

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

MARCH 1, 1954

FIVE CENTS

**The 'Young Socialist Challenge':
AGAINST BOTH WAR CAMPS!**

A 4-Page Section for Students and Youth

**'Responsible' GOP Leaders Look
More Like McCarthy Every Day**

... page 8

Langer, FBI, Attorney General's Office, Fascists Play a Shady Role in—

The Dirty Mess Around the Warren Case

By H. W. BENSON

Six weeks ago, a Senate judiciary subcommittee, under the chairmanship of William Langer, Republican of North Dakota, met to consider the nomination of Earl Warren for chief justice. Warren was already serving as an interim Eisenhower appointee. He had been governor of California, a pillar of respectable society, a conservative dependable Republican, unblemished, unstained, an American. By every law of reason and politics, the Senate should have confirmed this appointment as a matter of routine.

But these are not ordinary times. Do we really know, for example, that he was never a Communist? Only the FBI can tell. . . .

The subcommittee stalled and stalled. Meanwhile lengthy hearings

were opened. Wild charges from crackpots all over the country were solemnly entered into the record and weighed, until a furor of protest from the administration itself, Eisenhower, Nixon and Knowland forced the committee's hand and it voted to recommend confirmation. But not before a Full Field Investigation of Warren by the FBI had been ordered and completed.

A Supreme Court justice, who is charged with the responsibility of evaluating the Constitution and law in all their majesty, is in turn evaluated by cops and snoops on the basis of evidence supplied, among others, by nitwits and screwballs.

Senator Langer is reputed to be a fanatical defender of the patronage rights of the sovereign state of North Dakota, which he claims has been shabbily treated in the distribution of political plums. He sought,

it is said, to force the administration to correct this injustice by holding up its appointments. Such may have been his motivations, but only in this era of the Red Peril could such calculations be applied with spectacular success.

It was inevitable: among the charges presented to the subcommittee, and publicly announced by it, was the accusation that Warren had a "100 per cent perfect record of following the Marxist revolutionary line." A not unimpressive achievement, difficult even for dedicated Marxists!

FASCIST POPS UP

Another denunciation maintained that he is "biased toward the AFL labor monopoly." Besides, he was accused of being an ordinary crook. All this was duly submitted to the FBI, which reported that it had "followed all the leads we had."

Then began the battle of dossiers in which "communists" were flung about like mortar shells. Warren Olney 3d, assistant attorney general, sprang to Warren's defense and sought, to disprove the charge of "Marxism" by proving that some of the chief justice's denigrators were some kind of "Communists" themselves.

Olney drew out of his files an arm-long dossier on one Burr McCloskey, who had forwarded to the subcommittee a letter written by another man named Wilson, charging Warren with racketeering. Wilson, a shady character, a sort of

(Turn to last page)

Dulles Happy Over Zero Result In Berlin: He Kept His Shirt

By GORDON HASKELL

The sole decision arrived at by the Big Four conference in Berlin, which was able to settle none of the problems of Europe, was to hold a Big Five Conference on Asia. And the Eisenhower administration (that government of "initiative") which was so reluctant to send Dulles to Berlin, will now be just as reluctant to go to Geneva.

In both cases the conferences were not of this government's choosing. They were imposed on it by the demands of its allies in Europe that some attempt be made to reach agreements which would decrease the burdens of the cold war on them. These demands, in turn, reflect the ardent desires of their peoples for an extended prospect of peace.

The Berlin conference has only confirmed the prospect of an extended stalemate in Europe. There is little possibility that the conference on Asia will do more.

One of the most striking aspects of the Berlin conference, and of the one planned for Geneva in April, is that they have completely bypassed the United Nations as a factor in international politics. This is brought home with special weight with respect to the latter gathering.

Chief items on the agenda of the Geneva conference will be a settlement of the war in Korea and an attempt to do the same for the war in Indo-China. The Korean war was sponsored or at least endorsed by the UN, and sixteen UN nations participated more or less actively on the American side. Yet it is not the UN, or any subdivision of the UN which is calling this conference. The Big Four are calling it and inviting Stalinist China, North and South Korea and other governments which participated in the war directly to attend "if they wish to."

TALK-SHOP

Even if this may bring sorrow to the bleeding hearts who have stubbornly continued to regard the UN as a serious factor in world affairs, it has at least one advantage. It makes even clearer than before this reality: the UN is a talking shop, a propaganda soundboard. The real decisions are made by the great powers.

Last year, when the UN took up the question of what kind of conference to hold for the settlement of the Korean war, the U. S. government insisted that

it be a "two-sided" conference with its supporters on one side and the Stalinists, including Russia and China, on the other. With much reluctance and a good deal of American strong-arming, the UN voted for this kind of set up. That led to the blind alley of the Panmunjom discussions from which the U. S. government emerged with nothing but an alleged insult to its honor.

But now the Big Four have settled the composition of the conference in six brisk secret sessions. The settlement, to be sure, is an obvious defeat for the

Washington position. Stalinist China and Russia will both be there, the latter as an inviting power and the former as a welcome guest. No one knows whether Chiang Kai-shek will be invited at all. The UN resolution on the conference is . . . simply forgotten.

Reports from Berlin indicate that Dulles left the scene in what one describes as "high fettle." It appears that he was pleased that he came off as easily as he did. After all, it could have been much worse! What if the Russians had agreed

(Continued on page 7)

Business Booms at Detroit Welfare Dept.

By JACK WILSON

DETROIT, Feb. 21.—Two important subsidiaries of the auto industry already show every sign of the kind of spring pickup that President Eisenhower and C. E. Wilson have been talking about.

Business is booming at the first subsidiary. It has doubled its work force and put on a full second shift. The name of this company is the Detroit City Welfare Department. As more and more unemployment compensation benefits end, the Welfare Department expects even greater business.

The second subsidiary is growing in leaps and bounds on a national scale. It is the car bootlegging business. Only this weekend, the Akron Beacon-Journal printed a sensational story of the operations of car bootlegging rings in that area. Previously, the Augusta (Ga.) Journal exposed some chicanery going on down south. And last week Detroit

papers carried a reprint of an exposé in Motor magazine on the car bootlegging business which centers in Detroit, home of self-anointed virtuous car dealers and sacred car manufacturers, and in Chicago.

What this signifies is, of course, the real state of affairs in the auto industry, which neither the Republican administration, nor the newspapers which print the stories, care to talk about in basic terms.

The welfare story is the tragic part of the real situation in Michigan employment. After all the prodding and criticism by Walter P. Reuther, UAW and CIO president, government officials finally got around to making fresh surveys on unemployment, and as a result, Detroit was placed in the "distressed labor area" class. The government admitted unemployment in Detroit was 107,000 by mid-January. As part of this same survey, the fed-

eral administration admitted last week that unemployment figures they used were at least 728,000 too low.

As far as Detroit is concerned, even the latest figure is still too low, for the Michigan Employment Security Commission said on February 9 that Detroit unemployment had reached 121,000 and Michigan unemployment the high figure of 220,000.

The lack of confidence of the auto industry in any real spring pickup is shown by the desperate means being used now to sell new cars. This is where the car bootlegging racket comes into being, with the knowledge of the corporations, according to a Chevrolet dealer in Georgia until General Motors shut him up.

The racket consists simply of dealers selling new cars to used-car dealers, almost at cost. The used-car dealers then

(Turn to last page)

LONDON LETTER

Needed: Left-Wing Forces

Dissatisfaction Mounts in BLP

By ALLAN VAUGHAN

LONDON, Feb. 18—The condition of the Labor Party is not good; it is clear from some recent danger signals.

No less a personage than Richard Stokes, the former Labor minister of works, has said so. In a speech to his constituents in Ipswich, he declared that the party needs "more vigorous leadership at the top."

It will be recalled that Richard Stokes was the first Labor member to accuse the Bevanites of having formed "a party within a party," and his open attack on the official leadership can be interpreted only as a sign that dissatisfaction with the Labor Party's front bench in the House of Commons has reached even the hardened anti-Bevanites in the party.

In the course of his speech he said: "The Chinese have a saying that 'A fish starts rotting at the head.' Not that I feel as badly as that about the Labor Party, but what we want is stimulating and we shan't get it without a change." But he protected himself from any counterattack from the official leadership by saying that "This is no criticism of those at the top who have served the party and the country well and who would probably like to take things easier."

The main reason for Stokes' timely reminder to the Labor front bench was the unhappy showing of Labor candidates in two by-elections which took place last week.

UNREST

The failure of the Labor Party parliamentary group to take a position on the industrial issues that have arisen over the last few months has led to a state of apathy in the ranks. Although Wilfred Burke, the party chairman, established the fact in a party broadcast over the BBC that it was the Tory government's dismantling of the "welfare state" that is responsible for the threat of a general wage scramble, yet it was clear that he (i.e., the official wing of the party) has no use for "unconstitutional" strike action such as has been taken in the case of the well-organized and powerfully supported Electrical Trades Union strikes, or any concerted action by the unionists to get wage increases.

The recent "coup" in the Parliamentary Labor Party, which led to the replacement of the 71-year-old chairman of the trade-union group of Labor MPs by a young 40-year-old anti-Bevanite, George Brown, is a significant omen of future developments. More and more, the opposition inside the Labor Party will come from trade-unionists and trade-union MPs who will force the party to take a stand on these issues—even if they have in the past lined themselves up with the right wing of the party.

FARSIGHTED TORIES

It is no accident that the Tory party itself, which is concerned more with long-range policies and long-term interests than the employers are in many cases, has so far taken a rather detached view of the industrial disputes. Sir Walter Monkton, the "non-political" minister of labor, has urged the employers to make minor concessions rather than fight the unions with the big stick.

More farsighted than the electrical and engineering employers, he and the Tory cabinet realize that a last-ditch stand by these "irresponsible" employers will only spark the trade unions into decisive action. Retreat or withdrawal to prepared positions, at this stage, is the counsel of the Tory minister of labor. There can be little doubt that it will not need much provocation on the part of the Tory government to set in motion a train of industrial disturbances that would shake Toryism to its very core.

The problem in the Labor Party is quite simple. There are not sufficient forces or sharp enough political positions to be the basis for an effective left wing within the party. The periodicals that exist serve in most cases to glinger up or pepper the

life of the movement, but nothing more.

Even the Bevanite Tribune is falling down on the job. On international questions Tribune takes a broadly utopian line or a line very close to that of the traditional fellow travelers. For Tribune, the main task is to "ease" world tension by four- or five-power conferences, so that rearmament can be reduced and the resulting "surplus" expenditure be diverted to a "World Plan for Mutual Aid" in which all the countries of the world would participate. A very fine picture, only it cannot have any correspondence with the harsh realities of power politics.

Nowhere does the Tribune see the international working class movement as the only lever which can "ease" world tension by throwing the great powers on to the defensive, thus setting the ground for general action to remove all capitalist governments and bureaucratic tyrannies.

It cannot be said that the New Statesman and Nation is much better. As a matter of fact, it is much worse. Though it reaches only the so-called intellectual circles both within and without the Labor movement, its influence is considerable. It preaches a policy of "live and let live," which more often than not looks like the propaganda we are accustomed to from the CP when it is in a "pacific" or Popular-Frontist mood.

ILP AT A FORK

Only the Socialist Leader, the organ of the Independent Labor Party (ILP), carries on much of the grand tradition of independent Labor politics. Recently enlarged this weekly has a considerable circulation in the Labor Party. Most of its contributors are Labor Party members, including F. A. Ridley who has recently resumed his weekly column.

Further, the Socialist Leader keeps a firm anti-Stalinist position, which distinguishes it and marks it off from nearly all other significant left-wing publications. The tragedy is that this paper with all its potentialities is the organ of the ILP, which has hitherto resisted all efforts to enter the Labor Party. Although the ILP's membership is small, and many of its members are a bit on the old side,

there can be no doubt that the ILP's entry into the Labor Party, either as an organization or through individual members affiliating to the party, would strengthen the left wing not only physically and numerically but, more important, it would help to bring back the tradition of Keir Hardie which seems to have been lost in the LP.

In such a different relationship the Socialist Leader might get to serve as the banner of the genuine left wing of the Labor Party, opposed to both Anglo-American imperialism and to the Stalinist international machine.

It is to be hoped that the ILP's annual Easter conference will accept the policy proposed by its National Council, that "The National Council recommends that the relevant changes be made in the party constitution to enable the ILP to cease being an electoral body and that its members be permitted to join the Labor Party."

Already a prominent and formerly leading anti-entryist, David Gibson, once chairman of the ILP, has joined the Labor Party. This is all to the good. There are still many good socialists outside the Labor Party, even in the SPGB (Socialist Party of Great Britain), whose place is in the Labor Party, side by side with the left wing.

NEW LIBERAL GROUP

This also brings us to a very interesting pamphlet entitled "Radical Aims," published by the Radical Reform Group of the Liberal Party. This pamphlet sets out a policy of "social reform without socialism." It also recognizes the necessity of state intervention in the running of the economy. It rejects out of hand the traditional policy of Liberalism, free trade. On the positive side it advocates genuine "co-ownership," which it describes as an industrial reform "far more revolutionary in effort and far more satisfying to man's spirit than any amount of socialism."

What is interesting about this group and its pamphlet is its concern with the bureaucracy that accompanies nationalization, both of which it identifies with "socialism." The Commonwealth Party, an essentially middle-class but profoundly radical party nevertheless, arose during the war in much the same way as this Radical Reform Group is evolving. There can be no doubt that some serious thinking on the question of nationalization and bureaucracy is wanted, and this group can do it best inside the Labor Party; for "socialism" and "nationalization" are by no means synonymous.

Denounce New Franco Terror

Norman Thomas today released the text of a cablegram he and twenty other Americans have sent to Generalissimo Franco in Madrid. The group protested vigorously the current policy of the Franco regime of trying civilians accused of political offenses before military courts.

"We remind your excellency," the cable concluded, "that it is the custom in most countries not under Communist rule for civilians to be tried by judges and not by colonels."

Among the signers of the cable were: Max Ascoli, editor of the Reporter; W. H. Auden; Dorothy Day, editor of the Catholic Worker; James T. Farrell; Sidney Hook; Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr of the Union Theological Seminary; Victor Reuther, assistant to the president of the CIO; Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., vice-chairman of Americans for Democratic Action; Toni Sender, UN representative of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; and Norman Thomas. Also among the signers were: George S. Counts, David Dallin, Dwight Macdonald, Jean Malaquais, A. J. Muste, Prof. Meyer Schapiro.

Although one of the two recent courts martial of Spanish civilians mentioned in the cable was reported on February 6 by the American press, nothing has so far appeared about the second, a week later, in which ten civilians accused of political offenses were given sentences of up to ten years by a military court. Word of this trial came to a member of the Thomas group in a private letter from Paris. According to this letter, the defendants were convicted of "military insurrection" although a search uncovered no arms and although the chief evidence against them was that they had taken part in a social science study circle.

A partial list of the defendants and their sentences follows: Manuel Fernandez Grandizo, 10 years; Jaime Fernandez Rodriguez, 8 years; Maria Laguna, 4 years; Angel Caballero, 3 years; Jesus Lope, 3 years; Ignacio Leiva, 2 years; Ernesto Tojo, 1 year.

Among the group of 20 trade-unionists and socialists sentenced under the infamous military court system were Manuel Fernandez Grandizo, known in Spanish refugee movements by the pen name of Munis, and Jaime Fernandez Rodriguez. Munis, formerly associated with the 4th International and a long-time socialist, was convicted of the "crime" of organizing a study circle. Defense counsel provided by the Franco regime had to intervene to ask for a sentence of seven years' hard labor for Munis and four years for Rodriguez!

ISL FUND DRIVE

You're Starting Slow—Get Off the Dime!

By ALBERT GATES Fund Drive Director

The end of the first week of the 1954 ISL Fund Drive shows that while money has been collected (that we know of), reports are slow in coming in. Paper work always lags in the campaign, but we did ask all the branches not to wait for that before sending their collections in.

As a result, our first report does not show up very well. As a matter of fact, only \$374 has been received by the Na-

tional Office since the drive opened. Of this amount, New York City sent in \$200 which is the biggest sum received, although the percentage of its quota remains quite low at 5 per cent.

St. Louis and Streator, with small quotas, are now in first place with 40 per cent each. But they usually do their share in the fund drive.

The Newark Branch of the ISL has started out well. The \$79 contributed by it adds up to 19.7 per cent of its quota of \$400, and is a good omen. They are confident of going over their quota and think they can finish on top when the drive ends. Cleveland also let itself be heard from with a \$25 payment making 16 per cent of its quota. Oakland just got in under the wire too with a \$10 contribution.

Outside of these, nothing was received. Chicago, which is certain to meet and even exceed its quota, has not been heard from yet. Neither has Los Angeles, with one of the large quotas, shown any sign of life.

As it is, the first week of the drive, based upon what has been received by the National Office, indicates that only 3.7 per cent of the total quotas has been met. That is far out of line with previous experience. We usually have managed to pass the thousand-dollar mark the first week.

We are now waiting for everybody to get into the act. You don't have to be a member of the ISL to help the fund drive along. All you have to do is send in a contribution, using the blank below. Let's ring a few bells!

Support Your LABOR ACTION— GIVE to the Fund Drive!

CONTRIBUTE to the ISL FUND DRIVE!

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

Enclosed is \$..... as my contribution to the ISL's 1954 Fund Drive.

NAME ADDRESS CITY STATE.....

(Make checks payable to Albert Gates)

Labor Action FORUM • New York City THURSDAY, MARCH 4 at 8:45 p.m. Abe Stein Labor Action Writer on German and Russian Affairs on West Germany After the Berlin Conference at LABOR ACTION HALL 114 West 14 Street, New York City

New Young Socialist Movement Says: Against Both War Camps!

Two Youth Groups Integrate Forces At Unity Convention

By SCOTT ARDEN

The Young Peoples Socialist League and the Socialist Youth League are now dissolved, and in their place stands the only nation-wide socialist youth organization in America today, the Young Socialist League. The doubts and hesitations of the past period were dispelled wholesale by the unity convention. This is most clear in reference to the question naturally raised prior to the convention: Will the YSL really be an integrally unified organization, or will there be a continued division along former YPSL-SYL lines?

This question was posed, usually, in two different ways from two points of
(Continued on page 6)

By BOGDAN DENITCH

The young socialist unity convention which saw the foundation of the new Young Socialist League, from the merger of the Socialist Youth League and the Young Peoples Socialist League, was the largest and liveliest young socialist convention that has been held in a long time.

The convention, held in New York City at Labor Action Hall, lasted three full days over the weekend of February 12-14. Delegates representing groups from New York, Boston, Los Angeles, Chicago, Newark, New Haven, Berkeley and Ohio, and a membership at large scattered throughout the country but concentrated heavily in the Midwestern and Mid-Atlantic states, participated in the convention. A large number of observers and friends also sat in throughout most of the sessions.

The sessions were characterized by a high level of discussion which underlined the basic agreement of the delegates on the most important questions. This convention represented one concrete answer to the question that so many of us faced on the campus: "Why don't you socialists get together?"

The first session, after the seating of the delegates and the adoption of the convention rules, discussed the young socialist press. It was agreed that a youth organ was

needed that would be popular in character and suitable for mass circulation on the campuses and among youth in general. This organ was to act as the political unifying factor for the new organization and was not only to

deal with specific youth questions but was also to act as the vehicle through which the general political views of the Young Socialist League could become familiar to the students and youth in general.

The convention voted to endorse the plans of the pre-convention committee to establish the *Young Socialist Challenge* as such an organ. The *Challenge*, which is to be a section of *LABOR ACTION*, is to appear as a full 4-page paper about every six weeks and is to be edited exclusively by the YSL. All members will get the *Challenge*, which will be paid for out of the dues they pay to the YSL. The 4-page issue of *Challenge*, of which this is the first, will contain features, articles and political discussion.

In addition to the *Challenge*, the convention voted to instruct the National Office of the new organization to issue regularly, ten times a year, a theoretical discussion and information organ which is to be called the *Young Socialist Review*. The *Young Socialist Review* will carry the internal political discussion of the YSL as well as organizational information, and it will be available to our contacts and friends, as well as going automatically to all members in good standing. (Incidentally, both names, *Challenge* and *Young Socialist Review*, have also been used in the past by both of the tendencies which united at the convention.)

HAIL CONVENTION

The Friday evening session opened with the reading and presentation of fraternal greetings to the convention. Personal greetings were read from Arlo Tatum of the War Resister's League.

Victor Howard, a member of the YPSL NEC from 1941 to 1947 and the YPSL national chairman from 1945 to 1946, who had been one of the leaders of the Libertarian (left-wing) caucus that had been forced out of the YPSL primarily through the SP, sent warm greetings to the convention. The greetings read in part:

"At a time when perpetual mitosis is the rule on the left it is encouraging to see one step in the other direction. I wish
(Continued on page 6)

Agnes Meyer Calls on Students To Defend Academic Freedom

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The National Action Committee of the Young Socialist League has urged the Academic Freedom Conference at Sarah Lawrence College "to participate actively in the struggle for civil liberties on the campus."

The conference is being held on February 27 at Sarah Lawrence. Representatives of various colleges, sent by their student governments, will assemble to hear speakers on academic freedom and to discuss possible joint action.

The Young Socialist League Committee urged that they take a principled stand on specific issues and create some kind of machinery for action. The resolution went on to state that "the Young Socialist League endorses the suggestion of Mrs. Agnes Meyer of the Washington Post for a nation-wide student campaign against demagoguery and conformity and pledges all of its resources to such a project."

The YSL resolution in full reads: "The Young Socialist League greets the conference at Sarah Lawrence College. We heartily approve of all united student action which strikes at the spirit of conformity and fear which is abroad in the United States today.

"We urge the delegates to realize that such a forum is only the beginning of the task. Common action on specific issues in the light of a principled stand on civil liberties should follow after discussion. We propose the following suggestions on the principles and structure of such common action.

WHAT TO DO

"(1) A stand in defense of civil liberties for all, and especially for those with whom we are in violent disagreement such as Stalinists and Fascists;

"(2) A stand in defense of the Fifth Amendment, for a broader interpretation of it rather than the reactionary Brownell scheme to junk it;

"(3) An insistence that the only criterion for the dismissal of a professor is his competence in his job—and never his present or past political affiliations;

"(4) An organization supporting these principles providing for contact between all campuses, investigating the possibility of regional or even national student projects in defense of civil liberties; and a call for the membership of student political groups in such an organization.

"The Young Socialist League endorses the suggestion of Mrs. Agnes Meyer of the Washington Post for a nation-wide student campaign against demagoguery and conformity and pledges all of its resources to such a project. But above all, we urge that all action should involve a commitment to a principled stand on civil liberties and that it should be organized so as to involve the greatest number of students.

"To the conference at Sarah Lawrence, and to all students in the United States, we urge that they pledge themselves to participate actively in the struggle for civil liberties on the campus."

OPPOSE BROWNELL

The committee was especially insistent on the necessity for a principled stand on academic freedom and civil liberties.

The Young Socialist League has declared itself as unalterably opposed to the Stalinist system of exploitation, but it has specifically called for a defense of the civil liberties of American Stalinists as well as of all other political tendencies. The reactionary attack which would restrict civil liberties for many shades of political opinion other than Stalinist has gained its momentum by attacking members of the Communist Party. Under this smokescreen, procedures and rulings have been made which basically undermine the liberties of all.

In its resolution, the League pointed to two of these specific attacks which have followed from the witchhunt. The first is the Brownell proposal to allow the granting of immunity from prosecution in order to lay the basis for coercing witnesses to testify. This comes after severe limitation of the Fifth Amendment by the Supreme Court; in a series of Colorado cases, it was held that a person "waived" the amendment if he invoked it too soon or too late, and that if a witness answered one question on Communist Party activity he must answer all. In effect, the Brownell

proposal would allow the government to demand that a man become an informer under the threat of a jail term.

The second specific area mentioned in the resolutions is that of hiring and firing teachers for reasons not concerned with their teaching. Professor Sidney Hook, who acts as theoretician for "liberal" capitulators to the witchhunt, has called for a faculty trial to decide whether a teacher is a member of the Communist Party and thus a "conspirator" who should be fired. Professor Hook
(Continued on page 6)

MIDWEST TOUR FOR YSL

Two representatives of the Young Socialist League, Scott Arden and Bogdan Denitch, will be touring the Midwest this spring. They will be glad to speak, debate, or lecture before any student or youth group in the general area covered by their itinerary.

The tentative itinerary is as follows:

Philadelphia area	March 11-13
Washington, D. C.	March 14
Pittsburgh	March 16
Berea, Ky.	March 18
Ohio State Univ. (Columbus)	March 20
Ohio Wesleyan (Delaware, O.)	March 21
Oberlin, Ohio	March 22
Detroit	March 24
Earlham College, Indiana	March 26
Madison, Wisconsin	March 28
University of Minn.	March 30
Chicago area	April 1-4
Yellow Springs, Ohio	April 5-9

This itinerary is still tentative, and there may still be some reshuffling in the dates involved. However, if any reader of *Challenge* or *LABOR ACTION* is in a position to arrange a suitable meeting on any campus in the general area indicated, he should write in immediately to the National Office of the Young Socialist League to make the booking now. Our speakers will be glad to speak before any student or youth group on a number of topics; we suggest the following as especially suitable:

Civil Liberties and the Cold War
Socialism and Pacifism
Socialism and Liberalism
The Meaning of the East Berlin uprisings
America and the Colonial Struggles for Independence
An Alternative to World War III
The Role of Socialists on the Campus

The speaker will usually be Bogdan Denitch, national secretary of the former YPSL, now editor of the *YSL Challenge*.

The YSL speakers will appear before former SYL and YPSL groups, before pacifist and liberal groups and at meetings arranged by friends of the organization. This tour is a part of a major effort to restore a campus base to the socialist youth movement and come into contact with broader strata of young students who in many cases have not yet heard of socialism. This is why all friends, sympathizers and members are asked to make an extra-special effort to help make this tour a success.

For further information write directly to the National Office of the YSL, now temporarily located at 114 West 14 St., N. Y. C.

Why We Have to Build the YSL

By MAX MARTIN,
National Chairman, YSL

The Young Socialist League comes into existence during a period of retreat for the socialist and radical movement and of reaction on the campus and among the youth. The atmosphere of silence and conformity dominates the campus, which by its very nature should be a seething bed of political and cultural discussion.

The campus today is the scene of constant purges among the faculty to weed out the political dissenters; teachers are required to take loyalty oaths; students are forbidden to hear speakers of their own choice; and unpopular radical organizations, as well as Stalinists, are increasingly subject to outright banning.

A direct result of this assault on the campuses is that students are afraid to join organizations or to sign petitions no matter how respectable and innocuous. Students who refuse to be intimidated and continue to speak out are blacklisted for admission to graduate schools and future employment; school agencies cooperate with the FBI and other governmental agencies in providing the names of political dissidents to the witchhunters.

And yet they call us the "silent generation"—they who have ALREADY conformed to the pressures of the existing society call us that, forgetting the increasing price the "unsilenced" ones have to pay in America today.

THE BIG PICTURE

The militarization of the campus proceeds apace; with increasing frequency ROTC groups are added to colleges which have never had them before and which, until the recent period, would have never dreamed of having them. The government, as part of its war preparations, has a huge need for scientists, engineers and technicians. Consequently, there is an ever increasing shift of emphasis toward the physical and technical sciences and away from liberal arts studies in the nation's centers of learning.

Large research contracts are granted to universities by the government and by private industries, thus tying the campus ever more strongly to the government and providing "justification" for introducing into the college community the same witchhunting standards which prevail in government employment.

Interest in politics by students is at an all-time low as they learn to adapt themselves to the atmosphere of conformity

which prevails. And worst of all the capacity to respond with indignation to injustice and oppression, a distinguishing feature of students traditionally, becomes stifled to an ever-increasing degree under a cover of apathy, cynicism, and "sophisticated" rationalizations.

In this situation the traditional liberal organizations and voices have not, we regret to say, been either clear or loud. This is a result of two factors. In the first place the liberal organizations are tiny, having been hit by the same forces that have affected society as a whole.

Secondly, and more important, the record of liberalism and of liberals, with a few honorable exceptions, has been one of retreat in the face of the anti-democratic attacks. Because of liberalism's support to the Fair Deal and because of its acceptance of the methods of Washington's fight against Stalinism, it has been able to criticize only the most extreme sectors of the anti-democratic trends, those represented by McCarthyism. The initiation of the witchhunt and many of the ideas of the witchhunters, for which responsibility must be assigned to the Truman administration, it has overlooked in silence, or, worse still, it has supported them.

The time has come to call a halt, to raise a counter-movement against the drift toward authoritarianism. American students and youth must begin to fight for the preservation of our remaining liberties, for the reconquest of those which have been chipped away, and for an extension and enlargement of freedom.

CALL TO SANITY

The Young Socialist League calls upon students to begin the return to sanity. We support and aid all efforts by students and student organizations in behalf of academic freedom and call upon students to organize and be heard; to stand up and be counted.

The most consistent and thoroughgoing fighters for civil liberties and academic freedom are organized in the Young Socialist League. This is because the YSL understands the nature of the current anti-democratic drives, sees their connection with the foreign policy of the Truman and Eisenhower governments, with the war drives of American imperialism and ultimately with the nature of capitalism itself.

The world is divided between two antagonistic war blocks, the camp of capitalist imperialism headed by Washington and the camp of Stalinist totalitarianism headed by Moscow. During this period it has been the Stalinist camp which is on the offensive and has been gaining.

Despite its totalitarian nature, Stalinism is able to appeal to masses of people in both Asia and Europe. Its appeal is based on the fact that, reactionary as it is, it is in its own way anti-capitalist; it is for the destruction of the system which has given the European workers unemployment and hunger, misery and war. To be sure, it replaces capitalism with a different exploitive system but this the workers in France and Italy do not know as clearly as they know the impossibility of continuing under their present circumstances.

To the peoples of Asia, Stalinism seems to offer a road out of colonial oppression. While we know that Moscow is interested only in building its own empire, it does indeed appeal to the Asian masses in terms that they can well understand. It offers itself as the leader of the struggles of the colonial peoples against their present oppressors.

Capitalism, on the other hand, has nothing to offer these people either in reality or even in appearance. Since the American government fights its cold war against Moscow not for democracy but in order to preserve capitalism, it cannot even begin to speak to the people of the world. It cannot offer a dynamic revolutionary program to solve the pressing social problems which confront humanity. It can only react to Stalinism in two ways, by military means such as the futile Korean adventure abroad and by repression at home.

THE ROAD WE POINT

The witchhunt is Washington's hysterical alternative to a positive political program against Stalinism, and it is part of the preparations for the coming war. These preparations require the silencing in advance of all critical and dissident voices.

It is for these reasons that one cannot, in the final analysis, isolate the fight for civil liberties and academic freedom from the struggle against imperialism and imperialist war. Nor can this fight be conducted consistently, nor in the long run successfully, unless it becomes a conscious fight against the basis of totalitarian imperialism in war—capitalism.

The Young Socialist League invites students and young workers to enroll under its banner; to help build an organization dedicated to the militant struggle for democracy and socialism. The road which the YSL points is not the easiest one to follow in the present period of tensions and pressures. It is, however, the only one which does not abandon the heritage of struggle for a better world. Instead it calls for a resurgence of that heritage as the only effective means of putting an end to the drift toward barbarism.

Launch Fund Drives For YSL and Anvil

One of the first decisions of the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist League has been to launch two fund drives. One fund drive, beginning immediately, is to go to the support of *Anvil*, the student anti-war magazine; the second fund drive, which will begin in three weeks and last three months is to help establish the new youth organization. The tentative targets for the two drives are \$250 for *Anvil* and \$1500 for the Young Socialist League.

The tentative quotas (by units) for the *Anvil* drive are:

New York	\$80
Los Angeles	50
Berkeley	35
Chicago	30
At Large	25
Boston	10
Newark	10
	\$250

The quotas for the major fund drive for the Young Socialist League, totaling \$1500, will be announced next week.

The *Anvil* fund drive is supposed to last no more than three weeks. This means that the units of the Young Socialist League should start raising the funds right now. We are confident that all units will meet their assignments, and even go over the top, but we must emphasize that in this drive the question of time is all-important.

The comrades are reminded that the money for the fund drives is not supposed to come in its entirety from the pockets of our own members! Particularly in the case of *Anvil*, sympathizers and friends should be approached. They are willing to give in a surprising number of cases. An excellent issue of *Anvil* is waiting for publication, the fund drive must be over in time to get this issue of *Anvil* to the campuses early, as well as to clear the way for the major fund drive immediately following. The National Office is sending out a circular with fund-raising suggestions to all units.

Pacifists Join the YSL

By EDWARD HILL

Pacifists formed a significant grouping at the founding convention of the Young Socialist League, and their presence was formally recognized with the election of three activists to the National Executive Committee of the new organization. In addition, pacifist leader A. J. Muste addressed the convention and associated himself with the point of view of the pacifist-socialists at the meeting.

There were three delegates who were also members of pacifist groups and all of them won seats on the Executive. They were Bob Bone and Bill Shirley of New Haven and Michael Harrington of New York. Both Bone and Shirley are veterans of the Civilian Public Service Camps for C.O.s during World War II, and both of them participated in strike action against Selective Service during their stay.

Bone is a member of the National Advisory Council of the War Resisters League, Shirley an activist in the WRL and in the Fellowship of Reconciliation at Yale, and Harrington was recently elected to the National Executive Committee of the War Resisters League.

The convention did not take a pacifist stand. The C.O. delegates pointed out that they would even oppose such a move since there are already pacifist groups organized and functioning. What the YSL did do was to issue a specific invitation to pacifists to join and to work with non-pacifists in the struggle against the political, economic and social causes of war.

This invitation to pacifists was unanimously approved by convention vote in the discussion on the war resolution. The resolution pointed out that there were different viewpoints within the YSL on the question of the legitimacy of violence as such, but it committed the new League to full and free discussion of the question and guaranteed the rights of the pacifist, or of any other minority.

AREA FOR UNITY

Socialist-pacifist cooperation has been a reality for six months. Among the sponsors of the Third Camp Conference in New York last fall were both of the youth groups that have united in the Young Socialist League, as well as Peacemakers and prominent individual pacifists. Since then, the Third Camp Contact Committee has functioned to provide a center for the exchange of information and the initiation of common projects.

Michael Harrington, member of the Executive Committees of both the Young Socialist and the War Resisters League, commented on these developments:

"The question of violence is a basic and important one. For a pacifist, it is the central issue of our time. Yet, in the radical movement in the United States it is a question which rarely is raised in practice. All democratic socialists are opposed to violent revolutions when non-violent change is possible. If the Young Socialist League should ever be part of a mass movement facing a dictatorial minority, the question of violence will certainly rise. But for now, the resources of the anti-war movement are so limited, the question of violence so distant, that there is a tremendous area where it is not only possible but absolutely necessary for common action.

"Every member of the Young Socialist League is committed to the struggle against the war drives of American and Stalinist imperialism. Right here and now, I hope that all pacifists will avail themselves of the opportunity for common struggle against war and for free exchange of ideas. The Young Socialist League has publicly and specifically recognized its pacifists. It is an opportunity for all of us."

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

organ of the Young Socialist League, is published as a weekly section of *Labor Action* but is under the sole editorship of the YSL. Opinions expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of the *Challenge* or the YSL.

Editor: Bogdan Denitch

Editorial Board:

Denitch, Henry Gale, Michael Harrington

The YSL's Aim

The Young Socialist League is a democratic socialist organization striving to aid in the basic transformation of this society into one where the means of production and distribution shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. The YSL attempts to make the young workers and students, who form its arena of activity, conscious of the need for organization directed against capitalism and Stalinism.

The YSL rejects the concept that state ownership without democratic controls represents socialism; or that socialism can be achieved without political democracy, or through undemocratic means, or in short in any way other than the conscious active participation of the people themselves in the building of the new social order. The YSL orients toward the working class, as the class which is capable of leading society to the establishment of socialism.

—From the Constitution of the YSL

JOIN NOW AS A CHARTER MEMBER!

YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE (Temporary address)

714 West 14 Street

New York 11, New York

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

NAME

ADDRESS

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

SCHOOL IF ANY

ON THE YSL CONVENTION RESOLUTION—

Strike at the Social Roots of War!

By TED BARRY

The major political resolution adopted at the Young Socialist League foundation convention was its resolution on war. For the political nature of a socialist movement today is most centrally determined by its attitude, not only on war in general but on the present war crisis driving toward an atomic slaughter.

Historically speaking, the most important dividing lines in the socialist and labor movements formed over their stand on the two world wars of our modern era. And the YSL says, in the terms of its convention resolution, that it "identifies with the revolutionary anti-war traditions of socialism—that is, with those socialists who, remaining true to their tradition and class interests, opposed the two imperialist wars."

Socialists recognize that wars are not the result of "human nature" or plots by a few militarists, but that they are rooted in exploitive social systems. "It is, however, meaningless," says the YSL document "to express opposition to war without at the same time opposing and organizing against the social systems which breed war. The struggle against war, therefore, goes hand in hand with the struggle against capitalism and Stalinism. . . ." This is particularly what differentiates SOCIALIST opposition to war from mere anti-war feeling.

DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

Since socialist opposition to war is not based on a rejection of violence as such in principle, the YSL resolution makes clear that we are ready to support wars of colonial independence against imperialist rule (for example, Indonesia's struggle for freedom after World War II) where national freedom is really the primary issue in the war. We are only too well aware that in a general imperialist war, fought by two blocs each seeking to conquer the other, each side always claims to be defending its national freedom, sovereignty, "honor" or what-have-you. But in such a general imperialist struggle, whatever "national" elements exist are subordinated—they are not the decisive motives or stakes in the conflict, which is being fought for domination of the world.

Likewise, socialists support such Resistance movements against foreign domination as sprung up from the people against the Nazi occupations in France and Italy during the last war. We would seek to free such a Resistance movement from any dependence on either of the imperialist camps (the Gaullists in France, for example) and move it to fight for power in its own right, as a mass movement of popular social change.

The YSL resolution next comes to grips with the question of "national defense." It points out that when the ruling class of any country talks about national defense, what it really means is the defense of the existing social order—that is, defense of its class privileges. It also sees the slogan of national defense purely as a cover for actual aggression against another nation, as Russia did when she claimed that she waged a war of "national defense" against Finland in 1939 or as Germany did in the two world wars, etc.

Revolutionary socialists believe that in order truly to defend the nation the workers must first have their nation; or, as the resolution puts it, "to defend the nation, in America, the workers must first take the political and economic power into their own hands."

ANTI-STALINIST

Any position on war that ignores the question of Stalinism is, of course, either naive or a cover for pro-Stalinist sympathies. One problem involved is that the Stalinist movement always talks about "peace." The YSL resolution states: "Although it is true that the Stalinists oppose the war preparations of the American camp, they do this only because of their unconditional support for the Russian camp, a camp which is also arming to the teeth in preparation for an imperialist world war."

Just as the socialists in America oppose the war drive of their own ruling class, so also socialists functioning under the Stalinist power (naturally in an underground movement) would have to oppose the war drive of these rulers. It is not a question of choosing sides—the socialists oppose both blocs of warmakers.

But we are often challenged: "What will you do if the war does break out?" This is a very important question, since in the case of both world wars many so-

cialists who were "opposed to war" supported their regime when it came to the actual conflict. The YSL resolution is clear on this point.

IF WAR COMES . . .

In discussing the war it points out that "it would be an imperialist war fought with the most barbaric weapons of modern science, in which the victory of either side would represent a major catastrophe for humanity and socialism." The resolution goes on to say: ". . . if a third imperialist war breaks out we shall continue opposition to it, we shall continue participating in the class struggle, always retaining our identity as a part of the Third Camp struggling for the victory of the working class and the colonial peoples over our ruling class and the representatives of the ruling class across the sea." That is: we shall continue our political opposition to the war, we shall support labor's strikes during the war, and maintain our independent role—opposing both this social system and Stalinism.

Many socialists support the West in the

cold war, and would support it in a third world war. Now of course they have many criticisms of the Western capitalisms and they call their support "critical support." These people miss the main point: Such a war would not be a democratic war, i.e., a war in defense of democracy, but rather an imperialist war where the two power blocs would contest for world domination.

The American bloc does not even make a good pretense of thinking of the conflict in terms of a conflict between "democracy and totalitarianism," as they show by their readiness to support anyone—a fascist dictator like Franco, a clerical dictatorship like Portugal, and even an independent Stalinist state like Yugoslavia so long as the regime in question is willing to ally itself on the side of American imperialism against Russian imperialism.

AGAINST MILITARISM

Furthermore, in order to be able to wage an all-out war the U. S. is forced to move to suppress all internal dissension—and will be forced to shackle the labor movement to prevent any strikes in war time. Therefore the YSL resolution says: "To raise the slogan of critical support . . . [to] either of the rival imperialisms is to capitulate to the politics of that camp, since it is the ruling classes of that camp that will determine the basis and the conditions under which such a war would be fought. The working class has no say and therefore no responsibility in the conduct of such a war in either of the two camps, and can

acquire such responsibility only by taking state power in order to carry out its own internationalist, democratic and socialist program."

Thus the YSL opposes unconditionally the militarization of America—the ROTC, the UMT, draft and the huge arms budget.

FOR A THIRD CAMP

In summary, the resolution discusses the alternative to World War III. "In order to fight effectively against such a war we must redouble our effort to make the working class conscious of its own interests, since only the intervention of the working class and the colonial peoples on the political arena as an independent force can stave off the Third World War."

This Third Camp of the colonial peoples and the working class is the only potential alternative to World War III and barbarism. The task of the socialists, therefore, is to work for it, strengthen it and help build it until the potential can become a reality.

Today in America the first front in the fight against the war drive is the defense of civil liberties and democratic rights, which are under assault as a part of that drive toward war. In this struggle the Young Socialist League seeks to work with all democratic elements on the campus and among the youth. The fight for democracy is not only an inseparable part of the fight for socialism—it is also an inseparable part of the fight against imperialist war.

THE YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE'S ORIENTATION—

Politics & the Campus: A Socialist View

By HENRY GALE

In the discussion on "orientation" at the YSL convention virtual unanimity was displayed on two major points: the need for participation by socialists in the labor movement, and the need for the maximum possible activity of socialists on campus. The clash between these two aims is not insoluble.

Our view of the working class as the main basically progressive social class dictates that socialists should orient wholeheartedly toward the labor movement, as its loyal partisans and constructive critics. At the same time, we recognize that "youth" as a special social category exists mainly in connection with the campus (young workers generally are far more influenced by the general problems and conditions of the working class than by those of "youth"). In addition, young people on the campus possess an intellectual liveness that makes them far more aware than the average person of the depth of the crisis besetting modern America.

Yet we would be fostering a delusion to suggest that the atmosphere of the American campus is anything other than what it is: one of fear, conformism, sullen and apolitical indifference, a condition quite incompatible with the naturally alert, questioning spirit of American youth.

THE "MAIN DRIFT"

The first and most important cause lies in the "main drift" of American society, a process of "creeping conservatism," of steady encroachment on civil liberties, of diminution of the area of political life open to genuine disagreement, of growing restrictions upon labor and of increasing government (i.e., big business) interference in social life, all taking place under the aegis of an economy saved from complete disaster (as distinct from the partial disaster which is politely called recession, now developing before our eyes) only by a permanently high level of war preparations. It is an insidious and pervasive trend that permeates all levels of American society today, not least the campus.

An additional cause is to be found in the very fact of the inquiring, critical, basically democratic nature of American youth. It is this that makes the campus suspect, that makes it a primary target of the know-nothings, of McCarthyite reaction, in short, of all the present precursors of American fascism. Their attacks have ranged from those of the lunatic fringe on UNESCO to those of "liberal" educators (such as Gideonse) on student

newspapers, organizations and self-government.

Before their attacks, the academic community as a whole has kowtowed shamefully, criticizing only the methods of the know-nothings and asking only to be permitted to stage its own genteel purge, without the limelight of public inquiries.

Adding to these pressures have been those proper to intellectual youth under a war economy. Most immediate is the threat of the draft, hanging like a Damoclean sword over the head of the student, discouraging any serious long-term thought on any personal or political topic.

More insidious than this is the spread of government controls over more and more of the possible post-graduation employment opportunities open to college students. The Truman-Brownell "loyalty" program threatens students with the direct consequences for a possible unguarded thought or association during their campus days.

ROOM FOR POLITICS

Yet all these things do not make inevitable the present atmosphere of craven, ostrich-like, political blindness, in which a majority of students refuse even to read a socialist newspaper or leaflet. Only the lack of a powerful and vigorous opposition to the reactionary drift, propounding a real democratic alternative to the capitalist war economy, that is to say, the lack of an independent political organization of the labor movement, permits such a state of affairs to exist.

This set of facts has determined the small and generally weak character of all student political groups since the ebb of post-war interest for politics. Further, in dictating the general climate in which socialists and all those interested in civil liberties and social progress must work, it places limits on the possible size and scope of such movements.

Nevertheless, as long as the present remnant of our democratic freedoms (and it is a considerable one) is substantially preserved, a considerable room for politics is maintained on campus. This fact derives from the contradictory character of the climate of fear and repression which exists on the campus. Subject to the continuation of bourgeois democracy in the U. S., the climate of the campus cannot move too much in advance of the rest of the U. S. in the trend toward fascism. Thus the climate of fear has always a certain limit, determined by the special position of the campus in American society.

But this is not all; the intensity of the drive against academic freedom derives in large part from the justified fear that the reactionaries have for the free and critical spirit of American youth. Because the danger here is so much more evident, they seek to push in advance of the general limits set by the degree of democracy remaining in society. It is precisely this attempt that must result in the creation of a counter-tendency, specifically characteristic of the youth.

THE NEED ON CAMPUS

This counter-tendency to the "main drift" is caused by the growth of a direct and immediate threat to that which is of the highest importance to all intellectually alive young people: their intellectual independence and self-respect. The basic question becomes posed more and more clearly, as the assaults on civil liberties intensify: to accept the "main drift" away from freedom, so integrally a part of modern American capitalist society, or to rebel against it and therefore against that society, to speak out in defense of their basic intellectual dignity—and thereby become political.

The polarization of the campus on this decisive question is today in its initial stages, but it is already clearly visible in the rise of the first significant proto-fascist student group in American history, the "Students for America." The ferment on the left has not yet reached the stage of comparable self-assurance, as is to be expected given the pro-rightist social climate. But it will have to do so, in order to be meaningful; only a vigorous, nation-wide pro-democratic movement can effectively defend the freedom of American students and combat the rising fascist groups.

Such a movement, of course, will not arise automatically; it must be built; but its need is blatant, and a tendency toward it already exists and will grow. It represents an opportunity and a challenge to the revolutionary socialist youth, who understand clearly the necessary social ramifications of such a movement, to aid in its development, to integrate themselves into it, and to support it effectively.

Its fate and that of socialism among American youth are inextricably linked. In the long run, it is true, its success depends upon the ties it can create with, and the stimulation it can provide for, the American labor movement. But today it is the most vital task and perspective before American youth, and before young socialists first of all.

Against Both War Camps — —

(Continued from page 3)

that this convention has been a unity convention of more groups than the two which were represented. That it did not become such is the fault of others and not of yourselves. . . .

"We need a Third Camp socialist organization which is sufficiently flexible to include various tendencies, but which also understands that extreme divergencies in basic principles, while tolerable in an immediate-demand group, is a source of weakness and not of strength in a permanent political group. I hope that you will have the wisdom to know where the line should be drawn."

A. J. Muste of the Peacemakers, a noted radical pacifist leader and a veteran of trade-union struggles, greeted the convention in person.

He said that this convention was one of the first hopeful signs of development on the left; and pointing out that in the new organization would be included revolutionary pacifists as well as anti-war socialists, he noted that on the basic single political question before the youth, that of war, the convention was in principled agreement.

Max Shachtman gave the fraternal greetings of the Independent Socialist League to the convention delegates.

In a discussion of the basis of unification of the convention, Comrade Shachtman emphasized the importance of the convention and the friendly interest of the ISL in the new youth organization. He urged the delegates to consider the eventual need for the Young Socialist League to affiliate to an adult socialist group.

PERSPECTIVES

In response to a request that the convention take some action on the case of Bert Rosen, a humanitarian objector to war, the convention unanimously passed the following resolutions:

"The Young Socialist League commits itself to the defense of the rights of humanitarian, ethical and political objectors to war, which are being denied solely on the grounds that they do not believe in God. We believe that this violated the rights of religious freedom guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States. We particularly include Bert Rosen, Vern Davidson and Don Thomas."

A vigorous discussion came next on the question of the basic perspective and orientation of the new organization. In this connection it should be mentioned as a very notable fact that, in the course of the discussions and disputes at the convention, in no case did the lineups on any question follow the pattern of ranking the SYL delegates against the YPSL delegates in blocs that followed the old lines. That is, given the basic political agreements that were already present, disagreements on various points cut clearly across these old organization lines, thus providing a happy augury for the integration of the two formerly rival youth groups into a really united movement.

The convention adopted a "Perspectives" resolution stressing a turn to the youth, emphasizing the need for reaching

and recruiting younger and less sophisticated elements on the campus. Given the "aging" of the young socialists now on the campuses, this was considered essential to the survival of the new organization. Vigorous disagreement on the method of functioning on the campuses was expressed at the convention—whether to emphasize broad socialist-type discussion clubs or whether to stress the organization of YSL units and recruiting directly into the organization.

In line with a stress on reaching new younger elements, the convention came out in favor of emphasizing open YSL clubs and recruitment directly into the organization, urging that the broader coalition clubs be formed only when there are other elements involved and when it is impossible to set up an open YSL unit.

DEMOCRATIC STRUCTURE

On Saturday morning the convention adopted a constitution outlining the structure of the new organization. The constitution, while making clear the disciplined nature of the new organization and insisting on basic agreement with the statement of principles as a basis for membership, provides the broadest guarantees of internal democracy.

Minority tendencies are guaranteed representation on the committees of the YSL; proportional representation is mandatory in elections of delegates to the conventions; referendum and recall provisions are readily accessible; and—a provision that most organizations paying lip service to democracy do not allow—minority groupings within the League have the right if they wish to publish their own organs and have access to the mailing and technical facilities of the national office.

The delegates from the YPSL, highly sensitive to the possibilities of abuse of constitutional provisions after recent or past unpleasant experiences in that respect in the SP, showed extreme satisfaction with the new constitution.

A lengthy political discussion followed on the draft program proposed by the negotiations committee. During this discussion it became evident that most delegates were highly displeased with the document, which, they felt, was weak on economic analysis and wordy and weak in its formulation. The convention almost unanimously directed the incoming executive committee to prepare a new draft and to use the draft in the meantime as a provisional statement.

DEBATE ON 'ANVIL'

One of the liveliest discussions centered around the anti-war magazine *Anvil*. While *Anvil* is not an organ of either of the two youth organizations, they both support it and have provided the bulk of the sales force and finances for the publication.

Three general points of view were expressed as the opinion and recommendation of the League: (a) that *Anvil* should be scrapped, on the grounds that the funds going to *Anvil* could be better used by the YSL itself and that the organization's main energy should go to publish the *Challenge*; (b) that *Anvil*

should, as part of the "youth turn," be directed at a younger and much less sophisticated audience, be concerned more with directly political questions and emphasize a more radical line; and (c) that *Anvil* should be continued for one issue as in the past, but that it should stress more political items and attempt to broaden the base of its support.

In the discussion the last viewpoint mentioned drew the support of the maker of the opposing resolution on the grounds that a "younger" *Anvil* would duplicate *Challenge*, and that the new organization could use a broader publication which was a bridge between itself and the other anti-war elements. This third viewpoint carried at the convention.

UNITED AGAINST WAR

The last long session of the convention involved a discussion of the war resolution, a basic political document finally adopted by an overwhelming vote. In view of the large number of amendments made to strengthen and clarify it, the resolution is still in committee for revision, but in its main outlines it states a clear uncompromising Third Camp viewpoint, opposed to the war drives of both the Western and Stalinist camps, supporting a Third Camp of the colonial peoples and the working class. The resolution particularly stressed the preeminence of the war question as the touchstone by which a socialist organization must be judged today.

After a break during which the YPSL and SYL delegates met separately to pass enabling motions, the convention established the Young Socialist League, turning over all the assets and liabilities of the Socialist Youth League and Young People's Socialist League to the new organization.

The convention also unanimously expressed its support to the efforts being made by the Independent Socialist League to have the attorney general take it (as well as the now defunct SYL and Workers Party) off the list of "subversive" organizations. It also authorized the incoming National Executive Committee to exchange fraternal representatives with other Third Camp and/or socialist organizations.

ELECT NEC

The first National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist League was elected unanimously after the YPSL and SYL delegates proposed their respective slates. The new committee is composed of six former SYLers, six former YPSLs and two "buffer members," i.e., members that appeared on the slates of both.

The committee, which is to hold office until the summer of 1954, is broadly representative of the geographical distribution of the membership of the new youth organization, except that in order to have enough members of the National Executive Committee near the national office in order to allow for a resident committee, New York is somewhat over-represented. There are seven NEC members from New York, two from New Haven, one from Boston, one from Chicago, one from Berkeley, one from Los Angeles and one from Albany.

Alternates are likewise scattered throughout the areas where the YSL has members. The NEC also represents the membership functionally: six members are primarily students, six are primarily workers, one is an instructor and one is a divinity student. During the convention it was clear that only one unit of the YSL is homogeneous in the sense of being composed of industrial workers alone.

While it was clear during the convention that the divisions over various political and organizational questions had no reference to the old SYL-YPSL lines, the NEC represents the various groupings in the League. For example, there are four socialist-pacifists on the National Executive Committee.

From the way the discussion ranged during the convention and at the first

meeting of the NEC, it is apparent that the National Executive Committee of the new youth organization is a body that will be able to function well and develop a closely knit organization.

STRONG BONDS FORGED

Thus, on February 14, the YPSL and SYL went out of existence and a new unified organization representing the bulk of the socialist youth in America was established. The morale of the delegates, as they returned to their groups scattered from coast to coast, showed that by every yardstick the convention was a great success.

The bonds forged at the unity convention are not likely to be severed, and the solid militant revolutionary youth organization that resulted now faces the task of building a socialist youth movement in this country. In this they seek the support of all radical socialists. A great deal depends on that support. Since the thirties the radical movement has shown a continual tendency to split into ever smaller and more impotent groups; this convention in a small but potentially very significant way reversed the trend.

Two Youth Groups — —

(Continued from page 3)

view. Many friends (and even members) of the former YPSL or SYL genuinely wondered whether or not it would be possible to reconcile the very real differences in tradition and approach of the two organizations. Those not so friendly considered it in their interest to frame the question in terms of one of the two (either YPSL or SYL) being "swallowed" by the other.

Both the former and the latter have been decisively answered. The YSL has been founded, and in the course of unity the notion of division along "old lines" has been overcome. Needless to say, no one "swallowed" anyone else; instead there has been a merger of tradition, membership, and leadership, on a successful and healthy basis.

The convention did divide on many questions, and of course there was a tendency toward voting together on related issues. What surprised our friends (and some of our members), and remains to confound the cynic, is that in every case the divisions that arose cut across former YPSL-SYL lines. And the more important a question was, the more clearly was the vote not along "old lines."

For that matter, this was not unexpected by those of us who have been active in cementing this unity. Both the YPSL and the SYL were democratic organizations and each embraced varying points of view. It is completely natural that in the new unified organization, the Young Socialist League, members will tend to group with other members in terms of agreement or disagreement, rather than in terms of former organizational ties.

In any case, the YSL, as it came into being and as it now shapes up, is an integrally unified organization. This will be a strong factor in our growth and development, both internal and external. The frank, free, comradely atmosphere that dominated YPSL-SYL relations at the convention shows no indication of slacking off. The difference is that it is no longer a case of YPSL versus SYL, two separate groups competing with one another. We are firmly united under the banner of the Young Socialist League, and we raise this banner high.

Third Camp socialism now has a new voice on the youth scene and that voice is stronger and more resounding than any in recent times. Our task, that of building the YSL and making our voice still stronger, precludes the possibility of quibbling over past differences. We have learned from the past, which is one reason we now stand together, but we do not let the past hold us back. We have set our goals and we know where we stand.

Many new people have joined the YSL—youth who belonged neither to the YPSL or SYL—on the basis of the unity convention. And we expect many more to join with us in the next few weeks. JOIN WITH US NOW IN THE BUILDING OF THE YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE!

Defend Academic Freedom — —

(Continued from page 3)

did not specify what rules of evidence the faculty would use or who would perform the delicate task of investigating a teacher's entire past. The practical reactionaries—university presidents and Boards of Trustees—have adopted the much simpler rule of firing any man who pleads his constitutional rights under the Fifth Amendment.

The Young Socialist League called on the Sarah Lawrence conference to reaffirm its belief in the traditional criterion for hiring and firing: that of professional competence.

NEED ACTION

The second major point which the resolution made was on the necessity for organization.

The League has pointed out that the mere passage of resolutions or the exchange of information is not enough in today's atmosphere of conformity. United student action is of the utmost necessity—and such action can only be achieved through organization.

Specifically, the resolution proposed that the basis of such action must include student political groups: all student po-

litical groups willing to commit themselves to a principled stand on civil liberties. The League hoped that the Sarah Lawrence conference will provide the point at which the actual details of such organization can be worked out.

Commenting on the resolution, YSL National Chairman Max Martin said:

"It is our understanding that the Sarah Lawrence conference is intended primarily as a forum. Important as discussion is in these conformist times, it is not, of itself, enough. What the League has done is to emphasize to the conference—and to all the students of America—that organized common action must be taken now.

"And we have suggested the only basis which we can see for such common action: Adherence to a principled position on civil liberties. We believe that such a statement should not be a generality. The time for mere sentiments is passed. In the various Fifth Amendment cases and firings, the campus is faced with a serious repression of free thought. We must address ourselves clearly to these specific issues. We must organize to fight for our principles—for academic freedom and civil liberties for all, and especially for those with whom we disagree."

Students!

Get the

Young Socialist CHALLENGE

every week by subscribing to *Labor Action* at the low, low student rate—only \$1 for a year's subscription!

Use the LA sub blank in this issue.

SIDELIGHTS ON THE TITOIST CRISIS—II

The NR Whitewashes Tito

By HAL DRAPER

Since this week's column was scheduled in any case to give some more details about what happened at the Yugoslav plenum to purge Djilas, let us do that by considering what has just appeared in the *New Republic* under the title of "The First Full Account of the Struggle Inside the Yugoslav CP," by Alexander Kendrick, CBS correspondent in Belgrade.

It is a hatchet-job on Djilas and a whitewash for Tito. That could be a point of view, of course. But in addition Kendrick is a falsifier, and that exceeds the terms of the license.

Kendrick's motive is made quite plain at the beginning: Djilas's tendencies "would have seriously weakened the principal viable authority in the Yugoslav state." This Yugoslav state is an ally of "ours" in the cold war and it must not be weakened, certainly not just because some "coffee house debater" has notions about democracy. Kendrick has not sold himself to Belgrade; it is the "American party line" he is concerned with. Djilas has no army.

For simple slanting purposes, Kendrick's references to Djilas are derogatory half-truths: "He is the kind of man who cherishes ideas for their own sake" (like art for art's sake, he adds). On the other hand we are told that Tito has "a sense of party loyalty and discipline that younger men of the post-revolutionary period do not always have. . . ." Tito spoke to Djilas "like a chiding parent. . . ."

But Kendrick's main concern is to defend the Titoists from the suspicion that their crackdown on the Djilas tendency shows that they are not quite so enthusiastic about democracy as they have pretended to be. The first way he does this is to parrot the regime's official claim that it was not Djilas's democratic ideas that got him into hot water: "Djilas was not expelled for his ideas, which were in essence shared by those who did the expelling; but for the possible effects of those ideas—effects which they had not foreseen."

This is a triumph of logic: the Titoists shared Djilas's ideas (in essence anyway) but still they purged Djilas because of the "possible effects" of these ideas—which they themselves shared!

Kendrick apparently does not even think to ask the Titoists (1) why Djilas's ideas, which were the same "in essence" as their own, could have different "possible effects," and (2) how in the first place these great democrats could purge a man for the "possible effects" of his ideas.

At no point does Kendrick's "first full account" even mention the specific idea of Djilas's which brought the regime's wrath upon his head: his concrete proposals for the reorganization and transformation of the ruling party's life and role. He quotes Tito as saying that Djilas had "gone much too far." On what point? "This apparently was when Djilas began to concentrate his fire on bureaucracy; because, said Tito, these were 'assaults on an open door'—meaning that the diminution of bureaucracy was already under way."

So if Djilas was merely assaulting an open door, how was he going "too far" and why did he have to be disgraced? The trouble is, as I could show textually, that Kendrick has unskillfully put together a couple of different handouts of the Titoist line.

Was There a "Great Debate"?

On the basis of such nonsense, Kendrick is more or less trying to convey, then, that Djilas was not really purged for ideological deviation, and therefore the future of Titoist democracy is safe. Well then, why was Djilas purged, according to him?

Personal reasons! And how does Kendrick know? He says that the "real grievance" against Djilas was the one that was aired by—*Mosa Pijade!*

As it happens, I discussed Pijade's vicious personal attack in last week's issue. It was a typical Stalinist-hack job. In his anxiety to believe that democratic ideas were not in dispute, Kendrick presents Pijade's personal vilification as "the real grievance"! And he quotes some of Pijade's venom-dripping words with an air of disclosure.

Kendrick's second method of defending the Titoists is to present the Djilas purge itself as being, indeed, an exemplification of Titoist democracy. For wasn't it done in "public discussion"? right before the eyes of the people? didn't they let Djilas talk in his defense? etc.

Last week I quoted Pijade's declaration that the CC plenum was not to "discuss" with Djilas but simply "pass judgment." It was not the "Great Debate" that Kendrick makes out, but just what Pijade said it was—a Stalinist-type trial.

In an amazing statement, Kendrick makes the claim that this trial was "the most interesting public discussion among Communist leaders since the trial of Bukharin." That comparison is hardly a help to his thesis about the democratic character of the discussion.

In any case, the facts are not capable of dispute. The only discussion of Djilas's ideas at the plenum was that made in the formal report by Kardelj officially condemning Djilas's deviations. Djilas did not discuss his own ideas; he spoke only on the question of discipline and related accusations and issues. Tito likewise (except for some passing thrusts about Djilas's failure to mention the working class). There was no "debate" at the plenum over Djilas's ideas.

Up to this point, Kendrick's whitewash job might conceivably be considered to be the result of an honest, if in our view mistaken and biased, opinion. But then our CBS correspondent winds up with a last demonstration which won't fit under that head. He flatly denies that Djilas recanted at this CC trial! See, Kendrick is saying in effect, they didn't make him recant, as the Stalinist tradition demands. . . .

The contrary is beyond dispute. Here Kendrick is not purveying the official Titoist line but inventing his own for American consumption.

Djilas's Recantation

In his concluding statement at the plenum, Djilas repudiated his views. What is true is that his recantation was not a completely groveling one; he continued to deny the "faction" charge, for example.

" . . . there are so many things to discuss in order to show people that something broke in me during these two days [of the plenum], he told the CC. " . . . today I am convinced that this is the best way to end the whole thing." Only yesterday, he continued, "I remained on the same positions as before," but last night, he said, he decided otherwise, "and believe me, it was the first night that I have had a normal sleep."

"I accept your criticism in principle and in details," he specified, although "some details about materialistic dialectics are not yet clear to me and also those about Leninism mentioned by some yesterday."

"I accept everything said about it by Comrade Tito," he also stated, denying only Tito's remark that he had been "frightened by difficulties."

" . . . if I had continued on the same road, I would have arrived at the point indicated by the comrades, that is, a point in opposition to Tito's Yugoslavia," he confessed. And he added specific agreement with point after point made by his denouncers.

And in conclusion he said: "I will, comrades, vote for the resolution . . . unless there are going to be certain formulations . . . which would insult me too much."

Kendrick winds up with a hearty approval of "the realistic attitude of the Tito group" in disciplining Djilas for "wanting too much, too soon." We, as revolutionary socialists, greeted the emergence of the Djilas democratic opposition tendency in Yugoslavia, in spite of all of its inadequacies and weaknesses; but our great liberal magazine gives over its space to a denigration of it and a whitewash of the totalitarian regime. That is a contrast for genuine liberals to ponder.

Dulles Is Happy — —

(Continued from page 1)

to American proposals for the unification of Germany, and had left Dulles no way in which to retreat? He now has at least till the end of April before he will have to face the possibility of a series of proposals for the unification of Korea and Indo-China which could not be rejected. Good reason to feel relief!

The first thing which is likely to mar Dulles' joy is the questions he will have to answer in this country. After all, the Formosa Lobby is still with us. Both Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek have already denounced the Berlin decisions as outright betrayals of their governments by the United States. Their co-thinkers, mentors, or spokesmen (whichever they may be) in this country will not long be silent.

What they will want to know is whether the Geneva conference does not give factual recognition to the Stalinist government of China, and even more important, how the United States is going to negotiate settlements with respect to Korea or Indo-China without giving anything in return for Stalinist concessions there. For a very simple reason, Dulles will be hard-pressed to answer them.

That reason is that there is no answer. Recognition of Stalinist China, admission of the Mao government to the UN and on the Security Council in the place of the Formosa government—these are the demands of the Stalinists which may have to be met if anything at all is to take place at Geneva except more mutual denunciation.

NO WAY OUT

If the agreement to meet with the Chinese Stalinists at Geneva is a retreat from every position the Truman and Eisenhower governments have taken in the past, why did Dulles make it? His reply (and a pretty honest one, this time) is that he really had no alternative.

The French government has been pressed to the wall in Indo-China. Unless its representative could go back from Berlin with some hope, however dim, of settling that war, its very existence would be endangered, let alone any hope it may have of getting endorsement of the European Defense Community through the Chamber of Deputies.

For the Eisenhower administration the question boiled down to this: Which would be more dangerous to it in the long run—the collapse of its last few friends in France or the attacks of the Formosa Lobby in Washington?

For the moment, the assault of the latter can be deflected by assurances, written into the Berlin conference agreement on the Geneva meeting, that the invitation of Stalinist China does not imply recognition of its government. But once the Big Five have come together in April the facts the American government will have to face will be just as stubborn as they have been in the past.

The first stubborn fact is that this government has no real political program for the unification of Korea or for an end to the war in Indo-China. In the past it has simply demanded that the Stalinists give up their power position in the former and their powerful political position in the latter. The Eisenhower government (and the same was true of Truman before him) has not offered the peoples of these countries a social program which could enlist them politically against the Stalinists. Its demand for free elections for the unification of Korea is a mockery as long as Rhee's dictatorship is to conduct the elections; and in Indo-China, as long as it backs French rule, it has nothing to offer the peoples at all. Thus it has no way of really putting the Stalinists on the political defensive in either country.

That the totalitarian rulers of Russia and China, for their part, have no democratic interest in either Korea or Indo-China is also perfectly clear. It is doubtful that they would yield the strong position they have achieved in both countries in exchange for anything the Americans and French have in their power to offer in Asia. Thus, as long as these colossi dominate the fortunes of these two small countries, no really democratic solution, no solution in which free-

dom and justice are the prime considerations, can possibly be expected.

At the moment, the maximum that can be hoped for is some kind of stabilization of the cold war conflict in both countries roughly along the lines occupied by both imperialist power-combinations at the present time. Even this would be more warmly greeted by the world than a resumption of the war in Korea or its extension by greater American involvement in Indo-China. Such a stabilization would contribute to the "breathing spell" in which the forces of the Third Camp can gather and begin to exert a stronger, more organized and more conscious pressure on the capitalist and Stalinist rulers.

CHINA ISSUE

But the minimum the Stalinists can be expected to demand in return for such a stabilization is formal recognition of the Chinese government by the United States, or at least its admission into the United Nations as the official government of China.

In the August 24, 1953 issue of LABOR ACTION we had the following to say about the recognition of the Stalinist government of China. In view of the outcry which we can expect from the Formosa Lobby and its co-thinkers in this country in connection with the Geneva conference in April, it bears repeating:

"A government which had a progressive PROGRAM, a dynamically democratic foreign policy which it could counterpose to the Stalinist demagogic appeals, would have no fears about opening the UN talking-shop to Mao's men.

"The admission of Peiping to the UN would solve nothing, not a solitary thing. To 'demand' it as a 'step toward peace'—in the spirit of so many European neutralists—is possible only on the basis of the 'peaceful coexistence' myth. But while China's admission to the UN (or for that matter, its recognition by the U. S. government) would solve nothing by itself, the contrary policy of keeping out the Peiping regime by every species of threat and cajolery is quite another matter.

"This policy of exclusion is based four-square on Washington's continuing ties to Chiang; it has meaning only as part of the U. S. policy of relying on reactionaries everywhere for its allies; it gives the Russians a powerful and even legitimate lever of propaganda on its own behalf; it convinces all the peoples of the world that the U. S. is not interested in peace but in using the UN for its own devices and blocs.

"And so this tenth-rate question becomes the specter over the coming Korean political conference, while the U. S., with a genius scarcely paralleled in world history, isolates itself from every democratic opinion and force. It looks once again as if that, and little else, will be the positive accomplishment of the Korean talks."

With a sigh of relief, Dulles got out of Berlin without either having to agree to U. S. evacuation of Germany, or having France split away from the U. S. in Europe. The "price" he had to pay was to yield to French demands that he agree to the conference on Korea and Indo-China at Geneva. There he will have to face, once again, the specter described above. It, or its kin-folk, will haunt the American government, and hence the American people, as long as the political skeletons of the Rhee's, the Chiangs and the Francos are permitted to step their grisly dance in our political closet.



LABOR ACTION

March 1, 1954 Vol. 18, No. 9

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

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.

The Warren Case — —

(Continued from page 1)

former private detective, was picked up on a California charge of suborning to perjury as he ended his "testimony" against Warren.

Olney reviewed McCloskey's record to point out that he had once been a member of various Trotskyist organizations, presumably leaving the impression that McCloskey was still some sort of "red."

But that was a long time ago. In his devious career, McCloskey moved far from his original attachments and finally ended up where he is today: a semi-fascist who publishes a paper, *The American Rally*, whose fascist leanings and anti-Semitic overtones are evident to anyone with political experience. But Assistant Attorney General Olney is not interested in such details; he is out to find "reds" and thinks he has discovered one in McCloskey.

THOSE FBI FILES

Some very intriguing angles open up. If the FBI has compiled its life-long dossier on McCloskey, they undoubtedly have information tucked away which they are not eager, for the moment, to reveal. Olney can and does pick and choose.

A few years ago, long after McCloskey had severed all ties with the socialist movement and had become its enemy, he delivered a speech to the citizens of Akron in praise of a great champion of the people. Who? Why Senator Langer, of course. Langer seemed so impressed with this tribute that he inserted McCloskey's speech into the *Congressional Record*. McCloskey, in turn, was so impressed by this tribute from Langer that he spent hundreds of dollars painfully collected by his supporters to reprint the excerpt from the *Record* for distribution to the eager Akron voters. All this is in the public records.

Is it too much to assume that the FBI has already accumulated a massive dossier on Langer himself? We would assume, in fact, that this secret police agency which already assumes the task of investigating a chief justice is busily at work on a project to record the lives even of congressmen.

Langer, himself, was a featured speaker at a rally called by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee for its first conference last year. This committee was formed by well-known Stalinoids who keep their distance from the Communist Party but are always careful not to attack it. But it is Langer's expressed interest in the defense of civil liberties, entirely apart from the sponsorship of this meeting, that would make him suspect to the FBI.

Langer is a highly individualistic maverick who may have gotten himself involved with shady characters but he

has also taken many forthright steps in connection with civil liberties.

THREE RINGS

All in all, we get caught up in an endless, interlocking circle of circles of investigation, reinvestigations and cross-investigations. FBI agents trailing Warren jostle those tracking Langer, who bump into those shadowing McCloskey. The appointment of a Supreme Court justice has been turned into a three-ring circus with one ring at least fully occupied by the FBI.

One department, at the behest of Langer, sedulously follows the red thread in Warren's career. Another department, at the order of Olney, amasses mountains of evidence against the witnesses against Warren. And we suspect that a third

department is busily piling up the record against Langer.

Undoubtedly, the agents investigating Langer write voluminous notes on mysterious visitors who sink into the senator's home of an evening, only to discover that these sinister-looking creatures were merely other FBI agents reporting to Langer on Warren. . . .

In the case of the suspect justice we get a glimpse, and only a glimpse, of the steaming mess of anonymous charges and innuendos that find their place in the FBI files. Warren is an important man; he is influential and conservative and in the end triumphs over the "unevaluated" charges, i.e., lies.

But for every Warren there are, perhaps, thousands or tens of thousands of ordinary citizens, without recourse.

The 'Responsible' GOP Leadership Gets To Look More Like McCarthy Every Day

Two other facets of life in these United States may profitably be considered along with the news this week of the dirty mess over the Warren nomination.

While presidential assistant Sherman Adams addressed the Republican National Committee meeting, a bulletin board in the background spread out copies of the *CIO News*, the *New York Post*, the *Nation*, and the *ADA World* together with (other) well-known Communist publications like the *Daily Worker* and the *Sunday Worker*. This display illustrated his theme: the world of liberalism and labor are linked with the Communist Party; both, he insisted, publicize growing unemployment, to undermine confidence in America and Eisenhower.

Leonard Hall, GOP national chairman, had just smeared Walter Reuther with the same charge. For the first time, anti-CP trade-union leaders are lumped together with "Communism," not by extremist reactionaries and crackpots, but by respectable and presumably responsible spokesmen for the administration.

The unions wax indignant; but outside labor circles, the incident causes hardly a ripple.

THE DEMS HOWLED

Secondly, the uproar over the mysterious "2200" begins to subside as the first facts emerge.

Months ago, Washington announced that 1,456 government employees had been fired as "security risks." Leading Republicans quickly raised the estimates to 2,200 and reported with glee that most of these were "subversives," disloyal

characters employed by previous Democratic administrations.

Democrats howled and screamed—not because they were concerned with civil liberties, or because they were crusaders against injustice and arbitrary firings; their sensitivities were aroused, and their passion for facts and figures stimulated, only because they were accused of sheltering Communists. They intended to exonerate, not the 2,200, but their own party.

One incident helped demonstrate that the Democrats, on the principle of loyalty parges and political witchhunts, differed not at all with the Republicans and that their souls vibrated with the spirit of our times. In Detroit, six leaders of the local Communist Party were convicted under the Smith Act, adopted by the Roosevelt administration, under indictments brought by the Truman regime.

How many of the discharged employees were "disloyal," asked the Democrats, and how many were merely degenerates, perverts, and alcoholics? For months, Eisenhower spiraled around this question, pretending or announcing ignorance at press conferences where he steered inquiring reporters to Brownell. But Brownell was out, busy, in conference, or silent. Republicans splashed the charge of "Communist-coddling" against Democrats all over the country. Everything was forthcoming except facts, which were strictly "confidential."

BUBBLE BURST

Last week, at last, some shreds of truth leaked out. The power of aroused democracy may be weak, but the power of the purse remains effective. Democrats on the House Appropriations Committee forced various government departments, under threat of denying appropriations, to publish their analyses of the firings.

The subversive bubble burst. Of the 2,200, it is apparent, only an insignificant percentage were accused of "disloyalty." The vast majority were ordinary malefactors of assorted stripes. The Democrats were vindicated!

But what about the loyalty purge system? what about the anti-democratic mood under which it proceeds? This was strengthened. The Democrats, defending themselves, boasted that they had originated the loyalty purge system with its "subversive" list.

"In 1942, war service regulations of the Civil Service Commission disqualified government servants where a 'reasonable doubt' as to loyalty existed," wrote the *Democratic Digest*, official party publication. "As a result of CSC investigations, 1,307 persons were disqualified on loyalty grounds."

Thus, the Democrats claim credit and patent rights on loyalty purges.

But there was no public furor in 1942 while the Democrats purged in peace. We now know something about the Republican purge of 1953 only because the Democrats' private pride was touched. We know that the Republicans were lying and they will probably lie again.

To the non-existent innocent who replies: "Democrats don't lie," we simply add that they invented the loyalty purge system which makes the deception of citizens inevitable.

Detroit 'Boom' — —

(Continued from page 1)

sell the "new-used" cars for healthy discounts. The virtue of the auto industry—no price cutting—is thus kept intact, at least in the eyes of the blind.

In some states this kind of transaction also has the further benefit of no-taxes, as in Ohio, where wholesale deals are not taxable, according to the *Akron Beacon-Journal*.

The fact that mainly Fords and Chevrolets are involved in this kind of nationwide racket, which avoids tax payments, reflects the intense competition between these two giants in a smaller market. American business methods are going to be given quite a public demonstration at this rate of competition so early in the year.

The failure of the steel industry to receive any big spring orders from auto indicates that an important pickup is not shaping up. Likewise the huge new car inventories, the highest in history, with over 600,000 in dealers' hands, means that the usual spring sales increase will simply bring inventories down to a more normal condition.

What is especially irksome and alarming to auto workers is that all this goes on at a time when more than 100,000 auto workers are on short work-weeks. Thus the best they look forward to in a spring pickup is a return to a 40-hour week. What happens to the unemployed? The Michigan MESA says that only 4,000 auto workers will be rehired by mid-May, and that 6,000 construction workers will be rehired. That leaves over

100,000 unemployed with no work prospects!

The short work-week issue exploded this past week at GM, after John Livingstone, UAW vice president, blasted GM for a policy of short work-weeks, especially at Chevrolet, since November. GM blandly denies it, which means that it is just covering up. Hudson closed down for another week in Detroit, to make its usual weekly news item. What would really be news for Hudson workers for the first time in six months is a week in which they did work a full 40 hours. This at a corporation which used to employ 18,000 and now is down to 4,500 workers.

Perhaps the most disturbing factor of all for American industry and for the economic climate of 1954 is that the auto industry—bellwether of American economy—is still producing at a rate close to 6,000,000 cars and trucks for the year 1954, even with all the unemployment, short work-weeks, and short layoffs which show nowhere in the statistics! And as a matter of fact, the industry can produce what it privately figures it will sell, 5,500,000 units, in 10 months, at the current rate of production!

It is this grim outlook that is beginning to stir things up in Detroit, and already has the Republican spokesmen on the run.

The oversimplified and somewhat demagogic campaign oratory of the CIO spokesmen, "The victory of the Republicans means a depression," has found fervent believers in this depression-conscious industrial area.

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

Don't miss a single week of
LABOR ACTION
A sub is only \$2.00 a year!