

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

NOVEMBER 23, 1953

FIVE CENTS

Exclusive! Scoop!

THE TRUMAN HEARING OF 1960

... page 2

Labor Repulses Adenauer Grab

... page 3

A LABOR MP VISITS FRANCO SPAIN

... page 5

MORE ON THE SWP SPLIT

... page 6

SPOT-LIGHT

Homage

Samuel Butler once wrote that hypocrisy is the homage which vice pays to virtue. This homage, alas, is nothing new, and we cannot boast that the present age is more outstanding than any other in this respect. But hypocrisy, like history, does not repeat itself under different social conditions; and today we have a special form of it which sometimes confuses the virtuous. It is the comedy of "democratization" acted out by totalitarians and terrorists.

The Ku Klux Klan has opened its ranks to Negroes, it announced somewhere in Florida. To be sure, Negroes will be allowed to join this benevolent organization only on a segregated basis; but does this prove that the whitehooded race criminals are insincere in their protestations? Why should one have a closed, rigid, doctrinaire, attitude on that? Give them a chance to prove themselves; you can't expect everything at once, can you?

The above paragraph is not our own thought but plagiarism from the collected advice of some friends who have told us how wrong we are to doubt the democratic intentions of (say) Dictator Tito—or, on other occasions, that great democratizer Malenkov.

Franco's fascist organization, the Falange, announced a smidgin of democratization a couple of weeks ago, too. Portugal's dictator Salazar, the other day, permitted an opposition candidate to get defeated in his election. Batista of Cuba has told a joyful world that he will deign to decree freedom of the press pretty soon—apparently as soon as he is sure that this privilege will not be . . . abused.

The spirit of democracy is obviously sweeping over the world. It has its setbacks every now and then, certainly—for example, when the Guianese, or the Tunisians, or Moroccans, or Africans demand self-government and other extremely radical things. There are quite a number of democratic-minded idealists who are flexible-minded and very, very practical: they are buoyed up by irresistible waves of optimism when a bloody dictator announces that he has seen the light; but are very, very suspicious when a people fight from below for freedom, especially if there are any "Communists" around.

We then sometimes get denounced as "impractical" and "unrealistic" for being incurably skeptical of the former and enthusiastic about the latter. Perhaps Samuel Butler should have written about the homage which virtue pays to vice: it is such "practicality" and "realism."

Test Question

Quite a number of liberals have, in the past few years, systematized the theory that democratic rights cannot be granted to those who would use democratic institutions for anti-democratic purposes. It was, of course, a rationalization for refusing to stand up against the witchhunt tide, on the ground that Stalinists do not deserve any democratic rights at all.

(Continued on page 5)

The Political Climate of the White Case — Then and Now

By GORDON HASKELL

The case of Harry Dexter White (or is it the case of Harry S. Truman?) has crashed across the political scene, and its reverberations still surround us. In the course of this major political scandal, the Republican attorney general has as much as called a former president of the United States an abettor of foreign agents, and the former president of the United States has said that the attorney general has debased and prostituted his office, has told at least two lies, and has "made the Justice Department the headquarters for political skullduggery."

By this time, the charges and counter-charges concerning the White case have rendered it extremely difficult for any citizen to know just what actually happened. But at least two facts emerge from the fog.

One is that during and immediately after World War II a number of Stalinists were able to reach positions of trust and influence in the government. And the other is that although the FBI warned top government officials that they had strong suspicions about a number of federal employees they were never able to make a legal case against them.

Harry Truman has made an aggressive and devas-

tating attack on the motives and methods of the Republican administration in hauling out the old White case at this time. Yet it must be admitted that his explanation of why White and others were left in prominent government positions despite the FBI charges is far less convincing.

The Crux Is Politics

Since 1947, his administration has thrown out of government office much less important people on "evidence" which was far flimsier than what the FBI had gathered against White and his alleged associates in 1946. On the basis of Attorney General Brownell's and J. Edgar Hoover's testimony before the Jenner committee it does not appear that any extraordinary measures were taken to surround the suspects in this affair with special government agents, or to prevent them from gaining access to information which might have been important to the Stalinists. At the most it can be said that there was some embarrassment over the White appointment, but that the matter was soon forgotten in the press of other business, with the idea that the FBI would keep an eye on him via their usual methods in watching suspects.

What is involved here is obviously not a question of whether Truman, Clark, Vinson, Byrnes and even Hoover were guilty of collaboration with or even the shielding of Stalinist agents. Such a charge could be made by people outside the lunatic fringe of the fascist movement only in the political atmosphere of 1953.

What was involved, in 1945-6, was the end of a period in which the Russian Stalinists were thought of as "loyal allies," and the American Stalinist movement as a respectable, and even useful, ally of the government on the American scene.

We are now so far removed from the atmosphere of

(Turn to last page)

NOTE ON CLIMATE

From Leonard Lyons' column, N. Y. Post, Nov. 17:

"REPORT: One of Jimmy Byrnes' friends, a man I know, visited him at his office while he was secretary of state. As they were about to leave, the visitor commented about the mass of documents on Byrnes' desk. Byrnes told him: 'Those are FBI reports. You know what they're trying to tell me? The FBI,' he chuckled, 'is trying to get me to believe that Alger Hiss is a Communist.'"

TRUMAN'S ATTACK ON McCARTHYISM—

Strong Words Are Not Enough!

"Herbert Brownell Jr., the attorney general of the United States—the highest legal officer in our government—has degraded the highest function of government—the administration of justice—into cheap political trickery . . . he has made the Justice Department the headquarters for political skullduggery."

"It [McCarthyism] is the corruption of truth, the abandonment of our historical devotion to fair play. It is the abandonment of the 'due process' of law. It is the use of the big lie and the unfounded accusation against any citizen in the name of Americanism or security. It is the rise to power of the demagogue who lives on untruth; it is the spread of fear and the destruction of faith in every level of our society."

"This horrible cancer is eating at the vitals of America and it can destroy the great edifice of freedom."

"I hope this will arouse you to fight this evil at every level of our national life. I even hope that this may serve to stir the conscience of this present administration itself."

LABOR ACTION wishes to associate itself with every word in the above quotations from Harry S. Truman's radio speech of November 16. It is high time that these things were said as bluntly and forthrightly as this by a major figure in American life. It is to the disgrace

of wide sections of the liberal movement in this country, and especially of the labor leadership, which must bear the chief responsibility for fighting against "this horrible cancer," that it is Harry Truman, and not they, who has raised his voice most militantly and vigorously against it.

FINE WORDS

We applaud Truman's attack on McCarthyism, and hope that it will "arouse you to fight this evil at every level of our national life." But to be really something more than fine words, that must include levels of national life for which Truman bears a full share of responsibility.

It was President Truman's Executive Order 9835 under which his attorney general set up the "list of subversive organizations" without hearing, possibility of

(Turn to last page)

Exclusive Dispatch to Labor Action on

THE TRUMAN HEARING OF 1960

By H. W. BENSON

Mr. Harry S. Truman choked and sputtered over his breakfast coffee when he glanced at the third page of the *Independence Times*. He found his name on a list.

He read, for the first time, that pursuant to a decree based on Executive Order 1045.22 the attorney general had just published two new lists: "Communistical Individuals Associated with Government and Politics" and "Associates of Russian Spy Rings." And there was his name on both in bold type together with William Z. Foster and Lowell Thomas.

(The latter was an unfortunate typographical error, but because the decree provided no means for removing a name from the list it remained.)

News columnists explained that in view of recent hostilities in Zenobia, begun in June of 1960, lists compiled by previous Democratic administrations had, curiously enough, been found incomplete and inadequate.

Throbbing with rage, he penned an indignant letter to the attorney general denouncing, repudiating, excoriating. Many weeks later he received acknowledgment of his note by the first assistant to the A-G:

"Thank you for your communication. Please be advised, that the matters you mention will be recorded in accordance with procedures to be established under executive order 1045.11."

But Mr. Truman, stubborn and impatient, wrote again. By this time, anger came under the control of reason and he lodged a formal protest demanding the removal of his name from the list and insisting upon the right to refute all insinuations against him.

UNDER CONSIDERATION

Many more weeks later the second assistant A-G replied: "Thank you for your letter. If you happen to be passing through Washington ever again I will be happy to discuss the matters you mention."

Volatile by nature, he exploded with frustrated fury and telegraphed, insisting upon formal charges, demanding to know who, what, where, when. . . . Many months passed before he received an answer, signed this time by only the third assistant:

"Thank you for your special delivery letter. I regret that the matters you mention are classified as security information. For me to divulge such facts would be to commit a grave violation of trust as a public official. You will understand that in view of the recent outbreak in Zanzovia such precautions are unfortunately essential to our national security."

Mr. Truman grabbed for his phone and finally got through a long distance call to the A-G's office. How do you get off these damn lists, he wanted to know. His query was noted.

One year later, he got a brief letter from a clerk in the A-G's office: "Thank you for your letter. No formal procedures have as yet been elaborated to handle problems of the type you mention. The affair in Hanovia has consumed the attention of our office. Please be advised that such questions are already under consideration for early discussion."

WHO IS HAMMENFLEIMER?

Meanwhile, the life of Mr. Truman and his family was sadly altered. At odd hours, the phone rang, but when he picked up the receiver, no one answered.

One afternoon a strange voice on the phone said: "Your daughter Margaret has applied for a spot in a choir singing Russian folk songs and gives you as a reference. Has she an expert command of the Russian language? This is Mr. Flammenheimer speaking."

Mr. Truman replied, "How should I know, I can't even understand what she sings in English. . . . I mean, American. But I'll let you know. What did you say your name was?"

"Er . . . er . . . Hammenfleimer."

He leaves his number. Next day, Mr. Truman calls: it is the seal room of the St. Louis zoo; no one ever heard of Mr. Hammenfleimer.

Once he could stroll in privacy through the lanes of Independence immersed in thought but now people stared and whispered, "There goes Harry S. Truman, the notorious Russian spy. Wonder how he keeps out of jail."

His friends always imagined that he was a loyal and respectable citizen but now they shunned him. ("He was a politician, you know, and he did talk a lot about labor.")

He couldn't get up a poker game and his wife was cut out of the Wednesday afternoon canasta set.

Margaret had to abandon her singing career when the rumor spread that her voice inexplicably cracked on the high notes of the "Star Spangled Banner."

WHO IS TRUMAN?

While his lawyers were probing in vain for some avenue of legal recourse, he learned that a new administration (years had passed) had actually instituted an appeals procedure. He had ten days to file a request for a formal hearing and did so immediately.

Eleven days later he was informed by the A-G: "Thank you for your letter. However, we have received information that might lead us to believe that you are not Mr. Truman. Consequently we cannot at this time consider a positive reply to your application whoever you may be. You will understand that in view of the disturbances in Klangoon we

must exercise the utmost precaution in all matters which merit precaution."

Mr. Truman brought to bear his remaining if dwindling prestige and overcame the unexpected obstacle. By a process too devious and tedious to interest the average voter, he finally succeeded in winning an appearance before the newly established committee known as "Board of Appeals from Spies." The record of the hearings is lengthy, expensive, and unobtainable. For the information of our readers we are able to reprint only a few extracts.

Prior to the hearing, Mr. Truman received a lengthy statement from the attorney general in which he at last discovered the basis for the charge against him, "close collaboration with a known Russian spy, Harry Dexter White." He was accused of being "not directly associated with a Russian spy ring."

EXCLUSIVE TEXT OF HEARING

The appeals chairman who acted as an interrogator began as follows:

INTERROGATOR: Mr. Truman, we have received information that leads us to believe that you were president of the United States 1945-1952.

TRUMAN: Of course. It's a matter of public record. Millions voted for me.

INT.: Ah, you admit it. And while occupying this office you held many conferences and reached many agreements with Russian representatives?

T.: What is this? I always fought Stalin; I tried to stop his expansion. Why the man was un-American.

INT.: But, Mr. T, Stalin died! Would you tell us what his motive was for that?

T.: Are you crazy. How could I answer that?

INT.: You don't seem very cooperative, do you, for a man who alleges that he is now a loyal American. You knew that White was a communist and a spy?

T.: Accusations were made but never proved.

INT.: Come, come, it's all in the FBI files.

T.: I challenge your facts and demand to see the evidence.

INT.: Sorry, that is all security information.

T.: Bah, your files: I know all about them. You file the frothings of liars, lunatics, forgers, and agents paid by the piece.

INT.: Sorry, we must protect our sources of information. Do you think the FBI is a gestapo?

T.: What do you mean?

INT.: Didn't your friend Stephen Mitchell call the FBI a "secret police for the Republican Party" and didn't you in a radio address accuse the attorney general of the elected American government of prostituting his office and of undermining democracy?

T.: Yes, it's all in the public record and it's all true.

INT.: We must rule that out as irrelevant. Your attitude is un-American.

Truman fumed and shouted. He demanded an account of the evidence against him. "Let's have your proofs in black and white," he cried. All he could get in reply was:

INT.: And who is Mr. Black?

T.: This is a dirty outrage. Where did you get these rotten, infamous procedures?

INT.: Thank you, Mr. Truman.

And thus the hearing ended.

2 Civil-Liberties Meetings in Bay Area: McWilliams Debate and ACLU Conference

By JACK WALKER

BERKELEY, Nov. 7—On October 26 and 27 two civil-liberties meetings were held in the Bay Area, and the differences in character between them illustrate some of the problems of this important subject.

First was a very successful debate between Carey McWilliams, an editor of the *Nation*, and Arthur Smart, editor of the *Western Underwriter*, on "The Crisis in Civil Liberties," with close to 400 people occupying extra seats and standing along the walls of the University Unitarian Church. Smart, speaking as a conservative, was dismayed at seeing civil liberties lost when they should be conserved, and traced much of today's problems back to the "big government" that grew up with the New Deal, Second World War, and the current emergency. His solution to civil-liberties problems is: less government interference with business and the rest of social affairs.

Carey McWilliams, speaking next under the auspices of the Friends' Legislative Committee who were sponsoring the meeting, made a more thorough investigation of the subject in typical *Nation* manner. He considered civil-liberties problems in two periods, pre-1945

and post-1945, and the more prolonged "emergency" and cold-war characteristics that obtain today. He noted the deeper trend against civil liberties, beginning with the House's permanent Un-American Activities Affairs Committee in 1945, extended by Truman's loyalty order, and carried the situation forward to today, with a lengthy aside on the lack of security of the suburban middle classes that made Smart squirm.

The outstanding characteristic of McWilliams' effective talk on the drive for orthodoxy today was—the feeling of waiting for the other shoe to drop. But it never did, so that not a single topic was dealt with in any way that would have made a Stalinist uncomfortable.

ACLU MEETS

Without calling for a "hobbyhorse" diatribe against these anti-civil-libertarians, it still lends a hollow note to McWilliams' otherwise effective speech when the whole subject of Stalinism is airily worked in in the same manner that *Nation* foreign editor Del Vayo might submit an "objective" report on China—i.e., without really dealing with the facts of life.

(Continued on page 4)

GERMANY

Repulse Adenauer's Trade-Union Grab

By JACK WALKER

With the unanimous rejection of Adenauer's (the Christian Democratic Union's) ultimatum for greater control of the German Trade Union Federation (backed by the threat of splitting it) by the federation's 73-member Federal Committee on September 30, and the beginning of less heated talks between the federation's Executive Committee and government leaders, it appears that the first post-election attempt by Adenauer to decisively curtail the freedom of the German trade unions has been temporarily brought to a standstill.

Readers of LABOR ACTION will recall how Federal Minister Jacob Kaiser and North Rhine-Westphalia Minister-President Karl Arnold had submitted a plan for drastic revision of the trade-union federation (the DGB) in view of its "abandonment of neutrality" in the September 6 national elections by calling "for a better Bundestag," with Kaiser and Arnold considering a separate rival federation of Christian and non-denominational trade unions if their plan was rejected.

At that time, with Adenauer's newly absolute Bundestag majority and the disappointment of the predominantly Social-Democratic federation leadership, it seemed likely that the Kaiser-Arnold ultimatum, issued in the name of the Social Committee of the Christian Democratic Union and Christian Social Union (CDU-CSU) to the Executive Committee of the federation, was going to be carried out.

However, when report after report of support to DGB rejection of these demands came in from major DGB districts, prior to the September 30 special meeting of the federal committee in Dusseldorf, it became evident that the government plan was going to run into difficulties.

CDU DEMANDS

Perhaps, as was subsequently claimed by the Catholic paper *Michael*, it was due to the "unfair" action of the DGB Executive Committee in publishing these demands on September 24, so that the DGB's membership could see what was contained in the letter of September 17 signed by the CDU-CSU Social Committee, Catholic and Evangelical (Protestant) labor movements and other Christian social associations. These demands would have had quite an effect when looked at by trade-unionists.

They wanted:

(1) Two additional representatives of the Christian working population to be co-opted onto the DGB Executive Committee before a special DGB convention was called.

(2) and (3) While at least one or another DGB district must be led by Christian representatives, at least two additional Christian representatives must be co-opted onto the DGB district executive committees. This provision was also to apply to all 16 industrial unions at local, district and federal levels: (Did somebody mention authoritarian Bolsheviks?)

(4) Qualified Christians shall be appointed to all editorial boards of DGB papers, journals, and to the DGB Economic Research Institute.

(5) and (6) Equal Christian representation on training and educational committees, which would be empowered to select instructors; also on an arbitration board which would be formed to stop violations of political party neutrality.

(7) The members of Christian employees' associations shall organize in fractions which must be recognized by the DGB in its constitution.

(8) Agreement shall be reached on cooperation with international union organizations (presumably aimed at the International Federation of Catholic Trade Unions and also Evangelical Trade Unions).

UNIONS FIGHT BACK

The obvious effect of carrying through these changes would be to effectively destroy the autonomy of the unions, in favor of the dominant government and component religious groups, for the purpose of dulling the class struggle at the expense of the workers' social and economic aspirations. The insistence with which they sought to override the DGB constitutional provisions in electing officers or determining to hold special conventions, is tribute to the feeling of strength in government

circles as they issued these demands at the DGB's "eleventh hour."

However, backed by their own membership and support from the AFL and CIO, the Executive Committee and Walter Freitag, its chairman (and head of the Metal Workers Union), were able to resist government pressures. President George Meany had spoken against Adenauer's efforts at the AFL convention on September 21, while Victor Reuther, ex-CIO European representative and brother of the CIO's president, was quoted later as warning against limiting the freedom and independence of West German unions—a step which would affect all International Confederation of Free Trade Unions bodies.

Freitag, greeting Victor Reuther at Bonn on October 4, said that "if the autonomy of the federation were threatened it would shout louder than probably anyone had ever shouted before for the help of the whole democratic world."

Previous to this defiance on September 30 and its earlier preparatory meetings at lower levels, both Freitag and Heinrich Imig, president of the mining union, had refused to run again as Social-Democratic (SPD) Bundestag deputies, despite the strong pressure applied by Erich Ollenhauer, SPD chairman, especially directed at Freitag.

CATHOLICS PRESS SPLIT

Of the two forces pressing for SPD reorganization — government circles and Catholic trade-union bodies—it was the Catholic Labor Movement (KAB) that was most adamant in pressing for complete capitulation by the DGB or a divided labor movement, since KAB would like to set up Christian trade unions as soon as technically and politically feasible.

On September 10, most CDU-CSU Bundestag deputies had to separate themselves from CDU-CSU deputy Johannes Even, chairman of KAB, who had demanded the immediate formation of Christian trade unions, also encompassing the Evangelical Labor Movement (EAB)—a smaller Protestant international grouping with a section in Germany. The deputies thought Even was being too precipitous:

KAB claims a membership of 250,000, of whom 90 per cent are said to be trade-unionists, with the other 10 per cent including clerics such as Prelate Dr. Schmitt, its president, or lay staff members. It publishes a bi-weekly paper *Ketterler Wacht*, plus additional local newsletters in local fractional situations.

Well-disciplined and significant in size, it is used by its leadership—often at odds with rank-and-file members — to exert a disproportionate conservative social weight in government and trade-union circles. Throughout DGB sessions on the Kaiser-Arnold plan, KAB held extensive committee and active workers' meetings, and now that the plan has been rejected KAB has been working hard, although temporarily without success, to promote a split in the DGB. In this capacity it often embarrasses government circles.

KAB LINE

Because of its social philosophy it finds itself at odds with nationalization or extensive co-determination measures, favoring joint union-cartel property-forming committees such as exist in Holland. It thus opposes resolutions II and III of the DGB Foundation Congress in 1949, which were upheld at the Second Ordinary Congress held in Berlin in October 1952.

No. 1 calls for co-determination of organized workers on all matters relating to personnel, economic and social questions of management and economic structure. No. 11 calls for nationalization of key industries particularly mining, iron and steel industries, chemical industries, communications, banking institutions and power.

In addition to the approximately 45 per cent of German labor organized in the DGB, KAB also occasionally gets political support from sections of the Federation of German Civil Service Officials (DGB) and the German Salaried Employees Union (DAG). One of the latter's components, the Association of German Commercial Clerks (DHV), has come out for the foundation of Christian trade unions which it would support, at its Frankfurt meeting on September 9 where Fritz Irwahn, its president, spoke out.

"T-H" IN GERMANY

Two other indications of the general feelings of the Adenauer government about the DGB are in the field of anti-strike regulations. On September 30, Federal Justice Minister Dr. Thomas Dehler (Free Democratic Party) asked in the FDP news service for a final resolution of labor law, including the right to strike and lockout.

While temporarily set aside by broad CDU circles, the measures proposed by this supposedly responsible cabinet member would: (1) Declare political strikes

and lockouts (the latter tossed in for "objectivity") illegal; (2) prevent strikes or lockouts in "vital enterprises"; (3) guarantee free decisions in case of strike referendum votes, including the right of a non-organized worker to reject the union vote, and (4) guarantee "democratic" formations within the labor movement (i.e., religious fractions) along with a rejection of the check-off system of paying dues.

The DGB's reply in its weekly *Welt der Arbeit* said that such announcements would not be taken tragically if they were not in line with threats by other interested persons and with Adenauer's statements made until recently. Some of Dehler's opponents would like such a trade-union law, although it appears inappropriate at present. The DGB also rejected any manner of state intervention in the affairs of unions as an undemocratic act.

ECHO OF KAPP

The second event follows from an action in early September when the federal minister of the interior set up a "Technical Emergency Service" at Land (state) levels. This service was criticized by *Metal*, organ of the Metal Workers Union in Frankfurt, as being "not an aid in case of natural catastrophe as claimed" but "a new model of the ill-famed strikebreaker organization . . . 'Technische Nothilfe' (of Kapp Putsch days)."

Although objected to at first, this designation was confirmed when Interior Minister Dr. Lehr spoke at a CDU electoral meeting in Neumenster answering the DGB's electoral statement. He stated that "in case of a national emergency such as now exists during the strike in France (when 4 million workers were out) he would not hesitate to use the Technical Emergency Service as a factor of order wherever he considers it necessary," reported *Metal* as it urged trade-union opposition to Bundestag funds earmarked for the THW.

The epilogue to this was a letter of concern addressed to Dr. Lehr by the National Association of German Industry (BDI), objecting to the DGB's setting up of "Technical Clearance and Salvage Service" to be established at state level in competition to the government's THW. The letter writer would like to see cooperation between the two agencies!

These are some of the issues on which the class struggle is going on in Germany today.

Reaction Marches On in So. Africa

Among 89 persons recently forbidden by the South African government's order from holding any public position are 33 trade-union leaders. This measure has been taken under the so-called "law for the suppression of Communism" which allows the Malan government to banish its opponents from public life by simple administrative decree.

The Malan government is also going ahead with its proposed legislation for applying the principle of racial segregation to the trade unions. If the present bill passes the Senate, as is expected, African workers will be denied the right to strike and to collective bargaining.

A number of white union leaders have been ordered by the government to resign from their unions and to refrain from attending meetings. As a result many of the unions are losing their best negotiators.

The unions and the African National Congress which represent labor in South Africa are being subjected to what has been described as "mental and social concentration camps" and the South African form of McCarthyism." Ivan L. Walker, former secretary of labor, on October 31 reiterated his charge that the Malan government plans to destroy the unions.

African Conference

In an attempt to combat infringements of Africans' rights arising from the newly formed Central African federation, a regional conference of African Congresses will be held December 10-12 at Lusaka, capital of Northern Rhodesia.

Chief objective, according to the conference call, is "to unite our forces and

prepare our own defense against human injustices, against such policies as are now being prepared by the Confererate and Federal parties—of undisguised oppression."

The call goes on to state: "The policy of most of our leaders in Central Africa is the same, namely, non-cooperation without violence. This policy if pursued honestly is capable of achieving greater success than most of us have the power to foresee."

To be studied at the conference will be a 7-point program drafted by the Rev. Michael Scott for improvement of Africans conditions. The idea for the regional conference was approved at the August meeting of the Northern Rhodesia African Congress. The conference has particular significance in that it will mark the first time that such a meeting has been held under African auspices with representatives coming from all British Africa—east, central and south.

Police-State Law

A Malan government order has been issued making it an offense for any person to hold, preside at or address a meeting at which more than 10 Africans are present, without the approval of the Native commissioner or the magistrate of the Native area in which the meeting is held. Further, a person is guilty of an offense if a meeting of more than 10 Africans is held in his house or on his land. The penalty for violation is up to a 300 pound fine or up to 3 years in jail. Certain types of gatherings are exempt—such as "bonafide" religious services, funerals, sports gatherings, concerts,

weddings, etc. The order is obviously aimed at banning political meetings sponsored by organizations such as the African National Congress.

Controlling Education

A proposed law in South Africa which is causing much concern among people interested in African education is the Bantu Education Bill. Under this law, African education would be brought under direct control of the Malan government, which contends that Africans are not getting the right kind of education from the Christian missions.

In any other country the state's assuming control of education would be viewed differently. But in a country with a government such as Malan's—a correspondent informs us—the Africans fear what government-controlled education may mean. They fear that the education system may become a vehicle of government propaganda.

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.

Youth and Student Corner

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

SYL-YPSL Forum Hears African Student

By J. E. BOLDEN

NEW YORK, Nov. 13—Superstition to the contrary, Friday the 13th has proven that it isn't of necessity a bad date. In terms of stimulation, the jointly sponsored YPSL-SYL Friday evening forum on African liberation movements was a definite success.

The speaker of the evening was a young Nigerian who is in this country as a student. From the vantage point of a member of an oppressed colonial people—as well as one personally well-informed and politically sophisticated—the speaker presented an approach that was quite new to many members of his audience. Without bitterness, in the usual sense of the word, he conveyed a feeling of intense anger and resolution which gave such theoretical terms as "self-determination of peoples" a newly clear and concrete meaning to many of us.

Briefly, the analysis he presented was mainly confined to the Gold Coast and Nigeria—the general area, incidentally, which in a past stage of imperialism was the source of most of the Negroes brought to America in slavery.

NEW LEADERS

In the course of a broad survey of African history and civilization he pointed out that the concept of private ownership of property (primarily land) is alien to most, if not all, of Africa, and even today has not succeeded in taking firm roots in the thinking of most Africans. He described a system of what he termed "communal property," based around the local elected chieftain, as having been commonly the rule prior to the arrival, with chain in one hand and Bible in the other, of the standard-bearers of "civilization."

It has since become the practice of British imperialism to replace the native leaders—those who dare to differ with them, at any rate—with "appointed chiefs." As a result the real authority

of the chief in his group, based as it was on the fact that he was freely chosen by his people, has declined sharply.

In the Africa of today a new type of leader is displacing the "chiefs." That is the more specifically political leader, usually an intellectual, who heads a mass-based movement (or party) whose unifying factor is the question of national liberation.

Although tribalism is still a serious problem—and an unfortunate one in our Nigerian speaker's opinion—there are strong currents combating it.

FREEDOM THE ISSUE

In reference to the three major socio-political divisions in Nigeria (based around the three major "language groups," the Ibo, whose most prominent leader is Dr. Azikiwe, the Yoruba and the Hausa, who are dominantly Moslem) he stated that the cleavage between the Ibo and the Yoruba was based largely on Azikiwe's policy of exploiting Ibo chauvinism for his own power ends. His policy forced the formation of the Action Group (Yoruba), leading elements of which hope to eventually eliminate "tribal" considerations.

This attitude also has support in the Convention Peoples Party (CPP) of the Gold Coast. The Gold Coast is not itself faced with the problems of sharp, internal "language group" division—having but one major grouping, the Ashanti—but the more advanced sections of the Gold Coast intelligentsia see tribalism as one block on the road to a further goal, which is an independent, united West Africa.

The speaker ended his presentation by pointing out that the single important issue to Africans is independence from foreign domination in any form. Once Africa has rid itself of its foreign exploiters, it will work out its own destiny in its own way, and whatsoever that may be is for the African people alone to decide.

Civil-Liberties Meeting — —

(Continued from page 2)

The next evening was the annual meeting of the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, held in the Marines Memorial Theater in San Francisco before the largest audience to date, about 525. Besides the regular annual report on local civil-liberties matters by Ernest Besig, there was a discussion on congressional investigating committees, entitled "Congress and the \$64 Question."

Besig's report was a record of new violations of civil liberties on a continuing, expanding basis. He touched upon the plight of federal employees, who were being summarily dismissed without charges, security checks in private industry without adequate defense procedures, the lack of Coast Guard grounds for screening despite court orders to do so, the increasing denial of passports, new hardships in naturalization and deportation cases, loyalty oaths in housing unsettled under the Gwinn rider, FBI harassment, and the continued work of the state Un-American

Activities Committee. All in all, it was a dismal picture of a growing disease of "loyalty-itis," though not mentioned in that manner.

FIFTH AMENDMENT

Dr. Joseph Tussman of the University of California Philosophy Department and the Rev. Harry C. Meserve then went on to discuss the "\$64 question" from the point of view of the First and Fifth Amendments. Dr. Tussman's defense of the First Amendment presented the alternative of going to prison since the First Amendment isn't "legal" anymore. He thought that Einstein's position was the correct one, although temporarily no one will be able to protect a man from taking the consequences.

The Rev. Meserve spoke on the various ways that the Fifth Amendment was invoked other than to hide real evidence of guilt, although he had to confess most people he spoke with interpreted the invoking of the Fifth Amendment as a confession of guilt. He was also alarmed at Congress' threat to grant "immunity" from self-incrimination in order to force a person to speak against his moral beliefs or else go to prison.

The question period and the speeches themselves painted a weak position for civil liberties in the country today, with the recognition of the defection of the "liberals" and no present regroupment of any real size. Civil liberties were at a temporary impasse, with some hope for new partisans later on.

While the Northern California ACLU is a more liberal dissident branch of the national organization and would probably take a better stand, it is significant to note that the national ACLU pamphlet on "Democracy in the Trade Unions" comes out in support of the Taft-Hartley oath to screen Stalinists out of union offices.

At both meetings, those attending accepted several hundred copies of LABOR ACTION'S issue on "Is Socialism 'Subversive'?" and evinced a great show of interest in the attorney general's Statement of Grounds and Interrogatories. Many additional copies could have been passed out if available at the time in the Bay Area.

PPP Policy in Guiana

To the Editor:

Something ought to be said to supplement Comrade Draper's discussion of the recent crisis in British Guiana (LA, Oct. 19, '53). Something has been left out. I have no quarrel with anything which Comrade Draper says. His facts are correct, and his analysis and interpretation to bring out the character of the British move are admirable. More, even, could be said on this side of the question—more facts adduced to show that it was really a democratically elected and popular government which the British deposed by their show of force and threat of violence.

Unlike most political analyses in LA, however, this one seems to be onesided. It leaves the impression that the PPP government was a progressive government headed in the direction of a free society, and that it had been moving intelligently toward this goal when it was struck from behind by a completely unexpected imperialistic action. I do not believe that this is altogether the case.

The PPP may be progressive in some sense; it is difficult to say. But: (1) The British action was fully predictable, and Jagan and Co. were stupid not to recognize this fact (if indeed they did not). (2) They have done a great disservice to the cause of Guianese independence by acting in such a way as to give the Colonial Office a plausible excuse for turning the clock back and abrogating the constitution (and it has been plausible enough to lull the Labor Party). (3) Furthermore, even if the PPP is not Stalinist, at least the mistakes which it has made are of a typically Stalinist sort.

(1) The Tories never liked the constitution in the first place, and when the election was so sweeping as to nullify what they had counted on as constitutional checks to the power of native politicians (i.e., when the results gave the PPP a preponderance in the Upper House, too), they began actively undermining it. That they were going to oppose it should have been obvious from the fact that PPP had vastly more legal authority than any other popular government in the West Indies (in a politically more backward colony than Jamaica or Barbados), and much more power than even the Labor government had intended at this stage. That their opposition was going to be sinister should have been clear from the fact that Gov. Savage refused to act upon his disapproval of PPP measures by exercising the reserve powers granted him by the constitution—i.e., he refused to make what moves were permitted by the rules, refused to play the game.

His lack of action could only be interpreted either as a tacit endorsement of PPP, or as a sign of his intention to oppose by some sort of underhanded means—the former being a most unlikely possibility. The British action could come as a surprise only to someone who was either unaware of the situation or unacquainted with imperialists, and PPP can claim neither excuse.

(2) The combination of the constitution and the electoral success had given PPP more power than had been enjoyed by any other colonial party at a similar stage. By intelligent action this position could have been preserved and made more secure. But now (a) it will be some time before a new constitution will be introduced in Guiana, and (b) when it is, it will be hedged with "safeguards" to prevent such success as the PPP has had.

There can be no doubt that the British action was foreseeable, and that by failing to take steps to stall off or thwart this imperialist thrust, PPP stands re-

sponsible for another period of reaction and oppression in Guiana.

(3) This mistake is of a typically Stalinist sort because (a) it resulted from the use of self-righteous indignation and "principled" talk rather than intelligent effort; (b) it ended in a victory for reaction; and (c) the self-induced martyrdom of the PPP is being exploited (with disappointing success in England) for propaganda purposes.

This combination of features, this pattern, will be familiar to readers of LA. It is just what occurs, for example, in a Stalinist defense of civil-rights—emphasis on legislation and distribution of CP leaflets corresponds to conducting a case through the newspapers rather than by attention to the legal points, and the outcome (in both cases) is further hollow propaganda at the price of defeat on the issue at hand. By distinguishing between Tories and Laborites (the latter having a genuine interest in colonial independence) instead of damning and antagonizing all the British, and by concentrating on some of the hard administrative problems instead of putting all their resources into the magic of legislation and the importation of Stalinist propaganda, PPP would have been able to solidify their position so as to make it politically impossible for the Tories to take the step they did. Such tactics would have served better the cause of independence and social reform in Guiana, but then Jagan and Co. would not have had a world scandal to shout about.

Marx damned stupidity as the cause of most of the world's evils, and the damnation should apply equally to well-meaning "socialists" and "Marxists" as to well-meaning Christians.

Newt GARVER

Oxford, England
November 11

I'd say Comrade Garver is probably right about the fact that some sort of British action should have been expected by the PPP; and for all I know he may also be right in his claim that the PPP could have taken steps which would have made the British action even less tenable. My article of Oct. 19, however, did not express any opinion about whether "the PPP government . . . had been moving intelligently toward this goal [of a free society] when it was struck from behind by a completely unexpected imperialistic action." Nor do I feel in a position to have any firm opinion on such points now, not having the kind of detailed information on the Guianese situation which would, I think, be necessary for these conclusions.

I'd demur from the view that "the use of self-righteous indignation and 'principled' talk rather than intelligent effort" is a "typically Stalinist" characteristic. Comrade Garver may be influenced toward this over-generalization by the way in which the impotent British CP seems to behave. Nor would I care to refer to the Stalinist cadre in the PPP as "well-meaning" though "stupid."

Since Comrade Garver raises the question of how the PPP leaders rendered the British task easier, I'd simply say it was primarily in the fact that the Jagans (and their pro-Stalinist group in the PPP) were openly pro-Stalinist or fellow-traveling in their sympathies and some connections. I'm also pretty sure that it was this fact which has influenced the Attlee leadership in taking its present cowardly stand in three-quarter support to the Guiana suppression.

Hal DRAPER

BOOKS RECEIVED

Published by New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books; publication date Nov. 25:

The History of the World (in 240 pages), by René Sédillot, Mentor, 256 pp., 35¢. *One, Two, Three—Infinity*, by George Gamow, Mentor, 320 pp., 50¢. *Rage of the Soul*, by Vincent Sheehan, Signet Giant, 312 pp., 35¢. *Four Days in a Lifetime*, by Georges Simenon, Signet, 168 pp., 25¢. *The Conformist*, by Alberto Moravia, Signet Giant, 320 pp., 35¢. *Appointment in Samarra*, by John O'Hara, Signet, 192 pp., 25¢. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, by D. H. Lawrence, Signet Giant, 264 pp., 35¢. *The Big Sin*, by Jack Webb, Signet, 160 pp., 25¢. *A Cow Is Too Much Trouble in Los Angeles*, by Joseph Foster, Signet, 168 pp., 25¢. *The Saga of Billy the Kid*, by W. N. Burns, Signet, 200 pp., 25¢. *The Day I Died*, by Lawrence Larier, Signet, 160 pp., 25¢. *A Funeral for Sabella*, by Robert Travers, Signet, 192 pp., 25¢.

NOW—IN ENGLISH
THE FAMED "VOLUME 4"
OF "CAPITAL"

Karl Marx's
HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC
THEORIES

PART ONE

Langland Press—337 pages—\$5.00

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



LABOR ACTION

November 23, 1953 Vol. 17, No. 47

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: GORDON HASKELL,
BEN HALL, MARY BELL
Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

LONDON LETTER

'Don't Listen to Guiana Reps,'
Laborite Exec Tells Branches

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, Nov. 11—It has become my unpleasant duty to criticize the Labor Party more frequently recently than I would have liked. However, their treatment of the Guiana affair has been little short of going along with imperialism.

It will be remembered that in the parliamentary debate on Guiana, Jim Griffiths (Labor's ex-colonial secretary) and Robens, the party's two main speakers, supported the government in all its actions except suspension of the Constitution.

Now it is with the greatest shame that I have to report a circular issued by the Labor Party Executive to "secretaries of affiliated trade unions, constituency Labor Parties, local parties, women's sections and branches of the League of Youth."

SHAMEFUL CIRCULAR

It reads:

"The National Executive Committee reaffirms its belief in the promotion of democratic self-government in colonial territories. It holds that the new constitution of British Guiana introduced in April 1953, and based on the report of a commission set up by the Labor government in 1950, marked an important advance toward full self-government. The constitution gave political leaders in the colony, elected by adult suffrage, the opportunity of exercising the responsibilities of office in the service of their people.

"That the leaders of the People's Progressive Party on taking office failed to use this opportunity . . . is a matter for profound regret. Instead of pursuing a policy of social reform . . . leaders of the PPP pursued a communist policy and created a situation which necessitated the movement of troops to ensure the maintenance of law and order.

"While finding itself unable to support the ideology and actions of these leaders of the PPP, the NEC deplors the action of the British government in suspending the constitution. . . . The extreme power of suspending the constitution should not have been used until constitutional safeguards had been tried and found ineffective.

"The NEC therefore regards it as inadvisable [sic] for local parties to provide a platform for PPP speakers or to cooperate with other bodies (which may well be communist-inspired) in supporting them. If local parties wish to organize meetings on the crisis in British Guiana, they should engage speakers who will present the Labor Party's point of view, as indicated in this circular."

This is clearly an attempt to prevent Cheddi Jagan and L. Burnham, PPP leaders now in England, from presenting their points of view. The latter have already had very highly successful meetings under the auspices of the Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism, the London School of Economics, University College London, and many others.

It was pleasing to hear that the Newcastle-on-Tyne Labor Party had decided by a vote of 37-36 to defy the NEC and to provide a platform for Jagan. It bucked me up the other day to hear the famous historian, A. J. P. Taylor, in a discussion on television, say that he never thought that he would live to see a Labor Party applaud the sending of troops to a colony.

In the same discussion, he pointed out that where the British Colonial Office had to deal with colored peoples as a government, as in the Gold Coast and Ceylon for instance, there had been no major political problems of power transfer. However, where it has to deal with a local white community which already had real power, as in Kenya or Guiana, it had much more trouble implementing a liberal policy.

CEYLON TALKS BACK

All the English newspapers today are feeling a little sore with the Ceylonese. Recently, the new Ceylon premier, Sir John Kotelawala, announced that the Union Jack and the British national anthem were to be dropped. Lord Soulbury, the British governor-general, wrote him

a letter asking why. The premier replied:

"Although Ceylon is an independent country now, there are three points which the people of Ceylon are unable to understand. First, why is it that in a free land there should be a foreign governor-general? Second and third: Why should there be an English flag and an English anthem in free Ceylon?"

"The second and third have been suitably dealt with, which may kindly be taken note of."

GOOD CLEAN FUN

It is traditional for students all over Britain to have processions and a bonfire to celebrate Guy Fawkes Day, November 5. It was on this date in 1605 that Catholic intriguers talked a poor dupe, Guy Fawkes, into attempting to blow up the pro-Protestant Houses of Parliament.

Fawkes had, at great trouble to himself, hired some cellars under this august building, and placed 35 barrels of gunpowder there. He was on the point of lighting it when the king's men, who had been tipped off by one of the conspirator's cousins who sat in Parliament, caught him red-handed.

This year, for some unknown reason, the police banned the usual procession. Hundreds of students with energy and fireworks unspent determined to hold their procession.

Violent fights took place between the students and punch-drunk police in Parliament Square. About 170 students were arrested and fined three to ten dollars. The general feeling was one of disappointment that the police had not been a little more tolerant, even if there is a rule that no processions may occur within a mile of Parliament. The attitude of the police in this instance contrasted with that at the Coronation, when they were extremely amiable in the face of much greater provocation by much larger crowds.

The headlines of one of the newspapers next morning read "Crowds Riot in Trieste."

SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

We have pointed out many things in opposition to this view, but a new question arises with the growth and triumphs of McCarthyism.

Are these liberals in favor of democratic rights for McCarthyites?

Many such liberals have gone so far as to call McCarthy an outright fascist. At any rate, it is clear that the active, practicing McCarthyites, headed by McCarthy, Jenner, Velde & Co. themselves, answer the description quite adequately: they use their democratic rights, democratic processes and democratic institutions in order to destroy democracy itself.

If therefore the liberals whom we have in mind believe in their own point of view (as we do not), at what point will they be ready to apply it not only to the Stalinists—which is easy since that goes along with the current—but also to the McCarthyites?

Naturally, we do not make this point to encourage them in this direction, but to provide an objective test for intellectual honesty as opposed to running-with-the-crowd.

Columbia the Gem

The Columbia University faculty has been among the most courageous academic bodies in the country in standing out against the witchhunt in the schools, perhaps especially sparked by Dean

A Labor MP Visits
Franco Spain

Maurice Orbach is a Labor member of the British Parliament. He describes his observations in the following article, which was published in the London Tribune of October 23.—Ed.

By MAURICE ORBACH

A few hours after my arrival in Madrid I realized why there are so many political prisoners in Spain. The most striking first impressions of the city are the extreme contrasts between rich and poor, and the sheer inefficiency of its administration.

The new buildings of University City and large new blocks of modern apartments at rentals of from £15 to £20 a month practically jostle a town of shanty and cave dwellers, among whom trachoma and diseases of malnutrition are rife. War destruction nearby—after fifteen years—is still evident in the wide stretches of earth, rubble and bricks crossed by the outline of trenches, dug-outs and firing points.

Information from a large cross-section of workers revealed their miserably low rates of pay. Hotel chambermaids, for example, are paid 200 pesetas per month and have to sleep and eat out. A garage mechanic working long hours receives 20 pesetas a day, and the highly skilled mechanic earns up to 50 pesetas a day. But a man's thin shoddy suit costs from 600 to 700 pesetas and a pair of women's shoes of poor quality costs from 250 to 500 pesetas.

PACT NO SOLUTION

Bad though the situation is in Madrid, it is much worse for the people in the villages, who try to wring a bare existence from the parched and neglected land, a land which is crying out for irrigation, fertilizers and agricultural machinery.

A country with such a broken-down economy cannot afford the luxury of maintaining an extravagantly rich rentier

class, a host of officials and tremendously inflated armed forces. And no solution to its difficulties will be found in a pact which provides merely for expenditure on military installations, equipment of the armed forces and the stationing of foreign troops on Spanish soil.

There is no likelihood that the campaign now being officially worked up about Gibraltar will divert the Spanish people from concern about the real cause of their poverty and hunger.

Everyone in Spain seems to grumble. Discontent is so widespread that the government is forced to turn a deaf ear to this comparatively innocuous form of protest, but strong repressive measures are taken against anyone who makes the slightest attempt to organize this general opposition to the regime.

Political prisoners include Monarchists, Basque Catholics, trade unionists, Socialists, Communists and Anarchists. There appear to be at least three groups of Socialists in prison, some of whom were arrested as long as eighteen months ago, and none of whom have yet been brought to trial.

PRISONERS HELD

Inquiries about Tomas Centeno caused a good deal of embarrassment. The cause of his death in prison was officially stated to have been suicide. But his body, which was afterwards handed over to the family, bore marks including broken wrists and ankles, making it very probable that his death was caused by police brutality. It would appear that the authorities are reluctant to bring to trial his associates, who were impressed with him at Ocaña, for fear they would reveal the circumstances of his death.

Also in Ocaña Prison are Telesforo Torres and Luis Arrebal, for whom the death sentence is being demanded, although no date has yet been announced for their trial.

While many prisoners are held for long periods without being brought to trial, many others are held in prison after their sentences have expired because they refuse to promise that they will take no further part in political activity.

These men know that even if they did give such a pledge, they would be re-arrested at the first sign of trouble anywhere, and would then not only receive a very heavy sentence, but would have to serve that part of their previous sentence which had been remitted.

I visited the Madrid Provincial Prison at Carabanchel, where I noticed that the great majority of prisoners—both political and criminal—were wearing their own clothes. I was informed by the prison governor that these prisoners had not yet come up for trial.

SEND OBSERVERS

Here I obtained an interview with Gregorio Lopez Raimundo, General Secretary of the United Socialist Party of Catalonia and one of the leaders of the Barcelona strikes of March, 1951, who is held in the wing reserved for "dangerous" prisoners.

The courage and dignity of this man impressed me very deeply. Of medium height, with finely cut features and dark hair going grey at the temples, he stood at attention and quietly replied to our questions. He did not know why he was still being held in prison, as he should have been released on January 9. He was later told that his release would take place in July, but had been given no reason for his continued detention.

He expressed his thanks to all those in Britain who have taken an interest in his case, and especially to the delegation from this country which was present at his trial.

In my opinion, it is of the utmost importance that we should implement the welcome decision of the Margate Conference to send observers to Spanish political trials.

This should be carried out for all political prisoners, and should be accompanied by clear-cut expressions of the concern felt in wide circles here at the continuance of trial by military courts, long periods of imprisonment without trial and detention of prisoners long after the expiry of their sentences.

'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

More on the SWP Split —

End of the Line for a Movement

More information, and some documentation, is now available on the split which has ripped the Socialist Workers Party (Trotskyist group); and, besides correcting some details of our last week's report, we think it well to continue presenting as much of the picture as possible.

It is clear that what is taking place is the death throes of the "orthodox" Trotskyist movement, and the interest of this tragic event does not derive from any present importance assigned to, or sympathy with, the current Trotskyist movement itself, as organized in the self-styled Fourth International and its SWP co-thinkers. A movement which in its own way once played an important historic role is in full disintegration, and the last chapter is being written.

As LABOR ACTION reported last week, the split was finally consummated at a National Committee plenary session of the SWP National Committee on November 7, when the NC members of the Stalinoid minority ("Cochranites") were ousted—formally "suspended," effectually

ly expelled. This ouster, however, was engineered even more bureaucratically than our previous information made clear, as far as its mechanism was concerned. This is shown by the text of the resolution, now before us, which Cannon presented to this plenum, based on the Cochranites' boycott of the group's anniversary meetings in New York.

BELL, BOOK AND CANDLE

This majority resolution, first of all, characterizes the boycott action in typical Cannon style, beginning with "treacherous, strikebreaking" and including: "an act of objective aid to the Stalinists who expelled the initiating nucleus of American Trotskyism in October 1928" . . . "an organized demonstration against the 25-year struggle of American Trotskyism," etc.

Declaring that "all who participated" in this boycott "have obviously consummated the split which they have been long preparing," the resolution proceeded to read them out of the party. Five of the leaders are thereupon named as those "who organized the boycott" and these

are declared to be "hereby suspended from the party." No trial, no formalities of an inquiry as to "who organized the boycott," not even for the record; the charge and verdict are in the resolution slapped down before the committee.

Furthermore, the split is to be mechanically spread down into the ranks by what the Cochranites more or less aptly called a "McCarthyite loyalty oath." All supporters of the minority are called on to "individually disavow and condemn" the boycott or else be expelled. This is standard operating procedure with Cannon. It preserves in fossil form the method used to Stalinize and "monolithize" the CPs of over a couple of decades ago, when oppositionists were expelled and then all those who voted against the expulsion were in turn expelled.

MINORITY'S STORY

The leaders of the Cochranite minority are perfectly familiar with such procedure since, until they went into opposition themselves, they were among its principal practitioners, as Cannon's leading whips.

Four days after the NC blowup, the Cochran faction issued a mimeographed letter to the membership on "The Split in the SWP" which sums up their side of the immediate story. Its charges about the Cannon regime's miniature-size bureaucracy recommend themselves to any informed reader, while politically the document is not without some reflection on the character of this Stalinoid wing itself.

Cannon (the minority charges) has been trying for almost two years to line up his faction for driving through a hard split, and has now succeeded. That is true, no doubt, though what the minority omits is the fact that it itself obviously came to the conclusion that it too had to orient toward a split—otherwise its boycott of the SWP's public meeting does not make much sense. Neither group has taken much stock in presenting the dispute for decision by a democratically mobilized membership in convention assembled.

The minority faction explains its boycott move as follows: The anniversary meeting "like many other projects, was organized on the basis that the 25-year tradition was the private monopoly of the Cannon caucus. We concluded that we would no longer be supine victims of these unilateral strong-arm tactics that had repeatedly been used on the minority, and decided not to attend the open meeting, as an organized protest—long overdue—against the dictatorial methods of the Cannon machine."

The phrase that a protest against Cannon's methods was "long overdue" on the part of these former henchmen of his is something of a classic.

BUREAUCRATS

The minority document proceeds to explain that it was Cannon who ignored and broke the "truce" that had been arranged in the faction fight: (1) the Cannonites "started a drive" to replace the New York branch organizer, a minorityite; and (2) Cannon made a speech at his own caucus meeting in which he opened up against the minorityites' political inspirer in the Fourth International, its secretary Pablo, obviously proposing the formation of an anti-Pablo faction in the international.

At the same time the Cannon group proceeded to freeze the minorityites out of all practical collaboration in the leadership. "The majority leaders made their decisions in their private caucus meetings, and then came into the secretariat or PC and read off their decisions to us. . . . The Cannonites arrogated to themselves the right to proclaim by fiat the 'party line' on any and all questions without submitting their caucus decisions for adoption by any legal party body." On September 30 they decided to call a special NC plenum but refused to inform the minority NC members on its agenda, purposes, documents, reports or any other arrangements for it. (This was the plenum whose first order of business was the minority's expulsion.)

The Cochran faction further complains that the majority "opened the [SWP] magazine by private caucus decision to attacks on the minority," and it follows this complaint with a typical indecency, which need surprise no one about these ex-Cannonite minorityites in spite of their present indignation at bureaucratic treatment. Cannon, they write, opened the magazine to majority polemics "under the same compulsion that pushed the Shachtmanites in 1940 to justify themselves before Stalinophobe public opinion, but [Cannon] would not print the minority polemics against the majority."

In other words the Cochran minority-bureaucrats demanded exactly the same right that "the Shachtmanites" demanded in 1940, the right to present their point of view in the magazine; but in the very sentence in which they complain of its refusal, they repeat the very attitude they held about it in 1940.

DESCRIBING SWP

What this reflects, in case we didn't know before, is that we have here not a minority appalled by bureaucratic-Stalinist methods but a wing, splitting off in the direction of Stalinism on political grounds, which finds it convenient to lament the use of its own organizational concepts against itself. This does not impair the justice of their specific complaints but it guards one against misplaced sympathy with the complaining leaders.

(Continued on page 7)

Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

Cochran Letter Corrects and Explains

To the Editor:

Permit me to correct several errors in your November 16 article on the split in the Socialist Workers Party.

Your account conveys the impression that a special plenum was called on November 7 to take up the Minority's non-attendance at the 25th Anniversary public meeting of the SWP. Actually, the November 7 plenum was officially set on September 30, a month before the public meeting, or our non-attendance at it. While we had a pretty shrewd suspicion from the first that the plenum was being called to expel us and to launch a war on the World Trotskyist movement, officially we knew nothing, as the Cannon caucus leaders steadfastly refused us all information as to the purpose of the plenum.

This high-handed usurpation was followed in the next weeks by completely cutting out our representatives from all party decisions and plans, and subjecting us to a campaign of unexampled rowdiness and vituperation. When we saw the 25th Anniversary meeting being organized by the Cannonites as a demonstration against us (as can be seen from Cannon's printed speech) we decided it was high time to make an organized protest against their two-bit-dictatorial methods.

Your article further states: "The Cannon majority presented a resolution calling on all who failed to attend the anniversary meetings to give their explanation and excuse . . . but the minority NC representatives refused to participate and did not answer." What actually happened was that as soon as the plenum opened, Cannon presented a special motion "suspending" five Minority leaders and excluding from membership all our supporters unless they signed a "loyalty oath" and disavowed and condemned us. I thereupon presented a substitute motion of our resolution which called for the continuation of the political discussion, for the SWP to remain part of the world Trotskyist current, and condemned Cannon's attempt to dynamite the world movement. My substitute motion was ruled out of order, the expulsion resolution was adopted, and we were out of the plenum—in less than half an hour! One has to go to the Stalinist movement for any comparison with this bureaucratic outrage!

Then, immediately after the plenum, hoodlum tactics were employed against us. One of the SWP national leaders broke into our Youngstown headquarters when no one was present and stole chairs and other property belonging to the Youngstown organization, which had voted 8 to 3 to side with our group. The SWP leaders seem determined to befoul the socialist movement with a public scandal!

Our own press, which will be out in several weeks, will fully develop our po-

litical positions. I would like in this necessarily restricted letter to simply mention two important propositions involved in the present split.

World Trotskyism reared itself at its Third Congress when it correctly grasped the new world reality and set a correct tactical course. The Cannonites formally endorsed the thinking of the Third World Congress. When we, in the course of the discussion, tried to explain to them that their writings and positions were repeatedly and constantly at variance and cross-purposes with this program, they just screamed and yelled in reply: we were guilty of slander, frame-up—and they sought to smear us as pro-Stalinist. When your press similarly makes the false accusation of pro-Stalinism, it at least has the dubious advantage of being formally consistent, since you view the whole Trotskyist position—beginning with the concept of Soviet Russia as a degenerated workers state—as an example of pro-Stalinism. But Cannon and Co. supposedly accepted the same program that we did.

Actually, for the entire two years of the discussion, their stand was just an unholy jumble and eclectic patchwork of contradictory assertions. Only now, after expelling us, and after months of undercover war against the International, are they announcing the publication of a document which fundamentally breaks with the Third Congress program—and represents a kind of half-way house between the position of World Trotskyism and that of your tendency.

Their approach to the American scene, which is probably the most decisive gauge of the nature of the present Cannon faction, is one of thorough-going sectarianism. According to their new revelation, the tiny, unknown SWP has the "ordained leadership," the essential cadres of the revolution, and if it only remains "true to itself" and keeps blowing its own horn, its revolutionary triumph is guaranteed. Its political position is a compound of ultimatism and smug braggadocio. The SWP is due to emerge as the new DeLeonism of the radical movement. This sectarian ossification reflects no special trend of circles in the American labor movement, or even of American radicalism, but arises out of the petrification of the "old Trotskyists" who have succumbed to a quarter century of isolation.

You mis-state our position when you declare that we favor "a propaganda group oriented toward the Stalinist movement." We favor an orientation toward the Stalinist movement in countries like France and Italy, where that movement dominates the working class. We don't propose anything of the kind for the United States. We believe that the isolation of the Marxist cadre under present conditions of reaction and witch-hunt dictates for us a basically propagandistic approach directed in large part

to the most advanced elements in the labor movement and among the intellectuals. Where the general so-called Stalinist milieu is of importance in a city like New York and a few other places, we have to penetrate into these circles. In the country as a whole, where Stalinist influence is negligible, the field of work is necessarily elsewhere, primarily in the unions. The present Marxist cadre is doomed if it thinks it is "ordained." It will be a key factor in building the mass revolutionary party of tomorrow only if it understands that it must fuse with many new left-wing forces as they arise in the course of future class battles.

Finally, the SWP claim "that the Fourth International is certain to reject Pablo's line by an overwhelming majority" is just an impudent hoax. Our information is already sufficient to state categorically that the supporters of Cannon & Co. represent a small minority, and that their campaign to wreck the International will be decisively repulsed.

Bert COCHRAN

Cochran's corrections on what happened at the SWP plenum's split session coincide with the further information we have received, given in the article in this issue.

As for the political view he expresses in his letter, we have analyzed his tendency's political documents in articles earlier this year, and this is not the place to go through it again. Suffice it to say that when we say that his group favors "a propaganda group oriented toward the Stalinist movement," that is a considered judgment of its political position, and not only of its organizational orientation.

When Cochran writes "We favor an orientation toward the Stalinist movement in countries like France and Italy" but not the U. S., he is referring only to the extreme form of this orientation, namely, the line of entry into the CP. We know that the Cochran group does not propose entry into the American CP and have made that perfectly clear. They are not for entry in this country because the CP here is not important enough to justify such a far-gone step. Here, inside the SWP up to now, they have limited themselves to stressing that the work and propaganda and attention of the party be concentrated around the Stalinist movement and periphery wherever possible, and that the kind of political appeal made should be one that would attract Stalinists. It is also obvious, furthermore, that this orientation of theirs does not bear on the question of evaluating the possibilities of winning over Stalinists (a question on which there can be many opinions in anyone's ranks) but that it flows from their pro-Stalinist politics. What basically gives this tendency its character as a Stalinist-oriented propaganda group is its fundamental view that the Stalinist revolution is the vehicle of socialist revolution, with the accompanying ideas that we have analyzed elsewhere.—Ed.

PRESS AGENTS OF THE PENTAGON: THE MILITARY PROPAGANDA MILL—Part 5

PROPAGANDA TRICKS AND PRESSURES

Fifth installment of a series based on the new pamphlet, "Press Agents of the Pentagon," by John M. Swomley Jr., published by the National Council Against Conscription. The present installment is a condensation of the corresponding material in the pamphlet, in which sections are combined with summaries.—Ed.

One of the important techniques that pays big dividends to the military is its program of inviting important people to be its guests at army camps or navy or air force bases.

For example, a columnist for the Berkeley (Calif.) *Gazette* devoted three columns (Dec. 10-12, 1951) to describing his own junket, a trip to Florida and back, as a "guest of the U. S. navy." After enthusiastically describing the shows and expenses that were devoted to him and the other VIPs on the trip, he concludes:

"While we are a determined foe of waste in government, we do not feel the cruise was a navy extravagance. . . . They have had an opportunity to observe firsthand navy operating methods and procedures, to form sound individual opinions about the military service—and to carry back to their various schools and industries their new and valuable knowledge. . . . The knowledge imparted will repay the navy manifold for the comparatively minor expense of the trip."

Some junkets are more elaborate and costly than this one, including the sending of influential people on trips to Europe for guided tours. The army, for example, took a group of Negro newspaper publishers and educators on a trip to Europe at the height of the campaign against discrimination in the armed forces.

Some are less elaborate, like "Operation Professors." In this, "presidents, deans and professors" from 16 colleges were given the treatment at an air force base in order to win them to approval of the ROTC program. (Reported by the *Army and Navy Journal* for Oct. 1, 1949.)

"ORIENTATION" TECHNIQUE

One of the most effective and little-known techniques is the so-called Orientation Conference, with colonels opening and shutting doors for you and all kinds of military shows being put on just for your benefit. In addition, you are given supposedly secret information and encouraged to go home and sell the military program to people who can be told only part of the story.

The effect of one such affair can be seen in the article by Bennett Cerf "Ten Days with the Armed Forces" in the *Saturday Review of Literature* for July 22, 1950. Cerf was completely sold, and bubbled over with enthusiasm for the military. He writes that the defense secretary wants leading citizens to see how the military carry out their obligations and "counts on his guests to spread the good word as loudly and vehemently as they knew how. It worked like a charm."

Cerf recounts how he was dined, entertained and left "gasping" over the military demonstrations, and about his "unforgettable ride in a jet fighter plane" which "all began over cocktails with Hal Stuart, dashing young Assistant Secretary of the Air Force." He concluded his article:

"I came home revitalized and simply busting to shout from the housetops this deep-felt conviction; when and if a war comes with Russia or anybody else this country is blessed with the basic equipment and leadership to knock hell out of them. We need more fighter planes and more carriers. We need more men in the Armed Forces. Our intelligence and propaganda departments need bolstering most of all. . . ."

What more could the Defense Department want in return for ten days entertainment?

STOOING IN BRASS

Special techniques are used to win over women. To implement military thinking about women, the National Security Resources Board called to Washington Mrs. Waitstill H. Sharp, wife of a Unitarian clergyman, to lay the groundwork for conscription of women. In a press interview, Mrs. Sharp said: "We want everything on a voluntary basis at first. But every man, woman and child must have a role. . . ."

The Orientation Conference technique is also used on women, for example in one organized by the Army's Women's Interest Section. A House committee on July 24, 1947 exposed these sessions and reported that Gen. J. Lawton Collins asked the women to go out and lobby Congress for the military's UMT program.

Military speakers are, of course, frequently sent to meetings of civilians. One newspaper description of an army device is worth quoting:

"An army colonel wearing civilian clothes and 'planted' in an unsuspecting audience to heckle his commanding officer, Maj. Gen. I. D. White of Fort Riley, could claim credit Wednesday for putting over a novel stunt to promote universal military training.

"Introduced as 'Dr.' George Sloan of North Carolina

and an ardent opponent of UMT, Col. Sloan, General White's operation officer, was brought here by the commanding general of the army's ground general school to dramatize an address before the Wichita Junior Chamber of Commerce.

"Garbed in a tight-fitting suit which he said he had not worn in ten years, Sloan, a youthful-looking officer who actually hails from North Carolina, portrayed his role well enough to dupe his listeners at least until well after he had launched his series of well-prepared questions.

"Afterwards he said that General White and his staff had devised this new approach to the controversial subject, on which legislation is pending before the current session of Congress, and added that this was the first time it had been put into practice."¹³

INTIMIDATION

The propaganda program is also directed at children. *Look* magazine for Oct. 14, 1947 indicated that much of Joe Palooka's comic strip when he was in uniform was inspired by long conferences at the Pentagon.

Sometimes the military, instead of using propaganda, uses intimidation or censorship. In January 1952 an army intelligence agent called on a Midwest newspaper editor who had carried a publicity story of a proposed meeting against UMT. After showing his badge the agent asked, "Who is behind the meeting?" All the information about the meeting and its sponsors was available in the newspaper account, but the badge-showing and suspicious questioning was the army's way of "throwing its weight around." The incident was outlined in a letter to the *Christian Century* of Feb. 27, 1952.

The use of censorship was illustrated in the celebrated Voorhees case. On Feb. 21, 1953 Lt. Col. Melvin B. Voorhees, a former editor of the Tacoma (Wash.) *Times* and a reserve officer who had served a term in the army as a censor, was convicted himself of evading army censorship. In a book, *Korean Tales*, which he wrote after serving as chief censor for the Eighth Army in Korea, he told a story about Gen. MacArthur and made some comments about news correspondents to which the army objected. No secret material was published. Yet he was convicted by an army court martial for failing to submit manuscripts for review in advance of publication.

11. Congressional Record, August 2, 1950, p. A5886-A5887.

12. San Francisco Chronicle, October 22, 1950.

13. Wichita, Kansas Eagle, February 19, 1948.

End of the Line for a Movement — —

(Continued from page 6)

The minority document furthermore purports to analyze the roots of the Cannon line, and this is a sad business reflecting the political level on both sides. The faction is incapable of giving any political analysis of Cannonism, more or less substituting psychologizing and the "power-politics" thinking which they fully share with Cannon.

The document explains that the Cannon group is "too ingrown and politically disoriented, too thoroughly indoctrinated with mysticism about their 'ordained leadership,' and hypnotized with crackpot notions of 'power' . . ." The Cannon group formed "not on the basis of a secure political platform, which it lacked, but on prestige, tradition, seniority, personal loyalties and sentimental attachments." It is a "political vacuity." It is "hardening its scholastic traits, providing 'theoretical' grounding for its ultimistic approach, deepening its sectarian habits of thought, political outlook and positions." It is a "new DeLeonism." Cannon's attack on Pablo "began as a personal intrigue." It looks on the dispute solely as a "naked power-struggle." Etc.

POLITICAL ROOTS

The point is not that all this is untrue, but that there is no attempt to account for this development on political grounds. They write: "The new sectarianism reflects no trend of circles in the American labor movement, or even of American radicalism, but arises out of the petrification of the 'old Trotskyists,' who have succumbed to a quarter-century of isolation, and who have taken refuge in a make-believe world of their own creation, getting a vicarious thrill of playing at 'revolution.'"

Descriptively this is pointed, but neither the minority nor majority ascribe the split basically to what is obvious and well known as the political root: namely, the political dilemma which their movement faced when it found that its "degenerated workers' state," Russia, was setting up new "workers' states" outside its borders.

Both wings of this movement are founded on the dogma that Stalinist nationalized economy is the criterion for a "workers' state" and for the defense of

such a "workers' state" in imperialist war. The political starting point for the Pablo-Cochran pro-Stalinist deviation came with its inevitable conclusion that the East Europe satellites were "workers' states" too. And if they were, then somehow the "socialist revolution" had been made bureaucratically from above—by Stalinism. From this the more consistent thinking of the Stalinoid wing developed the theory of the progressive and revolutionary role of Stalinism in the world today . . . and the rest of its program.

Up to recently Cannon went along with this, at least formally, offering no other way out of the brutal political impasse into which "orthodox Trotskyist" ideas had been plunged by life. His group has now drawn back from the unpalatable conclusions, but they still have no other analysis to offer, and will have none.

GANGRENE

Politically speaking, therefore, the Pablo-Cochran tendency represents the consistent conclusions from the fundamental theory which both hold; while the Cannon faction is politically poised uncertainly between clinging to the theory and being unable to accept its consequences.

The comparison between Cannonism and SLP "DeLeonism" is not very bright. Among other things (including a great deal of real estate) the SLP does have a distinctive program, such as it is and absurd as it is in its "principled" though fossilized sectarianism. The disintegrative potential in the Cannon group is precisely its inability to think out any of its political ideas, not because of "psychological" reasons at bottom but because of the political impossibility of reconciling its "workers' state" theory with anti-Stalinism.

A genuinely independent life for the new split-off group is equally improbable, and also on purely political grounds, aside from their ability to publish a magazine for an indeterminate while. This group has no reason for existence outside the Stalinist movement except for the principled totalitarian-monolithism of the CP itself; and at the very best it can live only a half-shadow existence on the borders of the Stalinist periphery in the manner of the amorphous

Sweezy group (which at least has some intellectual forces to do so).

This political gangrene will now shake the Fourth International groups apart, out of their present condition of mere impotence into de-facto disappearance from the scene entirely. The result is assured by the fact that, at the same SWP plenum, a declaration of war on the leadership of the Fourth International was issued by the Cannon leadership and is now published in the *Militant* as "A Letter to Trotskyists Throughout the World."

THIS MEANS WAR

"The fight is now a showdown," it says. "The lines of cleavage between Pablo's revisionism and orthodox Trotskyism are so deep that no compromise is possible either politically or organizationally." One or the other must be driven out of the movement. But the safest bet is that neither can win, since the minuscule Fourth International will be buried by the flying debris.

Pablo's leadership in the Fourth International groups abroad, says the "Letter," is based on his "consolidation of an uncontrolled, secret, personal faction in the administration of the Fourth International which has abandoned the basic program of Trotskyism." This Pablo leadership ("faction") "is now working consciously and deliberately to disrupt, split and break up the historically created cadres of Trotskyism in the various countries and to liquidate the Fourth International." It is "determined to drive all orthodox Trotskyists out of the Fourth International or to muzzle and handcuff them."

On its political side, the "Letter" is merely pitiful. It knows what it is against now, at any rate: the Pablo theory of the progressive Stalinist revolution as the wave of the future. To this it counterposes the desperately nonsensical "old Trotskyist" theory that Stalinism "in the final analysis is a petty-bourgeois agency of imperialism [which means, incidentally, capitalist imperialism]." While nowadays this view verges on the crackpot, it is all that Cannon has to offer.

What we are describing for the historical record is, as we said, the death throes of a movement, the end of a line.

But one of the things which many SWP members still retain as the vestige of a different past is their recognition that a political line must be thought through. This was the strength of the Pablo-Cochran tendency, which did some thinking-through and came up with a "way out" of the blind alley of "orthodox Trotskyism," a way out which was simultaneously a way into the fetid morass of Stalinism.

THIRD ROAD

As the purged SWP disintegrates (not necessarily tomorrow, but inevitably at an ever-faster tempo), its militants will also have to do some thinking-through. Can they break the umbilical cord which binds them to the pro-Stalinist politics of the "workers' state" theory of Russia, as they strain away from the more extreme pro-Stalinist conclusions of the Stalinoid wing?

As their movement falls apart under them, to be sure a few may find their way to reconciliation with capitalism, as demoralized as the Cochranite capitulators to Stalinism. But it is to be hoped that more will see their way to a road of independence from and struggle against both exploitive systems in the world, Stalinism and capitalism and their respective war camps. This is the independent course on which alone a politically solid Marxist movement can be built today.

A Marxist Classic

Rosa Luxemburg's
The Accumulation
of Capital

Yale Univ. Press\$5

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

The Political Climate —

(Continued from page 1)

the late '30s and the war years that it is only with an effort that it can be reconstructed.

Those were the days in which the Stalinists proclaimed that "Communism is Twentieth-Century Americanism." They adopted Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Eleanor Roosevelt as their patron saints. Anyone in the labor or radical student movements who dared to criticize them had to reckon with Stalinist denunciations even more than with those of genuine New Dealers.

The Alliance with Stalinism

During the war, they were the most fervent advocates of the no-strike pledge for unions and of speed-up in the factories. Socialists who resisted them in the labor movement were all too frequently confronted by a united front of regular union leaders, Stalinists, employers and government officials.

On questions of war policy, they were to be distinguished from other war supporters only by their ardent demand for a second front in Western Europe before the American armies were fully prepared for such operations.

Those were the days in which Ambassador Davies' pro-Stalinist book *Mission to Moscow* was made into a movie by Warner Brothers and widely hailed as a true portrayal of Stalinist society, while Trotsky's biography of Stalin was suppressed by Harpers as being contrary to the national interest.

What distinguished the American government's approach to the war and the war aims from that of the Stalinists, both foreign and domestic? Hardly anything.

They were all agreed on the policy of "unconditional surrender"; on keeping down the colonial revolution in the interest of the prosecution of the war; on an amicable division of the world into spheres of power and influence.

Though there was some "friction" as in the case of Poland, the whole war policy of the United States was based on the assumption of a world ruled jointly and amicably by the Stalinists in "their" sphere and the Western allies in theirs.

It was not because of the influence of Russian spies and agents that for a time the highest American officials agreed with the Russians on the deindustrialization of Germany, but because that is the way in which they both approached the problem of what to do with a defeated foe.

Germans of the Times

In such an atmosphere, what was to prevent clever Stalinists from working their way into high office in the government? They could be ardent defenders and supporters of a wide range of policies in which they were in agreement with non-Stalinist government officials.

If Philip Murray could retain Lee Pressman for years as chief counsel of the CIO, although every adult in anti-Stalinist radical circles knew he was either a Communist Party member or was cheating the CP of his dues, what was to prevent dozens of his colleagues from gaining the same kinds of posts in the government?

It is not, at bottom, a question of the unusual cleverness or ruthlessness of the Stalinist apparatus, or of some peculiar and inexplicable blindness or stupidity on the part of government officials. It is a question of the political atmosphere which permeates a country because of the policies of its own ruling class and government at a particular time.

In a discussion of the charges against the "defendants" of the Moscow trials in the late '30s, Leon Trotsky made the observation that if the charges were based in fact, they were a devastating commentary on Stalinist society. It is well known, he wrote, that the human body carries disease germs at all times. But it is only when the body is weakened, its resistance greatly reduced, that these germs can penetrate to vital organs, get the upper hand, and do serious damage. If it be true, he wrote, that a number of the top officials of the Russian government and Communist Party were actually agents of foreign powers, and that they had accomplices who were in a position to do serious damage throughout Russian society, this means that that society has been rendered peculiarly vulnerable by some inner weakness.

Swing of the Wheel

In the case of American society during the late '30s and the war years, the "weakness" was two-fold: on the one hand, there were the widely accepted government aims and policies which were imperialist in essence and hence ran parallel with those of the Stalinist imperialist allies of the day; in the second place, there was no understanding of the nature of Stalinism as a political and social phenomenon.

Now the wheel has turned around. Stalinism is regarded as the chief danger. It is no better understood than it was then, though the misunderstanding is of a different nature.

From an attitude which regarded Stalinism as a relatively harmless ideology held by fine fellows who, in addition, had a powerful army which was dealing blows to a common enemy, the idea has now swung to a point where Stalinism is regarded as a diabolical plot, every adherent of which is a vicious and hardened conspirator or worse, and the chief menace of which lies in a powerful army which will sooner or later break forth to conquer the world.

It is quite true that in the atmosphere which now prevails it is highly unlikely that any but the most skillful and most deeply concealed Stalinist agent will get into government office. From a political operation of fairly wide scope, the penetration of the government machinery will now be possible only for a tiny group of trained and cultivated spies.

Safe for Democracy?

At the same time, however, the hysteria has now reached a point at which every man of liberal opinions and associations, every non-conformist, everyone who was touched by the broad social movements of the '30s, is suspect. "Twentieth-Century Americanism" becomes ever more closely associated with McCarthyism, to the point where the former president of the United States is no longer safe from charges and calumnies.

Though government secrets may be safer from the Russians than they were formerly, American society is less safe for democracy than it has ever been before.

Espionage has never been the sole, or even major, cause of the downfall of a healthy society. But the steady drift toward a police state in a major industrial country in this country is a symptom of a fatal social malady.

To combat this drift is the highest calling of socialists, consistent democrats, and above all, of those men whose power gives them the primary responsibility for leading and defending the labor movement. For even though the labor movement may not be the first victim of the drift, it will inevitably be the most important one.

Strong Words Are Not Enough —

(Continued from page 1)

refutation, or opportunity for administrative or judicial review. No "due process" was provided by which to challenge this "unfounded accusation" against organizations, and hence against their members or sympathizers.

TO BE REMEMBERED

It was under Truman's administration that "reasonable doubt" of loyalty was made sufficient for the discharge of government employees, who were denied the right to cross-examine their accusers or to be informed of the detail of accusations against them.

It was under his administration that the harassment by the FBI of individuals suspected of having some connection with

organizations on the "subversive list" was extended, and in no small part contributed to "the spread of fear and the destruction of faith in every level of our society."

Now the Republicans have sought to broaden and deepen the cancer. The fact that they are reaching out to high figures in the Democratic Party in this effort brings a powerful reaction. In fighting this further development of what was started under Truman all allies are welcome. But it would be wrong to forget the responsibility some of them bear for the beginnings of the danger to liberty which has now become so apparent.

THE PRACTICAL WAY

We think this has to be borne in mind not merely in order to point the finger and

say "You too!" but because, apart from strong words, however welcome, McCarthyism CANNOT be fought by men who accept its principles and get indignant only at its applications.

As Truman rightly said in his speech, it is not the man McCarthy who is the butt of an attack on McCarthyism. Nor, for that matter, is it merely Brownell, nor even Republic National Chairman Hall who announces that the GOP campaign will make "Communism" its central issue (in the United States today!). To denounce McCarthyism in the name of advocating a more clever, more "responsible" McCarthyism is only one form of capitulating before the trends of the times. Consistent democrats have to fight it all the way on principle because this is the only practical way to fight it.

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!

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