferiors, and all the foreign-born in this country, whether naturalized or not, as second-class citizens, and all people who do not happen to come from Western Europe as pariahs, any ideas they may have had that in the struggle with Stalinism the United States represents democracy and freedom will be effectively stifled.

But that is not the major reason why every American who does believe in democracy and freedom should rise to oppose this bill. The major reason is that although its provisions strike directly at people who are seeking entry to this country and at those who have arrived more or less recently, they are blows at the very fabric of the democratic rights of all of us who live here.

HE'S GETTING THERE

If today an ex-post-facto law can be passed for aliens or naturalized citizens, making acts which were perfectly legal when they were committed a crime punishable by denaturalization and deportation, how long will it be before such laws are passed for native-born citizens? If the attorney general and other administrative officials are given additional powers over the foreign-born which cannot be reviewed by the courts, another precedent is established for extending similar powers over the rest of us.

As an editorial in the *New York Post* for May 18 puts it: "Since native Americans cannot be punished for either indiscretion (belonging to an organization on the attorney general's list, or refusing to testify before the McCarran-Senate Internal Security Subcommittee), the bill would convert the immigrant into a second-class citizen. McCarran no doubt regrets this discrimination. He is getting to the natives as fast as he can."

Will the labor movement, Americans for Democratic Action, and all the other organizations which have opposed this bill make the voting record on it, to the extent that it can be established, a firm criterion for their endorsements in the coming election? To date the overwhelming majority of Democrats in the House present at the time of voting stood up for the bill. If it passes in the Senate with a majority of Democrats voting for it, how will they be able to justify continued support to the Democratic Party?

BOOKS RECEIVED

From the New American Library, publishers of Signet and Mentor pocket books, published May 28:

Greek Historical Thought, edited by Arnold Toynbee. A Mentor book, 208 pages, 35 cents.

Goodbye to Berlin, by Christopher Isherwood. A Signet book, 168 pages, 25 cents.

China Station, by Donald R. Morris. A Signet book, 160 pages, 25 cents.

Where Town Begins, by Richard R. Werry. A Signet book, 144 pages, 25 cents.

The Promising Young Men, by George Sklar. A Signet Giant, 336 pages, 35 cents.

LONDON LETTER

British Capitalism's Dilemma in World Trade

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, May 14—Every year the British government publishes an "Economic Survey" giving a broad picture of the financial and economic "state of the nation." Rarely does it fail to have interest for socialists. This year it vindicates their case so completely that I would like to make a few observations on it.

Looking back in retrospect, the Labor government of 1945 had as one of its tasks that of making Britain economically more self-sufficient. Since the British industrial potential was less affected than that of Germany, Japan, France, etc., it started off with a considerable advantage in the export field. However, under the capitalist system we must export or die, and our exports must compete with other industrial countries.

Because we had a good start our efforts were crowned with remarkable success. By 1950 not only had we stopped Marshall Plan aid but we had an over-all surplus of exchange. This apparent triumph was illusory. In a sellers' market with comparative-

ly little competition we had won through.

When, however, the Korean war started, the cost of raw materials rocketed, but manufactured goods rose only slightly. Furthermore, the "necessity" for rearmament which it caused diverted a large part of the British economy to arms production. Demand for textiles and pottery went down on the world markets, while our other major export, machinery, lost its monopoly. Germany and Japan, untrammelled by a rearmament program, began to promise earlier delivery of machinery, while their lower wages made prices competitive. All these factors—so points out the Economic Survey—converted a surplus of \$805 million in 1950 into a deficit of \$1164 million in 1951.

The answer of a Conservative government to the problem is: either increase production or lower the standard of living. But they avoid the fact that we cannot sell all the goods that we produce. "The result was that we could not sell enough of the things we could supply and we could not supply enough of the things we

could sell." The Conservatives admit in a way that the standard of living will not rise during the next year, and it may go down.

But the capitalist problem of intense competition for export markets is insoluble under the capitalist system. The Labor Party could not create the markets.

Where export efforts have been attended with success, as in the case of the British bicycle industry in the U. S., local producers have demanded an increase in tariff. Anyhow, with the present high U. S. customs duty, and higher exports, no foreign country has a real chance of capturing the American market. It has been pointed out that if the United Kingdom obtained one per cent of the American market, it would be financially solvent. Other countries like Australia, which have also been large British markets, have begun to cut down on British goods because of the lack of all currency.

The success of Labor in expanding the economy up to 1950 was reflected in its strong electoral support until then. But when the Korean war changed all

this, Labor was thrown out. Now that the people of England have been disillusioned with Tory economic policies, it is the Conservatives who are on their way out.

This is reflected in the striking victory of Labor in the municipal elections. Some weeks ago we reported success in the county council elections. (The former are comparable to local town elections in the U. S., and the latter to elections to the state legislature.) Labor captured about 20 town councils, with a gain of 657 seats, more than half of the expense of the Tories. Much as the American press may seek to minimize the Tory losses, there is no doubt that a great shift of opinion has been seen.

The slump in the world demand for textiles seriously hit the British industry in Lancashire and Yorkshire. The Conservatives were heavily defeated in these districts. A demand that textiles be relieved from taxes in order to encourage their sale had been previously turned down by the Conservative government. Now, since the municipal election results, the Tories have changed their minds about this. They have conceded to the extent of cutting the tax on textiles by a quarter.

The Economic Survey ends with the statement: "There is no easy way out of our present difficulties. Only by reducing imports and expanding exports now can we hope to avoid really disastrous cuts in imports later on. . . . The United Kingdom cannot dictate to other countries the terms on which it trades with them. . . ." These statements apply equally to a Tory Britain as to a Labor Britain. While the latter might share the burden of the difficulty more fairly, it is not historically prepared to attack the root of the matter. In the final analysis, only a socialist regime in a major segment of the world can meet these problems. If the British electorate calls a Labor doctor to attend for their next economic illness, he will have to use a new Manual of Medicine. The old one is some editions out of date.

It's Different!

The New York Socialist Youth League invites you to its

FOLK DANCE SOCIAL

Some folk dancing for all (no previous experience required) as well as demonstrations of folk dances of various countries—Russia, Israel, Mexico, Ukraine, Philippines, Scandinavia, Italy, etc. (no square dancing). Lots of fun, and authentic folk-dance music to go with. Of course, regular social dancing too, as well as refreshments and such.

SATURDAY EVENING — JUNE 7 — Come at 8:30

LABOR ACTION HALL, 114 West 14 Street, Third floor, N.Y.C.