

STUDENT SOCIALIST

FEBRUARY 16, 1953

STUDENT-YOUTH SECTION of LABOR ACTION

FIVE CENTS

McCarthy's Shadow Over the Schools

By SAM FELIKS

The Congressional open season on investigation into alleged subversive activities in the schools and colleges starts with the spring semester. In friendly rivalry to see who would lead the witchhunters, Senator Joe McCarthy reluctantly yielded the first crack at headline-hunting to his competitors, Senator William Jenner of the Senate Judiciary Committee and Representative Harold Velde of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The scope of the present congressional investigations appears to be much wider than past inquiries into Stalinist activities at least in the educational field. There have been the almost casual statements by these reactionaries that the investigations will seek out the "Communists and Communist-type thinkers." It is especially the inclusion of the vague "Communist-type thinkers" which indicates that the assault on academic freedom is being enlarged.

The question of what is a "Communist-type thinker" is a broadly dropped hint by Senator McCarthy that he is not merely concerned with Stalinists. A "Communist-type-thinker" to Joe McCarthy is a liberal or an anti-Stalinist radical given the studied avoidance of clear definition, the term could be and is easily expanded to include any critic of the existing social institutions, including even the mildest reformers.

The news of the impending investigations has produced a pall of anxiety among those concerned with education and academic freedom. Even those who have formally welcomed the inquiries have expressed doubt about the need for them and have pointed to their dangerous consequences to the educational system and the country.

VELDE ADMITS

This position was forthrightly stated by the retired president of Harvard University (now U. S. high commissioner to Germany), James B. Conant:

"There are no known adherents to the party on our staff, and I do not believe there are any disguised Communists either. But even if there were, the damage that would be done to the spirit of this academic community by an investigation of the university aimed at finding a crypto-Communist would be far greater than any conceivable harm such a person might do."

Representative Harold Velde, an ex-FBI agent, candidly proclaimed the reactionary point of view:

"It's a lot better to wrongly accuse one person of being a Communist than to allow so many to get away with such Communist acts as those that have brought us to the brink of World War 3."

And as a further demonstration of this judicious approach, ex-agent Velde implies the disloyalty of anyone who opposes his investigation. "It's true that 99 and 9/10ths per cent of the professors and students in American colleges today are loyal, but it's the other element that is protesting

the proposed investigations. . . ."

It is not necessary to go far afield to realize the effect of a search for "crypto-Communists" or "Communist-type thinkers" on dissident points of view, on free discussion and expression of opinion, especially if it is conducted by a man who beforehand announces lack of concern for innocently accused individuals.

The investigations into the schools and colleges, which started out to drive the Stalinists from the educational system, now are beginning to bare the other edge of the sword. It is admittedly to be directed also against non-Communist Party teachers.

These congressional hunting expeditions are spearheaded by forces holding reactionary and authoritarian attitudes on education. Under cover of going after the "Communists and Communist-type thinkers," reactionary economic interests, professional pa-

triotis and those who want to indoctrinate students with religious education seek to impose their views on all educational institutions.

RIGHTISTS PUSH

These are the groups that represent the clear and present danger today. The Stalinists are presently an insignificant minority in the teaching profession, with less influence than they have ever had. To consider the problem of academic freedom today to be Stalinist distortion of the educational process does not come to grips with the real danger to academic freedom, and even to the public educational system, from right-wing reactionaries.

Under the guise of their denunciation of Stalinist attempts to convince or indoctrinate students, these conservative groups are pushing their own indoctrination program to the conservative and chauvinist point of view. These reactionaries are no more interested in a free and democratic education, aiming at teaching a student to think critically and intelligently of the world about them, than are the Stalinists.

WHAT THEY WANT

The importance of the investigation of "Communist-type thinkers" and "crypto-Communists" is that these conservative and reactionary groups are gunning for liberal and democratic thinkers in education. Perhaps the current expeditions will not openly reveal their full intent by attacking

known liberals, perhaps they will be content for the moment with known Stalinists and their sympathizers, but the signposts are up for all who care to see. The ouster of Dean Lenz of Queens College in New York City, known for his activity in ADA and the Liberal Party, in the spring of 1952, due to the pressure of the American Legion and the Catholic War Veterans, should illustrate the point.

Groups such as Allan Zoll's National Council of American Education, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, Catholic War Veterans and the American Economic Foundation have long fought for a conservative economic, chauvinist and religious orientation in education. They believe, by and large, in the "agent" theory of education. That is, the teacher is the agent of the society and as such should be expected to indoctrinate the students to the dominant social institutions.

They believe that the teacher should indoctrinate loyalty to the status quo. Some are opposed to public education; they want to emphasize flag drills and the daily ritual of singing patriotic songs; they want religious education and daily prayers in the public schools, a "return to the Three Rs," the teaching of conservative economic ideas, and they oppose social science that emphasizes progress and change in existing institutions.

While not all of these groups push all of these ideas, there certainly is no widespread disagree-

ment among them. Together they form a conservative and reactionary spur behind the current investigations. From their point of view they are opposed to the liberals as well as the Stalinists.

THE SUSPECTS

A liberal educator, who believes that education should not teach loyalty to existing institutions but loyalty to democratic ideals and that the main emphasis should be on how to teach the student to think critically, is certainly suspect in their eyes. And if the educator also believes and teaches that a democratic education serves as a way of institutionalizing "revolution through peaceful change" to a better society, then such an educator is more than suspect in their eyes. Some might even go so far as to call him a "Communist-type thinker."

The liberal who entertains such ideas is put in the same bag with those who believe in collectivism. The attacks directed against the New Deal and Fair Deal as "creeping socialism on the road to crawling Communism" is also intended as an attack against this educational theory. The McCarthy's, the McCarrans, the Velde and the Jenners more or less agree with this basic idea. Their basic opposition to Stalinism is on the grounds of a conservative economic and social outlook which tends to lump liberals, socialists and Stalinists into the same "collectivist" bag.

To these reactionary forces the

(Continued on 4-5)

The Know-Nothings of 1953 Who's Behind the Attack on the Public Schools?

By DON HARRIS

Under the sponsorship of the National Student Association, Academic Freedom Week is being celebrated for the first time this year. The idea of such a week, during which student organizations would draw the attention of the entire campus to the problem of academic freedom, is an excellent one particularly in times such as these when the basic idea of academic freedom is being attacked on all sides.

Even as academic Freedom Week is about to begin, the actual start of the long-awaited congressional hearings into "Communism in the colleges" is announced. These hearings undoubtedly represent the most serious threat to academic freedom, which is why we give a most prominent place to a discussion of them and of the rationalizations which are today being used to defend them as "proper procedure."

But at the same time there are other forces at work, expressing the same tendency in the direction of stifling freedom of thought within the schools and harnessing them to the "national interests." These threats strike at every section of our educational institutions.

LABOR ACTION, in its regular Youth and Student Column, has carried news of such "incidents" as the banning of UNESCO material from the Los Angeles public schools, of the firing of teachers in various cities, and of various other aspects of the academic witchhunt. In this issue of the *Student Socialist* we can only cite a few additional instances,

and comment upon the total significance of the entire trend.

In addition to the congressional inquiry by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor (dealt with elsewhere in this issue) probably the most serious attack on our schools—as they have been traditionally administered—is taking place on the elementary and high school level.

For several years now organizations devoted to attacking the concepts and principles of "progressive education" have been feeding upon the public hysteria about anything "communist," and by linking modern educational practices with "communism" have mounted an attack on the public school system.

REAL AIMS

Naturally, the real aims and forces behind such movements are not confined to those of zealous patriots seeking in their own way to eradicate totalitarian ideology or even to instill "Americanism" into school children. Such patriotic (chauvinistic would be a more proper term) sentiments are utilized in the attack on the

schools, and the attack is for the most part conducted under their banner, but basically it reflects entirely different and much less reputable motivations.

Among such organized groups (and it is organized effort which created the "Pasadena Case" and the "Englewood Incident") the National Council for American Education is both typical and prominent. Superficially, perhaps, such an organization might seem to represent nothing more than a new career for its "leader," Allan Zoll.

It is true that, for Zoll personally, the organization is little more than a racket—the type of racket that his previous organization represented and the same as many

(Continued on 4-5)

STUDENT SOCIALIST

Section of LABOR ACTION

Published for the
SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

The Columbia 'Spectator' Takes a Poll

By JACK STUART

NEW YORK, Feb. 7.—The coming "investigations into Communism" on the campus have raised anew the question of whether "Communists have the right to teach," and, with it, what the actual practice is with respect to known or suspected Stalinist professors.

On Friday, January 9, the Columbia University undergraduate college newspaper, the *Columbia Spectator*, devoted some four pages in a special supplement to a survey of Communists teaching in the seven Ivy League schools as well as its sister college Barnard. This survey was initiated by the staff of the *Spectator*, which sent questionnaires to the staffs of the undergraduate newspapers at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, Dartmouth and Cornell, which together with Columbia form the so-called Ivy League.

In general the report concludes that there are no known members of the Communist Party on the faculties of these universities.

Be that as it may, the most interesting results of the survey do not concern the actual presence or absence of Stalinist teachers, but the attitudes toward the problem by administrators and the student newspaper staffs. Here we will summarize the results.

HARVARD: The oldest school in the Ivy League and the one with the longest and best tradition of academic freedom leads our list. Harvard's recent president, James B. Conant, has stated that "I certainly would not hire a Communist professor, for I believe that a Communist by the nature of the organized conspiracy to which he belongs is an incapable teacher." With regard to whether or not Harvard would hire teachers who had been "under fire as alleged Communists" the *Harvard Crimson* declined to say what would be done. (With regard to President Conant, many liberals feel that by accepting the job as high commissioner in Germany Conant is going to a calmer birth for himself during the troubled days of congressional investigations ahead.)

BOHM CASE

PRINCETON: This university is next on our list because it was the only one of the seven to suspend a member of its faculty because of "alleged Communist associations."

In December 1950 Princeton professor of physics David Joseph Bohm was suspended from the Princeton faculty because he was indicted by a federal grand jury for contempt of Congress. This indictment resulted from Bohm's refusal to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee regarding alleged Communist activity at the University of California during the last war. He was acquitted of this charge by a federal court but he was never reinstated.

The *Princetonian* is rather naive when it states that "it was impossible to directly relate this fact [Bohm's failure to be returned to the staff at Princeton] to his indictment since his three-year term here expired while he was suspended." It is interesting to note that this man was unable to obtain a staff appointment at any other college in the United States and is currently in Brazil (where the State Department has relieved him of his passport).

While Bohm's case was never made into a cause célèbre it was a very important battle in the current fight for academic freedom which the McCarthy-McCarthy opposition won by default. It is impossible not to believe that Bohm's contract was let go because there was some question as to his affiliations at some time past.

Finally, the *Princetonian* said it would "certainly not favor the university's hiring a Communist teacher merely to have a different viewpoint on the faculty," as if any serious person ever suggested this.

YALE: The *Yale Daily News* on the other hand stated in an editorial that "a Communist professor might under certain circumstances be a most worthwhile addition to the faculty in just the same way that Yale benefited from the presence of a Jesuit professor of philosophy. . . ." This paper also said that "a teacher must be judged on his teaching competence in his field and on that alone . . . the assumption that all Communists are incompetent teachers is unproved and dangerous . . ."—an interesting contrast to President Conant's statement mentioned earlier.

On the other hand, former President Charles Seymore of Yale has stated that if he ever found a Communist on the faculty he would fire him, and President A. W. Griswold has been quoted as having the same position.

OTHER COLLEGES

CORNELL: This university has formulated no clear-cut policy on Communist teachers; however, the university faculty, which has considerable power in hiring and firing, has passed a resolution which states that any member of the staff who advocated overthrow of the government by force or violence is guilty of misconduct! Of course any staff member guilty of misconduct may be dismissed.

The *Cornell Sun*, however, feels that the university would support any staff member "under fire."

The situation at the University of Pennsylvania and Dartmouth is much the same. At the former, the president must submit an annual report stating that there are no Communists on the staff; however, there is no individual loyalty oath as such. At Dartmouth there is no formal policy to exclude Communists.

Finally we come to Columbia and Barnard Colleges. In March 1952 the trustees at Columbia stated that they "would not countenance the presence of an avowed Communist on the faculty." However, no administrative action has been taken against anthropology instructor Dr. Gene A. Weltfish, who has been accused of being a Communist several times and has refused to answer questions by a congressional investigating committee.

Two other Columbia staff mem-

bers who have been "under fire" are Walter Gelhorn, professor of law, and Dr. Philip Jessup, professor of international law, and no action against them has been taken by the trustees.

SPECTATOR'S IDEA

In their own summary and comment upon these results the editors of the *Spectator* advance a novel (and perhaps naive) idea. They suggest that the trustees of Columbia (and presumably all other institutions of higher learning) reverse their formal stand against hiring Communist teachers, and "let college presidents and administrators announce which of their teachers are Communists. Then we avoid the danger of students being influenced by men who hide their real sympathies."

And further: "These Communist teachers should not be fired. They should be kept on the rolls of the faculty. Such a policy would permit students to come into contact with favorable statements of the Communist program."

While such a proposal demonstrates the desire of its authors to defend the essential principles of academic freedom, it also concedes that teachers adjudged to be "Communist" (presumably against their own claims) should be singled out—after a "trial," perhaps—for administrative labeling. It concedes to them, it is true, the right to hold their views and still remain on the faculty; but in turn it subjects them a special "listing" as suspect characters.

The attack on the right of Stalinists to teach comes principally from those who declare the ideas of Stalinism to be incompatible with democracy. With this we certainly agree, without thereby declaring it sufficient grounds for dismissal. For in the first place there are many other types of views held by teachers which would endanger democracy if carried into practice, or actually do constitute an anti-democratic threat—the views, for example, of the Jesuit professor at Yale.

Then there are scientists who, as scientists or as citizens, uphold the theory or practice of racial superiority. There are Catholics who "in advance and without investigation" grant the Church the right to determine truth in certain areas.

And the more "orthodox" believe in (and teach, as they must if they are good Catholics) the replacement of the American constitutional system by a hierarchically ruled theocracy.

LABELS

The "problem," however, at least for exponents of academic freedom as a basic democratic ideal, is who is to decide what ideas constitute a threat to democracy, and what shall be used as criteria? If "card-holding membership" is the basis for firing, there are likely to be few found who can be persuaded to display their card upon request. And if anything less stringent is proposed, who is to be endowed with the power to decide whether or not a teacher is really a "Communist"?

The difficulty with granting on anyone this power is that once granted, that power can be used against any individual or ideological tendency and the principle of academic freedom becomes freedom for all who are believed by the enabling authority to be "safe" and innocuous in their political and economic ideas.

The proposal to establish any kind of "listing" (along the lines of the *Spectator's* editorial) also involves the same danger: establishment of an authority which is delegated to ideologically screen all faculty members for the purpose of putting a label on them. But if it can label "Communists," what is to prevent such an authority from arrogating to itself the privilege of also labeling "atheists," "deists," "creeping-socialists," "New Deal bureaucrats," "pacifists," persons unfriendly to business and the "American Way of Life," and so forth?

And once the label has been established, who is to say that faculty tenure is secure in any case, much less that of any "Communist"? We doubt if many teachers would wish to exchange their present security for such a doubtful status.

FALLACY

One fallacy in the proposal rests upon the idea that a Stalinist professor is "dangerous" because his position is "concealed" or "hidden." It is implied that somehow he is able insidiously to

influence his students while (say) pretending merely to an interest in English literature. It is assumed that the student ought to be "protected" against him by being put in a position to distinguish his real views hidden in his lectures; that otherwise, he will be able to "poison" his students' minds by stealthy indirection, etc.

It is certainly true that Stalinist teachers in a variety of subjects can "angle" their instruction in accordance with their views. It is not less true that every other teacher does so also, and that among those who do so most blatantly are often those who are most reactionary in their social ideology. In any case, "listing" serves not so much to "protect" the student (the very notion of such "protection" would deserve some discussion in itself) but to prejudice the student against listening with an open critical mind of his own.

Moreover, just how much "poison" a Stalinist teacher can inculcate into his students by such insinuating methods—under conditions where the vast majority of the latter's other instructors are "safe and sound"—is also a question: One may ask "Just what are you afraid of?"

The fact is that it is not practically possible for a Stalinist teacher to really win students to his ideas except through more or less open presentation and discussion, and the same means are or should be available to the anti-Stalinist teachers (who are naturally much more numerous too!). From the point of view of effectively fighting Stalinist ideas, the answer is not less academic freedom but more: open confrontation of ideas and their full discussion in the classrooms and in extra-curricular activities wherever they relevantly appear.

From this point of view, we agree with the judgment of the *Yale Daily News* that "a teacher must be judged on his teaching competence in his field and on that alone . . . the assumption that all Communists are incompetent teachers is unproved and dangerous."

It is no contradiction to add: although a teacher must be judged for competence as an individual, there can be a relationship between his competence and his Stalinist views in individual cases; but the criterion must still be competence.

Detroit: We Get a Look Into the Mechanics of a Case Of 'Anti-Red' Hysteria in a City's Public School System

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Feb. 8.—Considering the times and the mood of American society today, the following story must surely be classified as a variation of the man-bites-dog theme in journalism.

Many Detroiters did the same double-take act last Friday as this writer, when he glanced at the headlines of the *Detroit Times*, a Hearst newspaper here. In big double-banner headlines the *Times* said, "No Evidence of Reds in Detroit's Schools." A bright red caption overhead emphasized: "U. S. Probers Admit." The subhead of the story read: "Senate Group Under Fire: Backs Down."

And the story underneath, thanks to the energetic drive of the Detroit Federation of Teachers against witchhunting, was as amazing as the headlines. It told of two official expeditions to Washington, D. C., to get information on the recent claims of the Senate Internal Security subcommittee that between 100 to 200 Detroit teachers are "reds."

One expedition consisted of Police Commissioner Don Leonard, School Board Attorney Clarence E. Page, and Arthur Neff, provost of Wayne University. The other consisted of Mary E. Kastead, executive secretary of the Detroit Federation of Teachers, who ar-

rived at the same time but conducted her investigation separately.

Everywhere the Detroiters went, they were told, "We never said that," referring to the wild charges about the Detroit school teachers.

Finally Mrs. Kastead traced the whole thing down, and this is how it all began, thanks to Senator Homer Ferguson of Michigan who conducted the hearings in New York City in September 1952.

THE SOURCE

On September 8, 1952, during the interrogation of Bella V. Dodd, Senator Ferguson asked, "In what cities have you attended conventions and operated with Communists of those cities in the school system?"

Mrs. Dodd: "Philadelphia, New York, Buffalo, Madison (Wisc.), Cleveland, Cedar Rapids, Boston."

Senator Ferguson: "Have you ever been in Michigan?"

Mrs. Dodd: "Yes, I was in Detroit twice. We had a convention in 1940 and 1941."

Senator Ferguson: "Did you find any Communists there?"

Mrs. Dodd: "There were some."

Senator Ferguson: "That co-operated in these caucuses?"

Mrs. Dodd: "Yes."

The Detroit delegation found out that from that unsubstantiated tes-

timony, the Senate committee admits, came the Internal Security subcommittee report of last January 2, which touched off the Detroit furor with this statement:

"Testimony before the committee indicated specifically that Communist activity took place among teachers in Philadelphia, Boston, Cleveland, Detroit, Buffalo and Madison, Wisc., as well as reflecting the certainty of substantial Communist activity among teachers in other areas."

The Senate subcommittee denied it had ever mentioned a number of suspected Communists in Detroit schools and admitted it had no secret evidence.

Police Commissioner Leonard declared, "We have found nothing, but we believe this trip was worthwhile because it at least clears up the idea that Congress has any concrete evidence against Detroit teachers."

Mrs. Kastead criticized the sensational publicity arising from the report of the Senate subcommittee and said:

"I have come here from Detroit to demand proof of the charges that have undermined the public's confidence in its teachers and even created suspicion of their teachers among the children.

"We want to know on what authority and what evidence the

Senate subcommittee publicized this damaging report. This is America where the innocent are supposed to be protected from blanket accusations, and where all are innocent until proved guilty.

"Detroit has been shocked by newspaper headlines charging that many Communists (50 to 100) teach in their schools. On Monday, February 2, schools were named as having Communist teachers on their staff!"

It began to appear as if one man in Detroit, as well as the Senate subcommittee, was responsible for the persistent reappearance of the Communist scare stories, and this individual is getting into hot water. He is George Schudlich, chairman of Detroit's Loyalty Board, created by Mayor Albert Cobo two years ago to start a witchhunt. It appears that he fed Detroit's papers with the "information" about the specific schools with "red" teachers.

UNSAVORY RECORD

Not only has this been disproved by the Washington expeditions, but it seems that Schudlich has a record which needs special investigation. Last Thursday night, Guy Nunn, UAW-CIO radio commentator, broadcast a brief biography of this individual, and brought up the startling fact that he had been

(Continued on 4-5)

U. of Chi. Groups Unite On Civil Liberties Fight

By BILL HICKOK

CHICAGO, Feb. 7.—For the last two weeks the students of the University of Chicago have again demonstrated their capacity for energetic response to assaults upon their political and academic rights. In that period they have re-established their All-Campus Civil Liberties Committee and brought its membership up to no less than 125 members.

The occasion for this activity was the announced intention of Senator McCarthy and Representative Velde to turn their talents to exposing and neutralizing "Communist thinkers" on the campuses and in the faculties of some of the nation's major universities and the recurrent threat of state legislation similar to the Broyles bills of two years ago. What the ACCLC will do about this threat, what tactics and political outlook it will employ, and what sort of leaders it will elect, are now the central questions that consume the interests and energies of the politically alert on the campus.

They are also questions that pose important problems, for which some political understanding is necessary. This is particularly the case in the perennial question of the group's relationship to the Stalinists.

CAUCUS VOTE

At its meeting of January 28, the ACCLC demonstrated at once its potential for a concerted civil liberties fight and its limitations in developing a satisfactory direction and leadership. The former was apparent as the result of seven hours of debate on the rules of the organization. The limitations appeared with the election of the two executive officers.

Here the classic dilemma of campus politics presented itself. Only two candidates were possible: one an activist from the liberal Independent Students League, the other a member of the new coalition (Student Representative Party—SRP) of Stalinists with those uncritical of the Stalinists. In light of the Stalinists' fight for "freedom of action" on the rules debate and the independent character of the (in this case, non-Stalinist) SRP candidate, the election of Matt Dillon of the Independent Students League was distinctly the lesser evil.

The strictly caucus-line vote by which he won and the absence of any candidate of an anti-Stalinist socialist character is the lamentable circumstance of the election. It means that the non-Stalinist and temperamentally leftist elements of SRP, the very individuals who should be playing an independent role, were driven more solidly into a caucus alignment where only the Stalinists provide a directing force. It means they were driven there for the wrong reasons—for reasons of the personnel in the leadership of ACCLC.

RULES FIGHT

The development in the vote on the rules held more signs of hope. It is from this that the non-Stalinist "radicals" of SRP and the non-machine liberal followers of the Independent Students League alike have something to learn.

The rules struggle centered around defining the relation between represented student organizations and ACCLC. The recom-

mendation of the majority of the rules committee provided that member organizations and individual members designated by petition of ACCLC would have to register plans with the steering committee for any independent activities and policy statements within the area of competence of ACCLC. If the steering committee disapproved of plans for policy statements to be distributed off campus or independent activities on or off campus, and such plans were carried out in spite of its decision, a majority of the ACCLC quorum could expel the member in question.

No limitations were placed on any group's right to write or distribute propaganda or hold a meeting on campus. At least such an interpretation was possible before debate started.

The rules committee minority, Stalinists plus "innocent" associates, submitted an "amendment" which simply wiped out the provision of Section VI. It prohibited any power to ACCLC to limit any activity of any student group carried out in its own name.

The motive of the amendment was clearly to give the Stalinists a free hand to employ any tactics in a campaign in their own interests without concern for the result for the rest of the campus. Throughout the debate, speakers for the amendment denounced the proposed rule because it supposedly stifled freedom of opinion.

The non-Stalinist supporters of the minority argued against the conservative, do-nothing "respectable" approach of the Independent Students League liberals. While their evaluation of the ISL is certainly valid, it had nothing to do with the point at issue, which was whether or not the ACCLC should have control over all student action for civil liberties. Their error was serious.

AMENDMENT WINS

The amazing development was the inability of four successive major spokesmen for Independent Students League, including the shortly-to-be-elected chairman, to answer the charges of infraction of freedom of speech. Yet freedom of criticism was clearly provided in Section VI.

Although unspoken on the floor, the motivation behind the views of several SRP endorsers of the minority recommendation was the old "unity" nonsense. They felt that no restrictions should be placed on the separate actions of a certain group so that ACCLC might be favored by their participation. This view, so far from being an effective means to maximize concerted campus effort, really militates against the idea of an all-campus representative action group to fight the witch-hunters. Such a group, it should go without saying, if it is to serve its function, must be empowered to assert its priority in the field.

The socialist Politics Club representative took the floor to denounce the accusations raised by the Stalinists and their associates as demagogic. He questioned, as well, the objectives of the Independent Students League people who were so consistently incapable of providing the proper interpretation of their own rules in their replies to the minority; and he pointed out that their behavior required that the majority report be amended to make explicit a guarantee of freedom of criticism. He advocated defeat of the minority amendment on the ground that those groups (obviously the LYL) who promised not to take any action outside of the spirit of ACCLC but opposed formal discipline by ACCLC were irresponsible to the only representative action group on campus. The amendment was defeated 74-49 on the same caucus lines that elected the chairman.

However, an interesting shift occurred when an amendment by the

Politics Club representative specifically reserving the right of groups to publish and distribute opinion and hold meetings on campus was accepted 56-52, this time with the support of the Stalinoid caucus and of independent liberals drawn away from the Independent Students League over the opposing vote of the ISL core.

On no other point was the political character of every tendency more clearly shown. The "innocents" of the minority were overjoyed. This was "all that they wanted." No Stalinist was overheard saying the same thing. They were left no alternative but to support the amendment or abstain. If any of them retain any notion at this time of pulling out of ACCLC, as some did at the time of the defeat of the minority amendment, they must also realize the act would be suicidal.

The great conservative development of the Independent Students League in the past year is all too clearly evident now from their indefensible vote on the Politics Club amendment. For that reason, the election of Matt Dillon must be considered only a poor lesser evil and not evaluated, as one would have done in the past—namely as the proper democratic liberal alternative to Stalinist personnel in the absence of a socialist alternative.

The Politics Club did not come to this ACCLC, as it did to the last, as the center of an organized-socialist caucus, capable of influencing and moving an independent democratic segment of the liberals. Then, at least, it had a reliably liberal ISL that it could in all conscience support as a proper alternative to any Stalinist leadership.

Today the importance of keeping ACCLC free from Stalinist control and its corruption into a mere sounding board for their most current dogma is as clear as ever, though the danger of that happening is not very great. What is worse, however, is the apparent retreat of the Independent Students League from the more stalwart outlook of its recent past.

PROSPECTS

The more peripheral elements of both caucuses will probably not leave, as they should, to form any third force, and that not simply because of the inability of the Politics Club to present itself as an already existing effective center. Those near the SRP gravitate toward Stalinism for reasons of their own.

These are few and simple: their inability or reluctance to examine the political alternatives before them in any but the most provincial and short-sighted fashion. Stalinism or socialism, for them, has little history outside their own little campus. They do not arrive at a generalized evaluation of these movements based on any broader theory or experience. They remain and function where they are because of their personal associations and a preoccupation with immediate activities.

As far as the Independent Students League periphery is concerned, it is not true they align themselves purely on a narrow-viewed basis without a generalized acceptance of liberalism and rejection of "all radicalism." For that reason alone they are of less interest to any potential third force.

At time of writing ACCLC has yet to select the remaining seven members of its steering committee and embark upon its activities proper. It will be important to get an effective and vocal minority on the steering committee from the independent left. Anything more optimistic is impossible, given the predominance of conservative and ISL forces and the small fraction of socialist forces. Anything less will be a block to satisfactory aggressive action by ACCLC.

SYL Fund Drive Gets Up Steam

By DON HARRIS

The 1953 Socialist Youth League fund drive jumped off to a flying start with plans completed in almost every unit, and, even before the drive is officially begun, with a large part of the different unit quotas already pledged.

Contrary to the estimates made in the SYL Fund Drive announcement sent to units two weeks ago, it would now appear that rather than having a difficult time to make its quota, the SYL can hope to really "make a run for its money." Which means that we will be able to push hard for top listing among the Independent Socialist League branches.

We have at least a good chance of ending up with an oversubscribed quota (in 1952 it went 33 per cent over) at the head of the entire list. And with energy and hard work we can be among the first two or three branches for most of the drive.

In order to insure this requires, it is now plain, only a "youthful" amount of energy in collecting pledges, and securing pledges from SYL sympathizers.

Final quotas for units have been slightly revised in the light of further information. The following quotas are now final, and where the information is available, we give an indication of how well the unit can be expected to do.

SET TO GO

New York, with the largest quota of \$550, has already collected over \$500 worth of pledges (and twenty-five dollars in cash). With a large number of members and sympathizers still to see, its prospects are more than bright—so bright that it is willing to accept a challenge to compete for first place in the drive with any other unit (N. B., Chicago!).

The second largest quota, for Chicago, is set at the revised figure of \$375 on the basis of reports that it will almost certainly be able to make \$450. Last year Chicago swept all honors, overfulfilling its quota by 90 per cent.

Berkeley's revised quota is set at \$130, and we are assured that it will aim to make at least \$150. The only regular unit that re-

mains unheard from on the drive is Los Angeles, again with a revised quota of \$75. Last year Los Angeles had everyone worried, but in the final week of the drive it came through with its full quota.

Finally, in the "General" listing we have a quota of \$120. While this is always a little slower in coming in, this year we have excellent prospects for making "General" a big success.

Comrades in Connecticut have promised \$20; an anonymous friend has already sent in \$25 and promised more by May; and a couple in Idaho have pledged another \$25. This is only a beginning since many of our scattered friends have not yet even been contacted for the purpose of informing them about the drive.

The success of the SYL fund drive can really be assured only if all pledges are collected as soon to its program and ideas: here is a national office. For this purpose, the SYL has set up a suggested schedule which it hopes units will attempt to follow.

MAKE THE GOAL

By next week, the beginning of the drive, it hopes that 10 per cent of the total quota, or \$150, will have been collected and remitted. It is well on the way to this initial goal, with \$50 having been turned into New York and "General." LABOR ACTION will carry the news on whether this, as well as later goals, have been reached.

By the end of February, it is hoped that one-third of the quota, or \$500, will have been raised; by March 15 two-thirds or \$1000; by the end of March, 80 per cent or \$1200; and by April 15, the full quota of \$1500.

With such excellent prospects for oversubscribing all quotas, there seems little reason why these goals should not be reached in the time proposed, so that the later stages of the drive can be devoted mainly to visiting sympathizers to collect their pledges.

For those students and youth who read this, who are not members of the SYL but sympathetic to President Conant, many your chance. Fill out the pledge blank below, and send it into the Socialist Youth League.

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

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

Enclosed is \$.....as my contribution to the ISL-SYL 1953 Fund Drive.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

New York SYL BOOK BAZAAR

Come and fill out your library with our bargains!

POLITICS, FICTION, SCIENCE, etc.

at give-away prices!

FRIDAY, February 20 — 8 to 10:30 p.m.

LABOR ACTION HALL

114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

(Don't forget to bring any of your own books that you want to contribute to the sale.)

FOLLOW

The SYL's views and news on youth and socialism

EVERY WEEK

in the regular Youth and Student Corner of

LABOR ACTION

McCarthy's Shadow Over the Schools — —

(Continued from 1-S)

ousting of Stalinist teachers is but the first step of an entire anti-democratic tendency in education. Anyone who gives support to these witchhunters strengthens these anti-democratic forces.

Those educators and liberals who have "welcomed" the investigation—though they may add, "Is it really necessary?"—and who hope to take the edge off one side of the witchhunting sword, are ignoring the real forces behind these investigations. They are chancing that by accepting the reactionaries on campus and by appearing to take them at face value (i.e., "merely" kick the Stalinists out), they will be spared a more sweeping attack against the schools and colleges.

What they are actually doing is giving legitimacy on the campus to those who have no right to be there. The "investigators" are there as inquisitors of the unorthodox and the dissident, and not to protect a free and unstifled academic life. They are undermining a academic freedom and creating fear of free expression in the nation's schools, and they are not disinterested legislators opposed to "indoctrinating students."

The way to defend academic

freedom and resist McCarthy is—first of all, not to capitulate to it. You cannot resist reaction by accepting the legitimacy of its methods and agreeing with half its program. Some former staunch defenders of academic freedom have come around to the position that it was a mistake to defend the rights of Stalinist teachers, and now argue for kicking them out of the schools.

GALLAGHER'S LINE

To this end they have developed a series of arguments based on totalitarian nature of the Communist Party and the argument that Stalinists have primary loyalty to the CP and Russia. From this accurate analysis of the CP, they conclude that the Stalinist has given up his independent role as a scholar, that he does not practice academic freedom and therefore is not qualified to engage in the "sensitive" occupation of teaching.

A more abstract variant of this argument is given by Dr. Buell Gallagher, president of the City College of New York:

"No one who adheres to the closed dogma can be trusted to teach children and youth for life in a democracy. It is scarcely an

infringement of our fundamental rights and liberties to prevent the abuse and destruction of these rights and liberties. Democracy has the right to defend itself. It has therefore the obligation not to put into the sensitive occupation of the school teaching profession those who have sworn to destroy democracy or who have given their minds and souls captive to a closed dogma which is anti-democratic. . . . The strength of democracy lies precisely in its embracing unity which gladly welcomes its diversities. . . . Totalitarianism of the left or right are incapable of imparting to youths what they themselves do not possess, namely, an affection for diversity. This is why exclusion of fascists, racists, communists and others of the closed mind from responsible teaching posts in our colleges and schools is essential. They hate diversity with a perfect hatred. Against them we have the right and duty to protect ourselves and our children."

What is apparent in this argument is that it abandons the idea of judging the qualification of a teacher on the basis of competence. For competence is substituted a political qualification. What the teacher believes, and not teaching ability, determines

whether he can enter the "sensitive occupation of the teaching profession." It is precisely at this point that the reactionaries enter the door shouting that there is a cold war going on, and that all "subversives" should be kicked out of the schools.

CLASSIC ROAD

The TEST of whether a teacher (who is accused of being a Stalinist) really DOES teach in such a way as to violate the precepts of democratic education is to be made not by investigators into his political opinions but by his authorized and educationally qualified supervisors using the criterion of COMPETENCE.

If the Stalinist "closed mind" prevents (say) a biology teacher from giving a fair and competent presentation of a theory of heredity, then the Stalinist can be expelled on the same grounds that any other teacher is expelled—incompetence as a teacher. But in all of the cases of Stalinist teachers, not one charge of this nature has been brought up. Instead educational boards have resorted to all kinds of subterfuges and kangaroo courts.

The criterion established by Dr. Gallagher is itself broad enough to start a witchhunt of its

own. For just exactly how does one define a closed mind? There are those who would apply it as well to those who adhere to the orthodox point of view. Perhaps the best criterion for others would be a mind that does not hold any points of view. Also where does a closed "dogma" end and a well-defined "point of view" begin? A point that should be obvious is that many of the groups which are spearheading this attack on academic freedom cannot make any pretense to having an open mind. A devout practicing Catholic, for example, does not have an open mind on many subjects which a teacher may have to teach.

The drive to exclude Stalinist teachers has opened a floodgate of reaction in the school systems, and even among those who fear its methods and consequences, there is tendency to adapt to it, to compromise with it, to yield to its major premises—to go along with much of it in order to make a stand on less fundamental aspects.

This is a classic road on which would-be defenders of democracy are pushed to fall in line, more and more, with the advance of reaction. A fight for the principles of academic freedom is also the practical fight.

The Know-Nothings of 1953 — —

(Continued from 1-S)

of the other small American fascist organizations. A past "national commander" of American Patriots, Inc., Zoll has found a more fruitful reception for his efforts in the field of education, bringing to it the same ideas and techniques he learned from such associates as Gerald L. K. Smith, Elizabeth Dilling, and other speakers for the American Patriots.

FASCIST LINE

For example, his pamphlets attacking education are priced to sell at sums well beyond their actual cost. Since the sales are wide, this is by no means an insignificant source of income. *McCalls*, for example, reports that Zoll's income from pamphlet sales and contributions in 1949 alone amounted to \$45,000.

The actual content of Zoll's attack on "progressive education" is in terms of its generally democratic and liberal philosophy. One of his pamphlets, for example, describes progressive education as "shot through . . . with the blight of Pragmatism," and permeated by such "subversive principles" as the denial of absolute truths (contradicting Christianity). In addition, it currently tries to "plug hard for the democratic equality of all men."

For the most part, as those know who are familiar with the standard content of fascist propaganda, this is the same stuff that used to be handed out with more or less anti-Semitic additions by the practiced purveyors of fascist ideology. The problem is: at a time when open fascist movements are insignificant and without influence, why should their ideology find a response in the attack on public education?

Public hysteria about Communism by itself is certainly not a sufficient explanation, because that is the fascist stock in trade. The real explanation, we feel, is that using the hysteria over Communism as a cover, the numerous forces which are opposed to public education as such, or to specific aspects of it, have chosen this opportunity to advance their cause.

The public school system—as a tax-supported institution—is always subject to being regarded as an "extravagance" by sections of the business community which regard themselves as entitled to determine the uses to which "their" tax money is put. This is particularly the case in the small community where considerations of the narrowest and pettiest kind are apt to dominate the business leaders and thereby the local schoolboard. Aside from their resentment at public education in general (sentiment which in its extreme form goes as far as to advocate the abolition of public education entirely); the small-town druggist and farm machinery dealer are often prone to oppose any "progressive" ideas which involve greater expendi-

tures, say for smaller classes, better equipment, etc.

Needless of say, such ideas are far from being universally held even in the business community and they are certainly not "capitalist" in essence. They represent primarily the penny-pinching view of the small businessman in the small community.

More responsible spokesmen (i.e., those more representative of business-management interests) recognize the necessary role of education in modern society, and even prefer the progressive theory and methods for their own sake. Thus, in a recent public statement, the National Association of Manufacturers called upon all of its members to assume greater financial responsibilities with respect to support of public education and at the same time urged support of "enlightened" and progressive education as the best bulwark for strengthening "our democratic heritage." These shades of Henry Wallace's "progressive capitalists" understand, for example, the real value of modern education in creating the necessary consensus for waging a total war.

This does not mean, however, that elements like Zoll can do no harm to a school system which, whatever its defects and shortcomings, provides universal instruction along many democratic lines. This is particularly true when many additional forces are at work for similar purposes.

Thus, in their effort to secure government subsidies for parochial schools, Catholic prelates and politicians bring their own criticism of "secularism" to bear. And religious groups in general are now pushing their claims for "more religion" in the elementary school program. While not directly involved in the attack on public education these religious elements gain a favorable public hearing for their claims when the suspicion of "atheistic-communism" has been aroused by the explicitly political groups.

MUNGER'S OUTFIT

Attacking as it does the very foundations of the modern educational system, the reactionary approach has up to now found little direct response in the educational world. Rather, school administrators and leaders have responded by making concessions while defending themselves from the most obviously malicious accusations.

Among students, the reactionary attack has had little effect, at

least until recently. In the past year, however, the operations of a group on campus which levels the same kind of attack against the schools has begun to be felt, if only sporadically.

This group, first organized as Students for McArthur and later changed in name to "Students for America," exists primarily as the instrument of its West Coast student leader, Bob Munger.

Claiming a far larger membership and influence than it actually wields, Munger's outfit functions primarily from an off-campus base; by lecturing to Rotary Clubs and businessmen about the "subversive threat in our colleges" Munger manages to enlist their financial support for his organ *The American Student*. On campus Munger's efforts were strengthened considerably by the recent publicity he received through *Walter Winchell's* nationally syndicated column, which devoted considerable space to praising Munger's efforts to bring Americanism to our colleges.

Possibly as the effect of this or other aid, Munger's influence has been felt in several places recently. Chicago and New York have seen organizational attempts to establish chapters of Munger's group.

More significant, perhaps, is the account carried in the University of Pittsburgh's *Pitt News* of a meeting of the Student Council

where the question of affiliation to the National Students Association was under discussion. Munger's organ has been carrying on a campaign "exposing" the NSA for such things as advocating an FEPC law, federal scholarships, academic freedom, and other "radical and subversive" doctrines. The *Pitt News* reports that these charges were raised against NSA, using *The American Student* as the source of reference.

Whatever the future of SFA may be (and it is undoubtedly bound up with the personal fortunes of its politically ambitious leader) its emergence marks a new stage in the development of the reactionary trend. We would expect that its general line of attacking all known liberals as "reds" will find at least limited acceptance, to a degree perhaps approaching that which the same charge has gotten in other circles, particularly the official bodies now about to begin their "investigations."

All of these attacks—stemming from sources both on and off campus—can be expected to increase in the immediate future. The efforts of all real believers in academic freedom must be mobilized against all such attacks whether they come from the reactionary opponents of public education, religious elements, ambitious campus politicians, or the professional investigators.

Detroit Hysteria — —

(Continued from 2-S)

arrested for manslaughter, following a traffic accident in which his car plowed through a safety zone and killed a woman. He was described by a police report as drunk at the time. His trial was due last April but somehow never came off! Questions about this and other notorious activities of Schudlich are embarrassing the Cobo administration at the moment. It appears that Schudlich is hardly a "paragon of virtue" capable of saving this country from the wicked Communists. This past week the Wayne

County CIO Council announced its endorsement of the Citizens Committee to challenge the Trucks Act. Its making its support public, the CIO Council took pains to distinguish itself and the Citizens Committee from a Stalinist committee which has been appealing directly to local unions for assistance.

Meanwhile the Supreme Court held a hearing on the Michigan law, and there are reports it is likely that the court will refer back to the Michigan courts the question of the legality of the Trucks Act, including its definition of a Communist.

SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE

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

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

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

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

SCHOOL (IF STUDENT).....

NOT IN THE HEADLINES . . .

A year's subscription to LABOR ACTION brings you a living socialist analysis of news and views on labor, socialism, minority groups, national and world politics — \$2 a year.