

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MAY 11, 1953

FIVE CENTS

SPOT-LIGHT

## Noble Allies

Syngman Rhee of South Korea, who often means what he says (as the corpses of his political opponents testify), has proclaimed that if a truce is arranged in Korea, his government "will continue to fight and, if necessary, invade North Korea to reunify the country."

Since this would be a clear violation of peace in the world and as clear a case of that aggression which the UN and Washington have sworn they will not tolerate, we should expect that American troops will be swung over to the other side of the parallel to put down the Rhee uprising. This follows naturally from the many declarations made by the Western peace-lovers that they will not stand for aggression from anyone.

The vision staggers the imagination, however. Even assuming that Dictator Rhee could mobilize a company of his new South Korean army for the adventure, we find it easier to dream that the U. S. will declare a "police action" against the bloody aggressions by the French against the Tunisia people.

On the same day, another noble ally, Premier Alcide De Gasperi, revealed that in 1945 he approached Russia with the proposition that he would keep Italy out of the Western coalition if Moscow refrained from pushing a punitive peace treaty upon his country. In the course of this election campaign speech against the Italian CP, furthermore, he denied that at that time there was any "anti-Russian" attitude on the part of Italy.

All of this qualifies another paladin of the West to speak in the name of the defense of democracy against godless Communism, or to denounce the "neutralism" which is so widespread a reflection of anti-war sentiment in Europe, or to attack misguided people who want to make deals over the counter with the Kremlin tyrants.

## Lesson-Learner

Considering the amount of attention paid to the "Russian soul" during the Moscow Trials of the '30s, we suggest that it is time for someone to look into its Anglo-Saxon counterpart. Latest in the line of weeping breast-beaters before the inquisition is Artie Shaw, the band-leader, who confessed his past sins in an obscene spectacle staged by the House Un-Americaners. Real tears poured from his eyes as he related how the durn Communists "duped" him when he returned from the wars "wrought up about black markets and crusading for a Fair Employment Practices Act," as well as suffering from migraine.

Now he has learned his lesson so well that, he told the star-chamber, he would not sign anything unless seven lawyers AND the House committee approved it first. Speaking, as we were above, of paladins of democracy, this sentiment naturally qualifies him to claim that at long last he understands the horrid meaning of totalitarianism. The true democrat is one who won't sign anything unless it's officially approved by a DEMOCRATICALLY elected government.

We record that the exact point where genuine brine gathered in his eyes was

(Continued on page 5)

## Eisenhower Extends Truman's Purge System, Pleases McCarthy

### Youngdahl Decision Hits Gov't Attack on Liberty

By L. G. SMITH

The courageous decision handed down on May 2 by Federal District Judge Luther W. Youngdahl flies in the face of the political atmosphere current in America. The specific judicial action involved was the dismissal of four counts of a seven-count perjury indictment against Owen Lattimore, Johns Hopkins lecturer and expert on Far Eastern affairs. Although Judge Youngdahl expressed "serious doubt" as to the strength of the remaining three counts, he ordered Lattimore to stand trial on October 6, and at the same time ordered the government to file a bill of particulars on what remained of the indictment.

The first and main count of the indictment had charged that Lattimore perjured himself when he denied before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee that he had been "a sympathizer or any other kind of a promoter of communism or Communist interests." The judge found this charge "fatally defective" and in violation of the First and Sixth Amendments.

He also threw out two counts involving the question whether Lattimore knew that certain contributors to the magazine *Pacific Affairs* were Communists and another charge that he had lied in denying that a 1937 trip to Yenan, then Chinese Stalinist headquarters, was by prearrangement with the Communist Party.

On the first count Judge Youngdahl declared that "this charge is so nebulous and indefinite that a jury would have to

(Turn to last page)

## SP Educator in Detroit Gets the 'Red' Treatment

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, May 2—Another illuminating example of how the witchhunt atmosphere and McCarthyite mentality destroy personal reputations and civil liberties was furnished here this past week.

It involved Dr. Walter Bergman, director of research for the Detroit Board of Education, a top official of Americans for Democratic Action, and a well-known dues-paying member of the Socialist Party.

As usual, it began with screaming headlines about another "Communist and red" being uncovered in the Detroit school system.

The story itself was that the State Department, under the order of Ruth Shipley of the Passport Division, had lifted the passport of Dr. Bergman, who is at present in Denmark studying during his sabbatical leave. He has been with the Detroit Board of Education over 20 years.

By GORDON HASKELL

The Eisenhower administration has finally made public its "loyalty-security" program which has been in preparation for the past three months. It can be said flatly that this program is in every respect worse for civil liberties, for the rights of government workers, than was its Democratic predecessor. The fact that Senator McCarthy has called it "pretty darned good" should almost be sufficient to demonstrate the point.

Like the old "loyalty" program, this one is supposed to deal solely with the federal government's criteria for who may or may not be employed by it. It is a well-known fact, however, that the "subversive" lists made up by various attorneys general under the old program have been used as a basis for pillorying and attacking organizations and their actual or alleged members or sympathizers in all fields of life in America, and that this practice will continue.

### Another Inquisition Due

Investigations conducted by the FBI under this program have had the effect of intimidating layers of the population which go far beyond the actual employees of the government. The assumptions under which the programs have operated have made a major contribution to the political atmosphere in this country in which the methods and ideology of a McCarthy and his similars could become widely accepted.

President Eisenhower's methods differ from those of President Truman only in that they go further and give the federal worker less chance to defend himself.

Under the new program, all federal workers who have been cleared will have to undergo a new "loyalty-security" check. All departments, however far removed they may be from anything to do with national security, will now be covered. The clerk, the janitor, the gardener, the truck driver will be investigated along with the ambassador and the Central Intelligence agent.

People who have been cleared under the old program will have their pasts put under the lens once more; and no one may henceforth safely seek a job with the government unless he is certain that in all his life he has never expressed a radical or unorthodox opinion, has never associated with people who have expressed non-conformist views—in short, unless he is certain that he has lived a life of irreproachable conformity, dullness and babbitry.

### LOOSE LANGUAGE

In the new setup all distinction between "loyalty" and "security" is erased. Anyone may be barred from a federal job if, in the sole judgment of his department head, his employment is not "clearly consistent with the interests of national security," or if he is guilty of "any behavior, activities or associations which tend to show that the individual is not reliable or trustworthy."

(Turn to last page)

## TUNISIA AND THE WAR IN LAOS: French Imperialism and the U.S.

... page 6

## Will Tories Pull a Stunt Election?

... page 3

## UAW Slaps Down Racist 'Strike'

... page 2



# Auto Workers Setting an Example for the Labor Movement — UAW Slaps Down Racist 'Strike'

By KEN HILLYER

The defeat of a racist strike at a United Auto Workers (CIO) national Harvester Company in Memphis, Tennessee, is a victory for the whole labor movement. It also bears a lesson to be learned by other labor unions on how to act in a similar situation.

The incident developed from the application of seniority on a layoff. A Negro worker was laid off from the Foundry and, having plant-wide seniority, applied for an open welding job, the only open job in the plant.

The Welding Department has Negroes as stockmen and checkers but is lily-white in the welding classification. The Negro took the welding test and passed.

As soon as he was given the job the department walked out. A small percentage of the machine shop followed. No one left the Foundry or the Forge Shop.

The second and third shifts were met at the gates by the welders and the respective shifts of welders stayed out. It was obvious that some of the union officers were involved.

## EXEC BOARD ACTS

The international union swung into action immediately. The Harvester Department representative and the regional director called the Executive Board into session. The UAW-CIO position on equal job opportunities was explained in a firm manner. They asked the local Executive Board to vote on the question and present the decision to the welders. The board voted to support the International on the question of equal job opportunities.

Because of the negative action of three officers, the welders gained confidence and refused to abide by the decision. John L. McCaffrey, president of the International Harvester Company, wired Walter Reuther demanding that the contract be lived up to and the practice of non-discrimination be enforced.

The International Executive Board was in session at that time. It took a vigorous stand to stop the racist walkout.

The rank and file other than the welders went back to work. Most of them had remained on the job. Faced with no backing from the union or the men in the shop, the welders capitulated, hoping to make the man's life miserable. They will not succeed because the active union men in the shop are determined that he remain on the job in spite of the minority of officers who are opposing them.

## CITE UNION POSITION

The position taken by the international was as follows, as explained in its telegram to the Memphis local:

"The International Executive Board of the UAW-CIO by unanimous action directs the members of Local 988 to return to work and to cooperate with the International Union and the management of the International Harvester Company in implementing the provisions of the UAW-CIO-International Harvester Agreement which provides for promotion based upon seniority and ability without regard to race, creed, color or national origin.

"America cannot be a symbol of freedom and equality in the struggle against Communist tyranny and at the same time tolerate double standards in employment opportunities. The work stoppage in the Memphis International Harvester plant is unauthorized and is in direct violation of our contractual obligations and the International Constitution of the UAW-CIO. A continuation of this unauthorized illegal and unconstitutional work stoppage can only create further difficulties which will result in hardship to all the workers and disciplinary action against those responsible for provoking this unauthorized action.

## INVOKE DISCIPLINE

"The UAW-CIO International Executive Board has wired International Harvester Management that 'our union completely supports the principle that any worker entitled to promotion on the basis of seniority and ability to handle the job shall not be denied promotion because of race, creed, color or national origin and that if any member of our union in any of your plants attempts to obstruct such promotion, you may feel free to take disciplinary action in the full knowledge that the union will not invoke the grievance machinery to defend a worker guilty of such obstruction?'

All workers are urged and instructed to return to their jobs and to carry out their contractual and constitutional obligations. The UAW-CIO Constitution was adopted by the democratic and unanimous action of approximately three thousand delegates representing a million and a third members of our union. The International Executive Board is determined to see that the International Constitution and the moral obligations contained therein are carried out to their fullest. We are of the firm conviction that the overwhelming majority of the workers in the International Harvester plant are in opposition to the current illegal and unauthorized action. We rely upon their good judgment and support in correcting this situation. We have advised the management of the International Harvester Company of the unanimous action of the International Executive Board in the preceding wire.

"Walter P. Reuther, President."

There are some lessons to be learned in this situation. The union can get itself

compromised only if it hesitates to act firmly. The best way to clean up such a mess is to move on the basis of "either abide by union policy or get out of the shop."

## VOTE OUT THE BIGOTS

The international union, on its part, has to have a more extensive educational program on the basic question of functioning as a class against the company, this being the only road to victory for the workers.

The Memphis plant has the highest average earnings of any plant in the South. Its contract is among the best in the country. The Negro workers in the shop have played a most important role since the beginning to make it that way. It is only a blind bigot or a company stooge that would attack the solidarity of a local union by such a reactionary strike.

It is hoped that the coming local union elections will give the bigots the proper answer by voting them out of office, lock, stock and barrel.

# SP Educator in Detroit — —

(Continued from page 1)

known for his socialist views as for his anti-Stalinist opinions.

Small wonder that Norman Thomas was quoted as protesting the injustice to Dr. Bergman.

After one day of hesitation and conflicting public statements, the Detroit Federation of Teachers issued an official statement by its Executive Board defending Dr. Bergman. It reads:

## DFT STATEMENT

"Dr. Walter Bergman has been a long-time, valued member of the Detroit Federation of Teachers. In the present case, no evidence has yet been brought forth to indicate that he has Communist affiliations.

"The opposition of the DFT to Communism is well known, and it is a matter of record that our organization will not defend a Communist.

"We are distressed at unfavorable publicity given to an individual before he has been given a chance to clear himself of charges.

"We insist, as would any fair-minded American, that a person is innocent until proven guilty. Dr. Bergman will receive our wholehearted support until the case is officially closed."

This statement was adopted after a heated three-hour argument at a special board meeting.

As a result of this action, the Bergman case was taken off page one in the Detroit newspapers, which still persist, however, in referring to Dr. Bergman as a suspected Communist.

Although it would seem that organizations like ADA, the Wayne County CIO, and the UAW-CIO, where Dr. Bergman is very well known, would have rushed to defend him, there seems to be a discreet silence on this case as we write.

## EDELMAN CASE

However, events indicate that the time and atmosphere are soon going to force the ex-socialists, and many others, to start fighting back, for there is no other way of stopping the triumph of McCarthyism.

How delicate this problem has become for the CIO and for Walter P. Reuther, its president, was reported last week by the New York Times, which said that the Eisenhower administration had requested the CIO to withdraw the name of John Edelman for the post of assistant secretary of labor, which had been promised to the CIO.

The Times reported that an FBI check showed what everyone in the CIO knew: Edelman is not a Communist, nor was he ever close to them. He was, however, a socialist, and he was quite active in the early strike struggles.

The Eisenhower administration is re-

ported as telling top CIO officials that it fears attacks in Congress against this nomination because of Edelman's early militant record.

If the CIO is defeated in the Edelman case, it may provoke a major crisis within the CIO leadership, for the opening gun of a major attack on Walter P. Reuther was published in the current issue of the American Mercury, where Ralph De Toledano gives Reuther the kind of treatment usually reserved for the Owen Lattimores. It is a vicious and lying attack whose main point is that Reuther is a truly dangerous man because of his "Stalinist" past!

DETROIT, May 2—Spirited debates in some local unions featured action on the United Auto Workers (CIO) convention mandate that local unions decide for themselves whether to hold officers and committeemen elections biannually instead of the present yearly balloting.

Ford Local 600 seems split wide open since Carl Stellato introduced a motion in the General Council for two-year elections, and this carried by overwhelming vote. At Locals 155, 174 and 157, the two-year term was voted without any trouble; also at Ford Local 400.

However, at the Kaiser-Frazier local, Dodge and Dodge Truck, and Chrysler local, the proponents for two-year elections were defeated after vigorous debate; or else the idea was dropped by the leadership following display of rank-and-file resentment against two-year terms.

# CALIFORNIA Sacramento's McCarthy — Cooking Up Vicious State Laws

By VICTOR SAVAGE

LOS ANGELES, April 27—The present session of the California State Legislature bids fair to go down in its history as the most reactionary to date.

Already this session has voted for three bills to prevent the various housing authorities from continuing aid to public housing in Los Angeles. The effect of this action can mean the scrapping of the entire project, which would entail a loss of some \$12-15 million to the taxpayers and would also, of course, mean that many will be deprived of decent housing.

The reactionary character of this session is also plain when we consider the bills most likely to pass in a showdown vote. These bills require the most "careful watching" and also demand that labor-directed publicity be thrown on them in order to arouse public indignation and quash them in the making. Among the more obnoxious of the anti-civil-liberties bills are the following:

AB 923 (Levering and Backstrand): This vicious bill would make it a felony to apply for local and state tax exemptions without the declaration that the applicant does not advocate overthrow of the government by force or support a foreign power in case of war. Every wage-earner in the state would be directly affected by this bill if it is passed. There is some doubt whether or not it is constitutional but this may not stop its passage, in view of the general state of hysteria prevailing here today.

## RISE OF LEVERING

AB 3312 (Levering): Another bill proposed by the McCarthy of Southern California. This odorous piece of legislation would provide for the dismissal by any civil-defense worker who has the courage to refuse to testify before any court or legislative committee (state or federal). The Levering Act of last year declared that state employees were civil-defense workers, and so it seems reasonable to believe that if this bill becomes law we may expect to see all sorts of irrelevant jobs and professions ticketed as civil-defense in nature.

This man Levering has had a meteoric rise in popularity on the horizon of the

California extreme right. He is very rapidly taking over the title of most reactionary legislator in the state, beating out State Senator Jack Tenny, who may not be with us much longer in any official capacity since he is now walking the primrose path of anti-Semitism and Smithism (Gerald L. K.) Out-and-out fascists being unpopular today, it seems likely that Levering will be even more dangerous than his predecessor.

SB 1425 (Kraft): This bill declares that belonging to any organization listed by the U. S. Internal Security Act of 1950 would be grounds for dismissal of any state teacher or professor for "unprofessional conduct." The effect of this would be to set up a stoolpigeon system in every school in the state.

Here is how it would work! Any person who thinks that a teacher is a "subversive" would file an affidavit of "facts" and this would immediately set in motion machinery for dismissal proceedings.

AB 26 (Shaw): This bill would be responsible for the establishment of a type of thought-police (in the terms of the bill—an Anti-Subversive Commission). This authoritarian organization would have as its duty the discovering and registering of members of totalitarian organizations. The registration of members would be solely on the basis of holding an unpopular opinion and not on any overt acts.

Up to now the only important analysis of these insidious bills has come from that old reliable force of liberal opinion, the American Civil Liberties Union. Because of its forceful presentation of the real intent of these bills, we may hope that labor will join the fight against them.

## LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14 Street, New York City  
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.

Now available!  
COMBINATION OFFER—

BOUND VOLUMES  
(Completely indexed)

for 1951  
and 1952

Labor Action .....\$3  
New International .....\$4  
BOTH (for 1 year) .....\$6  
BOTH (for both years) ....\$11

Order from:  
Independent Socialist League  
114 West 14 Street, New York City



**LONDON LETTER**

# Will the Tories Pull a 'Stunt' Election?

By **ALLAN VAUGHAN**

LONDON, April 22—Two years ago Aneurin Bevan resigned from the then Labor government over Gaitskell's budget. On Monday it was Aneurin Bevan who wound up the case of the Labor opposition against Butler's budget.

This fact alone demonstrates the extent of the change in fortune of what is now popularly described as "Bevanism." A year ago, when the Bevan controversy appeared to be reaching its maximum intensity, the suggestion that Bevan himself would be winding up officially on behalf of the Labor opposition in the 1953 budget, had it then been put forward, would have been laughed out of house.

Not only has Bevanism been absorbed into much of what is, in effect, the Labor Party's "hand to mouth" policy, but also its chief representative is playing a significant, though not as yet a dominant, part in the shaping of Labor's every-day policy as well as its longer-term policies.

**SUPPORT FOR BEVAN**

The constituency (branch) parties are now discussing resolutions for this year's Labor Party conference to be held at Margate. It is likely that further shifts to the left by both main sections of the National Executive Committee—constituencies and trade unions—can be expected. An interesting indicator of the leftward swing on the part of the trade unions was afforded by the Easter conference of the Clerical and Administrative Workers Union.

A motion deploring an attack on Nye Bevan which appeared in the December issue of the union's journal was carried by an overwhelming majority, despite strong opposition from the platform. More important still, a resolution calling for a reduction in the period of conscription—now advocated by Emanuel Shinwell, the former minister of defense in the last Labor government—was carried, again notwithstanding opposition from the platform. Finally, to crown the victory of the left, a resolution which urged the party NEC "to give a lead to the workers by drawing up a militant socialist program" was carried by the conference.

**RIGHT-WING IRRESPONSIBLES**

The borough council elections to be held on May 7 will provide the Labor Party with a relatively reliable guide to the mood of the electorate after the Tory budget. It would be downright stupidity on the part of Labor supporters to deny the effect of Butler's "Election Budget"—though Churchill has assured the country that it is no such thing—on the floating vote, particularly the middle classes and salaried employees.

Election stunt or no election stunt, the Labor Party will have to put up a better and more solid performance both in Parliament and outside, to convince the British people that Labor has a policy which is distinct at all points from Tory policy. A game of Ins and Outs fools no one.

Last year Douglas Jay, the former Labor financial secretary to the treasury, described Butler's budget as "the most reactionary of the 20th century." Alfred Robens predicted a million unemployed. This irresponsible demagoguery and tomfoolery on the part of the Labor Party right-wingers assists no one, not even themselves. The truth of the matter, that Hugh Gaitskell himself would have offered a budget different only in degree from Butler's is conveniently obscured by the "left" antics of the right wing.

To return to Churchill's assurance that no stunt election is being contemplated:

it would be opportune to mention a few indisputable facts. Firstly, it must be realized that Churchill is more of a figurehead than a real policy-maker and director of the Tory party.

Churchill's own Liberal past and his weakness for "National" Governments has always made him suspect in true-blue Tory circles. It is an open secret that Churchill himself favors proportional representation which would enable the Liberal Party to exert the influence in Parliament appropriate to their perhaps millions of supporters. But this scheme has been flatly turned down by the Tory party, year in, year out. The same for the Labor Party, though it may be less adamant now, since the introduction of PR would have given them a majority or plurality in Parliament.

**Churchill's great age and "tainted" past reduces his political weight in top policy-making Tory circles; and the statement that Butler's budget is no stunt Election Budget may well represent Churchill's view and not the shrewd businessmen who effectively run the Tory party. A coronation, a Stunt Budget, and, coming on top of all this, a "peace offensive"—what more is needed for a snap election?**

These considerations play a more decisive role in Tory electoral strategy than considerations of honesty or public welfare. The Tory party is a class party.

**MCCARTHYITES ABROAD**

The visit of McCarthy's sleuths, Roy Cohn and Gerald Schine, was not welcome in Britain. McCarthy receives a bad press in this country—almost on "principle." The Tory papers as well as the Labor papers have expressed their displeasure at "snoopers" from other countries.

McCarthyism is considered in this country as the ideology of the hooligan or lunatic-fringe elements in American society. What is not understood sufficiently is that McCarthyism is a disease of a system of society, and not just a mid-summer madness.

The fear that McCarthyism will prevent the U. S. government from taking advantage of the "peace" overtures of the Malenkov government is very strong. Equally strong is the firm—though, it must be admitted, as yet unsubstantiated—belief that the Malenkov government means business:

The Bevanite organ *Tribune* is concentrating its main fire on the Tory government for its alleged failure to seize the initiative for sounding out the Russians on the possibilities of a general peace agreement and an all-around "easing of world tension."

Certainly, the internal developments (such as the release of the "doctor poisoners") point to interesting and very real changes in the mode of operation of the Stalinist bureaucracy. The "external" changes do, however, resemble changes that took place during the switch from the Third Period to the Popular Front line, and might well be aimed at dividing the Western bloc.

**FOR BLP INITIATIVE**

However, the Labor Party, and *Tribune* particularly, is perfectly right in insisting that a "peace offensive" should be organized, that the Moscow proposals should be carefully examined. The Stalinist bureaucracy may well make concessions internally and externally in order to consolidate its position and rebuild the morale of its parties in Europe.

What is wrong and must be guarded against is any suggestion or hint of a new conference on the lines of Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam, aiming at redividing the world and carving the small countries into "spheres of influence." Such suggestions—and they have already been made—if acted upon, could only lead to the sort of cold-war situation that exists today, except that its effect would be delayed. The false security of the Big Three conferences quickly came to naught, once the "main" enemies, the European revolution and the axis powers, had been dealt with. This applies equally to any future "Yalta."

One thing is quite clear, however, and that is: the Labor Party is now presented with an opportunity for seizing the initiative from the Tories on the subject of the cold war. Only the Labor Party can put forward the necessary peace policy which can throw the Kremlin onto the defensive—a policy of freedom for the colonies, a policy of alliance with all oppressed countries against imperialism, and a policy of extended social ownership of industry at home.

# BLP Exec Looks To Next Steps

By **DAVID ALEXANDER**

LONDON, April 29—Last weekend the National Executive Committee of the Labor Party held a meeting to discuss policy.

**The committee started out with the axiom that Britain must expand production in order to become solvent; this economic necessity was foremost in their minds, and it was with this in view that they considered the possibility of adding more industries to their list for nationalization.**

Various proposals for taking over the chemical, shipbuilding and land concerns were put forward. For each of these, however, some pretext for procrastination was made. As a concession to the left they agreed at least to hold the matter over until they were returned to power and would be enabled to investigate the industries more fully.

A most interesting suggestion first brought up last December was reconsidered. That was the possibility of the state's acquisition of a controlling interest in the industries, presumably leaving their management to private capitalists. There are obvious misgivings to be held about this scheme. Would the government be using the capitalists, or vice-versa? In the former case—that is, if the policy really meant decisive public control—it is highly unlikely that the capitalists will be prepared to cooperate in such a scheme, and the unhappy marriage of two such partners could only prejudice the success of the offspring.

**RELUCTANT TUC**

The only issue at the committee meeting which led to a significant rift between left and right was that of nationalization of rented land. Aneurin Bevan considered this to be essential to gain the confidence of small farmers, but the right wing thought that it was too early to say whether it would contribute to the expansion of food production. A vote was taken in which it was agreed to shelve the matter temporarily.

The Trade Union Congress has shown a marked reticence to take part in Labor's decisions. It has felt, since last year's Morecambe conference of the Labor Party, that if it identifies itself too much with the party it will have to accept its guidance on many political issues on which it would like to be free. Only on the question of nationalization of the chemical industry was it prepared to exchange views with the party. The TUC has been acting the part of a shy bride, occasionally expressing its views when asked but feeling no desire to share responsibility for the political future of the country.

The Executive Committee of the party again affirmed its determination to renationalize both the transport and steel industries as soon as Labor is returned to power. However, this may lie in the historical future if they don't pull up their political socks—especially as Churchill has now got the Garter.

**Read The NEW INTERNATIONAL America's leading Marxist review**

**ISL FUND DRIVE**

# Almost Over the Top!

By **ALBERT GATES Fund Drive Director**

This semi-final report indicates that the 1953 fund drive will be completed successfully.

Contributions during the past two weeks reached the figure of \$1931.75 giving us a total of \$1114.50 or 96.6 per cent of the goal in the drive.

The clean-up week yet to come should push us over the top in one of the most successful drives the ISL has had.

For this we owe thanks to the entire membership of the ISL, SYL and the friends of the organization. With few exceptions, everyone came through nobly in this campaign, and when all the returns are in, we shall find that we have gone over the national quota.

Special comment is reserved for the Socialist Youth League. We all thought (the youth included) that they would have a tough time setting the pace in this year's drive and for a time it looked as if they might have to take second place to some branch or branches of the ISL. But the SYL drove ahead of all others in the final weeks of the campaign and are out ahead with 123.7 per cent while carrying one of the largest quotas in the campaign. Don Harris advises too that the SYL is not yet through and that we can expect more contributions!

ISL branches have also done well. The Box Score shows those in the 100 per cent bracket. Some have been there for several weeks, but others like Seattle and Pittsburgh broke in these past couple of weeks. Close to 100 per cent are the Chicago and New York branches with 95 per cent and 91.2 per cent respectively, both cities carrying the largest quotas in the drive. Others too are within striking distance of their local quotas and we expect that in the cleanup they will reach 100 per cent. If Philadelphia and Newark come through, and we hear from Indiana and Akron, we shall go way over our national goal.

Only 3.4 per cent to go! \$385.50! Let's clean up quickly.

**Box Score**

	Quota	Paid	%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$11,500</b>	<b>\$1114.50</b>	<b>96.6</b>
SYL .....	1,250	1547	123.7
Streator .....	25	30	120
Seattle .....	200	220	110
General .....	1,075	1181	109.8
Cleveland .....	200	203	101.6
Detroit .....	500	503	100.6
Pittsburgh .....	150	150	100
Reading .....	50	50	100
Oregon .....	50	50	100
St. Louis .....	25	25	100
Chicago .....	1,800	1711.75	95
New York .....	4,000	3649.25	91.2
Buffalo .....	650	556	85.5
Los Angeles .....	600	506	84.3
Oakland .....	500	400	80
Philadelphia .....	250	169	67.7
Newark .....	250	128	51.2
Akron .....	50	0	0
Indiana .....	75	0	0

**CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!**

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

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

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

**The CASE of COMRADE TULAYEV**

A Novel of Modern Russia

by **Victor Serge**

Formerly \$3 . . . now while our special stock lasts

**\$1.50**

Labor Action Book Service  
114 West 14 Street



# YOU and SCIENCE

## Scientist Shows 'Human Nature' Is a Social Product

By CARL DARTON

No cliché is more familiar to socialists than "You can't change human nature." It is the thesis of M. F. Ashley Montagu in his "Our Changing Concept of Human Nature," (*Impact of Science on Society*, UNESCO, Winter 1952) that this saying is not only threadbare but completely unscientific.

Dr. Montagu explains that no member of the human family is born with "human" nature but that each one of us comes into the world with merely a complex of potentialities for being human. Being human requires training and its meaning is continually changing. Building upon his inborn nature, which is essentially animal, man acquires human behavior by learning to interact with his environment. Failure to understand this results in much personal, social and political confusion.

Dr. Montagu also clears away the usual dualism between heredity and environment. To quote from his article:

"Heredity is usually taken to mean the innate, i.e., the unadulterated biological inheritance of the organism as determined by the genes or heredity particles in the chromosomes. This is usually referred to by geneticists as the genotype: the visible expression of the genotype is termed the phenotype."

However, since the genotype develops within the medium of the environment the phenotype is the resultant of both factors. Since the individual inherits both the genotype as well as his environment it is almost impossible to separate that which is innate from what is acquired after birth. This is particularly true since science now realizes as never before that the unborn baby is deeply influenced by his environment within his mother's womb. Prenatal care, so stressed by medical science today, is a recognition of this. Actually the Chinese, says Dr. Montagu, by reckoning age from fertilization or conception rather than birth, are more scientific than we.

To put it another way, heredity, as formerly understood, may determine what we can do but it is environment which decides what we do. Speaking of the genes, Dr. Montagu writes:

"Finally, it has become quite clear that genes, the heredity particles carried in the chromosomes, do not determine either character or traits; what they determine are the responses of the developing organism to the environment. The genes that the individual inherits are not, therefore, equivalent to predestination, but are amenable to the influence of the environment, and hence, to some extent, to human control."

Another myth of our culture is that the baby is born inheriting the psychological as well as the physical traits of his animal ancestry. Thus, according to this misconception, an "aggressive" animal nature is something which is inherited by all of us and civilization is a more or less unsuccessful attempt to keep this innate character under control. There is no scientific evidence, according to Dr. Montagu, supporting this viewpoint. Rather, hostility in the child is developed as the result of deprivation and restraint of his activities which leads to frustration or reactions of aggression. His naturally born need, so evident to those around babies, is to be loved.

Dr. Montagu concludes:

"It is incumbent upon us to realize that we can best change human nature for the better not by working on man's biological inheritance but by working on his social inheritance: by changing those conditions which produce disharmony in the person and corresponding disharmony in his society. . . . The school of evolutionary thought which preached the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest gave a one-sided view of nature as a competitive 'red in tooth claw' process, and omitted almost entirely the factors of co-operation and mutual aid, which play so great a role in the ecology, the balance, of nature. The resulting view of nature was thus put badly out of focus, but upon it was erected a view of human nature which was as readily accepted as was the evolutionary theory of nature modeled on a laissez-faire industrial civilization."

This can only lead to the viewpoint that the axiom "You can't change human nature" is false since it is apparent that man is a learning animal who is capable of changing and modifying his habits and views throughout his life.

This columnist will now inject his comment that it is this property of human nature, the capacity for human growth and cultural change and improvement, which is the great promise for man and for socialism. This is the hope and faith of all of us.

## BOOKS and Ideas

### This Stuff Gets Published Too

**THE SOVIET IMPACT ON SOCIETY**, by Dagobert D. Runes.—Philosophical Library, N. Y., 202 pages, \$3.75.

By BERNARD CRAMER

Dr. Runes is the author of several previous books, including the *Dictionary of Philosophy*, former director of the Institute for Advanced Education, and editor of "many scientific journals" (we quote the publisher's blurb) including *Journal of Aesthetics, Philosophic Abstracts, and The Modern Thinker*.

All that is very impressive, especially when we read his newly published book and find that it is a cut below the intellectual level of a Hearst columnist.

The book, Dr. Runes explains in a note, is published exactly as written in 1937, when it "could find no publisher . . . because it appeared too daring in its accusations." The contents suggest a different and simpler explanation.

The bulk of it is a catalog of "accusations" on the totalitarian nature of the Stalinist regime. Most of the accusations are entirely true, of course. They are also rarely documented and mostly thrown out as indignant and horrified assertions, with a plethora of exclamation marks instead of references. Since the catalog of charges itself is today quite familiar (assuming it wasn't in 1937), the book is of no value to the anti-Stalinist who wants to understand and will have no impact on the Stalinist who refuses to believe.

#### A SCHOLAR, HE IS

That completely sums up the positive aspects of the book. For the rest, Dr. Runes has not a glimmering of an understanding of Stalinism: it is, it seems, simply an awful, awful monstrosity. He also knows absolutely nothing about the development of Stalinism and Russia. The book is chock-full of such statements as that the children of Russian workers "belong to the political hierarchy"; Stalin "reverted to the use of money"; Stakhanovism is a "gag" (this typifies the analytical level of the book); Lenin "personally directed" the Communist seizure of power in Hungary under Bela Kun, whose "government was a government of college boys and military riffraff"; the Communists broke with the Second International because it consisted of "in-

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### On 'Jewish Newsletter'

To the Editor:

As a reader of the *LA* I was disturbed by Zukerman's attack on the Jews published in the March 30 issue. This time, Mr. Zukerman complained that it is chauvinistic for the Jews to be concerned about the current anti-Semitism in Russia. Since it cannot be taken for granted that even all liberals and socialists are immune to anti-Jewish prejudice, I wish to make some observations on his article:

Mr. Zukerman states that "it is difficult to understand why the assault on Zionism and Israel should have moved these people more than any other actions of the Communists." Further, he asks, "In what way is the present Soviet attack on Israel a greater crime than the subjugation of Czechoslovakia . . . and the number of other states . . . which Communist Russia brutally enslaved?"

(1) It should be noted that the above assertions presuppose the correctness of the Stalinist lie that what has taken place in Russia was only anti-Zionism rather than an outburst of anti-Semitism. True, Zukerman mentions the existence of "anti-Semitic features," but as the above quotations show, he pretends that it is only anti-Zionism, similar to an attack upon Poland or Latvia, to which the Jews are reacting. I do not have space to comment upon the vast difference between the two cases; it should be clear, however, how deceitful is Zukerman's presentation of the facts.

(2) Mr. Zukerman mentions the extermination of Armenians, etc., in Russia. If this has actually taken place, we can expect the survivors to be especially bitter. If, then, someone should attack these remnants as chauvinists for this, I would have as low an opinion of him as I do of

the hypocrite who wrote the article under discussion.

(3) Zukerman accuses the Jews of being complacent about the "mass deportations to slave-labor camps of millions of other non-Jewish people." Here the man's anti-Jewish prejudice becomes quite open. For all reports agree that the Jews have always provided at least their "just share" of slaves for Stalin's camps. The lack of any special previous resentment, therefore, does not mean the Jews remained indifferent as long as it was only the *goyim* that suffered; rather, they accepted with stoicism, like the rest of the world, a situation which they were powerless to remedy, and in which they suffered in common with other people in Russia. The "special" Jewish reaction came about with the evidence that, once again, they were being chosen for special anti-Semitic treatment.

What Zukerman detests, clearly, is any Jewish attempt at self-defense; always, this seems to him as an aggression of Jews upon a defenseless world. He is like an editor who lectures Negroes upon their insensitive chauvinism because they are more concerned about a lynching threat than they are about the starving Chinese.

In conclusion, it should be clear that I am not defending Stalinists who only recently broke from the CP; Zukerman attacked them only as manifesting that Jewish "chauvinism" which is his real target.

James CORDELL

Correspondent Cordell has just about everything wrong that he could possibly get wrong. Least important is the fact that the article he refers to, which *LA* quoted, was signed Diarist and appeared in the publication edited by William Zukerman, which is a liberal Jewish organ (anti-Zionist).

The article did not complain "that it is chauvinistic for the Jews to be concerned about the current anti-Semitism in Russia." The *Jewish Newsletter* itself has been blasting Stalinist anti-Semitism in full force, of course. The article by Diarist discussed only one thing: the phenomenon of Jewish Stalinist fellow-travelers who have been able to stand all the crimes of Stalinism except its current attack on the Jews, and who boggled only at this point. It is these types who were attacked.

This clearly indicates why the rest of Cordell's letter is a regrettable imputation against the *Jewish Newsletter's* article, which was perfectly clear and unmistakable in its references.

There was not a word in the *Newsletter* article giving color to the Stalinist line of apology. The *Jewish Newsletter* has fully exposed the pretext of "anti-Zionism" as the apology for the current anti-Semitism. Typical of Cordell's letter is his statement "Zukerman accuses the Jews of being complacent. . . ." As we have pointed out, it is a group of Jewish Stalinists who were specifically and plainly under discussion.

We are quite aware of the enormous hatred for William Zukerman's outspokenly anti-Zionist Jewish periodical which exists in Zionist and Zionist-influenced circles, but it is always regrettable when this antagonism leads to such blinding prejudice and blatant misreading of what his organ has to say.—Ed.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, out May 27:

*Barbary Shore*, by Norman Mailer, Signet, 216 pp., 25¢. *The Grass Harp*, by Truman Capote, Signet, 144 pp., 25¢. *Mittee*, by Daphne Rooke, Signet, 208 pp., 25¢. *The Courting of Susie Brown*, by Erskine Caldwell, Signet, 144 pp., 25¢. *The Green Bay Tree*, by Louis Bromfield, Signet Giant, 312 pp., 35¢. *Scalpel*, by Horace McCoy, Signet Giant, 312 pp., 35¢. *Knife at My Back*, by Adam Knight, Signet, 160 pp., 25¢.

## WEEK by WEEK . . .

LABOR ACTION screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.

A sub is only \$2 a year!



LABOR ACTION

May 11, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 19

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—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.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Asst. Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON HASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH



# LINGUISTIC NATIONALISM

*More or Less Assorted Notes Suggested by Mexican Decree*

By PHILIP COBEN

It was with mixed political feelings that we read that the Mexican government has promulgated a regulation prohibiting shops from displaying signs in bastardized tourist-Spanish—for example, *loncheria*—though the signs will be permitted to translate the pure Castilian into equally pure English for the benefit of the money-spending gringos.

Linguistics is a science which inevitably merges into politics on its borders. In its political aspects it is not always easy to draw the line between linguistic chauvinism or even racialism, and simple linguistic nationalism; or between linguistic imperialism and the inevitable diffusion of culture.

As far as the Mexican government is concerned, we tend to sympathize, but with a reservation. The reservation is that we will be more willing to believe in its bona-fides if it orders the removal of that giant Pepsi-Cola bottle from out of the middle of the bull-fighting ring at the Plaza Mexico in the capital.

But does the state have a right to step in and try to regulate the people's language on political grounds? For political the measure assuredly is. It is the understandable reaction of a country which feels the pressure of the capitalist giant on the North, resents its subordination to the neighboring imperialism, and winces when it sees its very culture corrupted (or, if you wish, simply affected) by the purchasing power of the U. S. dollar.

It would be wrong to think too quickly of the principles of "linguistics" proclaimed by Stalin not long ago in the work on the subject which gained him the title of genius among all perspicacious Russian lickspittles. To be sure, here was a simon-pure case of linguistic nationalism as an instrument of colonial policy. But this is the linguistic nationalism of the imperialist, not the linguistic nationalism of the oppressed.

Nor should we amalgamate the Mexican government's measure with the linguistic racialism of the Hitlerites, who tried to "Germanize" German by proscribing Latin-derived words and inventing pure "Aryan" multisyllabic replacements for them, not to speak of their attempt to make the Gothic alphabet the only acceptable one. It is the political context which is decisive in such cases, even though the questions can also be discussed non-politically on purely scientific grounds.

## IVANHOE, ISRAEL, IRELAND & INDIA

The linguistic nationalism of the underdog is a knottier problem. In *Ivanhoe*, the jester Wamba, with witty bitterness, discourses on the fact that the English words for the different cuts of meat—beef, veal, mutton, etc.—were derived from the language of the Norman conquerors and overlords, while the animals retained their Anglo-Saxon names only while they still had to be cared for by the lowly English serfs. The economic oppression of the whole people was symbolized in the language. At this distance it is easy to be philosophical about the processes of language diffusion.

In Israel, a linguistic nationalism with at least strong overtones of chauvinism pushed the Zionists to revive a dead language, the chauvinist tone coming most strongly to the fore in their hostile treatment of Yiddish. Indisputably, leaving the rights and wrongs aside for their discussion, it is because Yiddish is bound up in their minds with the inferior status of the Jews in the Diaspora.

In Ireland a revival of Gaelic comes along with the struggle for freedom against the English.

Some of these movements have taken real root, some have remained quixotic. The reason for one development or the other is not linguistic but social and political. The most obvious reason why Hebrew could be reborn in Israel is that some sort of common or international language was a social necessity, in view of the multi-national origin of the elements of the Israeli nation, and the Zionist ideology did the rest, whereas Gaelic is no kind of social necessity for Ireland but *only* a nationalist symbol (culturally or politically). For the same reason, we are not aware of any nationalist trend in India to supplant English as the common (but not the only) language of the country, because there is no good substitute and there is a social necessity for it.

And perhaps the Mexican government is also knocking its head against too strong a social drive. In the last analysis, it is not its decrees that will decide that. Some degree of diffusion of English into Mexican Spanish would be an inevitability in any case, regardless of the relations between the two countries, just as Spanish diffused to a degree into the U. S. West, and through Mexico at that. The difference is enormous, of course: in the U. S., it lends a tone of the culturally exotic; in Mexico the reverse process reminds the people of the invasion of American capital in other forms than through tourists.

## CULTURAL PRIDE

Certainly we Americans have no right to be judges in this matter: we never felt the problem; and if the very issue seemed semi-humorous to the U. S. newspapers that reported it, that is simply a matter of naive chauvinism too. This country has been a colony also, but of course the language question was not raised.

And in its whole history, never having experienced the symbolic bitterness of twisting the lips to mouth a conqueror's tongue, Americans have been among the most hospitable to foreign linguistic importations, so much so that one has a right to object on other grounds.

The American language has no cultural pride. It is thought eminently "correct" in this country to try to preserve the French pronunciation of imported words like envelope, nuance, garage, chauffeur, etc., including the nasals and the stress, and the bastardized pronunciation of such words is often even embalmed in dictionaries. The British do it better, when they rhyme garage with marriage, for example; and the Elizabethans did it much better when they cut roughshod through the French spellings to Anglicized pronunciations in harmony with the rest of the language. The French have had little trace of the Amer-

# SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

when he burst out with the following heart-moving effusion: "I have, I think, personally a very large stake in this country. . . ." Portraits of the patriots Washington, Lincoln and Hamilton plainly were swimming in his moisture-laden eyes, tastefully decorated with the usual \$1, \$5 and \$10 in lovely green.

Some scorn has been poured by certain people upon the "martyrs" who have defied the congressional witchhunters by standing on the 5th Amendment. Behold the non-martyrs, who wouldn't be caught dead standing on anything—principles, dignity, or the order of their going.

## Liberal

An entirely different sort of case is that of James Wechsler, editor of the *N. Y. Post*, who has carried on a vigorous campaign of exposure against McCarthy and who, when recently called before his committee, talked back like a man. Now (May 6) we find that the *Post* editor—one of the most consistent of American liberals, relatively speaking, on the issue of civil liberties, as we have said before—has broken down in midstream.

Incredibly, he has given McCarthy, at the demagogue's demand, "an apparently lengthy list of names of persons he said he had known to be Communists between 1934 and 1937."

It is true that he points out that "many" on the list are probably or certainly not CPers now, and that he pleads with McCarthy to keep the list secret and "merely" turn it over to the FBI, but he admits that publication of the names "could do them irreparable harm and serve no conceivable national purpose."

ican self-consciousness about foreign words, what with *bifteck*, *redingote* and all; though we are not sure what is happening in these Marshall Plan days.

In fact, the United States could use a bit of linguistic nationalism itself. But that's a personal opinion. In any case, it is not the sort of thing that can be regulated by state decree, or even by a National Academy which pretends to be watchdog of the language's purity while in reality it itself becomes a period piece. Mexico may find that out too, if the Mexican people do not resent *loncheria* as much as the politicians.

And what conceivable purpose does this capitulation by Mr. Wechsler serve? It will not win him McCarthy's love, certainly. Nor will it help others who may want to stand up against the bullying of the storm-trooper type from Wisconsin.

It would seem that Wechsler has buckled, at this point, under the pressure—not of McCarthy, no—but of those "opponents" of McCarthy who follow the brilliant tactic of trying to undercut McCarthy by capitulating to him, that is, of those who act as the transmission belts for McCarthy's pressure, with the *very* best of intentions.

## Sir Anarchist

It seems there has been quite a tizzy recently in anarchist circles. Herbert Read, who is one of Britain's better known anarchists, author of a number of works expounding that philosophy, is also a noted art critic and aesthete. In reward for his contributions to the world of art, the British crown offered him a knighthood, the last time the titles were passed around. He accepted. Our anarchist is now Sir Herbert Read, just like W. Churchill.

Naturally, this was denounced as a betrayal by his anarchist friends, who wanted to know whether (for example) Bakunin would have knelt to a throne. Sir Herbert, being no slouch at the pen, replied among other things that Tolstoy was a noble, wasn't he, and, although it is true he tried to get rid of his title, he thereby only caused grief to his friends and relatives. He, Read, wasn't going to make any trouble for people by refusing the honor, being a benefactor of humanity in principle. Good knight!

Before pushing this line of thought further into the ground, we might mention that we did not ourselves see, in the course of the anarchist literature on the Sir Herbert affair, any reference to the positive aspect. This is the fact—just stop and think about it for a minute—that an avowed, active and agitational anarchist was so honored in Britain.

Don't bother to remind us that the British don't take anarchists as seriously as they take Bevanites—this we know—but contrast it with the picture of what happens in America to mere band-leaders who marry Katherine Windsor.

## Brass-Check Dept.

Since many of our readers, even outside of New York, follow the *N. Y. Times* for detailed international news which is skimmed in other papers, we'd like to call attention to the fact that its dispatches from Tunisia in the last few days have been following the Duranty-Handler pattern: cynical rewriting of the handouts and planted news turned out by the French military dictatorship. This is known as cooperation with the State Department.

Outside of sins of omission (suppression of the real facts of the electoral terror of the French) the tipoff is such passages as the following on May 5. The dispatch refers to a "terrorist organization"—unnamed—whose headquarters were raided at Dermeche and then adds: "Dermeche is less than one mile from the palace of the Bey of Tunis . . . who does little to hide his sympathies for the nationalist movement." It's crude, but in the tradition.

As we go to press on May 6, the *Times* carries a signed article by Michael Clark, from Tunis, which brazenly gives out the old Paris line about how France is just pouring money into Tunisia to keep up the people's standard of living. This moth-eaten bit of falsification by the colonialists was taken up in detail in "The Story Behind Tunisia's Fight for Freedom" which appeared in LABOR ACTION for February 4 of last year, when the uprising broke out; but we will just mention the main point here. The French government does expend money on Tunisia indeed, for military expenditures, administrative services, etc.; and this is all that Clark refers to. The gimmick is that the swelling profits taken out of Tunisia are not pocketed by the government but by private French interests, who have a real "patriotic" interest in holding on to the subject nation.

**A Labor Action sub is \$2 a year  
Get it EVERY week!**

# Protest to Attorney General

Upon the announcement of the new "loyalty and security" program of the Eisenhower government (see front-page story in this issue), the Independent Socialist League once more pressed its demand upon the Department of Justice for a hearing on its inclusion in the so-called "subversive list," which is retained by the new administration according to press reports.

As our news story indicates, the newly revised program apparently provides for some kind of hearing. This is the basis for the following telegram which was dispatched on May 4 to the attorney general, Herbert Brownell:

**"PRESS REPORTS ATTRIBUTE STATEMENT TO YOU THAT ALL ORGANIZATIONS LISTED BY PAST ATTORNEYS GENERAL UNDER PARAGRAPH 3, PART III OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 9835 ARE RETAINED ON LIST OF SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS ISSUED BY YOU UNDER SECTION 12 OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S EXECUTIVE ORDER OF APRIL 27 ON SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT. WE ASSUME THAT INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE, SOCIALIST YOUTH LEAGUE AND FORMER WORKERS PARTY ARE RETAINED ON LIST ISSUED BY YOU. WE PROTEST SUCH LISTING AS UNWARRANTED AND REQUEST HEARING AT EARLIEST POSSIBLE DATE AT WHICH WE MAY CONTEST IT. REQUEST YOU FURNISH US GROUNDS ON WHICH LISTING OF AFORENAMED WAS BASED SO THAT WE MAY PREPARE OURSELVES FOR SUCH HEARING.**

**"MAX SHACHTMAN, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN  
"INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE."**

The inclusion of socialist organizations such as the ISL on the list by the attorneys general of the Truman administration, now carried over, it would seem, by Eisenhower's, has been one of the most notorious examples of the fact that the government's "loyalty" purge system is not even formally aimed only at the Stalinists and "agents of Moscow" but is used to strike a blow at all radical and non-conformist opinion. The Independent Socialist League aims to challenge this listing vigorously.



# Tunisia and the War in Laos

## The U.S. Holds Hands with French Imperialism

By HAL DRAPER

President Eisenhower is calling on the Russians to show "good faith" for peace by "deeds, not words," and, when this demand is directed to the Moscow imperialists, it is naturally justified. At the same time, this virtuously indignant Washington government is getting ever more embroiled in the imperialist oppression unleashed by its French ally over two colonial peoples.

**The "good faith" which it demands from the Kremlin it shows itself by announcing new "steps" to arm the French forces in Indo-China at the same time that the French are pulling off a police-state "election" in Tunisia against the resistance of virtually the whole Tunisian people.**

The American people get a distorted view of the world from even the least rabid of its big newspapers. The front pages feature shocked headlines about the Stalinist guerrilla attacks in Laos (Indo-China) at the same time that the editors print the lying handouts of the French colonial administration in Tunis.

The truth about the Tunisian crisis is that it is the continuing result of French terror over the land. The situation made the headlines in our Sunday papers only when a pro-Paris native quisling, traitor to his people, was assassinated. It did not make the headlines when the French troops assassinated scores of Tunisians in its last-phase drive to "clean up" opposition as a preparation for its fake election.

**That is what has been happening in the North African colony in the past weeks.**

### IMPERIALIST STRATEGY

Faced with the demand of the people for self-government, the French made a counter-proposal for local elections in Tunisia, so rigged as to be meaningless for the people's aspirations to independent status. By practically open intimidation of the Bey of Tunis, that nominal native ruler was "persuaded" to decree the French-type election—after a number of the bey's counselors had been eliminated by imprisonment, after deportation of trade-union leaders and execution of many Nationalists, after the assassination (widely thought to have been inspired by French colonialists) of Farhat Hached, head of the Tunisian labor federation, after blackmail threats to dethrone the bey, etc.

The French strategy is to get its puppets into control of the rural and municipal assemblies first, so that it can use these "representatives" of the people to ensure control of any later maneuver it may have to make with regard to nation-wide representative institutions. Its aim is also to be able to claim "progress" in case of debate before world public opinion in the United Nations, if its crimes are called into court.

For years now, the demand of the Tunisians—in virtual unanimity from the bey and native chambers of commerce down to the exploited workers and peasants—has been for national sovereignty first, instead of grandstand plays at "municipal reform." The Tunisians in the colonial cabinet, through their Prime Minister Chenik, told this to French Foreign Minister Schuman in their very last reply to his maneuver:

"... the foundation and basic principle of any democracy depends in the first place on an undivided sovereignty. Without this unity of sovereignty... Tunisian democracy would be nothing more than a caricature of democracy and the system which professed to embody it would be nothing more than a farce and a fiction."

### FAKE REFORM

**The local "reform" which the French seek to substitute for freedom is, precisely, a farce and a fiction. For the elections which have been held during the past month, the setup is as follows:**

(1) Voters are strictly limited to persons paying certain taxes, including officials, recipients of special honors, etc.—i.e., those who the French think can be "controlled." A small minority has the right to vote.

(2) Although members of the rural assemblies are elected by direct vote, the candidates are carefully screened by the Kaid (a local Tunisian official) and the *Contrôleurs Civils* (French administrators).

(3) The Kaid can at any time have a candidate's name dropped from the voters' register because of the candidate's past political beliefs or other reasons. The

Kaid can also disqualify the candidate if he is elected.

(4) The Commission on Disputed Elections is controlled by French officials, who also have the right to be present during the voting, with consequent power to "steer" it.

(5) The powers of the elected assemblies are illusory. The counselors vote taxes proposed by the Kaid, but the administration is not bound by this vote if it goes against it. The counselors may make suggestions but the final decision rests with the Department of Finance, which is directed by a high French official.

(6) The Kaid can suspend any decision of the Council of Kaidats (a kaidat comprises several territorial administrative units), and the council meetings can take place only in the presence of the French *Contrôleur Civil*.

(7) The "reform" perpetuates the system whereby the minority French-colonial population has equal representation in most of the assemblies with the Tunisian majority, even where the French are a tiny minority (as in the towns of Sfax, Sousse, Gabès Béja, Nabeul).

### ELECTION UNDER TERROR

**But all this is not enough. The French are conquerors in a land which hates them. Administrative gimmicks must be supplemented with bloodletting.**

During the election period the French unleashed a violent repression to spread fear and intimidation. Hundreds were arrested in Tunis (the capital), Sousse, Kairouan, Sfax and Gabès. For this very purpose, the Paris *gauleiter* Resident-General de Hauteclocque decreed that the elections be staggered over a period extending from April 13 to 23 so as to allow the authorities time enough to move their intimidation squads from one region to another during the voting.

Most of the leaders of the opposition have been arrested and interned. This too followed a staggered schedule: on April 7 at Siliiana, on April 11 at Sbeitla, on April 13 at Menzel-Temime, on April 15 at Gafour, on April 17 at Teboursook, Mateur and the Island of Djerba. Tunis, Sousse, Sfax, Gabès and Nabeul were subjected to a systematic "clean-up" from April 7 to 20.

In Tunis, a group of physicians were arrested for signing a motion of protest, and during the electoral period about 60 Nationalists were sentenced by the French Military Tribunal. Four of these were given death sentences; three others were handed life sentences at hard labor; six got 20 years in jail; one woman and several young boys were sentenced to 1 or 2 years in jail.

**Even in France itself, leading newspapers did not conceal the election terror. On April 16, the Paris *Le Monde* wrote:**

"While the elections for the Kaidat councils are being held, measures for local banishment have been taken against persons who allegedly sought to create disorders during the voting. Authorized circles wish to make it clear that these banishments are 'strictly temporary' but let us remember that similar measures, taken immediately after Farhat Hached's assassination, have not yet been withdrawn."

On April 19 *France-Soir* revealed that press censorship in Tunisia had been intensified. It specified that on that very morning native newspapers had been prohibited from printing (1) the bey's own notes to the prime minister and officials' reactions thereto; (2) election results in certain regions where less than 10 per cent of the registered voters had gone to the polls; (3) attacks on Tunisians in the interior the day before.

The Socialist Party paper of Tunis *Tunis-Socialiste* suspended publication for the election period, presumably because there was no point to coming out with all the space blanked out by the censorship.

**In Paris, the French SP paper *Le Populaire* carried the head: "How M. de Hauteclocque, on behalf of the French Republic, fabricates 'good elections' in Tunisia according to methods used by Stalin and Franco."**

*Le Populaire* explained the election fraud which we have already mentioned: "They [the French administration] choose the voters—an arbitrary choice—among people who, for one reason or another, need a governmental license to make a living, as for instance driving licenses, peddling licenses, licenses for sale of beverages, disabled veterans' pension booklets, etc. . . . They are forced to place their names on the voters register and are instructed what to do."

### THE PEOPLE ANSWER

**These farcical elections were held under a formally declared state of siege, with public meetings forbidden, press censorship not only in force but intensified, and with military operations galore going on. But in spite of protests the French refused to postpone the show.**

It can be understood, then, why the Tunisians decided to boycott the election, rather than be party to the deception. This decision was made in conference assembled. On March 19 a wide-ranging conference of Tunisian political and economic organizations met and adopted a resolution which denounced the "dupery" and declared that "such elections cannot give a valid indication of the Tunisian peoples' present wishes." It was signed by the Neo-Destour party (the Nationalist party), the General Union of Labor, the civil servants' federation, the General Union of Agriculture, the Handicrafts and Commerce Union, and several chambers of commerce, agriculture and industry in Northern, Central and Southern Tunisia.

It can be understood also that, under such conditions, any Tunisian who acted as an agent for the

French military dictatorship would be regarded unanimously by the population as a paid traitor and seller of his people. There are somewhat fewer of these vermin in Tunisia than in less nationally-conscious areas, but they are there, of course, acting as the fronts for the imperialists. Such a one was newspaper publisher Chedly Kastally.

But that is no reason to conclude hastily that his assassination on May 2 was the work of a Nationalist. It most certainly was not the responsibility of the organized movement, headed by the Neo-Destour, which has long been one of the most moderate nationalist movements in the region. It is not excluded that the affair was a provocation arranged by elements from the other side. It may have been, of course, the desperate and misguided recourse of an individual nationalist maddened by the French atrocities.

After the assassination, the *N. Y. Times* reported, "a number of Tunisians" who were performing the dirty job of running for office "were reported to have withdrawn."

**As we write, it is announced that, the day after, on Sunday, when the city of Tunis was supposed to go to the polls, less than 9 per cent of the eligible Tunisian voters cast their ballots. That was Tunis' answer to the terror.**

### THE 'DIRTY WAR' IN LAOS

The troops, guns, artillery and assorted war machines (which have included tanks and planes), devoted by the French to "protect" the Tunisian people of their Protectorate from the dangers of freedom, are sadly needed by these democratic gentlemen to defend their imperialist outposts in Indo-China, but their good friends in Washington make it possible for them to spread themselves.

**On Saturday, Secretary of State Dulles made the announcement of intensified aid to French military operations in Laos. It would be interesting to find out whether U. S. arms do or do not fall short of replacing the arms withdrawn by the French for the purpose of subjugating the Tunisian people.**

In Indo-China, where the Vietminh forces of Ho Chi Minh are pressing the assault on Laos, the demand for independence from French rule arises as in Tunisia. On his recent visit to the U. S., the king of Cambodia openly said that his people wanted freedom. Last week, the press reported, the Cambodian embassy in Paris "warned that unless Cambodia were given independence, there was danger that the people might turn to the Vietminh as liberators."

That, of course, is an understatement. Preachments about the horrors of Stalinism, including documented books, with footnotes and references—all perfectly true—are not likely to mean much to a people who know that the present oppressors on their necks are not the Stalinists but the French messieurs who do the preaching about the crimes of Russian imperialism. To tell these people—again perfectly truly—that the Stalinists would exploit them too is not guaranteed to fill them with enthusiasm for their present lot.

**"All wars are dirty, but this is a particularly dirty war"—so writes the *N. Y. Times* correspondent from Hanoi on May 3, speaking of Indo-China. He continues: "As Gen. Mark W. Clark noted when he visited Indo-China in late March, 'The enemy is everywhere—coming through the walls, the ceilings and the floors.'"**

This is the description of a war in which the people feel they are fighting for national liberation. It is the French who have convinced them of that, and not the Stalinists, who only utilize this national-revolutionary fervor for their own purposes.

### A DEMOCRATIC POLICY IS NEEDED

The Vietminh forces, says the same dispatch in the *Times*, "are getting stronger and annexing more territory." They "have manifestly developed a greater punch during the past two years." The French have not been able as yet "to arrest the gradual process of erosion here."

"Many villages in the delta are in French hands by day and in Vietminh hands by night. . . ." That means, as anyone can understand, that the people of the villages are largely with the guerrillas. The Vietminh guerrillas pose as rice farmers during the day, complain the French, and this makes it difficult to spot them. They could not do so with impunity unless they could rely on the rice farmers' cooperation. Ho's men make surprise raids. "The most recent of which was a bold night attack in which they kidnapped 350 recruits for the new Vietnamese army from a training center at Namdinh in the lower delta." Let the French try to "kidnap" soldiers from the Vietminh and see whether they would do them any good.

"Altogether, the Vietminh insurgents have an estimated strength of 280,000 . . ." and altogether the French, with American aid pouring in, have so far been able to get together a Vietnamese army of 160,000 to supplement their own forces.

**It is the Stalinists who hag-ride this revolution, while the U. S. lines up with the imperialist bayonets.**

**Meanwhile the American press tries to tell us that President Eisenhower has taken over some kind of initiative or other when he calls on the Russian totalitarians to show "good faith" in "deeds, not words."**



## A Suggestion on the Debate over Economics in the Kremlin —

# The Dispute Over 'Objective Law' in Russia

By B. D. NADSON

Several years ago it was observed that Nikolai Voznesensky, a prominent official of the Russian government, had suddenly and inexplicably vanished from the scene. He had, evidently, been disgraced, but why, nobody knew.

On general grounds, it is safe to assume that his disappearance was the result of a conflict within the Stalinist ruling class, but beyond such generalities it has been difficult to venture. In October of last year, however, an event took place that may help us to penetrate the mystery of Voznesensky's political demise.

We refer to the publication of Stalin's work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*. On the face of it there seems to be no connection between Stalin's book and Voznesensky; but an examination of certain aspects of the book, together with an analysis of the Russian press's response to it, at least suggests an interesting possibility of such a connection.

**At the very outset, it hardly needs to be emphasized that Stalin was not the sort of man who would write a theoretical work either in dispassionate pursuit of truth or to give free play to the energies of his intellect. His theoretical pronouncements have invariably been in the nature of an intervention in some bureaucratic snarl or in a conflict within the ruling class. His last work is probably no exception.**

Therefore, with these general considerations in mind, let us try to uncover the connection between the downfall of Voznesensky and the appearance of Stalin's work on economics.

### Economists Rebuked

Recall the main theme of Stalin's book. On the first page he writes:

"Some comrades deny the objective character of laws of science, and of laws of political economy particularly, under socialism. They deny that the laws of political economy reflect processes, governed by objective law, which operate independently of the will of man. They believe that in view of the specific role assigned to the Soviet state by history, the Soviet state and its leaders can abolish existing laws of political economy and can 'form,' 'create' new laws." (International Publishers, New York, page 7.)

This theme has naturally been taken up by the entire Stalinist press. Unfortunately, we do not have the space to entertain the reader with the many choice quotations that could be collected. Suffice it to say that there has been the usual wailing and gnashing of teeth, the usual orgy of sackcloth and ashes, breast-beating, and retroactive confessions.

In January of this year an impressive crowd of leading economists were not too gently rebuked for the blunder of not emphasizing the objective character of economic laws under "socialism." This blunder was formulated in the following words:

"They denied the objective character of economic laws under socialism, maintaining that the state creates economic laws, that thanks only to the conscious action of Soviet people do economic laws arise." (*Voprosy Ekonomiki*, No. 1, 1953.)

### Suspicion

L. A. Leontiev, a prominent economist, was singled out in particular, as though to say: Behold, even Leontiev has strayed from the straight and narrow path of orthodoxy. P. Yudin, a perennial hack, made the following comment on Leontiev's "blunder":

"When it's a question of the economic laws of capitalism, Comrade Leontiev leaves no doubt that he recognizes their objective character. But as soon as Comrade Leontiev moves on to a consideration of the economic laws of socialism, he changes his point of view on the objective nature of economic laws and enters the path of subjectivism, maintaining that here there operates objective necessity 'which passes through the consciousness and the will of men.'" (*Kommunist*, No. 3, 1953.)

**It is at this point that one must pause, first in perplexity, then in suspicion. A careful com-**

**parison of Stalin's work with Leontiev's statements on the subject of objective law (see, for instance, his article in *Science and Society*, Vol. VIII, No. 2, 1944, page 1118) throws suspicion on all these charges that Leontiev somehow denies the objective character of economic laws, either under capitalism or under Stalinism. One is inclined to suspect that the main objective is something different from the charge that Leontiev and others have sloughed over the objective character of economic laws under "socialism"; for, on closer inspection, the whole discussion reveals its scholastic, hair-splitting character.**

Stalin, for instance, emphasizes that economic laws "operate independently of our will" (page 12 of his book), while equally emphasizing that "we get to know them and master them, learn to apply them with full understanding" (page 11). Leontiev maintains "that here there operates objective necessity which 'operates through the consciousness and will of men.'"

### Role of State Involved

The party hacks are so hard put to make a principled distinction between Stalin's formulation and that of (say) Leontiev that they must distort the latter's views, which do not include the idea that the state "creates" economic laws.

This whole business might indeed be hard to understand were it not for the circumstance that the Russian Stalinist press itself suggests an answer. As article after article on Stalin's work appeared, certain general tendencies began to manifest themselves.

For example, the discussion on the nature of objective law almost invariably involved a discussion of the role of the state: to such an extent, in fact, that one soon suspects that the role of the state is the main point at stake. In *Questions of History*, to cite an instance, there recently appeared an editorial entitled "Against Subjectivist Mistakes in the Study of the History of Soviet Society." This editorial is revealing because it deals with the historiography of Russia after 1917. After attacking philosophers, historians, and economists for subjectivism and voluntarism, the writer declared:

"These economists and philosophers had considered that the Soviet government, at its will, by its economic plans and by its whole policy can 'transform,' 'form,' 'create' and 'abolish' the economic laws of socialist society." (*Voprosy Istorii*, December, 1952.)

### Polemic Within Ruling Class?

**The editorial as a whole leaves one with the unmistakable impression that it has now become an error to emphasize the role of the state apparatus in bringing about "socialism," i.e., Stalinist socio-economic relations: to put it bluntly, the entire system of police terror, permanent purge, bureaucratic efficiency, and the low standard of living is the result of economic laws that operate independently of men's will. It seems, therefore, that at least one function of Stalin's book was to deflect attention from the state as a "free," "creative" agent of history, and to emphasize its role as an obedient servant of history.**

But even this aspect of the question is suspicious: one senses that the Stalinists cannot go too far along such theoretical paths. In other words, it is doubtful whether we have to do here with any major theoretical about-face. Stalin's book seems to involve, rather, a polemic within the ruling class.

But now, what about Voznesensky? How does he enter into all this? Behind the flimsy façade of Stalin's poker-faced theorizing, there hover the shadowy figures of "certain comrades"; but in the concrete line, as handed out in the press,

these figures yield their place to a real flesh-and-blood comrade. P. Yudin, for example, in his attack on Leontiev, ended by saying:

"Is there any wonder, then, that Comrade Leontiev had praised the anti-Marxist book of N. Voznesensky, which contains idealist, voluntarist chatter about the economic laws of socialism?" (Op. cit., page 53.)

**At last the real content of Leontiev's blunder reveals itself. Leontiev, whose writings will be searched in vain for any meaningful denial of the objective character of economic laws, had simply done what every obedient intellectual had done at the time, i.e., praised a book written by a member of the leading core, who has since been cast into outer darkness. The book under attack is *The War Economy of the USSR*.**

### Voznesensky Attacked

In *Questions of History*, a journal already cited, there appears the following characterization of Voznesensky's book:

"N. Voznesensky's anti-Marxist book on the war economy of the Soviet Union during the Fatherland War is permeated with subjectivist views on the role of the Soviet state and state planning in the USSR, [a book which] . . . served as one of the sources of the spread of voluntarist ideas." (*Voprosy Istorii*, No. 12, 1952.)

This is not the place to examine Voznesensky's book. However, the nature of the book is such as to suggest preoccupation on his part with problems of proportionality between the two departments of social production: the department producing means of production and the department producing means of consumption. Moreover, from time to time, he rather sharply reminds his readers of the dire consequences of upsetting the pre-established proportion.

It is true that, as his critics emphasize, Voznesensky stresses the role of the state. He writes in one place, for example: "In Soviet economy, the planning socialist state is the source of movement and development of the national economy." (Page 150, Russian edition.) But it is a question whether, with such a formulation, he departs from Stalinist orthodoxy.

### Road to Lubyanka

**The whole point, however, does not lie in a book. Voznesensky was not dismissed from his post several years ago because he wrote a book that was condemned only a few months ago: he was dismissed in the course of a top-level struggle. His book expresses ideas that, apparently, belong to a certain section of the ruling class.**

We can only speculate on the precise nature of these ideas as reflections of economic contradictions in the base, or conflicts in matters of policy, or power struggles at the top. Owing to the nature of the Stalinist ruling class itself, and the problems attending its own cold-war economy, conflicts must necessarily arise as to the correct proportion to be maintained between the two departments. Such problems as the tempo of accumulation, concessions to the working class, needs of the various sections of the bureaucracy, etc., must be faced. Almost inevitably, the formation of a "hard" and a "soft" line develops in the upper reaches of the bureaucracy. At this point, it is very difficult to ascertain Voznesensky's position in this division.

One thing emerges rather clearly. The "opposition" that seems to have centered round Voznesensky must have pointed to the "omnipotence" of the Stalinist police state, "which can do anything," to bolster up their argument. What Voznesensky and his entourage wanted the state to do is still a moot question: from the point of view of Stalin they were subjectivist adventurers, who were following "in the footsteps of Bukharin," which footsteps are said to have led to the basement of Lubyanka prison and the proverbial hole in the head.



# Eisenhower's Purge System — —

(Continued from page 11)

Under the old purge setup, a worker could appeal from the findings of a departmental loyalty board to the Loyalty Review Board, which was an independent body and applied criteria which were uniform to all cases. Now the worker may appeal a suspension to a three-man Security Hearing Board made up of people drawn from a roster of government workers outside his own department.

Before such a board he has the same rights which he had before the old departmental loyalty boards, which means that he will not be permitted to cross-examine witnesses who have brought adverse information against him, and that he has no right to be informed of the exact nature of the "evidence" which the board has against him. The Security Hearing Board will then hand its recommendations to the head of the department, who in turn will make the final decision.

## WARNING

It is true that in the new as in the old programs, the worker may then seek redress from the courts. The time, effort and expense involved are prohibitive for the average person who has got caught in the wheels of the machinery.

Past experience shows that the overwhelming majority of those suspended or fired under the old procedure preferred to let the matter drop and seek some form of livelihood in the obscurity of private employment rather than exhaust themselves in legal struggle against the resources of the United States government.

The "List of Subversive Organizations" has been retained under the new order. One of Attorney General Brownell's first acts after it was issued was to announce that all organizations previously listed will be retained on the list, and to add an additional 62 organizations to it.

A large number of the new organizations listed bear titles such as "Families of the Baltimore Smith Act Victims," "Committee to Defend Marie Richardson," "Maurice Braverman Defense Committee," etc. In other words, people are now warned that if they come to the defense of Stalinist victims of the witch-hunt in organizations which have been formed by the political friends or the

relatives of indicted or convicted Stalinists, they are liable at least to this degree of governmental reprisal.

The attorney general also announced that organizations listed will have a chance to appeal their listing and to receive some kind of hearing by his department. This right was denied to listed organizations under previous administrations, and the denial drew a rebuke from the Supreme Court.

At present, information is lacking as to just what kind of hearings will be granted organizations which appeal their listing. For instance, it is not known whether appealing organizations will be furnished with the criteria on the basis of which the Department of Justice determines which organizations are placed on the list, and the acts, documents or other material on the basis of which the Department has determined that any particular organization falls within the criteria for listing.

It is clear that unless the department is willing to furnish this information to appealing organizations it will be extremely difficult for them to know just what they are expected to disprove about themselves.

## ANYTHING GOES

The language of the new Executive Order is so broad in its definition of the proscribed organizations that it appears to be designed to make any defense difficult. "Membership in, or affiliation or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic group . . . which has adopted or shows a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States . . ." is the broadest language used.

It appears that under this language any union which has engaged in a strike in the course of which scabs have provoked its members to "acts of violence" could be placed on the list. The union need not advocate such acts in writing or by word of mouth. It need only "show" that it "approves" them, perhaps by not expelling the members who have committed them.

Of course, at the moment the administration has not listed unions, and probably does not intend to list them. This extreme example has been presented only

to show that the order has been drawn so loosely as to make it possible for the government to do so.

It has been the tendency of many well-intentioned liberals to accept the government's argument that federal employment is a privilege rather than a right, and to accept the further principle that the government may draw up the rules and regulations under which this privilege is extended to the citizenry. Further, they have accepted the idea that where "sensitive" jobs are concerned, the government is justified in making very stringent the rules under which such jobs are held. They have confined themselves to attacking only the most flagrant cases of injustice to individual government workers and the procedural practices which have either deprived such workers of the possibility of making an adequate defense or have made this exceptionally difficult.

We do not contend that the right to federal employment is in the same category as the rights to free speech, press, assembly and the like. We do not contend that the government should be deprived of the ability to defend itself against spies, or to assure itself of the political loyalty of its policy-making or major policy-executing officers.

## SETTING THE TONE

The fact remains, however, that the government is now by far the largest employer in the United States. It is a further fact that the government sets the TONE for increasingly wider numbers of employers throughout the country, and that if this tone is repressive it spreads into all sectors of American life.

It is now quite clear that the government's program has gone far beyond what can be considered necessary even from the broadest conservative interpretation of the demands of "national security." It has placed restrictions on the personal and political associations of over a million Americans which have been exceeded only in full-blown police-states.

A government worker, or anyone who thinks that he may one day wish to become a government worker, must now abstain from any but the most orthodox political associations through his whole life. To be completely safe, he must break off all personal relations with anyone who holds unorthodox political views or who is sympathetically associated with others who do.

Well-meaning liberals who have accepted the "loyalty" and "security" programs in the past without realizing their full implications for American life may well re-examine the stand they have taken. The assumptions they have accepted have compelled them to meet each new program in the confines of a narrowing circle of the very idea of freedom, of what a free society is.

Each constriction of the circle is opposed not as an intensification of an evil, but in the name of defending the previous "lesser evil." This can continue only to a point: the point is reached when the circle has narrowed to a noose around their own political necks. But then it may be too late.

## ONE FIGHT

The fight for civil liberties, against the kind of constriction of them represented by the old "loyalty" program and, in worse form, by the new one, must be fought on a broader basis. It can only be successful if it enlists the workers, the youth, the mass of the people in a struggle against the social and economic power-groups which are moving slowly but with clearly defined drive and purpose to regiment American society.

Civil liberties and democracy are not independent categories which can be successfully defended and expanded regardless of what happens in the political life of the country in general. They are under assault by the same groups which seek to hamper and crush the labor movement; which block effective civil-rights measures; which are destroying public housing; which seek to impose the will of American capital on all the governments and peoples of the world.

Surely the time has come to recognize that all these measures of reaction are interconnected, and that they can be fought only by a mass political movement which is united in its opposition to them and to the social, political and economic groups which are behind them.

## 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!

# Youngdahl Hits — —

(Turn to last page)

Indulge in speculation in order to arrive at a verdict. Sympathies and beliefs and what they mean to different individuals involve concepts that are highly nebulous and speculative at best."

## ALERT!

He stated that the constitutional guarantee of free speech was designed to protect an individual "in the expression of ideas though they are repugnant to the orthodox." He then went on to say:

"Communism's fallacy and viciousness can be demonstrated without striking down the protection of the First Amendment of discourse, discussion and debate. When public excitement runs high as to alien ideologies, it is the time when we must be particularly alert not to impair the ancient landmarks set up in the Bill of Rights.

"The greater the importance of safeguarding the community from incitement to the overthrow of our institutions by force and violence, the more imperative is the need to preserve inviolate the constitutional rights of free speech, free press and free assembly in order to maintain the opportunity for free political discussion, to the end that government may be responsive to the will of the people and that changes, if desired, may be obtained by peaceful means. Therein lies the security of the republic, the very foundation of constitutional government."

Judge Youngdahl then made a statement which well might be committed to memory by every defender of the present witchhunt, by every "liberal" who lends his voice to the purge of Stalinist teachers, or to the idea that today "anything goes" against the Stalinists because on a world scale their movement is a threat to democracy:

"In our proper concern for the internal and external threat of communism and in pursuing our efforts to strike down these threats, we should endeavor to be consistent and not attempt to require a conformity in thought and beliefs that has no relevancy to a present danger to our security."

## HE'S "CONTROVERSIAL" NOW

The New York Times report on Judge Youngdahl's decision quite correctly surmised that it is "almost certain to make him suddenly the center of a new controversy" in Washington. He was appointed to the Federal District Court by President Truman in July 1951, and was Republican governor of Minnesota at the time.

Senator McCarthy and his whole pack can be expected to go into full cry for his scalp. No doubt he was well aware of that when he wrote his decision. Only a fool could believe that in these times even the federal bench is a sufficient protection from the pack, and there is no reason to think him a fool. Hats off to Judge Youngdahl!

## 'THE NEW INTERNATIONAL'

is the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, internationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world.

SEND 35 CENTS FOR THE CURRENT ISSUE  
OR SUBSCRIBE AT \$2.00 A YEAR

New International, 114 West 14 Street, New York City

## SEE PAGE 4

for ISL's telegram to Attorney General on the "Subversive List"

## Get Acquainted!

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

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

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....

## The Handy Way to Subscribe!

**LABOR ACTION**  
Independent Socialist Weekly  
114 West 14 Street  
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2.  New
  - 6 months at \$1.  Renewal
  - Payment enclosed.  Bill me.

NAME (please print) .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

ZONE STATE .....