

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 11, 1952

FIVE CENTS

**Civil Rights and Taxes:
How All of Us Pay for Jim Crow**

... page 2

**A Peasant-Eye View of Marxism:
Reviewing David Mitrany's Opus**

... page 6

The Olympics in the Cold War

... page 5

Steel Deal Won't Bring Era of Good Fellowship

By BEN HALL

As the 175-man Wage Policy Committee of the United Steel Workers Union met on July 25 to consider the agreement which finally settled the long steel strike, an unusual visitor entered the hall. It was Benjamin F. Fairless, chairman of the U. S. Steel Company; he had been invited by Phil Murray in a spirit of good-will to speak to the delegates and bury the hatchet.

Fairless warmed up his unenthusiastic listeners with homey reminiscences of his own background in a mining village; he attributed the strike to a "series of mistakes by all of us" and concluded with a plea for mutual understanding between labor and management. The U. S. Steel Company, he said, would overhaul its whole labor-relations machinery to reduce misunderstandings to a minimum.

Everybody rose to applaud, except a few suspicious realists.

Murray was not to be outdone. He expressed confidence that a new era of good-fellowship was in the making. "It is up to us to develop more faith in one another," he said. The Wage Policy Committee voted to "extend the hand of peace and cooperation to management in the hope that in the steel industry of the future, strikes and lockouts will be unnecessary." And Murray and Fairless announced that they would jointly make a speaking tour of all the big steel plants in the nation to prepare the workers for mutual understanding and cooperation between them and their employers.

ARE THEY SERIOUS?

The leader of the Steel owners and the leader of the steelworkers, who had been exchanging invectives a few weeks ago fawned over one another.

Perhaps both men are sincere; perhaps they take themselves seriously and truly do expect the dawn of industrial peace. That is possible. But nothing in the course of the steel strike or its aftermath points to an era of brotherhood between capital and labor.

The same session of the Policy Committee pinned responsibility for the strike on the companies. The same

day, the steel companies called the strike a national tragedy caused by the demand for a union shop.

GAINS MADE

The union hailed the new agreement as a "mighty victory." The contract does give the union gains and added protection. Even after its demands had been whittled down by the Wage Stabilization Board and sliced down further by the companies, the union still was able to bring wages up to meet rising living costs. The union did not win its full demands.

(Turn to last page)

While Eisenhower Appeases the Taftites— Stevenson Juggles With The Civil Rights Issue

By MARY BELL

The preliminaries in the quadrennial selection of a president for the United States are over and the preparations are in the making for the speechifying, TV appearances and general campaigning prior to the elections in November. The candidates and their staffs are busy trying to shape their policies on issues to capture as much of the popular vote as possible and at the same time reconcile the various and contradictory tendencies in their own parties.

While neither party nor candidate openly admits that civil rights—specifically, the issue of federal compulsory legislation to end discrimination in employment for minority racial groups—is a major campaign issue, nevertheless at this moment it is.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell Jr. of New York,

at a meeting of 3500 in Harlem, has called for a "boycott" of the election unless Governor Stevenson and Senator Sparkman speak out more forthrightly than heretofore on the issue of FEPC legislation. Powell labeled William Dawson, Negro representative who assisted the Democratic national chairman in 1944 and 1948, an "Uncle Tom" for allegedly urging compromise on FEPC in the Democratic resolutions committee. Powell also described Sparkman as "a slave of the South. I think it's time that we Harlem Negroes set him free."

"You can cram a candidate down our throats," he told the Democratic leaders, "but you cannot make us vote for him." The convention plank, he charged, was a complete disappointment to every Northern liberal. "It does not even mention FEPC. It evades the segregation of the Negro in the U. S. army and in the nation's capital, which should be the citadel of democracy but is its cesspool. It ignores the abolition of segregation in interstate transportation. It does not pledge any action; it does not even urge; the only word that it uses is 'favor.'"

PORTENT

This Harlem rally is undoubtedly a portent for Stevenson, and NOT because Powell can "deliver" the Harlem vote nor because of Powell's own influence nor because there is any substantial evidence that Negroes will go over to the GOP. Powell has jumped in to swing out vigorously along a line of feeling which is unmistakably strong among Negro people and also among Negro leaders who themselves will have nothing to do with Powell. IAs we go to press, a New York Liberal Party conference of state leaders, while endorsing Stevenson, showed such sentiment along these lines. Report on the conference next week.—Ed.]

Here one runs into the well-recognized ambiguities of platforms and their meanings. The Republicans emphasized the primacy of "states' rights" in their platform and said so openly. Now, because of the Democratic platform's compromises and their effect on the Negro people, the Republicans are demagogically at-

(Turn to last page)



CANDIDATE IN THE MAKING I—Adlai Stevenson's Background

By DICK OLIVER

"The more I see of this awful mess
The more I want to be president less."

Governor Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois, aristocratic gentleman, middling scholar, top-echelon wartime troubleshooter—and above all a prudent man while writing these doggerel lines prior to his nomination as Democratic party candidate for president—is now warming up his drive for the presidency. And it is quite possible that he will attain it—and with it the "awful mess."

His candidacy having resulted, objectively considered, from the boldest stroke of political manipulation in the recent history of American politics, even conceding the full sincerity of his reluctance to run, little wonder need be felt that both his supporters and opponents of all shades still concern themselves with reconstructing how and why it all happened.

Let us turn here to survey his political role and policies up until the moment when his star blazed high in the national political firmament. Such an analysis, together with an appreciation of the mechanics of his winning his candidacy, may provide clues to understanding Stevenson's future intentions. The inevitable campaign hoopla about him will only deepen the illusions of labor and its political allies.

Diametrically opposite to the wishful thinking of the Alsop brothers, in their "dope column," that Stevenson might be shunning power in order to ensure the victory of Eisenhower, the Illinois governor held out until faced with the alternatives of

full power or political suicide. The Alsops had written during the convention:

"One suspects that deep down, he, too, thinks the two-party system will be damaged if the Republican opposition is not cured by responsibility of its growing neurotic tendencies. One suspects also that he expects the final world crisis to come in the next four years, and that he fears the reaction of the electorate against the party then in power, if the opposition is led by the neurotics and extremists who may capture the Republican Party if Eisenhower is defeated. If this is Stevenson's reasoning—and there are excellent grounds for so believing—it is the reasoning of a large-minded and sensible man."

HIS MIDDLE ROAD

This can be rewritten in another way which the Alsops did not have in mind: the two-party system will be damaged if the labor-liberal opposition within the Democratic Party is not cured by responsibility (read: trappings of power) of its rebellious tendencies.

Examination of Stevenson's political past proves his consciousness that maintenance of the profit system requires in future not a dismantling of but a new consolidation of the labor-liberal coalition with traditional Democratic conservatism, to restrain the former and modify the latter.

Though Stevenson has not been widely known to the public outside Illinois, his actions as governor of this \$2-billion state establishment over the past four years since he first ran for elective office have securely established him as a model of such a middling Fair Deal type. He brought to that office an even less known record of accomplishment, but one significant in terms of an extensive experience with both policy and practical detail as an appoint-

(Continued on page 3)

CIO ARGUMENT STRESSES TAX ANGLE ON CIVIL RIGHTS—

How All of Us Pay for Jim Crow

One of the biggest issues in the presidential campaign thus far is that of civil rights. The term "civil rights" has been used generally to denote the whole area of the rights of the citizenry in relation to their government—democratic rights, free speech, free press, rights of minorities, etc. However, the term has more and more become restricted in current use to the field of the rights of minorities—racial and national minorities, that is, rather than political minorities.

Perhaps the underlying political reason for this is the fact that there is a growing ferment, particularly among the Negro people, and an increasingly strong groundswell toward breaking down the barriers of racial discrimination. In other aspects of civil rights, namely, the rights of foreign-born and aliens and the rights of political minorities, the drift has been the other way, toward greater discrimination and suppression.

The trend toward greater freedom for racial groups is marked, of course, by all kinds of obstacles and setbacks, but we believe, nevertheless, the trend can be charted.

CAREY TESTIFIES

The CIO has been, outside of the Negro organizations themselves, the most powerful supporter of anti-discrimination legislation and the enactment of an FEPC measure.

From its outset in the middle '30s, the CIO was compelled to fight for equality of working conditions and employment opportunities when it first invaded the basic mass-production industries of the country.

Now that the CIO is felt as a factor in the national political scene as well as in the councils of the Democratic Party, it is naturally foremost in attempting to make its power felt in the achievement of a national Fair Employment Practices Act. It is therefore interesting to consider the arguments employed by this wing of the labor movement in its efforts for such civil-rights legislation.

They are embodied in the testimony given by James B. Carey, CIO secretary-treasurer, to the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations during the last session of Congress. This committee had for consideration two bills on fair-employment practices which suffered the fate of all similar proposals.

THREE ARGUMENTS

The first argument was that of "domestic decency," as required by the philosophy of government set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. It is of interest that the labor movement is more vigorous in its championship of the first principles of American democracy, save for an occasional dissenting Supreme Court judge, than the official representatives of that democracy. Carey urged the subcommittee to consider, in addition to the Negro Americans, the discrimination employed against Mexicans in the Southwest, against Oriental-Americans on the West Coast, against American Indians in the West, against Jews in many communities and against Catholics in many areas.

The contrast between the two groups' dependence on the federal government is further shown in the figures which give the amounts paid back by the federal government for every dollar paid in federal taxes. (See Table II.) Carey comments: "The significance of all this is that Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina all have more money kicked back to them by the federal government on a per-capita basis than they collected in their own state revenues."

Thus, in those areas where minorities are not permitted to pro-

TABLE I: Comparison of Southern and Northern states regarding population, internal revenue, and taxes paid back to the federal government.

The next argument employed was that of "the impact on our foreign relations of prejudicial discrimination in employment." The CIO, standing for the abolition of discrimination, and with its own experience of the exploitation of minorities by Stalinists in its own ranks, is keenly aware of the shortcomings of the government in this field as compared with international Stalinism.

The argument is restricted here to what Carey elsewhere describes as "colonial dependencies... within the continental borders." As a spokesman for a labor movement which supports the administration foreign policy, he cannot pursue the problem of the "colonial dependencies" abroad and the advantages they yielded to Stalinism.

The most expanded argument used by Carey is that of the ECONOMIC effects of discriminatory employment. He describes the degradation of the individual who "is limited to producing only what he can consume himself" or even less, so that society must meet his minimum requirements. He demonstrates how the factor of discrimination operates to penalize all.

WASHINGTON PAYS OUT

In figures obtained from the Library of Congress are set forth the revenue paid to the federal government and that paid back by federal grants and state taxes, in two groups of states. (See Table I.)

The first group—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—are Jim Crow anti-FEPC states. They habitually cover their prejudice with the howl of "states' rights." The table is particularly revealing in this regard, for it shows how heavily these "states-righters" rely, in contrast to the Northern industrial states, upon federal aid.

The contrast between the two groups' dependence on the federal government is further shown in the figures which give the amounts paid back by the federal government for every dollar paid in federal taxes. (See Table II.)

Carey comments: "The significance of all this is that Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina all have more money kicked back to them by the federal government on a per-capita basis than they collected in their own state revenues."

Thus, in those areas where minorities are not permitted to pro-

duce fully, society is denied the benefit of their potentialities and society is compelled to give proportionally greater sums for their assistance. The heaviest taxed group, proportionately, in "society" is of course the working class.

VICTORIES POSSIBLE

The economic and social arguments against discrimination are not necessarily socialist arguments at all. Economic expansion and prosperity in capitalist society, especially in the South, are hampered by discrimination. The prosecution of the war, all-out mobilization and ideological warfare are retarded. Thus argues the CIO. Political and economic expediency have contributed and will contribute more to the freedom of minorities.

While this is true, and points to reasons why—in case of this issue and in the context of today's world—there are important capitalist reasons for ameliorating the Jim Crow blight, it is also true that the Negro people and other minorities will be able to realize the possibilities for extending civil rights only insofar as they fight militantly for this aim. Victories are possible, but even the reasonable potentialities will not be achieved if either labor or the minorities organizations merely wait to be handed such rights by self-proclaimed men of good will. Above all, little progress will be made if either of the old parties feels that the Negro vote (or the labor vote) is "in the bag" regardless of the spread between election promises and government performance.

Gordon Haskell to Tour West Coast, Midwest

Gordon Haskell, assistant editor of LABOR ACTION, will make a nation-wide tour this fall in behalf of the Independent Socialist League, at which time he will also speak at meetings organized by the Socialist Youth League.

Coming as it does in the midst of the presidential election campaign, the meetings on this tour will concentrate on the politics of the elections, the role of the labor movement, and the views of independent socialism in this campaign.

Other meetings will discuss the nature of the war economy, inflation and the war situation.

Haskell's tour will also be an organizational affair. He will meet with branches of the ISL and units of the SYL to take up problems of the two organizations, meet with executive committees and individuals in preparation for the fall period.

The tour will begin in Los Angeles on September 15 and up the West Coast, covering the San Francisco Bay Area and Seattle. Haskell will then continue on to the Middle West, covering a number of areas there, and complete the tour in Newark at the end of October.

Below is the schedule which the tour will follow. All branches, readers of LABOR ACTION and friends are asked to watch this paper for meeting dates and places so they may be able to attend these functions.

Table listing tour dates for various cities: Los Angeles (Sept. 15-21), Bay Area (Sept. 22-28), Seattle Area (Sept. 29-Oct. 5), Kansas City (Oct. 6-7), Chicago Area (Oct. 10-15), Detroit Area (Oct. 16-19), Cleveland Area (Oct. 20-22), Pittsburgh (Oct. 23-24), Philadelphia (Oct. 25), Reading (Oct. 26).

FOR A SOCIALIST EDUCATION Get it EVERY week! A subscription to LABOR ACTION is only \$2.00 for a year

Plans for SYL School Completed

The Socialist Youth League has announced the three lecture series which will make up the educational program of the SYL Institute, to be held in New York City on the weekend following Labor Day.

The Institute is planned as an end-of-summer socialist school to extend through three busy days. In addition, special lectures, seminars and social affairs will be arranged.

The faculty will consist of three outstanding Marxist writers and teachers. The first class will deal with the economic tendencies in American capitalist development. Albert Gates, secretary of the Independent Socialist League will discuss:

- (1) The rise of monopoly and the problem of crises. (2) The depression and the New Deal. (3) The war and the Permanent War Economy.

These will be related to international trends and to the social and political conclusions drawn by Marxists.

CLASSES SET UP

The second class will be given by Max Shachtman, national chairman of the ISL, on the Marxist theory of the state and its relation to the socialist program. Consisting of three sessions, like the others, it will take up:

- (1) An analysis of the Marxist theory of the state and its transformations. (2) The relation of the theory of the state to the socialist program. (3) The theory of the state in the light of political developments in Britain and Russia.

The third class, by Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION, will be on "What Was Bolshevism?—A Critical Survey." Choice of this subject, of course, is due to the fact that the term "Bolshevism" has a wide variety of political (and emotional) connotations and meanings for different people, and that in the case of both proponents and opponents there are innumerable misunderstandings and oversimplifications. The individual sessions (each partly historical and partly analytical) will be:

- (1) Before 1917: the Russian development. (2) After 1917: the early Communist International. (3) Bolshevism and Stalinism.

DISCUSSION INVITED

Initial response to the announcement of the SYL Institute has been enthusiastic. A number of SYL and ISL members from outside New York City will be in attendance, as well as a number of non-members from in and around the city. The SYL, in fact, is especially desirous of such attendance. A diversity of viewpoints among the students at the Institute will be a good thing to stimulate a better understanding of the subjects discussed. The coming Institute will provide an unusual opportunity for such discussion.

The registration fee at the school is set at the nominal figure of 50 cents per lecture series, or \$1.50 for the entire course. The SYL urges immediate registration—just notify the SYL at 114 West 14 Street, New York City, of intention to attend—so that fullest preparations can be made.

By August 15 mimeographed subject outlines and bibliographies for the classes will be ready. The school itself will start Thursday, September 4.

Read THE NEW INTERNATIONAL America's leading Marxist review

LONDON LETTER

Will There Be a Slump?

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, July 29—The Olympic games at Helsinki are undoubtedly the main topic of conversation in Britain this week. The summer holidays have come as a welcome relief to Labor Party and trade-union officials after a hard year's work, and it is not surprising, therefore, that Britain's rather dismal performance at Helsinki should be uppermost in the minds of most people in this country, politically inclined and otherwise. Only the dramatic abdication of King Farouk and Dr. Mossadeq's resumption of power in Iran have been able to compete with the Olympic games for the newspaper headlines.

This is not to say that nothing is happening inside or outside the Labor movement in this country. Quite the contrary. Everyone is getting prepared for the Trades Union Congress and the Labor Party conference this autumn.

And it is not only the Bevanites who are planning ahead. The right wing too is feeling the pressure inside the party—their brief glare at the resolutions submitted to the conference was quite sufficient—and it is making a brave attempt to keep hold of the party machine. The great issue of rearmament has been partly cooled off by Churchill's admission some months ago that Bevan had been right after all, and more recently by the statement of Lord Swinton (chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster) that as far as the Tory government is concerned, exports have priority over armament requirements at this stage.

The right wing (Woodrow Wyatt is the leading spokesman, or at least the most vocal) is now insisting that it is in favor of spreading out the rearmament program over a longer period of time, in order to prevent the country's export drive from being completely halted in its tracks. But this argument is exactly the same as Bevan's, only it is stated in a different fashion and given a different tone. Whether Britain cuts down absolutely on arms ex-

penditures, from 4,700,000 pounds (now \$5,200,000) to 3 million pounds, or spreads the expenditures over a longer period of time, the effect would be the same. Britain's balance-of-payments situation would improve, however, if the reduction (an immediate one, that is) of arms expenditures was implemented.

Of course, the Tories are concerned primarily with the capitalist aspect of an arms reduction—that is, its effect on the export drive. The Bevanites are concerned primarily with the socialist aspect of an arms reduction—that is, its effect on wages, social services and the cost-of-living index.

SHINWELL MOVES

The sort of arguments now advanced by the right wing are well summed up in a letter which Emanuel Shinwell (minister of defense in the last Labor cabinet) wrote the News Chronicle on July 21. In it he said: "My views on the need for national defense have not changed. As long as there is a threat to world peace defense preparations are essential. But I agree with those who say that defense expenditure must be considered in the context of the national economy, which is exactly what all the members of the Labor government said. [?] Some revision may be necessary if in the light of the slow progress being made in the field of Western defense our policy may require modification."

It would appear that Shinwell is well over the "Bevanite" bridge! The question is whether he will be able to convince the delegates at the Labor Party conference that he has crossed the bridge quickly enough.

The fact is that the capitalist class in Britain, also in Europe, is opposed to the breakneck speed of the American-inspired arms program. The idea that the European capitalists welcome the arms program in order to stave off a slump is completely fallacious. The economically weak second- and third-rate European powers are caught between the threat of a "permanent cold-war economy" and a severe slump. Harold Wilson, former president of the Board of Trade, is

convinced that by the end of this year, or certainly at the beginning of 1953, we will be faced by a crisis of first-class dimensions.

WAGE PRESSURE

My own opinion is that Britain's economy will oscillate between conditions of deep recession and feverish arms drive expansion, unless a new Labor government cuts this unstable situation short. A slump is inevitable unless Labor comes to power within two years at the outside. The government would have to take drastic nationalization measures to prevent the worst effects of such a world slump affecting Britain.

Of course, the most compelling reasons for the adoption of "Bevanism" not only by the Labor Party but even (in a sense) by the Tories, is the inflationary pressure of the new wage claims which have already been put forward by the National Union of Railwaymen, the National Union of Miners and the USDAW. Sir Walter Monckton, minister of labor, referred back the wage demands of the Wages Council which represents both employers and trade unions, an action which, technically at least, is unconstitutional. If the Tory government should fall foul of the Trades Union Congress, anything might happen.

Sir William Lawther, president of the National Union of Miners, defends the government that the hitherto-accepted principle which guided the TUC in its dealings with any government, Tory or Labor—that the recommendations of these joint employer-labor councils be respected by the government in power as well as the TUC itself—would be imperiled. In such circumstances, the TUC might well find itself in a more militant mood than of recent years. This was the gist of Sir Walter Lawther's warning to the government.

The combined effect of a new period of militant unionism and re-energized political activity on the part of the constituency Labor Party branches would be such that it would sound the death knell of both Toryism in the country and conservatism in the Labor government.

Candidate in the Making — —

(Continued from page 1) ed bureaucrat in the fields of high international politics and domestic class relations. A running account of his previous posts will serve to illustrate that he is no provincial administrator of the ordinary party-hack type.

Descending from a family as prominent and politically active in Illinois as the Roosevelts of New York State, his grandfather was a U. S. vice-president, and some of his more remote forebears were important abolitionists and Copperheads. As he says, he was a "compromise from the first."

After the customary genteel upbringing he was voted one of the biggest campus "politicians" at Princeton, where he managed the daily student paper. Traveling abroad extensively as a young man, he spent a month in Russia in 1926 attempting to interview Finance Minister Chicherin on aspects of the New Economic Policy (incidentally seeking out a monarchist friend of his family). His professional work as a lawyer involved corporate law in Chicago's La Salle Street financial district, and in the early depression period his legal activities centered in handling farm foreclosures and bonded indebtedness of bankrupt cities.

DURING THE WAR

Beginning in 1933 he entered the Department of Agriculture as a counsel, traveled the country discussing with farmers problems under the AAA and investigating marketing conditions. It was there he first met Alger Hiss, with whom he had only business dealings, though repercussions of this association still reverberate in demagoguery from the McCarthy-Nixon wing of the Republicans.

Back in Chicago during one of his lengthier sojourns out of government service he built the small Council on Foreign Relations into an influential forum voicing the Rooseveltian collective-security foreign policy to those businessmen and intellectuals who would listen under the eye of Colonel McCormick's isolationist Tribune. After the outbreak of war in Europe he joined the Committee to Defend America by Joining the Allies.

He made extensive contacts during this period with prominent business, political, educational and international figures devoted to plunging the country into World War II.

In 1941 Stevenson's bent for coalitionism found him as an assistant to Republican Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, himself part of the newly-forged bipartisan bloc on foreign affairs.

In Washington Stevenson first distinguished himself by drafting the legal plans for the government to take over the strikebound Kearney shippards. These plans, utilized to break strikes during the war on some sixty occasions, initiated him into the procedures of navy labor relations for stilling labor unrest in an expanding war economy. His duties also involved race relations, in which he helped "to modify the tradition whereby Negroes in the navy had previously served mainly as mess-boys," according to Noel F. Busch's recent biography.

Besides writing Knox's speeches, he traveled incessantly, probably more than most other civilian officials. On inspection he covered the Pacific, the Caribbean, North Africa, Italy and Western Europe. After Mussolini's downfall in 1943 he headed a Foreign Economic Administration mission to Italy, which submitted its analysis of the entire economy of the country and upon which basic decisions on policy were derived for the occupation, serving also as a model for subsequent similar surveys in Germany. Later he joined an AAF mission to Germany to evaluate strategic-bombing damage as a guide to policy on Japan.

Subsequently he became an official to promote public understanding of the 1945 San Francisco Preparatory Commission of UN in London, senior advisor to the U. S. delegation at the first UN session and alternate delegate to the second.

His training, well directed to steer him in the direction of the White House, had as its unifying thread—not so much a lot of hard work well done but a progression of steps in meeting the expanding needs of American foreign policy.

(Next week: Stevenson in Illinois.)

California Law Adds New Gimmick To Worsen Cross-Filing System

By JACK WALKER

SAN FRANCISCO, Aug. 2—Now that the California labor movement and liberals have perhaps gotten over the shock of Republican U. S. Senator William F. Knowland's surprise capture of both the Republican and Democratic primaries on June 3—which virtually assured him undisputed election in November—they are due for another shock unless they want to do something about it.

Another California electoral law (as if cross-filing isn't bad enough) prevents them from running an independent candidate in November now that both regular party nominations have been captured.

The formula governing independent candidates ("California Election Laws, 1952") runs like this:

- (1) Five per cent "of the entire vote cast in the area at the preceding general election" is needed to nominate an independent candidate, and such nomination may be made from 65 to 40 days before the election will take place. This is not the gimmick.

(2) A candidate who has been defeated for nomination at his party's primary cannot be nominated later as an independent candidate. While this is a hindrance to democracy (why shouldn't a defeated nominee appeal to the voting public over the head of his party if he can secure the necessary nominating signatures?), this is not the gimmick.

- (3) Each candidate or group of candidates shall file a nomina-

tion paper (Section 3040) which shall contain "a statement that the candidate and each signer of his nomination paper did not vote at the primary election [my emphasis—J. W.] immediately preceding at which a candidate was nominated for the office mentioned in the nomination paper." THIS IS THE GIMMICK!

DISFRANCHISED

Every liberal or labor voter who voted against the "senator from Formosa" in the Democratic primary of June 3 is thereby disfranchised from nominating an independent candidate (even if it is not McKinnon but some other symbol) before November; and since most politically alert voters had voted in the primaries, only the remaining disinterested majority who didn't even bother to turn out for the primaries are able to nominate this independent. Small wonder that the AFL, CIO, and American for Democratic Action are resigned apathetically to another six years of reactionary, anti-labor, anti-civil liberties, pro-Chiang "representation" at the tender hands of Knowland.

Under present laws they are helpless at this time. The only positive act they can perform on this score is to vote for the abolition of the cross-filing system, which allows candidates to file in more than one party in the primaries, when it comes up on the November ballot as a referendum issue. That they will do this, at any rate, is a foregone conclusion.

THE LABOR FRONT IN L.A.

By LES WRIGHT

LOS ANGELES, July 27—The strike of 6000 AFL Retail Clerks against 2000 grocery stores, including most of the big supermarkets and chain stores, ended after three days with Joe De Silva's Local 770 claiming a victory.

A majority of the big firms agreed to union demands for time-and-one-half for night work and triple holiday pay, demands granted by the National Labor Relations Board. De Silva's office released a public statement as the strike terminated, claiming that the narrow majority of the larger firms who agreed to the demands would act as a lever to force other markets to fall in line. Many persons in the labor movement were surprised when the union failed to prolong its strike in order to gain the maximum number of concessions. The aftermath came several days after the strike when the Regional Wage Stabilization Board ruled that the Retail Clerks may not receive the premium pay they desire even if the companies agree to it. The WSB, by this action, reaffirmed a July 11 ruling. The union will appeal this ruling to the national WSB next week.

Two important strikes came to an end last week with the unions concerned winning considerable wage increases and benefits, according to their official statements, though short of their demands. The AFL Engineers and allied Ironworkers ended their long strike which had tied up major construction projects. The CIO Communications Workers of America (CWA) ended its strike against the Associated Telephone Company in the suburban areas and won some concessions from the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, which it had planned to strike. Thousands of workers were involved in all of these cases.

Drivers for the local Yellow Cab Company voted to strike unless the company meets their demands for a wage increase in the drivers' guarantee and for a medical plan. A total of 794 drivers voted to strike, as against 169 voting to reject it, and the tentative strike date has been set for September 5, which will allow the union to comply with the Taft-Hartley waiting period. Local 640 of the AFL Teamsters is the cab drivers' bargaining agent.

MARITIME RULING

Shortly before the nation-wide steel strike came to an end, which had shut down several steel plants in this area, the CIO United Steelworkers won a victory in their attempt to organize the Bryon Jackson plant. But the vote in the NLRB-supervised election, which climaxed a long battle in this plant, was very close, so close in fact that the union must launch a drive to maintain and extend its bargaining powers. A margin of ten votes where 680 workers are concerned means that the steel workers' union has not really pushed its case aggressively enough.

Todd Shipyard reached an agreement with the CIO Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers for an increase of 15 cents an hour for 1300 production and maintenance workers. This raise is subject to approval by the Wage Stabilization Board.

On the maritime front, a new hiring system for marine cooks and stewards has been set up with a new referee appointed. The Ninth U. S. Court of Appeals ordered that all cooks and stewards who have been aboard Pacific Maritime Association ships during the past four years must register with the new office (run by a San Francisco attorney, J. H. Hoffman) even though they will actually ship out through their own union hiring halls. In connection with the coast-wide strike of Lundeberg's Sailors Union of the Pacific, Bridges' ILWU claims that the SUP failed "miserably in its real attempt to raid the Marine Cooks and Stewards" (independent, Stalinist-dominated) in favor of a Lundeberg-sponsored AFL "MCS."

Get it EVERY week! An LA sub is \$2 a year

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 worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

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

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join 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

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

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

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY ZONE.....
STATE TEL.....

HANDY WAY TO SUBSCRIBE

LABOR ACTION

114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

Please enter my subscription:
 Six months (26 issues) at \$1.00
 One year (52 issues) at \$2.00

- NEW RENEWAL
- Bill me. Payment enclosed.

NAME
ADDRESS
APT.....
CITY
ZONE..... STATE.....

YOU and SCIENCE

FEDERAL AID TO SCIENCE STUDENTS: OPPORTUNITY, WITH STRINGS

By CARL DARTON

One of the most important phases of the war preparations of the United States and Russia is the struggle for technological supremacy. Though violent war may break out any month the general feeling is that both imperialist giants need time to flex their muscles, technically speaking. Both realize that they have not yet realized their full war potential in these days of startling scientific and technical innovations.

Perhaps the greatest limiting factor in this scientific race, besides time itself, is the availability of scientists and technicians, chemists, physicists and engineers. The need becomes greater as warfare becomes more "pushbuttonish." Yet the trend in the United States is for such manpower to be in short supply.

It is estimated that in 1954 there will be only 29,000 graduates from college in all scientific fields, compared with 75,000 in 1950. The large advertisements in newspapers and technical journals for technicians by industry and government testify to the acute shortage right now.

BUILT-IN BIAS

The draft speedup is partially responsible for this. Students who have the fortitude to risk college under the threatening paw of the military have little desire for the additional hardships of tough technical courses which require long laboratory hours and the grind of concentrated study. Rather, students trend toward reserve military status which offers, at least, some assurance of completion of the four college years. College-qualifications tests to determine the number of technicians in training.

The class bias of these college deferments is notorious. Of the three out of four high school graduates who are capable but fail to attend and graduate from college, the main difficulty is financial. Thus, by the "laws" of capitalist society, the overwhelming majority of the technologists and scientists who are saved from the war machine are from sections other than the working class.

NEW BILL PROPOSED

The government would have no particular concern over this injustice except that it inevitably reduces the sources of scientific and technical manpower. Therefore, not from the goodness of its heart nor to right an injustice, the United States government is making some effort to tap the pool of more talented working-class students who cannot now afford to go to college.

Those who follow activities in Washington will be interested in a new "Student Aid Bill" just sent to Congress by the Federal Security Administration. It is the wish of this agency that congressional committees hold hearings on the bill before presentation to the 83rd Congress early in 1953. We have not seen a copy of the bill but according to a report in the July 4 issue of *Chemical and Engineering News* its purpose is said to be "scholarship aid to the neediest of the ablest."

It would provide scholarships averaging \$500 to \$600 per year for 50,000 to 60,000 college students and in addition annual loans up to \$600. These funds would be available to high school graduates first on the basis of ability and second on that of need. He would receive the money direct in installments and could go to the college of his choice. If he remained in "good standing" there would be renewals yearly until graduation.

SCHOLARSHIPS

One inevitable string tied to the scholarships is that at least 60 per cent of the recipients will specialize in studies related to "national defense" or "defense-supporting" activities. The president alone would decide which studies were so classified. These scholarships would be in addition to those originating from all other sources and would be divided among the states in proportion to the number of high school graduates and youths between the ages of 18 and 21.

The cost of the program would be about \$32 million the first year with a final cost of 128 million after three years. This is a mere pittance as government expenditures go today. If democratically administered, however, it would mean 200,000 to 240,000 students in college who could not otherwise attend. Under the plan each state would have a scholarship commission representing organizational and professional interests in education, and the "public." It would be their task to determine ability and need.

ADVANTAGES

This bill and plan would appear to have some progressive educational and social features. If properly applied it could be of considerable value in furthering the democratic concept of mass education. However, the chances of such legislation passing Congress and being equitably administered is highly uncertain in the present state of the nation.

It is desirable that trade unions as well as youth organizations present their case for a democratic version of the plan at

READING from LEFT to RIGHT

THE TRAGEDY OF FORMER DPs, by Nahum—*Jewish Newsletter*, Aug. 4.

This is an interesting item from William Zukerman's independent liberal organ of "events and opinion of Jewish interest," which we have recommended to readers before as a source of valuable reports on Israeli and Jewish problems from a refreshingly non-Zionist point of view (though it unfortunately tends sometimes to reflect some influence from the conservative American Council for Judaism).

"What happens to the former Displaced Person in America?"

"Once in a while we read in newspapers stories about former DPs who after only a few years in this country have become prosperous. Such stories often appear under prominent headlines. Less prominently displayed—perhaps because they are much more frequent—are items concerning deaths from privation or suicides of former DPs. The fact that the majority of these survivors of Hitler's hells are living in wretched conditions is mentioned only rarely, if at all—no doubt because it is taken for granted. Recently one of these former camp inmates, S. Machnowsky, committed suicide, leaving behind him his wife and their 13-week-old baby, and this led to a spurt of articles in the Jewish press and to a few comments by radio commentators. One of these articles, which appeared in 'Unser Zeit,' written by I. Zelemenski, himself a former DP, gave a particularly revealing insight of the conditions of these people.

"Sixty thousand former DPs are settled in New York City, according to the author. They are for the most part young people, but unlike

the immigrants of former years, they have no families left overseas and they are entirely on their own, materially and spiritually. Many are ill after years of inhuman suffering, many are wholly or partly disabled as a result of maltreatment in camps. Their housing conditions are wretched, and the mortality rate is very high. "The situation of the intellectuals—artists, teachers, writers, musicians—is even worse. Nothing is done to open up fields of activity for them.

"The *Kazetter Verband* is poor and cannot do much. Other Jewish organizations, busy collecting funds for Israel, do little, less than little. As for the manner in which help is given, Zelemenski tells us about the USNA, the principal welfare organization dealing with ex-DPs. The social workers there, he says, are bureaucratically-minded; they receive the new immigrants coldly, refusing to address them in Yiddish, often the only language they understand. And when material help is given, it is loudly publicized, without regard for the feelings of the recipients.

"While material aid is at a minimum, there is no cultural help at all. Ironically enough, the Jewish DPs who often at the risk of their lives had done miracles to preserve their culture in camps and ghettos, organizing newspapers, theaters, schools and libraries under the noses of their oppressors, in this country are deprived of any congenial cultural atmosphere.

"Zelemenski concludes his article with an appeal to Jewish labor unions and organizations to do something quickly—otherwise there is danger that a whole generation of Jews will be lost to the Jewish community."

Here's One for the Scrapbook: New Theory of 'Colonialism'

By BERNARD CRAMER

We give three cheers for the *New Leader* for printing the best political joke of the year.

Don't be misled by the fact that it is presented in an outwardly sober and serious article; this is no doubt only in the dead-pan tradition of Mark Twain's hoaxes. Don't be misled by the fact that the article is even headlined on the *New Leader's* cover for Aug. 4, under the title of "Does Imperialism Cause War?" by Nobel Peace Prize-winner Norman Angell. That isn't carrying a jest too far, if you have a sense of humor.

Maybe, even, Sir Norman was serious, but the editors of the *New Leader* must have been rolling on the carpet.

Look, here's how it goes: For two pages Sir Norman writes along, debunking the old-fashioned idea that nations have a right to be independent. This is only the come-on, because it's sure-nuff serious stuff, highly philosophical and all about how it's immoral and anti-social to allow a people to govern themselves. This is so profound and deep-thinking-like that you get ready to turn the page quick when—bang!—he comes out with the twister and you suddenly get it.

That's when he gets to the part that gives the article its title. He goes after refuting the silly notion that "imperialism" causes war. Then, before you know it, he's arguing against the proposition that "colonialism is the cause of war."

And what he does to that old chestnut is nobody's business. He proves conclusively that no war was ever caused by colonial peoples. So how could colonialism be the cause of wars?

... Just writing that down has gotten us a bit confused, so maybe we'd better give it in his own words:

"The assumption that 'colonial-

ism is the cause of war,' that wars are caused by the revolt of oppressed colonial peoples, is not borne out by the events of the last half century. Neither of the two world wars nor the present cold one are attributable to revolts of colonial peoples. Germany was not a colony; nor was Japan; nor Italy; nor is Russia's challenge to the West the result of the West having inflicted upon her a colonialist system."

With that refresher, let's try it again: If "colonialism" causes war, then it's the colonials who must be guilty. If it's the colonials that are guilty, then they must be imperialist. Therefore, it's the colonial peoples who are the real imperialists, being colonialists, or at least colonial, because it is well known that they live in colonies. But it is an established fact that no colony started a world war, by a revolt, so colonialism does not cause imperialism and imperialism does not cause wars...

No, that isn't quite the way it goes either; we must have gone off somewhere. Maybe Sir Norman and the editors of the *New Leader* ought to call in Abbott and Costello. It sounds as if it's in their department. We give up.

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 W. 14 St., N.Y.C.

- The Fight for Socialism—Max Shachtman \$1.00
- Socialism, Utopian & Scientific—Engels .75
- Marxism in the U. S.—Trotsky .35
- Plenty for All—Eriber .25
- Principles & Program of Independent Socialism (LA special issue) .10
- Independent Socialism & War (LA special issue) .10
- Marx as Economist—Dobb .15
- Reform or Revolution—Rosa Luxemburg .50
- The Accumulation of Capital—Rosa Luxemburg \$5.00
- Studies in the Development of Capitalism—Dobb 3.50
- From Hegel to Marx—Hook 4.50
- Theory of Capitalist Development—Sweezy 4.50
- New Data for Lenin's 'Imperialism'—Varga & Mendelsohn 2.25
- Social Revolution—Kautsky .95
- The Evolution of Property—Lafargue .95
- Materialist Conception of History—Plekhanov .20
- Role of Individual in History—Plekhanov .25
- Karl Marx—Otto Rühle 1.00
- Lenin on Agrarian Question—Rochester 1.75
- Anti-Dühring—Engels 3.00
- Materialism & Empirio-Criticism—Lenin 2.75
- Theory of Marxism—Lenin .15
- Living Thoughts of Karl Marx—Trotsky 2.00

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 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.

AT THE OLYMPIC GAMES

U.S. Press Fights the Cold War To Last Drop of Athletes' Sweat

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The Fifteenth Modern Olympiad has now run its course. "As is known" (to borrow a phrase from the Russians), the Olympic games are designed to bring together the foremost amateur athletes of the world in harmonious and cheerful competition. This one gathered 5,781 of them in Helsinki, Finland. In the course of the games 151 new Olympic records were set, and ten new world marks were established. Furthermore, all this was done in a manner which, as far as the athletes were concerned, came very close to the Olympic ideal much to the surprise of some and the dismay of others.

For, in addition to the competitors, the Olympic games were graced by the presence of 1,243 journalists, 165 broadcasters and 160 photographers. We do not know too much about the contribution to international amity made by the reporters from other countries. But as far as the Americans were concerned, from first to last it is clear that they regarded the Olympics as one of the major events in the cold war, and their own role in them more as that of war correspondents than of sports reporters.

This "reporting" started off long before the athletes met on the field of contest. Last spring the committee which organizes and finances the American contestants found itself short of funds. All over the country sports reporters sprang to the rescue. Naturally, it was not a matter of digging into their own pockets to make up the deficit. From their columns they trumpeted the message that money was needed, and gave as the chief argument to prospective contributors that a dollar for the American Olympic team was a dollar to put the upstart Russian athletes in their places; a dollar to re-establish the superiority of American manhood over anything the Russians could dig up. (American womanhood was not so prominently mentioned, as it was pretty well conceded that the Russian women were a cinch to come out ahead of our girls with or without the cash.)

What! No Blood?

Once the games were under way, the reporters started out in full cry. They predicted that the Russians would "cause all sorts of trouble," type unspecified. The Russians, they insisted, were going to turn the games into a propaganda affair of the cold war. "Communists Defy True Tradition to Spread Propaganda at Classic," read one *New York Times* headline. The unwary reader might have concluded from this that Russian wrestlers were grunting Stalinist slogans, or that Zatopeck, the Czech runner who so outclassed his opponents that in the marathon he stopped to chat with correspondents, was engaging them in political discussions. Actually, this headline referred to a Stalinist international youth camp which was located at some distance from the Olympic doings.

It would seem, on the contrary, that the Russians were on their good behavior. This tactic of theirs can also, naturally, be interpreted as a stratagem in the cold war, but in any case it left the U. S. press kind of frustrated.

During the first days of the meet, the American correspondents concealed their disappointments at the early Russian advance in points by writing that their victories were merely in gymnastics, a minor sport. It is true that in this country not too much attention is paid to the parallel bar and high-horse artists. In Europe, however, it gets a good deal more attention.

The chief ray of light in the first days was, to be sure, a reflected one. The Yugoslavs trounced the Russians in soccer, the most popular sport in Europe. It is reported that the Russian team failed to line up for the customary congratulations to the victors, and that the Yugoslav captain had to chase his Russian opposite down the field to get him to shake hands. It may be that the latter was just preoccupied with a question which at the moment seemed to him much more serious than etiquette, namely his chances of avoiding a Siberian rest cure on his return to the Gligolous Fatherland.

Even in reporting the Yugoslav victory U. S. correspondents showed visible disappointment at the failure of mayhem and bloodshed to develop. As a matter of fact, the only blood spilled during the games, to our knowledge, was (a) the result of an attack by two Uruguayan basketball players on a referee (American) who rendered a decision which annoyed them; and (b) the perforation of an ulcer in the duodenum of the assistant United States track coach, Clyde

Littlefield, a casualty which can be blamed on the Russians only indirectly.

On the days when the American reporters found it impossible to score up a hot incident featuring the Russian menace to sportsmanship, they filled in by writing stories attacking the stories written for the Russian press. We assume that the Russian reporters were doing our boys the same honor.

Peace on Earth and Beat Those Russians!

We do not contend that the games passed completely "without incident" as the saying goes. For instance, there is the case of the weight-lifting competition. "Amiability Drops in Weight Lifting," was the *New York Times* headline. The biggest hassle developed over whether Stanczyk, American light-heavyweight lifter, had bent his back too far in the military press, and over the judges refusal to recognize a lift by Aleksander Vorobiev (Russian) that would have constituted a world record of 374 pounds in the clean-and-jerk.

The *Times* records that in this dispute "voices were raised and muscles on both sides bulged belligerently as the issue was hotly contested." Trofim Lomakin, a new Russian champion weight-lifter, is reported to have charged that the jury of officials "stole" the lift from Vorobiev by making him hold the weight so long that he swayed and consequently was disqualified.

In a fit of uncontrollable temper, Lomakin is reported to have said: "Today's judging leaves all of us with a most unpleasant impression." We recommend this language to Leo Durocher next time an empire calls a close one on the Giants.

As the Olympic games drew to a close, the big question in the American press was: Would the United States team score more points than the Russians? This despite the fact that the Olympic games are not supposed to be a competition between teams but solely between individuals. The heat developed over team scores (in the press) grew so great that Olympic officials held a special press conference in which they deplored the tendency toward team scoring.

On the last day of the games, President-elect Brundage of the International Olympic Committee told the press that "if these games degenerate into a national competition we will have something entirely different than we are supposed to have. If this becomes a giant contest between two great nations rich in talent and resources the spirit of the Olympic games will be destroyed."

It is to be feared that Mr. Brundage is whistling in the dark. The games have already become such a competition, and in the present context of world affairs it is inevitable that they should become part of the cold war, once the Russians decided to enter them. It is reported that they carefully scouted the games in London four years ago, and on the basis of the reports decided to enter the games with the hope of winning the highest team scores.

For a while the American reporters were charging that the Russians had devised their own scoring system for the purpose of "stealing" the team victory, though just what makes the American unofficial method of scoring sacred is left to the imagination. The fact of the matter is that the Russians erased the team score from the board at their headquarters after the request of the IOC that such scoring be abandoned, though it is a matter of speculation whether there was any connection between this act and the fact that on the same day the Americans forged ahead, even by the Russian method of reckoning.

Well, when all the shouting was over, the team scores (American-style reckoning) were 610 for the good old U.S.A., and 553½ for the "New Soviet Man" (and especially Woman). The American men were way ahead in track and field, canoeing, yachting, swimming, boxing and some other events. The Russian women swamped the American girls in track and field and gymnastics, but were not in the same class in swimming. The Russian men had all the best of it in gymnastics and Greco-Roman wrestling, while the athletes of the two countries were pretty close to each other in free-style wrestling, rowing, and weight lifting.

But there was one event which did not get too much attention from the American reporters. We would like to call it respectfully to the attention of those who made special efforts to portray the Fifteenth Modern Olympiad as a contest which is relevant to the cold war. The event: shooting. The score: United States 15; Russia 30. Come to think of it, maybe it would be better if we look on the Olympics as a competition in sport.

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor...

WATCH OUT FOR JOE THE WRECKER!

To the Editor:

As a responsible citizen concerned with this country's politics, I have recently taken to distributing LABOR ACTION at various popular gatherings where it invariably arouses lively comment. So at the gathering of the "Partisans of Peace" in Chicago, or the convention of the Progressive Party. I meet more interesting people that way.

Take this man, for instance, member of the Fur and Leather Workers, sterling proletarian, who tipped me off that LA was a Trotskyite paper. He said that I seemed honest and sincere to him, but that I was doing a dirty job, because LA was Trotskyite and "there was a Trotskyite in his

shop who took money from the boss and was a racist."

Later, on a similar occasion, I got to talk with a girl from the Distributive, Processing and Office Workers, another sterling proletarian, who told me that I "sounded all right, but in her office there is a Trotskyite who takes money from the boss and he's a racist."

I never got a chance to ask her where her office was because a fat, little individual pointed a finger in my face and yelled that I was probably an FBI agent.

Only a few weeks ago I was passing out LA at the convention of the Progressive Party. I had some difficulty at first, being surrounded by a screaming, whoop-

ing, hollering mob accusing me of having put ground glass in Maxim Gorky's tea, but eventually I managed to talk to an old man who happened to be a member of the United Electrical workers, also a sterling proletarian.

He had aroused my interest by watching me while I was trying to get some of the more aggressive fundamentalists out of my hair and muttering: "What a shame! What a pity! They catch 'em young and pervert them! Probably from a working-class family too!" When I got to him and offered him a copy of LA he sadly refused saying: "There is a Trotskyite in my shop; he takes money from the boss and he's a racist."

Now some of my best friends are Trotskyites. So I asked them

about it, and we sat, and thought, and puzzled, and finally we understood:

It's always the same one! It's Joe the Wrecker, the travelling company-Trotskyite. Wherever he goes, he wrecks unions, takes money from the boss and is a racist. It's the same one who put ground glass in Gorky's tea and who smuggled arms to Franco. It's him who was laying British mines after the Stalin-Hitler pact and it's him who was planted by Himmler as fifth columnist when the Third Reich collapsed—"to create difficulties for the Allied armies," no less. So he goes his merry little way through the decades, wrecking here, wrecking there, wrecking everywhere. Talk to the right people in the Fur and Leather Workers, in the UE, in the DPOPW, in the Mine, Mill

and Smelter Workers and other assorted Partisans for Peace, Progressives and semi-Progressives, and they'll tell you all about him: Joe the Wrecker, traveling company-Trotskyite, who takes money from the boss, is a racist and wrecks.

Daniel FABER

SCREEN THE NEWS

with LABOR ACTION

A sub is \$2 a year—

Subscribe now!

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
Vol. 16, No. 32 August 11, 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.

David Mitrany's "Marx Against the Peasant"

A Peasant-Eye View of Marxism

MARX AGAINST THE PEASANT, by David Mitrany.—University of North Carolina Press, 1951, 301 pages, \$4.50.

By HAL DRAPER

Since its publication last year, Mitrany's book has naturally been added to the list of titles which the busy political pundit of our day can refer to when in need of a suitable erudite reference to the errors of Marxism. It's been used to a fair extent, too, as we've seen in reading around. That's a sufficient reason for discussing it, in spite of its lamentably poor quality even within the ranks of anti-Marxist "annihilations." Readers of LABOR ACTION generally, we fear, are not raptly interested in the peasant question; but some of them, like me, may take a morbid interest in the specimens of scientific and political incompetence and vacuity which pass nowadays as contributions to the critical literature against Marxism.

Even an anti-Marxist polemic on the peasant question could have made a contribution of interest to Marxism, however much they might disagree with it; but Mitrany cannot, for a very simple reason: He does not know the slightest evidence that he understands what Marxism is all about. That he has pored through Marxist literature is, of course, undoubted; after all he is a scholar, member of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton, former professor at various universities, etc. But he has evidently done his research with approximately the kind of zeal shown by a village Citizens Committee for Purguing Schools of Subversive Textbooks as they pore through the writings of (say) John Dewey, blissfully ignorant of the intellectual content of their assigned victim but ready to blue-pencil passages which offend their prejudices.

Mitrany's prejudices stick out on every page. We are not referring here to anti-Marxist prejudices. For Mitrany these are only derivative. The point of view which guides his pen is that of peasant-village populism, dressed up in the language of a Westernized scholar, as a peasant boy in his native Rumania might be dressed up in boughten town clothes. And time and again, Mitrany shows that it is only with difficulty that he can even grasp any other point of view, and that he cannot hold on to this grasp for more than a couple of pages at a time. At bottom, he writes as an authentic representative of the limited and circumscribed peasant mind, with a Ph.D. degree.

WHO'S "PRO-PEASANT"?

If he picks on Marx and Marxism with special ferocity it is only for obvious reasons. (Actually, his book should have been entitled "Everybody Against the Peasant," or "Why Do We Peasants Always Get a Rooking?")

Being "pro-peasant" means, to Mitrany, being for the conditions of peasant life, the peasant mentality, peasant economy, reactionary-utopian peasant aspirations. In the last analysis, this is why he sees Marx as "against the peasant," and, as we shall see, why all of modern civilization is "against the peasant." He cannot even understand the concept that a man or movement can be "pro-peasant" precisely because they want to rescue the peasant masses from the "idiotism of rural life." This phrase of Marx's, in fact, is cited by him, in utter naiveté, as if by itself it sufficiently indicts Marx's attitude "against the peasant," without the necessity of any discussion on the idea involved.

In all of this scholarly study, there is no discussion of the wider context of Marx's ideas in which the peasant question was only a minor aspect: Marx's views on capitalism, class struggle, historical materialism, or anything else. That would be sufficient to judge the worthlessness of his contribution to the subject. With all this perfectly clear, it is regrettable that he pretends (in his Foreword) that his book is academically neutral in its approach, neither "panegyric" nor "attack." The pretense of objectivity ends with this statement. There is nothing wrong with writing a frank polemic, as this book is. Why do these professorial Pecksniffs have to deceive themselves?

A BRACE OF WHOPPERS

Before illustrating the main nature of Mitrany's book, we only mention some of the cruder stuff in it. On the page before the above-quoted claim to objectivity, Mitrany mentions quite casually "the fantastic episode . . . when a handful of Bolshevik revolutionaries, with the Revolution already in full flood, were brought into Russia in sealed carriages to do a job of disruption for the German High Command." (My emphasis in all quotations unless otherwise noted.) We learn on page 69 that Trotsky opposed the adoption of the New Economic Policy! On page 45 the formulation "dictatorship of the party" is unqualifiedly ascribed to Lenin, in quotation marks but without any reference. (In spite of the fact that a full fourth of the book consists of notes, some of the damndest statements are made with no authority cited at all.) We read also the offhand statement that Lenin, and Rosa Luxemburg too, considered that "the goal of the proletarian movement . . . was not the creation of the socialist commonwealth . . . but the seizure of political power."

There is only a thin line between such impositions on

the facts of history and political interpretations which merely display Mitrany's thorough ignorance of anything in Marxism which cannot be set down as an "anti-peasant" quotation. For him the Russian Revolution, which was, in its "natural course," a peasant revolution, "was given an accidental twist through the sudden injection of the Bolshevik element into the process of revolutionary gestation." What Mitrany doesn't know about the gestation of the Russian Revolution is plentifully demonstrated by his lack of discussion.

—AND SOME BLOOPERS

August Bebel, he relates, argued for expropriating the peasantry first, ahead of the bigger landowners, because the peasants were more backward. This may be a sad commentary on Bebel, but Mitrany remarks that this position was the "consistent" one for Marxism. In that case the argument would also apply to expropriation in industry, and therefore Marxists should "consistently" be for expropriating the corner grocery store ahead of U. S. Steel. Maybe he never heard that, for Marxists, what makes an enterprise ripe for socialization is precisely the degree to which it has already acquired the economic prerequisites for large-scale socialized operation, and that this is in inverse proportion to its economic backwardness. (Nor should we trust his account of Bebel's views, which we don't know of our own knowledge: not because he might be untruthful but because he is obviously quite incapable of understanding anything he reads in Marxist literature.)

At a Socialist International congress before the turn of the century, a peasant group from the Belgian Ardennes advised the International that "it will be difficult to build up Socialism on the soil of old Europe" and proposed a "general emigration to America." It is fantastic but Mitrany greets this as simple peasant good sense and comments that "by the early '90s some of them at least came to realize that the Ardennes peasants had spoken wisely!"

He is capable of this too: He quotes one of Lenin's many discussions of the social differences among the peasant strata, working peasants, middle peasants, exploiter peasants and kulaks; and this is his sole comment: "Whatever the circumstances, it seems curious to find Lenin stooping to such quibbling." What more can one want to know about Mitrany?

The trouble with the Western socialists was that "They remained under the influence of the industrial-proletarian philter injected into socialism by Marx. . . ."

ON CONCENTRATION

We forcibly restrain ourselves from merely continuing to list many more such awe-inspiring monuments to scholarly ignorance, in order to take up Mitrany's attempt to deal with Marxist theory on the agrarian question. That there are many important problems here all socialists know. Only, Mitrany is no help.

The biggest to-do he makes is over Marx's view of a continuous tendency toward concentration in agriculture as in industry. This hasn't worked out the way Marx expected it, and the question has been often discussed by Marxists. Mitrany, of course, has no conception of how Marx went about this question in his *Capital*; in this as in other cases, Marx posited an abstraction from the tendencies of capitalism, in order the better to highlight the fundamental trends, without yet inquiring into the way it links up with the actual processes, openly making it as an assumption (see Sternberg's *Capitalism and Socialism on Trial*, page 104, for example). Mitrany shows awareness that later Marxists carried the question further: Lenin investigated the figures in terms of class strata, not merely taking land-tillers as a single mass; others pointed out the forms of concentration to be seen in the ownership relations, not merely in the figures on size of land holdings; the effect of growing indebtedness of farmers and their subjection to capitalist power and finance; the divorce of many of the functions of the farmer from his land, putting processing, packing, etc. in the hands of capital; the decline of the specific weight of agriculture as a whole in the economy, and the greater integration of agriculture in the capitalist process, making the "independent" farmer and peasant more and more dependent on the products of capitalist industry and control from capitalist sources; etc.

AGRARIAN SUBORDINATION

But all Mitrany knows is that land ownership has not become as concentrated as Marx seemed to predict, and anything else (which is far over his head) is dismissed as the making of "excuses." (Even so, though referring to the U. S., he makes no mention of the fact that farm-holding is concentrating in this country. The last census report shows that American farms are getting fewer and larger. The number of farms has decreased by more than a million since 1920. Their average size was 215 acres in 1950 as against 148 acres thirty years ago. Nor does this adequately tell the story of factory-farming in this country: according to the census figures, "less than a half million or 10 per cent of all American farms produce over half of the food and fiber products grown each year.")

Quite apart from statistics on land-holdings, it is the

land tillers' real dependence on and subjection to capital which is the prime POLITICAL fact, presumably most relevant to the subject of Mitrany's book, but of this he makes nothing.

His second target, under the head of the agrarian theory of Marxism, is the view that large-scale production is economically superior to small-scale. His statements on this point throughout the book are evasive and contradictory, but it is clear what he would like to convey: he would like to defend the economic superiority of small-scale production, since this is true of peasant economy, and he is the peasant's lawyer.

SOMEBODY'S GOT A DOGMA

Everywhere he refers bitterly and derogatorily to the "dogmatic" Marxist view in favor of large-scale production, and yet constantly pretends that he is not arguing the question. On page 11 he says "this is not the place to join in the heated and endless debate" on the point, but winds up with the misleading statement that "Experience would almost suggest that often it is the small-holder and not the capitalist farmer" who is best for "scientific prolific cultivation." Those three qualifications may be enough to save his academic reputation, but the idea he wants to implant is plain. On page 33 we read that this question (which he steadfastly refuses to argue) is "the crux of the peasant problem." On page 108, he asserts more confidently that "The economic fallacy was to assume dogmatically that the larger the scale the greater the efficiency," and doubts that it is true even in industry, citing as evidence the TNEC reports on monopolized industry in the U. S. Only to write, a page later, that "It may be true that peasant farming does not produce as much as mechanized large-scale farming [precisely the idea he has been snidely sniping at for a hundred pages], but it has never exhausted the soil"—which may be consolation, if true, but has nothing to do with his thesis.

Very objective and scholarly is this Marx-slayer, who subtitled his book "A Study in Social Dogmatism." Since the advantages of small-scale tilling are vital to his glorification of peasant life, he is as capable of an undogmatic approach to the question as is a Jesuit priest on the subject of the immaculate conception.

A MOST INGENIOUS PARADOX

Why Marx and Marxists are "anti-peasant" (to Mitrany's educated peasant mind), we have already indicated sufficiently. He can write such nonsense as that Marx was "annoyed" at the very existence of the peasants, that Marx passed a "sentence of death" on the peasantry, that Marx had "undisguised contempt for the peasant," as if all this was almost a personal matter of "resenting" Mitrany's folks back home. When he does take note of Marx's undisguised admiration for the revolutionary spirit (at one time) of the Russian Narodniki and his hopes for the future of the Russian *mir*, he can treat it only wonderingly as some aberration on Marx's part.

Even so, however, Mitrany apparently could not bring himself to quote the main passage in all Marxist literature in which Engels speaks of policy with regard to the peasantry—against any kind of coercion and for the demonstration to the peasants in experience that collective large-scale tilling is superior. If Mitrany somehow failed to see this in Engels he would have run across Lenin's references to it. Anyone can decide for himself how come this honest and very objective scholar somehow omits mention of this passage.

But since his thesis is that Marxists don't want to pay any attention to peasants, Mitrany is constantly running into an embarrassing paradox, namely, the fact that the most orthodox Marxists were the ones who did pay the closest attention to the peasant problem. The reformist social-democrats slighted the peasant question; the Leninists studied it carefully and developed their program.

In other words the most "dogmatic" Marxists do not conform to his image of Marxism; the least "dogmatic" Marxists (like the German social-democrats) do, much more! One would think this fact would give him pause. Not him. He gets rid of the inconvenience to his theory by calling it "ironical" that it should be so; or "peculiar."

REFORMISM AND THE PEASANT

The fact itself, however, is quite important. The reformists were, quite generally, indifferent to the peasant question; and this was an aspect precisely of their reformist approach to the problems of socialism; they were not interested in the peasantry as a revolutionary force but as electoral material, and if it was difficult to get peasants to vote social-democratic under ordinary circumstances, their interest ended. The Bolsheviks were led by their theory to look on the peasantry as one of the two revolutionary classes poised against tsarism, and for this reason paid close attention to them, while remaining of course primarily a proletarian party.

So Mitrany quotes from Kautsky as if the latter embodied Marxism, and wonders at Lenin's "flexibility," all without the vaguest notion of what is involved.

This isn't the only paradox for Mitrany. (To give him his due, he does make clear his own bewilderment, and does not merely suppress the facts.) To wit: Kerensky,

(Continued bottom of next page)

REPORT ON NORWAY—

'Middle Way' or Just—Caught in the Middle?

By JIM HINCHCLIFFE

As one of the small countries whose northernmost tip borders on the Soviet Union, and with a Labor government for nearly 20 years (since 1935), Norway poses some rather interesting questions. A visit to this very English member of the Scandinavian countries makes one realize how interrelated are the problems of today, for of all countries, Norway is very dependent on the world market.

Thirty-three per cent of her needs are imported, compared to the U. S. total of 10 per cent. Norway imports 85 per cent of her bread grain; 55 per cent of her feeding stuffs; 70 per cent of her iron and steel, and all of her cars, tractors, sugar, etc. Boasting of being the world's largest producer of whale oil, the most significant asset is the merchant fleet, which equals 160 tons per 1,000 population, compared to the U. S. figure of 85 tons.

The whole historical background of the country has bred a very independent race of people. Memories of Norway's "Golden Age" when the Vikings ruled the seas were by no means eliminated during the 400 years when Norway was a Danish province, or during the union with Sweden.

From an abstract socialist point of view, one may well ask why are three countries with such similarity of outlook, etc., still existing as separate nation-states? You need only visit the countries to see that many changes will need

This article is received from a British correspondent who has recently spent some time in Norway in close contact with the Labor movement.—Ed.

to take place before such a step will become a reality, not least of all being a change of regime in Russia, for the nearness of Russia dominates a good deal of Scandinavian thinking.

Generally speaking, the foreign policy of these countries are determined by their geographical distance from Russia. Thus Norway is the only country of the three (Finland, Sweden and Norway) which is part of NATO, although even here no bases are being allowed for the American or other powers. Traditionally Norwegian foreign policy has been neutral, but the experience of the last war, when the country was invaded by Germany and the northern part laid waste, effectively killed this attitude. It was for this reason that Norway opposed Sweden's idea of a Scandinavian alliance if it was not linked to Western bloc arrangements, and Norway is part of the Atlantic Pact on the basis of the need to prepare for possible war in peacetime.

This has little to do with a socialist foreign policy of course, but one needs to appreciate the

position of such countries in a world dominated by only two powers. They are impotent to guide events, and in the case of Norway tend to follow the lead of Britain on such matters. There is one consolation, however, for when the Stalinists call for a Five-Power Peace Pact, the reply comes swift and devastating—Norway will not support any imperialist carve-up between Stalin and Truman at the expense of the small powers.

LABOR GAINED

In the field of domestic relationships, the Labor movement is very strong. The employers are by no means as powerful as in Britain and America, and the class relationships, are (shall we say) much softer. This reflects itself in the relationship between wages and the cost of living over the years, for since 1939, although the cost of living has increased by 77 per cent, the wage increase has been in the region of 136 per cent. Even if we assume the cost-of-living index to be as unreliable as it is in every other country, there has been an unmistakable shift in favor of the working class.

No small factor in this change has been the strength of the trade-union movement, closely associated with the Labor Party, and much more centralized than in Britain. No union may submit wage claims until it has secured the permission of the Trade Un-

ion Congress, and its decisions are binding on all members. On the other hand, the very smallness of the movement (Norway's population is only 3,100,000) prevents the bureaucracy which is characteristic of the movements of the larger countries and therefore enables such a policy to work reasonably well.

COLD-WAR TRENDS

Labor theorists refer to their policy of a planned economy based on a mixed economy (with only 10 per cent nationalized, incidentally), and to their wages policy (largely theoretical), which, if implemented, would stop the rise in prices. Unfortunately, the calculations of these mathematical socialists have been rudely upset with the effect of rearmament, and the cost-of-living index has revealed some alarming rises which not unnaturally caused certain repercussions in the ranks of the organized working class.

The fact that there has been no further change in formal ownership since pre-war days is explained by the desire to make private property a social function with democratic control. They point to the negative side of nationalization, but ignore the class factor involved, i.e., the occasion when the capitalists decide to disobey the government is when the Labor movement lacks the power—as a class—to impose its will on the employers. Much as they may dislike Marxism, the mechan-

ics of rival economic interests work with embarrassing consistency. Nevertheless, there is a widespread realization of the nature of Stalinism, and of the vital need to develop the aspect of democratic control as a counter to the tendency toward bureaucratism.

"BEVANISM" GROWING

As in all social-democratic movements, a period in office breeds conservatism and inertia. Rearmament is increasing the profits share of the national income (32.9 per cent in 1949; 37.8 in 1951) while the working class share tends to decline (50 per cent in 1951). The philosophy of the Labor leaders is to remain content with making the private sector a useful servant, and obey the wishes of the government; and underneath the surface the Norwegian equivalent of "Bevanism" is growing, both in Parliament and particularly in the Labor League of Youth.

There is no doubt that given a lead from one of the major countries—particularly Britain, which is studied very carefully—the entire Scandinavian movement would be galvanized into action. In the meantime we have to rest content with the knowledge that in Norway we have a very advanced and cultured movement only too well aware of its own limitations, and refreshingly independent and democratic in its general structure.

A Peasant-Eye View of Marxism —

(Continued from page 6)

he notes, who was not "anti-peasant," presumably, put off giving the land to the peasants, while those terrible dogmatic Marxists of Lenin's "at once handed over the land by decree to the peasants." Amazing!

He comments: "There was indeed not much else that Lenin could do"—pressure, you know, and all that. Somehow, however, Kerensky did find something else to do, namely, resist the peasants' demands. Somehow, the Pilsudski regime in Poland found something else to do despite the pressure, namely, it "passed a bill in great haste when the Bolshevik armies were approaching, but after victory the ruling group held back again and all idea of radical reform was definitely shelved after Pilsudski's coup in 1925."

How come then it was the "dogmatically anti-peasant" Marxists who gave the land to the peasants while other movements which claimed to speak for the peasants betrayed them time and again? One would think that a professor would delay writing a book until he had figured out this little discrepancy between his thesis and history. Perhaps Mitrany thinks he is saying something to the point when he ascribes all pro-peasant acts by Marxists to "opportunism" and all anti-peasant acts by other leaders to betrayal.

FAILURE OF THE PEASANT MOVEMENTS

By far the most interesting portion of Mitrany's book is the third part on "The Peasant Revolution"—the upsurge of peasant parties and movements following the First World War, and their failure. Especially because of the way it reflects back on his anti-Marxist tirades. It will be worth while to quote from it, for this reason and for its own sake.

As we have already mentioned, everybody is against the peasant, as far as Mitrany's real viewpoint is concerned. "Everybody?" Well, all the real social forces of urban, industrial, capitalist society. It is not only the Marxists who disparage the "idiotism of rural life."

In his Part III, however, Mitrany is dealing with the efforts of people he likes, the peasant movements themselves, unburdened by the "dogmatism" of the Marxists. And what do we find in his own account, which we follow faithfully since we are neither capable nor desirous of disputing his history?

First of all, here again we find that the impetus to the movement even of the "authentic" peasant leaders came from—the Russian Revolution. We have already quoted his reference to the pressure of the revolution on the Polish regime. On page 102 he refers again to "the acute popular pressure which followed the Russian Revolution." On page 119 he notes that "The Russian Revolution had aroused the political consciousness of the peasants. . . . At the very end of his book he says that this "peasant revolution" had "come about after 1919 as an indirect effect of the Russian Revolution."

Typically, then, the peasantry was set into motion in the post-war period by the revolutionary movement of the working class. Does Mitrany see any meaning in this historic pattern? Not a bit. We can only be grateful that he parenthetically notes the fact if only in passing.

What were the results of his vaunted "green rising" and why did it fail to change the lot of the peasants? The peasants, in the tail of the proletarian revolutionary upsurges, developed unprecedented political organization and activity—futilely, as long as they stayed within the framework of the social system which crushed them.

"THE GREEN RISING"

Summarizing the effect of peasant reforms in Eastern Europe after 1919, Mitrany laments that these reforms "were never enacted as agricultural reforms but simply as measures for dividing up the land." But this did not solve the problem of "rural overcrowding," and "In spite of their sweep the reforms could not give land to all."

The new Eastern European governments "displayed an astonishing neglect of agriculture and its workers." The peasant economy was distorted because, although best fitted for dairy farming and market gardening, the governments insisted on pushing cereal production, which, says Mitrany, was "unnatural." (Honestly! Mitrany does not discuss why the governments wanted grain. . . .)

"In general the tendency was to leave agriculture to manage as best it could while granting favors of all sorts to industrial activities."

"After being given land cheaply the peasants were made to pay for it several times over by such indirect means; they escaped the exploitation of the landlords only to fall into the stepmotherly tutelage of the mercantilist state." (That term, mercantilist state, is rich: he is delicate enough never to mention that the class forces into whose hands the peasants fell were those of the capitalist classes.) He quotes a Rumanian on the post-war situation: "The situation which before the [land] reform existed on the land, where a number of latifundary [big landholding] owners retained the greater part of the agricultural revenue, has now been transferred to the domain of trade and industry."

And so "the eastern land reforms did not provide the start of an economic advance and . . . agricultural output fell, though the area under cultivation had increased." He laments that "certain groups" favored "capitalist industrialization" instead of aiding the peasantry, without even raising the question as to why they followed this policy.

In his chapter "The Green Rising," under the impress of his sad story, he actually virtually repeats the Marxist analysis of the inherent political incapacity of the peasantry as a class in our modern world, after all his denunciation of Marx's disparagement of his beloved class! "The peasants were aroused, but what were they capable of as a class? Political revolution did not come naturally to them." When they rebelled it was against immediate abuses and director tormentors "while they looked upon

king and government rather as courts of appeal. They never thought of changing their status except by orderly means. . . ." (He is really speaking here of the peasant leaders.)

Further: "Socialism had indeed a set and confident doctrine before it had an organized following. [But the peasant groups] grew into a movement while its doctrine was still in the making." As a matter of fact, the peasant movement never found a program, because there was no such animal in the modern world, that is, no peculiarly peasant program which could solve their problems on the basis of maintaining essentially the old ways. One might imagine that Mitrany would think that this absence of "dogmatism" was a good thing (no program—no dogma), but he ruefully has to ascribe the failure of the movement to it.

"Nor were the country people as easily stirred by general ideas or as easily organized. They did not find it as simple as the workers to fight for themselves or to find champions elsewhere; while the radical movements bent upon putting an end to autocratic or privileged rule through political action, and needing mass support for it, naturally found it more readily among the congested agglomerations of industrial workers." What is Mitrany talking about here if not some consequences of "the idioty of rural life?"

TURNING BACK THE CLOCK

And so the peasants were defeated and rooked and betrayed from all sides. They could not become an independent political force. They could be historically effective when they threw their weight to allies who led them: the revolutionary working class, as in Russia, or—the fascist reaction. With reluctant pen, Mitrany has to admit how the reactionary-utopian aspirations of the peasant masses came to be utilized by the fascists, like the Rumanian Iron Guard, like the Hitler Nazis, like the Vichyite collaborators of the Nazis during the last war, who demagogically spoke the language of the peasant ideologists who wanted to repudiate industrialism, urban civilization and the ways of modern civilization.

For what emerges from Mitrany's very dogmatic defense of peasantism is the deeply reactionary nature of the populism which he constantly praises. It dreams in terms of turning the clock back to agrarian society, reversing or at least limiting the trends to industrialization, dreads the cities and towns and urban life in general, idealizes the peasant as a social product while it seems to speak in terms of defending his interests as a human being. Mitrany himself quotes these sentiments in bushel-fuls—and with benign favor, even though he never explicitly commits himself to agreement with these Neanderthalian social views.

In this way he willy-nilly adds the final explanation of why the peasant movements could never get anywhere. It also explains adequately enough why Mitrany's attempt to counterpose these ideologies to Marxism is so pitiful.

Stevenson Juggles with Civil Rights —

(Continued from page 1)
tempting to pose, as an "FEPC party," or at least some Republicans are.

We refer to the statement of the sixteen GOP "progressive" leaders, led by Governor Driscoll of New Jersey and Senators Irving Ives and Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., who declared that a Republican victory would hasten FEPC legislation. Such statements can embarrass Southern support which the Republicans have also been carefully cultivating, as they try to be many things to many potential supporters. Nevertheless, these backers of Eisenhower would place their candidate ahead of the Republican program on the civil rights issue.

Governor Stevenson, on the other hand, would seem on the basis of published interviews, to be somewhat lagging behind the Democratic program. According to the daily press, he backed Sparkman's contribution to the platform as "a national contribution, both in its craftsmanship and also in heading off any minority report to the committee." Stevenson is reported to favor the "substance without using words such as 'compulsion.'"

RETREATS ON PLANK

Stevenson was evasive at best on the matter of using his efforts to amend the Senate rules in order to have fair-practices legislation

passed more easily. "I do not know that I would. I should like very much to know more about that. My impression is that there are two sides to the problem of closure (limiting debate), and it would be a very dangerous thing indeed to limit debate in a parliamentary body in a democracy." He felt the Senate could administer its own rules in this regard. And further: "You could have filibuster, you could filibuster the anti-filibuster proposition. You could not even change the rule, for you could filibuster the effort to change. . . ." This argument is not far removed from statements heard from the filibusterers themselves in arguing for the retention of the filibuster weapon.

In this instance, it is Stevenson who is apparently retreating from his party's platform promise to stand by majority rule, a plank hailed by many as THE liberal victory in Chicago.

STRADDLING

But one must recall, when Ike is presented as an "FEPC candidate" by some members of his party, that Negro leaders have also assailed his testimony before Congress that he would not favor whites and Negroes in the same military units. One must also recall that Stevenson is trying to straddle all sections of the Democratic Party, which has striven and thus far succeeded in maintaining unity of North and South, Georgia and Mississippi having decided to go along with the party at this writing.

As if to counter the effects of those who charge that Stevenson is captive to the South and the machine bosses, he appointed Wilson Wyatt, former federal housing expediter and former head of Americans for Democratic Action, to be his campaign manager, and Arthur Schlesinger Jr., liberal historian and ADA leader, to help him with his speeches. Then,

to counter the charges that these appointments indicated he had been taken over by the "left wing," Stevenson replied that he knew very little about ADA and based the appointment on "competence" and "personal friendship."

Republican National Chairman Summerfield calls Wyatt the man who "tried to foist a program of socialized housing on the country." This approach is not likely to gain any popular support for the Republicans — even Senator Taft authored legislation which (quite wrongly) was denounced as "socialized housing" by other Republicans.

IKE WOOS TAFTITES

In the Republican camp, while the Eisenhower clubs, somewhat independent Republican formations outside the regular party machine, will be permitted to continue during the campaign, Senator Everett Dirksen, "the protégé of Chicago's Col. Robert R. McCormick," as the Alsops lament in the *Herald Tribune*, is now in the Eisenhower inner circle, Eisenhower's speakers' bureau is headed by Taft, Halleck and Mundt!

Eisenhower has pledged himself to support vigorously the whole lineup of Republican candidates, "me-tooers" and "troglodytes." In his statement to the Ohio Democratic Convention, Stevenson focused neatly on the problems this attitude presents the general:

"I wonder if he is well advised. What kind of crusade can unite Eisenhower and Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin, Eisenhower and Senator William E. Jenner of Indiana; Eisenhower and Senator James P. Kern of Missouri; Eisenhower and Senator John W. Bricker of Ohio? . . ."

On the other hand, Republican columnist David Lawrence points out, with equal relevance, that this is a delicate matter for Stevenson to talk about, referring to

course to the right-wing Dixiecrat, Dixiegot and McCarran-type candidates who will be running on the same ticket with Stevenson.

The *New York Times*, which has endorsed Eisenhower, points out that if Eisenhower "were to oppose the re-election of so-called isolationist senators who won their party nominations before he even entered the presidential race, he would, under present circumstances, be asking for the election of a Democratic Senate." It is equally true that the carrying out of Eisenhower's program would mean control of Congress by Senator Taft and Joe Martin.

The Alsops state that Eisenhower plans to give the "silent treatment" to both McCarthy and Jenner, by not appearing in their states and by warning of the "dangers of hatemongering and character assassination." Whether this is wishful thinking or whether at least this act of elementary political sanitation will be carried out is still to be seen.

DEMS vs. GOP

There is also indication that at least some of the Republican campaigners will call Stevenson to task for his testimony presented in the Hiss trial. Senator Dirksen has already attempted to make a campaign issue of "Communists" and homosexuals in the State Department.

In his message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Los Angeles, Stevenson condemned "those who would turn us from the enemy to the pursuit of phantoms among us." His staff reports that he refers to McCarthy and McCarthyism and that he is likely "to meet this issue."

The greater role of the labor movement in the Democratic Party and the adherence of the liberal, urban, and minority groups to it give it greater vitality and account for its "progress-

sivism" in relation to the Republicans. The conservative mood of the country, the war economy and the role of the U. S. in world affairs account for the displacement to the "right" of this party. The radical slogans (such as the one about the \$25,000 ceiling on incomes) are part of the past. Its campaign is likely to rest on the current prosperity, generally full employment, high profits, pensions, the past steps of the New Deal and Fair Deal in social legislation, the slogan of repeal of Taft-Hartley, anti-McCarthyism and its foreign policy.

OVERRIDING ISSUE

The overriding issue—and it is so even if both candidates say so and both agree on general principles—is the war, the peculiar "police action" in Korea which is regarded as a kind of "preventive war," and the threatening third world war. This is the overriding issue in domestic affairs, affecting as it does wages, prices, profits, the rights of labor, the rights of racial minorities, the rights of political minorities, the power of government. Internationally, it determines U. S. relations with the rest of the world and the well-being of the rest of the world.

Both candidates and both platforms become vaporous on the issue of war and peace. The Democrats make a sortie in the direction of Point 4 and the United Nations, but basically rely upon force and remilitarization. Neither has a program for peace.

Peace—and real security and prosperity which depend upon it—must await the emergence of new forces.

It is to be hoped that the involvement of the labor leaders in the councils of the Democratic Party will teach them the severe limitations of playing capitalist politics and hasten the emergence of new forces in an independent labor party.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION

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.

Leon Trotsky's

"STALIN"

The definitive biography of the Kremlin's master

This book is out of print, but we have a number of copies available for \$6.00

Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

Labor Action FORUM • New York

THURSDAY EVENINGS at 8:30 p.m.

AUGUST 14

Ben Hall

reviews

"The God That Failed"

at
LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, New York City

Steel Deal Won't Bring New Era —

(Continued from page 1)

But in this case, as in all strikes for such wage demands, the strikers and their union have to judge whether a longer strike could have won more and, if so, whether the possible gains would outweigh the sacrifices in energy and income.

LOADED GUN

But if the union at least evaluates the strike in economic terms, it makes no effort to examine the political and social background of the settlement and their implications.

The big steel monopolies won increases of \$5.20 to \$5.60 a ton in the price of steel. These increases were ordered direct from the White House as part of the settlement, even though Pres-

ident Truman had told the country weeks before that steel profits were at unprecedented levels. Roger L. Putnam, Economic Stabilization Administrator, bitterly denounced the companies for holding a "loaded gun" to the government's head to get higher prices and added that the increases in prices "exceed stabilization policy."

The steel increase was quickly followed by increases in the price of aluminum, both destined to add hundreds of dollars a year to the cost of living. The CIO Political Action Committee in its weekly report treads very gingerly over this very important question. "The steel industry gave up its demand for a price increase of \$12 a ton," it reported and adds non-committally: "and instead will receive a boost of \$5.20 a ton on carbon steel with raises on other grades running up to \$5.60 a ton." The CIO has insisted on price controls. What happened in this case? If the union can claim a victory even though it did not win its full demands, can the steel companies claim a victory in their price demands?

WAGE-FREEZE BOARD

The Wage Stabilization Board intervened in negotiations and issued recommendations which the union found highly satisfactory. When the companies precipi-

tated the strike by refusing to accept this suggestion, Truman seized the mills. But he refused to institute the conditions of work called for by his own wage board. And as punishment for its role in this case, Congress proceeded to strip the board of all power to intervene in industrial disputes and transformed the board once again into a body whose exclusive function is to hold down wages.

In 1950-51 the whole labor movement fought a bitter struggle against the board as then constituted. One of its key demands was for the transformation of the wage board from a purely wage-freeze committee into a board which could consider all union demands. The steel strike has come and gone. Now the Wage Stabilization Board is back to where it was in 1950.

WHITTLING AWAY

Its sole function right now is to veto wage increases where it sees fit. In an editorial on July 30, hailing the decision to strip the board of its "disputes" functions, the *New York Times* outlines the future course of labor relations. It anticipates the appointment of special government mediation committees to intervene in labor disputes.

By reading between the lines we get a hint of what is

to come: (1) the union maps out its demands; (2) a special mediation board suggests that it compromise away some of its demands; (3) the compromise goes to the Wage Stabilization Board which (as in its early days) cuts away more in the interests of "stabilization"; (4) if the companies are still not satisfied, they, like the steel companies, tell the assorted committees to go fly a kite; (5) the compromised compromise is then finally compromised.

The United Automobile Workers Union appealed to the CIO for a boycott of the Wage Stabilization Board. It is obvious that if labor was "window dressing" in 1950 it will be window dressing in 1952. If the big fight that culminated in labor's withdrawal from all war boards was justified, how justify collaboration with a board whose status reverts to that of 1950?

The UAW has no representative on the newly constituted, dehydrated board. But the CIO and AFL have decided to take their seats. Like Murray, they are seeking peace. But all are doomed to disappointment. When labor is amenable and yielding, its enemies see only weakness. And so do its peculiar "friends." Such are the sad facts of life with labor and employers.