

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

**THE STALINOID MIND:  
Two Case Studies—Two Countries**

... page 6

**THE TWO FACES OF STERILITY:  
Polar Types on Campus Today**

... page 5

**Problems in Class Solidarity:  
The Westinghouse Testers**

... page 2

MAY 2, 1955

FIVE CENTS

## THE NEW LYNCHERS THIS IS A 'FREEDOM FORUM' IN THE SOUTH

Following is the whole of an AP news item published in the Pittsburgh Gazette:

SEARCY, Ark., April 13 (AP)—A man who praised Communist peace efforts and attacked racial segregation in the South was almost mobbed before his audience was told that it "was all a hoax."

The speaker, a last-minute addition to a "Freedom Forum" session last night, introduced himself only as "Ben Bennett of Cleveland."

Several members of the audience started down the aisle toward Bennett but they were stopped by Glen A. Green, associate director of the National Education Program, who said Bennett's speech was a carefully planned hoax.

Green said "things had gotten out of hand." He said that the hoax was designed to demonstrate Communism in action to forum participants.

Green then introduced Bennett as executive in charge of education among Republic Steel Corporation's 7,000 supervisory employees.

## SPOTLIGHT

### Through Fascist Eyes

The G. L. K. Smith outfit, which entitles itself the Christian Nationalist Crusade and stakes out in Los Angeles, has put out a pamphlet "101 Questions Answered Concerning Washington, D. C." by Opal Tanner, which is worth looking into because through it you can see the figures in the national government as they refract through the fascist lenses.

Who are the Good Guys and who are the Bad Guys to this vicious anti-Semitic pamphleteer? Naturally, praise from Smith does not make a politician a fascist himself; but one can get an inkling of what appeals to the Smithite "crusaders."

The main butt is Eisenhower. There are only perfunctory and passing slanders directed against Eleanor and James Roosevelt just to keep in practice; bare mention of Truman; and no other Democrats are given a raking, for after all their party is out of power in Washington.

Eisenhower, however, is depicted as controlled by Jews (Baruch again, Anna Rosenberg, one Max Rabb) and therefore betraying the Republican Party, with whose right wing the Smith fascists identify themselves overtly.

The two other punching-bags are Republicans—Secretary of Defense Wilson (for advocating trade deals with Russia) and Chief Justice Warren (for the desegregation decision).

More interesting is the list of those about whom the snarling pamphleteer waxes enthusiastic. Some are obvious candidates for knighthood: McCarthy of course; Knowland (mentioned as the best in the Senate); McCarran, for whom a tear is shed; Jenner (two pats); Bricker.

Nixon and Velde are plainly regarded as "our boys" who sometimes deviate toward Eisenhowerism but who really know better and will turn up on the right side of the barricades. Secretary of Agriculture Benson is hailed as "best man on the Cabinet" on the basis of the Ladejinsky Jew-baiting case.

The No. 1 Democrat, as far as this Smithite is concerned, seems to be Sen. George, the same who is referred to by liberals as the "revered" chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. George succeeded the Republican Wiley, and the pamphlet gives him the accolade: "far superior as a statesman." The author, mentioning that she "visited the Bricker office twice and he expects to carry on a

more vigorous campaign than ever" for his amendment, notes that Bricker "is closely associated with Sen. George," who will support him.

Democratic Senator McClellan, successor to McCarthy on That Committee, is really OK, we are given to understand in an "inside opinion," he just had to act as if he was against McCarthy because he was up for re-election and needed votes. And Sen. Walter, "who stood so firmly along with Sen. McCarran... is likely to stand up well on all issues involving the safety of our nation."

J. Edgar Hoover, the "great patriot," gets his all-hail and genuflection, with a curse against "a Jew by the name of Max Lowenthal who wrote a smear book against the FBI." Among lesser lights, the name of Don Surine is singled out for special mention as the most important man on McCarthy's staff: "He is perhaps closer and more intimate with the Senator than anyone else outside of Mrs. McCarthy"—a remark that might be considered shady under other auspices.

There, for your information, is the Smith-eye view of Washington.

### Barcelona & Coca-Cola

In the liberal anti-Franco organ *Iberica*, an article by George Dennis (pen-name for an American author who recently revisited Spain) on Barcelona says that the most important difference about the city is easy to see: "America has arrived. The U. S. Sixth Fleet is in and out of Barcelona."

A night spot advertises itself as "Typical U. S. Sailors' Night Club." Cheap drinks. Cheap souvenirs in the shops. Comic books on the newsstands. Radio Nacional and its jazz. . . .

"All this is an old story over most of Western Europe, but a new one in Spain, now in the year 19 of Franco and the year 2 of America. But, as is only to be expected, the change is not universally welcomed. When the citizens of this city tell each other the latest *chiste*, that 'Barcelona huele a colonia americana,' they do not mean that it smells of American eau de cologne, but of an American colony. An old gentleman who shared a stone bench with me in the Plaza del Rey put the matter in a nutshell with typical Spanish realism and typical Catalan *seny*: 'America is now Franco's main support. The moment the first church burns in Barcelona, the American Marines land here.'"

(Continued on page 3)

THE AMERICAN PARTY LINE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR

## What the Stalinists Got Out of Bandung

By GORDON HASKELL

The symbolic importance of the Bandung conference can hardly be overestimated. For a week the situation of the world has been concentrated on a gathering of representatives of African and Asian governments which rule over more than half the human race.

Yet prior to World War II the majority of these governments did not even exist. Their nations were colonial vassals of Europe and America with no voice of their own

either in the administration of their domestic affairs, or in the field of foreign relations. The Bandung conference was a dramatic expression of the revolution for national independence which has toppled the old empires, and the one question on which the conference found itself in passionate and wholehearted unanimity was the determination that this revolution shall not be stopped until every undeveloped nation which still remains a colony is freed from the grip of its present masters.

To the extent that the Bandung conference had a unifying theme, that was it. Not a single voice was raised for British rule in Malay or French rule in Africa. Even the most ardent partisan of the American government at Bandung, Carlos Romulo of the Philippines, was forced to join in the attack on America's role in helping France to keep her colonial empire—North Africa.

The symbolic importance of the Bandung conference should not be confused with the concrete political significance of the gathering. For the conference revealed clearly that while the governments involved represent new forces in the arena of world politics, they do not represent a new force. The governments of Africa and Asia are as divided among themselves as the governments of the

rest of the world, both along lines of national economic and political interests and on the lines of the cold war which tends to split the world into two great hostile camps.

Nor did the Bandung conference, in any sense, represent a new or progressive social force. Socially and politically most of the governments represented could hardly be called even democracies. In this respect too, Bandung did not represent a bloc but was divided along lines analogous to the rest of the world.

### CHOU'S CRUSHER

That the United States would suffer another defeat at Bandung was a foregone conclusion, accepted by everyone. The only question was: how much is there left of American policy in Asia which is worth the effort of defeating? That much was adroitly taken care of by Chou En-lai by a simple offer to meet with the American government to lessen tension in the Formosa area.

Chou made it clear that such a meeting would in no way affect China's determination to "liberate" Formosa. But here he was on perfectly safe ground, as none other than that master of diplomatic self-entrapment, John Foster Dulles, had already suggested that a truce could be arranged for the Formosa Strait without affecting either Chiang

(Turn to last page)

## The 'Dead Horse' in Algeria

While the French government has been using army troops and airplanes against the Algerian people, in the colonialists' desperate attempt to keep the land under imperialist control, an accident betrays the fact that the U. S. is over there at France's side.

The following item is from the Chicago periodical *Toward Freedom* (April), a liberal anti-colonialist newsletter. It is very polite:

"Readers may have been puzzled, as we were, to read back in February that a U. S. pilot had saved the life of a French paratrooper in a drop over Algeria. This was a praiseworthy deed, but in view of French military operations against African nationalists, the question naturally arose as to whether the U. S. was getting mixed up in the affair. Here is the U. S. Air Force reply to our inquiry:

"... the United States Air Force is responsible for training in airborne operations in support of NATO.

"The Air Force, in conjunction with NATO-committed troops of other countries, often conducts exercises as part of that training. The drop you mention was one of these exercises.

"The Air Force is not involved in aiding French Colonial forces in their operations in Algeria."

"But why do NATO exercises have to be held in areas of colonial unrest? If one of the NATO planes should have a forced landing, who could blame resentful Algerians if they didn't realize the distinction between an exercise and the real thing?"

The newsletter asks its question on the basis of believing, or pretending to believe, the air force's reply. It is just a coincidence that, at the very place and at the very time where French military forces are going into action against anti-colonial unrest, American NATO forces are training French paratroopers. As everybody knows, paratroop action has been particularly emphasized by the colonial powers (particularly Britain and France) as a technique against colonial guerrilla forces, as in Malaya. It is therefore also just a coincidence that the training exercise which just happens to be going on in Algeria is the training of paratroopers. . . .

At the same time the American press is sneering at the way in which the Bandung powers insist on "flogging the dead horse" of colonialism.

# Problem in Class Solidarity: The Westinghouse Testers

By GERALD McDERMOTT

PITTSBURGH, Apr. 22—The much-publicized and long-drawn-out fight of the testers at the main Westinghouse plant in East Pittsburgh is an instructive illustration of the problems of unions in an industry with high unemployment. This struggle between a militant group of skilled workers and a clever management throws light on a number of problems. The running fight has been in the headlines in Pittsburgh for more than a year.

The East Pittsburgh plant of Westinghouse manufactures the heaviest electrical machinery—dynamos and turbines for huge dams, transportation equipment, and the control equipment that goes with these things. The testers are the men who examine and test the finished products for defects, short circuits, and the like. It is highly skilled work requiring a great degree of engineering skill and long experience and schooling. In addition, it is dangerous work—a mistake can result in electrocution. For all of these reasons, the testers have been trying to get pay at least as high as inspectors or time-study men, who make more money for less skilled work.

As a well-organized and militant group, the testers could strike easily. However, the East Pittsburgh plant is plagued with layoffs. People with more than ten years seniority are now laid off, and there is no end in sight. If the testers go out, all work stops and production employees are laid off, and are ineligible for unemployment compensation.

To avoid hurting their fellow workers, the testers have tried all sorts of techniques. For a long time, they refused overtime, but this eventually created a backlog of untested goods and started to cause more layoffs. The testers then resorted to

## Discontent Grows in Steel Against McDonald's Brass

By EMIL MODIC

PITTSBURGH, April 19—Further evidence of discontent with the McDonald administration in the United Steelworkers of America (CIO) has come to light in Cleveland.

No district director of District 28 (Cleveland area) has been chosen since the death of William Donovan many months ago. It now appears that the administration is trying to force a new director on the district.

At a recent meeting of the Cleveland Industrial Union Council, a delegate from Republic Steel Local 1157 charged that an international representative whom the local hoped to back for the district director post in the coming September elections had been threatened with being fired by the international if he ran without their prior OK. If anyone is fired in such a way, Local 1157 warned, they would throw a picket line around the District 28 office.

In other developments, 15,000 steel workers in Birmingham, Alabama, went on a wildcat strike in sympathy with Communication Workers of America (CIO) members on strike against Southern Bell Telephone.

McDonald ordered the workers to return the same day they went out. The steel workers were protesting scab-herding by Birmingham police.

Before McDonald ordered the steel workers back, there was talk of a general strike in Birmingham, where, in addition to the telephone workers, the employees of the Louisville and Nashville Railway are on strike.

In the meantime, upcoming Steelworker wage negotiations are dependent on the situation in auto. The steel workers are in a relatively strong position with the industry operating at 95 per cent of capacity, but much of the tonnage goes to the presently booming auto industry, and a major strike there would change the picture in steel.

Under the terms of the present steel contract, which still has a year to run, only wages may be discussed under this year's reopener. Current talk is of a ten-cent package. Wages in the industry now average \$2.33 an hour.

Read the

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

# LABOR SCOPE

## The UE Goes Shopping for a Home

By BEN HALL

The United Electrical Workers (UE) is getting ready to end its independent existence. The only question is: Where can it get a comfortable berth and what price can it command? Things have gone so far that UE leaders of its New York-New Jersey District 4, largest section of the union, have already held unity discussions with a top committee from the International Union of Electrical Workers (IUE-CIO) in the area.

Last month, the UE's International Harvester Council voted to disaffiliate with it and join the United Auto Workers en bloc, unifying Harvester workers for the first time under the CIO banner. The UE News reports the event in an article which is amazingly factual and mild-mannered, as though it feared to give offense to those with whom it might soon be negotiating itself.

No thundering epithets hurled at the seceders; they are not traitors or fascists, or bosses' agents, or enemies of the working class:

"The impression had been given to local leaders in Harvester locals," reads the UE account, "that the UE National Office knew all about the move and approved of it. This was false."

"False," by the way, is a very polite word in the Stalinist lexicon.

UE leaders, we are told, opposed the move, "pointing out that it had been engineered secretly, that it was ill-timed, panicky and jeopardized the contract, steward system, grievance procedure, and other protections of the Harvester workers in the plants affected." Furthermore, it comments, the secession was "hasty or irrational." The temperance of the story reflects the anxiety of the UE for a merger partner of its own.

### NEW LINE

Some time before these incidents, the UE General Executive Board issued a special statement on the need for unity, and its District 4 followed with its own statement. If we swallowed the pretext, District 4's newly awakened desire for some kind of merger is simply a product of the looming merger between the AFL and CIO.

It asks, "How can the UE make its best contribution in view of the changes taking place in the labor movement?" Actually, the real motives are somewhat different.

The UE has been badly battered in recent years as whole sections left to join CIO and AFL unions. The legal status of independent unions which have a history of Communist Party influence is in danger. Obviously the Stalinists have made a conscious decision to send the remaining unions which they control into the AFL or CIO for cover.

The move in the UE flows from the new line. "The UE stands ready to merge with, or affiliate to, any union in the industry on the basis of preserving the principles of trade-union democracy for which UE has always stood." A pretty broad hint that it is accepting offers from all bidders.

Naturally, the UE is eager to preserve its own unity up to the moment of its dissolution so that it can command better terms. "Under no circumstances," says District 4, "should there be individual 'shopping around.'" But it has no intention of dragging things out; it wants in somewhere and it wants it in a hurry.

It warns against "rushing ahead without regard to whether or not we are protecting the interests of our membership and the achievements of our union." But "the other extreme, equally dangerous, is to sit back and handle this question as a 'long term' proposition. What is required is sober, sensible exploration of the subject beginning immediately and carried through to a conclusion." The real emphasis is on "beginning immediately" and a "conclusion."

### STALINIST FLIPFLOP

Incidentally, the decisive role of the CP in working out the District 4 statement pops out in one paragraph: "It is necessary to criticize the [AFL-CIO] merger's stated goal of 'fighting communism'—a practice which prevents union democracy and undermines its union's capacity to fight for the real needs of the workers." This comment is dragged in by the tail, mechanically, without trying to convince anyone of anything. It is a pure genuflection before the CP.

"hit-and-run" tactics to try to win their demands without shutting down the plant. They did this by calling a series of departmental meetings during working hours. However, management always answered these meetings with disciplinary layoffs, confirming the suspicion that the company would like the testers to strike so as to divide them from the rest of the local, and then whip them.

The company's counter-offer to the testers was a clever one. The company suggested that the workers go on salary, after which they would be considered for "merit" increases.

This offer was loaded with booby-traps. For one thing, the company proposed to put only some testers on salary, thus dividing the group. For another thing, being on salary would make the testers' pay subject to a discretionary merit "spread" and would encourage individual favoritism with all its evils for the workers and the union. Then, too, by going on salary, the testers would be separated from the rest of the workers under terms of the national Westinghouse contract. It would be a step backwards toward craft unionism.

### UNION SENSE

The testers understood all of this, and therefore rejected the offer. And in so doing, they reached a dead end in their departmental bargaining with the corporation, at least for the time being. They recognized this and voted to break off negotiations, although remaining on the job.

Throughout the long struggle, the testers have exercised a high sense of union responsibility. They have refused to allow themselves to be pitted against the other workers in the local, and have respected the jobs of others who are dependent on them. Since the testers' wages are high only because production workers' wages are good, this solidarity was very much in the testers' own interest, of course.

The truth of the matter is that, acting as a single department, there is little more that the testers can do to improve their position. This does not mean, however, that the testers are beaten.

The weak spot in the testers' fight has been the layoffs and fear of layoffs in the plant as a whole, the weakness of the local generally, and the small size of the testers numerically.

The surest way by which the testers can win their own fight is by building the local and even the international as a whole. If that seems like a big order, even for a militant and union-wise group like the testers, let them remember that the "easier" roads have led nowhere for a year.

### WHAT TO DO

In the final analysis, layoffs can be beaten only by the thirty-hour week with forty hours' pay. That is going to have to come if jobs are to be saved, and anyway the workers are more than entitled to it. If everybody was working, and if testers lead in fighting for the jobs of all, then nothing would stop the testers from winning their just demands.

The other aspect to the testers' fight is political. The truth of the matter is that testers' wages now are above average for the Westinghouse chain as a whole, and for an obvious reason—run-away shops in the South, which depress wages and which not only keep the testers from getting a raise but which threaten their present hard-won standards. The protector of the open-shop South is none other than the Democratic Party, for which Local 601 goes down the line at election time.

Labor needs a party of its own to open the way for organizing the unorganized Taft-Hartley South, and Local 601 is the logical local in western Pennsylvania to say so.

There is one last point to be made about the testers' situation. It has showed the weakness of the Skilled Trades department of the IUE-CIO. The testers have gotten almost no help or guidance from the international. Skilled workers have special problems, and the international should anticipate their needs and try to help them as much as possible.

On March 7, a committee from UE District 4, after clearing its action with the UE National Office, met with a similar committee from IUE-CIO District 4. The IUE had been seeking unity with UE locals on an individual basis; more accurately, it had been trying to induce locals to leave the UE and join the IUE; but without success. At the conference, the IUE indicated that it might be willing to merge with the UE on a district-wide basis, a proposition which obviously interested the local UE.

The UE thereupon listed 12 demands as a precondition for unity. That's a big bundle of demands but most of them could easily be granted by the CIO union. One or two demands are somewhat provocatively phrased, like "Discontinuance of the stoolpigeon role of IUE in witch-hunt congressional committee hearings." Still, no insurmountable barrier is thrown athwart the path to merger.

The Stalinists want unity with someone. But as in all changes in line, they leave their fellow travelers befuddled. All the honest, well-meaning people who followed them in the ways of bitter denunciation of AFL-CIO are not quite ready to abandon the great principles they imagined they were upholding when they left the CIO.

Join together with bosses' agents, near-fascists, betrayers? One can understand the confused reluctance of the ordinary UE activist who was never initiated into the devious mysteries of the CP line.

### INNOCENTS APPALLED

At a special meeting of 100 District 4 UE shop leaders and officers on March 11, the top district leaders reported on their discussions with the IUE and their general outlook on unity. The meeting ended by endorsing, unanimously, the efforts and opinions of the leaders. But not before a discussion which revealed a significant difference of mood between the hardened Stalinists and the non-party UE activist.

The CPers pounded away at the need for unity, unity in one solid body. But the others, a little disturbed, emphasized the need for preservation of "UE principles." They could hardly see the value of unity, if it was achieved by dumping the UE line.

"What will happen to the American Labor Party?" asked one innocent questioner. The reply came: The ALP is not our affair; it is a separate and independent body. Bursts of indignation came from others, who couldn't understand such callous indifference to all that should be so dear.

It would seem that the possibility of taking over the UE in bulk brings the IUE-CIO to a turning-point in its career. If it does not do so, some other union or unions will.

The IUE has never succeeded in establishing itself as the recognized union in its field. It goes into negotiations without solid support from workers in the industry; it has not been able to demonstrate its ability to organize and lead a solid national strike; above all, it is shaky and weak in the General Electric chain. Consequently, in negotiations it is hesitant and ready to compromise.

The opportunity now arises to bring tens of thousands of workers into the IUE. When the UAW had the chance to bring in thousands of UE Harvester workers, it did not hesitate. The IUE need only follow the example.

### 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.

ON THE JIM CROW FRONT

# Liars and Legal Lynchers . . . Union Calls for a Crusade

By SCOTT ARDEN

In an interesting display of the intricacies of Jim Crow, when you get south of the line drawn by Messrs. Mason and Dixon, Pulitzer Prize winning editor Hodding Carter is slugging it out with Mississippi's House of Representatives.

The row started with Carter's article "A Wave of Terror Threatens the South" in the March 22 issue of *Look* magazine, in which he exposed the state's "Citizens Councils"—groups which rely mainly on economic pressure, rather than physical violence, to stifle anti-Jim-Crow voices. (The activity of this organization, sort of a clean-cut Ku Klux Klan, was touched on last month in our discussion of the NAACP's campaign to build a loan fund at the Tri-State Bank of Memphis, which was slated to ward off this economic attack.)

While Carter, a Southern-style "liberal," did slam these white reactionaries, his article was in reality a not-too-subtle defense of Dixie's "separate but equal" credo. In the name of "moderation" and "the American Way" he argued against enforcement of the Supreme Court's anti-segregation decisions.

Apparently, however, his basic agreement with the aims (i.e., half integration) of the "Citizens Committee" clique was not sufficient to keep his Bigot Badge unblemished. The Mississippi House of Representatives condemned him for writing "untruths" and by a vote of 89-19 approved a resolution stating that his article was based on "the flimsiest kind of evidence."

Carter, in a page one editorial in his paper (the Greenville, Mississippi, *Delta Democrat-Times*) replied: "The House of Representatives has resolved me into a liar because of an article I wrote. . . . If this charge were true it would make me well-qualified to serve with that body. It is not true."

Thanking the nineteen who voted against the resolution, he continued: "So to even things up, I herewith resolve by a vote of 1-0 that there are eighty-nine liars in the State Legislature. . . ."

## Battle-Fund

While the racists wrangle, the Negro press announces that the NAACP's fund

Get All Your Books from  
**LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE**  
114 West 14 Street, New York City

## ISL FUND DRIVE

# We Can Make It, IF . . .

By ALBERT GATES  
Fund Drive Director

There was a slight improvement in contributions this past week. With \$863 sent in, the total amount now stands at \$8270.25 or 82.2% of our goal. That still leaves us just a little short of \$2000 to close our campaign successfully.

We don't know just how we will finish. There are enough small amounts remaining due that could lift us over the top easily enough. The problem is to get them. Two cities have asked for an extension of two weeks in the drive because they feel they can complete their quotas with this extra time. That matter has to be decided.

FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE			
Branch	Quota	Paid	%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,050</b>	<b>\$8270.25</b>	<b>82.2</b>
St. Louis	25	56.25	221
Detroit	200	275	137
Los Angeles	450	496	110
Cleveland	150	165	110
Streator	25	25	100
Oregon	50	50	100
Pittsburgh	125	125	100
Reading	50	50	100
Chicago	2,000	1832	91.6
N. Y. City	3,800	3135	82.5
Nat'l Office	1,500	1165	77.6
Bay Area	500	329	65.8
Newark	400	234	58.5
Philadelphia	250	133	53.2
Seattle	150	60	40
Akron	50	20	40
Buffalo	250	40	16
Indiana	75	0	0

for the economic "squeeze" victims has hit the 250G mark. With the subhead "Unions help swell deposits in fight on white councils," the Pittsburgh *Courier* lists a substantial number of labor organizations (predominately CIO) among the major depositors.

This represents a real body-blow against dollar-sign KKKism, and by forces that have a real interest involved in junking Jim Crow. The Negro and the labor movement as a whole, whose interests are interrelated in the closest possible way, cannot accept the "moderation" or "leadership" of the Southern white "liberal" of the school that Carter represents, however courageous Carter may be considered to be in his own context.

## Execution Statistics

Anti-Negro violence has by no means disappeared but the forms have, for the most part, changed. That is, the "night-rider" mob murder of previous eras has increasingly declined in favor of what can aptly be termed legal lynching.

Specific examples of this tendency have been commented on, over the years, in the pages of LABOR ACTION but a series of statistics carried in last week's *Courier* contribute to a full realization of the extent of the legal terror directed against Negroes—and this despite the fact that these figures deal with one limited aspect of the question, execution rate.

Although Negroes make up roughly ten per cent of the total population of the U. S. they accounted for over half of the executions carried out by state and federal authorities during 1954. Forty-three Negroes were executed out of a total of 82.

Of all states, Georgia led the list. Of 12 men executed, 11 were Negroes. Texas and California had the second highest number—9 each. But while in California only one of the 9 was colored, Texas executed 5 Negroes as opposed to 4 whites. New York was next, 4 Negroes, 4 whites. Florida executed only 2 whites—5 Negroes.

(Turn to last page)

With the over-all percentages at 82.2, it is necessary that all cities under that mark really push hard in the next week. These are the areas that are holding us back from finishing over the mark.

A glance at the box score this week will show that we now have 8 areas that have made 100% or more in the drive. In this past week, Detroit went way ahead of its quota and is right behind St. Louis in the standings. Los Angeles too, which has been dragging for some weeks, pushed across and went into a third place tie with Cleveland. Pittsburgh and Reading also hit the 100% mark.

But Chicago and New York have been the real bellwethers in the drive. Representing more than half of the national goal and having the hardest job of all, they have done remarkably well. Chicago is less than \$200 from its goal of \$2000. Readers should remember that Chicago voluntarily raised its own quota from \$1800. On the old basis, it is already over the top, but our Windy City friends are confident that when the campaign is finished it will have made good on its promise.

New York too, with a really stiff quota, has done a fine job, although it has a somewhat tougher haul than Chicago, its quota being almost twice as large.

We hope, then, when the next report is written that we shall be able to tell you that we have once again completed a fund drive successfully.

# SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

Elsewhere in the magazine we learn that Franco, in connection with celebrating the fascist victory in the Civil War, "decorated Mr. James A. Farley, president of the Coca-Cola Co., with the Order of Isabela la Católica."—Or did he decorate la Católica with the Order of Coca-Cola? The words are swimming before the eyes and we can't make out which is right.

We can read, however, that (according to *Variety* recently) Franco's film censors take out all remarks disrespectful of Hitler or the Nazis. Two examples of lines removed from U. S. movies:

"He's another fellow Mr. Hitler didn't like."

"It was the Nazis that put out his eyes. It was Himmler's men. They're working for the Russians now."

Now we can turn, if our stomachs are sufficiently stable, to the lead article in the issue by Salvador de Madariaga, who is one of the honorary chairman of *Iberica*. It is an earnest think-piece in which this profound philosopher convinces himself of the right of foreigners to intervene in another country where democracy is being violated. He wants to re-evaluate the liberal prejudice against intervention, he says. The "principle of non-intervention" is outdated.

"Let us take two brutal examples to illustrate this: would it not have been a blessing if someone had intervened to drive Hitler out of power in 1933, or Lenin in 1925? The answer is obvious. Evidently, a reappraisal of this question of intervention is indicated."

Leaving aside the irrelevant fact that Lenin was already dead in 1925, De Madariaga, profound philosopher, seems unaware of the fact that 14 interventionist armies invaded Russia after the revolution to carry out his new idea. As for Hitler, he should rather ask himself, not why the Great Democracies refrained from intervening, out of some democratic prejudice, but why they positively aided and financed Hitler, without any visible democratic prejudices whatever.

However, De Madariaga is a profound philosopher, and has no time for these quibbles. What he is interested in doing is finding some reason to advocate intervention against Franco by some good foreigners, if he can find any. He winds up by expressing some perturbation over that fact that even the UN "lacks the moral authority" to do so and resigns himself to accepting non-intervention as "a poor second" for the none.

Nowhere in his article does this profound philosopher refer to the democratic advantages of struggle-from-below as the answer to tyrants.

## Sacred Cow

A British book (*The Big Puff* by Thomas Whiteside) has been published on the U. S. advertising world, and in the London *Tribune* we read a review of it which summarizes some juicy sections in a frankly anthropological vein. For example:

"Mr. Whiteside also tells the story of Elsie the Cow, the advertising symbol of the Borden Company, one of the best-known figures in the U.S.A. In a 1948 poll, just before the presidential election, she had a 'recognition rating' of 88 per cent.: General Eisenhower only got 83 per cent.

"To date, Elsie the Cow has received the keys to seventy-four cities, and to five states, and other keys are still being presented. The educators are not far behind the aldermen: the cow has been made the recipient of honorary degrees by several institutions of higher learning."

"Elsie's importance, it seems, was not appreciated by Gypsy Rose Lee, the celebrated strip-tease veteran, who offered to do a publicity tie-up with the Cow at a trade fair. 'The dignity of the cow's stature in American life could not permit the association. As one Borden executive remarked later, "the damn cow's on a par with Mother Goose or even George Washington."

"Say," he added thoughtfully, after a short pause, "that's an idea. George Washington. I'll see how he compares in the next recognition poll."

## Porterism

The recent battle for proxies to control Montgomery Ward between S. L. Avery and Louis Wolfson excited a great deal of interest, of course—though properly not as much as the Dodger's record-breaking winning streak—but it remained for N. Y. *Post* columnist Sylvia Por-

ter to announce another one of her social revolutions: "a 'stockholder democracy' is being reborn in America."

This would have been fairly routine stuff for the easily stirred Miss Porter, except for the fact that in this very same column she had already explained to her readers how the battle was being decided:

"From a big Wall Street house holding a wad of Ward stock: 'Wolfson may have won the battle of the headlines but Avery has the votes of the major institutional owners of the stock and these are the votes that will decide the outcome.'"

This combination in the very same column exceeds the terms of Miss Porter's franchise for galloping discombobulation.

## Fascists' Civil Liberty

The following civil-liberty item has been on our desk for weeks now, awaiting publication. It's from the ACLU news service:

Prosecuting the neo-Fascist National Renaissance Party under the Smith Act for advocating violent overthrow of the government would be unwise and an attack on free speech, the American Civil Liberties Union declared.

"Fascists, Communists or anyone else should not be prosecuted purely for the exercise of freedom of speech in the absence of a clear and present danger," Patrick Murphy Malin, ACLU's executive director, asserted.

He conveyed the Union's views in a letter to Representative Francis E. Walter, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, made public recently. That group's preliminary report of December 17 on neo-Fascist and hate groups recommended prosecution of the National Renaissance Party. Emphasizing that the ACLU had opposed the Smith Act since its adoption in 1940, Malin urged the committee to eliminate the recommendation from any final report.

"While we believe the government has the right and duty to deal with the real subversive acts of any individual or organization, action taken against the expression of their particular philosophy—heinous as it is—must fall under the First Amendment," Malin wrote.

"In our opinion, after a careful reading of the preliminary report, we do not see the clear and present danger to the safety of our country that is presented in the activities of the National Renaissance Party. While the views it advances are contrary to the American concept of peaceful, democratic change, the report itself specifically states that the party has only 'some two dozen followers.' We fail to see the danger that arises from some two dozen pro-fascists, especially when there is no evidence of their engaging in sabotage or espionage or similar subversive acts. If our concern is with the political philosophy the party expounds—and the ACLU completely disagrees with it—surely there is time to answer their propaganda by the argument and reason of pro-democratic forces that are so much more numerous. If we fear subversive action, then it is the job of the police to keep the group under surveillance and plan to meet action before it is taken. The operations of the NRP are apparently open, not secret, and can carefully be observed, which always decreases the degree of any danger that might otherwise arise."

Malin said in his letter that if the existence of the party's "elite guard" presents a danger, legislation prohibiting the wearing of uniforms by private armies would not violate civil liberties principles. But, he added, the ACLU did not recommend legislation of that type now, feeling that because of the small number of people involved the "elite guard" did not constitute a danger "so great or so imminent that Congress need deal with it. But we urge that the proper way to deal with any menace of a private army is by outlawing that private army, not by outlawing the advocacy of that private army's sponsor."

To persons and organizations concerned that the "hateful propaganda of the NRP and its appeal to bias and prejudice . . . will impair efforts" to develop racial and religious harmony, the ACLU said it was confident that such propaganda can be answered by counter-argument.

Subscribe to LABOR ACTION —  
\$2 a year does it!

## PRO &amp; CON: DISCUSSION

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

## Toynbee and Christian-Socialism

To the Editor:

I am greatly interested in the recent article (February 28) in LABOR ACTION, "Toynbee, Stalinism and the Politics of Sainthood." Unfortunately I have not seen Toynbee's article in the February 20 Times magazine. But, as Philip Coben summarizes it for the readers of LA, Toynbee reiterates his plea: "We must return to true religiosity in order to be saved from Communism; only so can an effective alternative be offered."

I had the good fortune to hear Toynbee lecture, two years ago to huge audiences on a college campus. Being myself a retired missionary from the foreign field I was deeply impressed by his earnest appeal to his predominantly young listeners not to bank any longer on the superficial ineffective security of mere church membership—but to explore sedulously and sincerely what is implied in being a Christian, viz., a follower or disciple of Christ. He pointed out that the Christian, or Western, world bears far greater guilt for the present world turmoil than Communism, because it has held sway so much longer and over a much wider area. It has lost its grip on the minds and hearts of its adherents, because their guide books, the Bibles, lie unused on their dusty shelves. The almost total ignorance of the teachings of Christ and His apostles among today's teachers, government officials, social workers, commentators and journalists is appalling. It is a case of the blind leading the blind, and neither of them realizing their blindness.

I am in deep sympathy with socialism. I am convinced that a Christian faith which does not express itself in deeds of social justice, in the field of labor, education, racial and economic equality, universal peace, etc., is not only ineffectual, but an abomination before God. I find it as difficult to understand how a person can be a Christian without at the same time being a socialist, as it is illogical to be a real, thinking socialist without being also a believing Christian.

True socialism, as opposed to materialism, capitalism, colonialism, fascism and communism—is a natural product of religion at her best—only it does not go far and deep enough. It is a one-sided development—as is the tragic case of the missionary movement in foreign lands as well as the methods and policies of the churches in the U.S.A. It has taken the convulsive experiences in Communist China to wake up the mission boards and the churches in America to the fact that there are important avenues of service which have been completely neglected in the past.

That an authority of Toynbee's caliber should urge his audiences to return to God, as the only sure foundation for the reconstruction of a world trembling at the rim of a great abyss, is very significant. The wise will heed his warning. It is a personal matter between each individual and his God; and any valid decision can only be reached by an objective, open-minded study of the New Testament, especially the four Gospels, the short biography of Jesus, our supreme Example. What a dynamic, truly constructive organization the Independent Socialist League would become, if each member, led by its leaders, decided to

make contact with this vital source of power!

Our distracted world of today needs the leadership of a consecrated, God-inspired organization as much or more as the Roman Empire needed the impact of that little band of determined simple followers of Jesus in the first century. The same power and resources are available to us today. It is up to us to use them.

(Mrs.) E. H. MARSH

The only comment I would make on Mrs. Marsh's letter (not to get into an argument on religious views, which would be quite beside the point and which anyway is outside the purview of political program) is that Christian-Socialists like our correspondent should not confuse their own approach with Toynbee's. There is a great gulf, and it is this which gives Christian-Socialism whatever progressive impulse it has.

Toynbee counterposes religiosity to secular social action. He does this by making "spiritual reawakening" a precondition for social solutions. He specifically polemizes against the very idea that a social solution can be achieved through secular action. (Hence the revealing attitude he set forth on Stalinism, as I discussed.)

On the contrary, most Christian-Socialists (and, I have no doubt, Mrs. Marsh) do not counterpose one to the other. They propose, initiate and support secular social action for its own sake—though they try to link it up with religious faith which they hold. In fact, it would be quite consistent, if not indeed required, for a militant Christian-Socialist to maintain that a social revolution is needed in order to make possible a return to "true Christianity." This is precisely the reverse of Toynbee's reactionary approach.

In point of fact, historically, Christian-Socialism cut its eye-teeth by attacking the Toynbee-type of connection between religion and society. Christian-Socialists should be the very first to separate themselves from this reactionary ideologist's particular views on the social relevance of religion.

I take it Mrs. Marsh quite agrees with the general idea as here expressed; I wanted only to set it down in so many words for the sake of clarity.

Philip COBEN

## Glad-Hand

To the Editor:

Congratulations. Every so often LABOR ACTION outdoes itself. I have just finished reading "Behind Yalta." What a record in horsetrading for those precious warriors who "wanted" to rescue the world from fascism.

I have often said Jesse James and his gang were small potatoes compared to the brigands that represent Stalinism and capitalism today.

John HOWARD

Seattle, Wash.

## MAY DAY GREETINGS

THE ALTERNATIVES  
STILL ARESocialist  
Democracy  
or  
Barbarism!

Congratulations to LA

For Holding the Fort!

CHICAGO ISL

## Nature of Stalinism and Its Wars

To the Editor:

After reading the exchanges between Comrade Shane and the Editor of LABOR ACTION [Feb. 28 and Apr. 11] and Comrade Barnes' exchange with the editor [Feb. 7] on the question of the attitude of Third Camp socialists toward Stalinist China, we want to express our thoroughgoing agreement with Comrade Draper.

We have felt for some time that Comrades Barnes and Shane have had mistaken views with regard to Asian or colonial Stalinism, and we have written a lengthy criticism of their views as concretized on Indochina in the August 1954 issue of the *Young Socialist Review*, to which no reply was ever forthcoming. In addition to the comrades' tripping over the problem of Stalinism *per se*, it is regrettable to see them floundering over the old, old question of the subordination of the national to the imperialist element where both occur within the same war camp. We concur with Comrade Draper in saying that Chinese Stalinism, while an ally and not a complete puppet of the Russians, is not a progressive force tending to solve the problems in Asia, nor would its counterparts in other colonial areas of the world. Chinese Stalinism is bureaucratic-collectivist in nature, like Russian or Yugoslav Stalinism, differing only in degree because of its backwardness. Any examination of its internal political and economic developments reveals the determination of the Chinese Stalinist regime to catch up with its Russian inspirer. There is every indication that Chinese Stalinism is embarking on an imperialist policy in Asia (Tibet, Indochina) in a similar manner to Russia in Europe.

There can be socialist support to China's efforts to obtain the offshore islands by war or threat of war, because the politics of such a war are inextricably bound up with the contending powers now maneuvering for a Third World War (i.e., Russia and the U.S.).

While the views of Comrades Barnes and Shane can be looked upon not only as symmetrical with those of "anti-war socialists who play around with conditions under which they will be willing to support this capitalist non-puppet [England] in the context of the imperialist war, although not supporting the U.S." (as Comrade Draper puts it); in addition Barnes' and Shane's views must also be looked upon as a reaction to social-patriotic ideas with reference to the "West." Thus it ill becomes "Western" quasi-social-patriots and conditional opponents of capitalist imperialism to sit on their typographical hands and try to appear "holier than thou" when partial defenders of colonial Stalinism are being criticized. Hence a little balance and clarity are in order, as Comrade Draper indicates, when assessing these comrades' views on Asian Stalinism, and correcting them.

Jack WALKER  
Jim THOMPSON

Berkeley, April 14.

## Wang &amp; Other Things

To the Editor:

I wish to comment on the discussion that has been taking place between Shane, Barnes and the Editor on the nature of the Chinese state, etc., the last exchange appearing in the Feb. 28 issue. Shane correctly points out that no refutation has been made of M. Y. Wang's article (NI, March-April 1951.)

The editor's reply is that none was necessary since the only differences are terminological. It is this point that I emphatically dispute.

The position of LA is that the Chinese (and Russian) states represent an entirely new social system—bureaucratic collectivism. This is not Wang's position as I shall show. The differences between you and Wang are not, as you say, over what terms should be used but over what those terms mean. Wang uses the term bureaucratic collectivism even as you do, but he uses it differently.

In his article Wang states: "On the face of it, bureaucratic collectivism . . . would appear to be a completely new thing. But upon closer examination it is not difficult to perceive that it belongs under a subheading of capitalism. . . . Bureaucratic collectivism has two great advantages over private capitalism and even over state capitalism (under the latter also there is large-scale private ownership): (a) it is possible to regulate capital in a more systematic fashion, (b) it is possible to exploit workers more efficiently. . . . Stalinism is essentially the transitional form which ob-

tains during the delayed and difficult birth of socialism from the womb of capitalism. It cannot create a new historical era but it can maintain itself for a time. . . ."

If we reject Wang's view and consider Stalinism as a new, reactionary social system, we must logically assume that its slaves have lost their character as a modern proletariat and have been degraded to the point where they are incapable of establishing socialism. If Stalinism solves capitalism's problems and has a historical era ahead of it, likewise we must rule out the possibility of socialist revolution against it.

While the ISL hesitates to go all the way and draw this grisly conclusion, it has moved in this direction. The theory of the "new social system" provides the theoretical foundation for the ISL's slogan of "turn the imperialist war into a democratic war" (against Stalinism) with all the lesser-evilism that it implies.

William STANLEY

Berkeley, March 15.

(1) On Wang and terminology: We have often made the point that there are two kinds of people who talk of Stalinism as "capitalism." One: those who really and consistently argue that the two systems are basically identical in some operational sense. Two: those who argue that Stalinism should be called "state capitalism" but who, in all essential respects, differentiate the laws and operations so that they are in effect treating them as two different systems. We have always tried to point out to the second group that, whatever label they choose to use, their basic analysis is essentially the same as ours.

Where did Wang belong? Stanley quotes Wang's phrase that Stalinism "belongs under a subheading of capitalism." On the very same page Wang also says categorically that Russia "is not a capitalist state" (my emphasis). On the next page he presents Stalinism as a "transitional form" between capitalism and socialism. On the page after that, we read: "The capitalism represented by the Stalinists is no longer capitalism in the original sense of the word, but bureaucratic collectivism. . . . This distinction is of exceptional importance." Four different formulations; take your pick.

This gets one nowhere. If this were the important part of Wang's article, it would not have been worth printing, let alone refuting. Actually, all this is an injustice to Wang, since it is his more concrete discussion of Chinese Stalinism which made his article worth while. The NI at the time merely pointed to what we have pointed to here, and let it go at that.

It is therefore not easy to understand why Stanley (and Shane) make a fuss about this one most obviously mixed-up aspect of Wang's otherwise interesting article. If they are casting about for a theoretical prop for a state-capitalist theory, since they have none at present, Wang is not a good prospect.

(2) Stanley asserts that our view of Stalinism as "a new, reactionary social system" means "logically" abandonment of socialism. This sort of thing is "logically" simply a way of throwing mud. There is no resemblance between the Independent Socialist point of view and the pessimistic straw-men that he erects out of thin air. (It is, however, interesting to find out that Stanley believes that if Stalinism "has a historical era ahead of it" then he would rule out socialist revolution against it, i.e., capitulate to it.)

(3) Stanley's further assertion that the ISL "has moved in this direction" is simple slander, no more, and plagiaristic at that.

(4) The ISL has never raised any such slogan as mentioned in Stanley's last fistful. He is loosely referring, as he well knows, to a point made in an NI article by Max Shachtman some years ago, which was the basis for a good deal of discussion pro and con, and which has little to do with anything that Stanley deals with in his present epistle. For Stanley to pluck it out of the air so irrelevantly is just irresponsible, though disingenuous.—Ed.

## YOU'RE INVITED

to speak your mind in the letter column of Labor Action. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

LABOR  
ACTION

May 2, 1955 Vol. 19, No. 18

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

Associate Editors:

GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL

Business Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

## THE TWO FACES OF STERILITY

### The 'Intellectual' and the Careerist on the Campus Today

By DEBBIE MEIER

The new middle class (professionals, bureaucrats, managers, etc.)—notes sociologist C. Wright Mills in his now famous *White Collar*—are the "rearguarders," waiting for someone else to move. As a group they have no cohesion, but are on sale to the highest bidder or the most likely winner. "They have no steady discontent or responsible struggle with the conditions of their lives. For discontent of this sort requires imagination, even a little vision; and responsible struggle requires leadership."

As individuals with private positions, continues Mills, "they hesitate, confused and vacillating in their opinions, unfocused and discontinuous in their actions . . . they have no targets on which to focus their worry and distrust. They may be politically irritable, but they have no political passion. They are a chorus, too afraid to grumble, too hysterical in their applause." In the short run, he concludes, they follow the panicky way of prestige; in the long run they follow the ways of power.

This bitter and at times scathing portrayal of the rootlessness and political mediocrity of the "new middle class" is graphically illustrated in its contemporary form by two recent studies of American middle-class youth. These two studies demonstrate two different reactions to a similar social phenomenon.

The phenomenon is strikingly described by Daniel Seligman of *Fortune* magazine in the first of these two studies. It is a study of the character of a group of 25-year-olds entering the ranks of management ("The Confident Twenty-Five Year Olds," *Fortune*, Feb. 1955). "What is it like," he asks, "to grow up into a world that offers almost absolute political insecurity—yet at the same time starts one off with a comfortable salary?"

#### TODAY'S ZOMBIES

Seligman's findings are interesting, and provide a striking picture of the dilemma of our society and its impact upon this vast group of the "new middle class." Unintentionally perhaps, Seligman poses a vital question in a pertinent manner.

Despite the fact that they were born in a depression, reared during a war, and reached manhood in the midst of the cold war, these 25-year-olds, interviewed

by Seligman, were cheerful and sanguine. They did not remember the depression, and felt that "their type" of person was not seriously hurt by it. For the future they expect high salaries (\$15,000 and up), plentiful opportunity, and security to boot.

They expect to lead the "good life"—a suburban custom-built home, two cars, a maid, 2-4 children, country club membership, and a sailboat. And that is it. They are intelligent and sophisticated, but non-intellectual. They rarely read and are uninterested in culture. In general, says Seligman, "they are incurious" about life. Their drives, their sophistication and their intelligence is reserved for only one object: "to get ahead" in a personal sense.

#### BUILT-IN BRAIN-WASH

It is not strange then that Seligman found them incredibly ignorant about the world around them. These future "leaders" of our business world "know nothing about current events and are even less interested. If they are unfrightened about the future, they are equally unconcerned and unknowing about it. And they have a firm objection to becoming interested. "It's silly to get steamed up about politics," is the typical attitude. They are, thank god, says Seligman, all "middle of the roaders" politically (which means between McCarthy and Stevenson—the two "extremes"). "They are not going to make much political trouble for the U. S. in the years ahead," Seligman notes reassuringly.

But even Seligman, who is after all a realistic and sophisticated proponent of American capitalism, is a bit troubled about all this. For this so-called "middle-road philosophy" which seems to appeal to so many of these "bright young men" is based, he fears, not so much on its actual content "as on the fact that it provides a logical cover for the absence of political opinions." They tend to be sus-

picious of any ideology, and are in the middle merely because "they feel the position is innocuous—and fashionable."

As a group, groans the author, "their political thoughts tend to be vague, uninformed and platitudinous." Their political myopia may be a real danger, warns Seligman in conclusion, because America is not in for as rosy a future as these leading lights expect. Even their own personal futures are not likely to materialize as fruitfully as they seem to imagine—there simply aren't that many \$15,000-and-up jobs available!

#### FRIGHTENED

This picture of the contented managerial type should sound familiar. He is around every campus and in every management-training program. He has chosen one way out of the dilemma posed by Seligman. For the political insecurity of America in 1955 is too hopeless for most to face, and thus those who are able escape by climbing into the mundane struggle for personal betterment.

And how easy! It begins for these young men with a good solid job at \$5-6,000 a year, a pleasant home and agreeable companions. It necessitates cutting off all "thinking" about the "world," but that was never a much-appreciated habit anyway, and they are determined not to make a point of practicing it. They have no visions, no ideals, no scope. They are nearsighted, self-centered, decadent and bankrupt—yet, in that "healthy" sort of way which our prosperity permits.

The Seligmans mourn it. They would like instead a dynamic, creative and ideologically oriented class of conservative youth who will take their places in the crusade to "Save Free Enterprise." They sense that this group of nincompoops is totally unprepared and unwilling to take on that job. And they are a bit frightened about how these young men will react when they find out that even their nearsighted personal goals are not so easily and cheerfully attained.

But this dilemma, so well posed by Seligman, is in a nutshell the dilemma of capitalism today: how to create a dynamic capitalist class.

Capitalism survives in America in a prosperous and relatively stable state. Nowhere else in the world can there conceivably exist a group of young people who might be enthusiastic about capitalism. Nowhere but in America. Yet this prosperity and stability has not produced it. For an ideology of hope cannot be built upon the quicksand of a war economy, creeping totalitarianism, cold war and a groping for the maintenance of the status quo.

#### YOUTH IN BLINDERS

European capitalists, having long ago recognized this, have for some years now given up the search for an ideology. They concern themselves with two things: making quick profits and living well as long as they can. America scolds them for their lack of ideological commitment to a driving, competitive capitalism. But the French bourgeois know that the society they symbolize is dependent today not on their efforts or ingenuity, but upon the ability of America to hold her part of the world together through a combination of force, economic aid, bluster and wishful thinking. They understand that the society they believed in and profited from is a doomed one—no matter whether in months, years or decades.

Americans, and especially the personable college graduates, do not understand this consciously. And how can they? They see around them a hitherto unknown prosperity—they see homes, good jobs, automobiles, TV sets, etc. Yet unconsciously they must face this fact in one way or another.

Because the moment they attempt to go beyond the appreciation of their good

fortune and develop a perspective, an "ideology" for the future, they begin to sense this phenomenon that all the rest of the world is aware of. They begin to sense their futility, their instability and their bankruptcy. They sense that there is no long-range perspective that they can even pretend to aim at in the direction of "saving capitalism."

And yet their immediate life experience does not lead them to rebel—how rebel from a society which provides comfort, money and status? How rebel when the only potentially dynamic force—the labor movement—lies quiescent and unsure? How rebel when rebellion brings neither prestige, power nor money? So they do what is easiest—they take the money and the status and put political blinders over their eyes and minds. America is rich enough to provide this retreat.

And it is rich enough to provide still another, somewhat different retreat: a retreat for those who are too sensitive perhaps, too ideological perhaps, too concerned with using their minds as a tool, to fall whole-hog into the managerial scramble. This other is a retreat which is open for the intellectual.

#### STERILIZED

An interesting analysis of this other way out is suggested by a second recent study, conducted this time by the Social Science Research Council. This study examines the intellectual development of a group of undergraduate students in an effort to discover more about their motivations, incentives and goals. And while doing so it casts a light upon their reaction to this same modern dilemma.

The students sampled, according to Robert N. Wilson of the Social Science Research Council, were juniors in college, with average grades of B+ to A—(in contrast with Seligman's sample, whose grades in college were considerably inferior), and oriented primarily toward the social sciences. Half were the children of managerial or professional parents and another third the offspring of small businessmen.

Most of these young students—the author notes in the September issue of *Items* (publication of SSRC)—found their first "energizing force," their "first impetus for serious study," in the desire to "change the world for the better" and

(Continued on page 7)

#### Tour by Draper

The National Office of the Young Socialist League announces a forthcoming tour of some YSL units and college campuses in the Midwest. Hal Draper, editor of *LABOR ACTION*, will visit Chicago, Antioch, Oberlin, Cleveland and Pittsburgh from May 4 to May 12.

Meetings for him are being arranged in these localities by YSL units and campus socialist clubs, at which Comrade Draper will speak on the Formosa crisis or on Yalta. At the University of Chicago, Draper will participate in a symposium with several economics professors there on "Economic Theory and Social Change" on Thursday May 5 at 8 p.m.

In addition to speaking at formal meetings, Comrade Draper will meet with members and friends of the YSL and ISL in informal get-togethers and participate with them in social affairs.

Following is tentative schedule of the tour: Chicago—May 4-5; Antioch—May 6-7; Cleveland and Oberlin—May 8-10; Pittsburgh—May 11-12. *Challenge* readers in these areas should consult with the YSL units and campus clubs involved for details on time and place of the meetings and other activities.

#### YSL FUND DRIVE

## A Slowdown Points to Danger

By MAX MARTIN

The 1955 Fund Drive of the Young Socialist League has slowed down since our last report. As this is being written, at close to the midpoint of the drive, we are behind the schedule we should be on to complete the drive successfully and on time. The pace in the last three weeks has been decidedly below what it was during the first three, at the end of which we were ahead of schedule.

To date we have collected \$654.50 or 40.9 per cent of the \$1600 goal. Were we on schedule, we would now have \$700 or almost 44 per cent. At this point in the drive, every unit should have about half of its quota, with several above that point.

Los Angeles, "At Large" and National Office, and Chicago are doing quite well. All three are above the 50 per cent level, with Los Angeles maintaining a firm hold on first place. Both "At Large" and Chicago, second and third, respectively, are moving up fast, however.

The major snag has been New York, which got off to a good start but has not done well recently. Nor has any additional money come in from Pittsburgh

or Berkeley. Seattle has yet to be heard from at all. Surely, our friends there are going to be represented by something more than 00.00 in the *Paid* column by the next report!

Our new Cleveland Area unit came through with an excellent initial payment last week. Keep up the good work, friends!

There is no doubt that the League can achieve and surpass its goal. What is needed now is vigorous and persistent effort. May we invite YSL friends and *Challenge* readers to join the fight. Send all contributions to YSL, 3rd Floor, 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

#### WHAT'S THE SCORE ?

	Quota	Paid	%
TOTAL	\$1600	\$654.50	40.9
Los Angeles	100	69	69.0
At Large & N.O.	150	84	56.0
Chicago	400	221	55.3
New York	700	242	34.6
Cleveland Area	50	16.50	33.3
Pittsburgh	75	10	13.3
Berkeley	100	12	12.0
Seattle	25	0	0.0

# THE STALINOID MIND: Two Case Studies

## France: the 'New Left'

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Apr. 18—As we pointed out in our January 3 article, the main problem of the French "New Left" has been to find out what it is and what it wants. Based as it is on a neutralist mood rather than on a socialist program, its political positions are purely negative.

The inadequacy of its political basis is constantly revealed in the face of events and of outside interventions, particularly from the Stalinist side. Being more clearly aware of this situation, the socialist elements in the New Left are seeking to re-define with more precision the purpose and the nature of their organization. Thus, in spite of itself, the New Left is driven toward a clarification of its program, an attempt which must bring it nearer to socialist positions.

Characteristic of its initial confusion is its slogan of "independence from both power blocs." On first sight, this sounds much like the slogan of the "Third Camp" but, unlike the latter, it is not supported by any clear understanding of why power blocs exist, why one should remain independent from both, and what is to replace them. The contradiction between its Stalinist and non-Stalinist elements has so far prevented the New Left from clarifying this question. As a result, its slogan has become a pious wish rather than a program and an inspiration for a policy.

The same is true for its position in French politics. From the start it has presented itself as completely independent from both SP and CP. It stayed clear of the SP, it said, because the SP is dominated by a reformist bureaucracy, is pro-American and collaborates with the bourgeoisie. Why it wanted to remain independent of the CP has never been made clear for fear of offending the Stalinists.

### IN-BETWEENERS

The nearest thing to an explanation that has been given runs along these lines: We want a Popular Front in which the SP and CP would be the main elements held together by us. In order to achieve this, we have to be independent of the CP or else the SP won't listen to us.

This also was a compromise position on which the Stalinist and non-Stalinist elements were able to agree. Further clarification would probably have led to a split even before the organization had fully come into existence.

Consequently, it was never decided whether the New Left should have a program of its own, besides match-making between the SP and CP, whether it should enter into competition with the SP and CP organizationally as well as electorally, whether it should become a new socialist party or a propaganda group with a limited purpose.

While it was floundering in its confusion, the CP did everything it could to confuse the issues further. Never attacking the New Left directly in its press, it systematically identified it with the "Mendésist" coalition of liberal bourgeois, headed by men like Mitterand, Mauriac, Malraux and supported by *L'Express*, which had also tried to appropriate the name "New Left." Thus one could read in *L'Humanité* denunciations of "the New Left of Malraux and Mauriac which is trying to put over the London and Paris agreements."

At the same time, local sections of the CP, such as in Paris and in Toulouse, would sabotage the new organization with all their might. This deliberate attempt to confuse the issues could only be explained by the uncertainty of the CP, after Malenkov's fall, as to whether it would be required to follow a "soft" or "hard" line, and whether the New Left would be useful to it or not.

### CP LAYS DOWN THE LINE

In February, however, the mists gradually cleared. Jacques Duclos, and later Jeannette Vermeersch, distinguished between the "true" New Left and the "false" New Left, in articles that were gratefully acknowledged by *France-Observateur*. The CP leadership had evidently decided that the New Left could be useful after all.

Then, solving the doubts and hesitations of the New Left leadership as to its own purpose, the Stalinist press came out with a program for it and a definition of what it should be: a middle-class

front for the CP. Here is what François Billoux wrote in the CP weekly *France Nouvelle* of March 19:

"The workers have their own trade-union organization; the CGT; their party: the Communist Party. As to the workers who are still laboring under the political and ideological influence of the bourgeoisie or of social-democracy, they will leave their present positions only to join their class positions and their class organization. . . ."

"It is therefore an illusion to believe that the New Left could win over large sections of the working class, either by taking those who are now with the Communist Party or by winning those who are now under the influence of other parties. The experience of the PSU, now called PSG, and of the Mouvement de Libération du Peuple (MLP) prove this. . . . Perhaps it is due to an illusion that one finds, in the draft program of the New Left, certain propositions designed to flatter the feelings of the working class, such as the demand for the right of peoples to self-determination, and all parts concerning socialism and the perspective of establishing a socialist society. . . . This whole part is at the very least highly questionable but, above all, what is it doing in a program of the New Left?"

"Why should men and women who ardently desire a change in policy and are ready, for this reason, to work with the Communist Party without, however, accepting socialism, join a New Left which proclaims that its final goals are the same as those of the Communist Party? . . ."

"Probably the ambition of some is too big. Perhaps they dream of turning the New Left into a large party, instead of limiting themselves to what they can actually undertake, in the first place and essentially among the middle classes, and thus bring a contribution which would be far from negligible in the assembly of national and democratic forces. . . ."

In short, the CP will bestow its benevolence on the New Left provided it is neither independent, "left," socialist, working-class oriented, nor anti-colonialist but instead an aggregate of fellow-traveling bourgeois led by Stalinist cadres.

### STALINOID REPLIES

Gilles Martinet, in *France-Observateur* of March 24, wrote a lengthy reply to François Billoux. This task of defending the integrity of the New Left as an independent organization could not have fallen on weaker shoulders.

First he told the CP that, even in order to keep the New Left allied to it, the organization needs a few workers to counteract the "Mendésist" influence of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements. By denying us a working-class membership, Martinet says, the CP also denies us every possibility of autonomous action. Martinet, of course, makes an interesting point.

But even more significant is the fact that Martinet defines "autonomy" as a stalemate between Stalinist and "Mendésist" influences. This describes accurately the neutralist concept of "autonomy," but it has nothing in common with genuine working-class independence, which involves freedom from both foreign influences, not subjection to both at the same time.

It is also interesting to note that Gilles Martinet does not even raise the question whether the "socialist program" which he wants the New Left to have in order to attract workers to it, could turn out to be different in any way from the Stalinist program. He does not even ask himself whether the working-class membership which he wants to flock to the New Left might not be attracted to it because it wants more independence from the CP. Billoux and Martinet agree that the workers are, by definition, Stalinist; the workers themselves, however, have on numerous occasions turned out to think differently.

The reason why Martinet agrees so readily with Billoux on this all-important question, is that his definition of a "socialist program" is purely economic: planning, nationalization, etc. The main element of any socialist program, the self-determination of the working class through its own democratically controlled organizations, Martinet has conveniently forgotten since it stands in the way of his "unity" with Billoux.

(Continued on page 7)

## G.D.H. Cole and His Unity

By PHILIP COBEN

In the current *Nation*, the British left-wing Laborite professor, G. D. H. Cole, bares his political soul in an article which is interesting as a revealing portrait of a typical European socialist intellectual doing his best not to be a Stalinoid and not quite succeeding; or perhaps let us say, rather, a typical Bevanite neutralist filled with illusions about Stalinism.

The article is entitled "A New Socialist Program" but that should not mislead anyone into expecting that the article suggests one, or its outlines. The intent of the article is to propose "an international group" of people who share Cole's state of mind to work one out.

Much of the article is devoted naturally to an attack on what is wrong with the Labor Party reformists and the right-wing social-democrats generally; and this is Cole's long suit. With much or most of this critical portion, left-wing socialists can go along without too much demur. But the nature of the article also requires him to set forth similarly his fundamental criticisms of the Stalinists. This he does briefly, even perfunctorily. Here we get one of the more condensed statements by Cole of his form of Stalinoid ideology.

"I am no Communist," repeats Cole more than once, and of course he is not, not in the sense of Lenin's Communism and not even Stalin's "Communism." He merely sets himself forth as an admirer of Stalinism; that's all.

"I have much in common with them. I share their wish to help all the subject peoples of the world to emancipate themselves from foreign imperialist rule; I admire their planned economies and their vast achievements in economic construction; and I see them, on one condition, as advancing, however deviously, toward the classless society and an expansion of freedom for the ordinary man and woman in the affairs of everyday living. The one condition is, of course, that they escape from the ever-present peril of utterly destructive world war, fear of which poisons their behavior and forbids them the luxuries of common honesty and decent tolerance."

### WHITEWASH

One may well ask: If all of this is true, why on earth isn't Cole a Stalinist? For Stalinism is indeed leading toward classless society and freedom, he believes. It is doing so "deviously"? In this world where Cole sees so little hope, he should be glad it is doing so at all. After all, he calls himself a socialist and a Laborite, but his socialists and Labor Party (he stresses) are not leading toward socialism even deviously.

On the world field, he has space only to note that the Stalinists wish to help all subject peoples emancipate themselves from "foreign imperialist rule." He is thinking, of course, of Stalinist "anti-colonialism" where capitalist imperialism is involved. Does Cole, however, have any wishes of his own about emancipating the East European prisoners of Stalinism from their foreign imperialist rule? The notion does not come to his pen in this programmatic article.

He admires the vast economic achievements of the Stalinist "planned economy," but he has no room to mention the vast exploitation of the workers in the USSR, which has something to do with this. Does he admire the vast achievement of the White Sea Canal, for example? No doubt. Does he admire the

vast massing of slave labor which accomplished it? Of course not; he is a democratic Englishman; he merely does not think of it. And so he is lying, to himself as well as to others, about the Stalinists' anti-imperialism and their economic achievements, as the two mentionable underpinnings of his admirations.

So why doesn't he consider himself a Stalinist, like so many others who go no further than he in their opinions of Stalinism, about whose totalitarianism they are not really deceived? "I detest the suppression of free thinking. . . . I hate cruelty, centralization, rigid discipline, and the vindictive mistrust which the Communist philosophy appears to involve." That is all he has to say on this interesting subject. The man's admiration of Stalinism is perhaps even more evident in what he omits from this side of the story, than in what he was willing to include in his positive statement!

### HALLMARK

Cole's thinking, by explicit statement and by its omissions as well, views Stalinism as today's road to socialism—not as good a road as he would take if he were running things, of course, of course; but still a road which is actually being taken by millions of people, whereas all the anti-Communists (as he sees it) are betraying socialism or doing nothing about it or incapable of doing anything about it. To Cole, the Stalinists are the socialists who mean business, though with unsavory ways. His perfunctory statement of why he is "not a Communist" is a statement of personal taste, and has no relevance to his basic politics.

The hallmark of the Stalinoid, as distinct from the Stalinist (in our dictionary), is his acceptance of Stalinism as genuine socialism while criticizing its methods. Therefore he travels alongside the Stalinists rather than with them, calling on all good men and true to please get together, sink their petty differences and unite with his Stalinist friends against the common enemy.

The "new socialist program" for which Cole is so cloudily calling (for someone else to work out for him) is one that will be "wide enough" (he writes) to bring all kinds of socialists together "in pursuit of a common purpose." Since one of the most important purposes that Cole has in mind is freeing the poor be-deviled Stalinists of their fear of the war which forces their otherwise honest and tolerant natures into cruel and vindictive patterns, and since to Cole and all other such neutralists this means concentrating fire on Western imperialism while whitewashing the Stalinist war camp, it turns out that the big, big Unity he is calling for is the unity of all Stalinoids of his stripe, who find themselves for good or bad reasons outside of the Stalinist movement or its peripheries.

### THE UNITY BOYS

The big, big Unity he is talking about turns out to be a wish that his particular ideological sector of in-betweeners should take on some organizational form. (As it has in France and Italy, for example.) The real Stalinists, after all, have their own organization and don't need Cole's proposed new one, except as a front and a trap.

This serves to explain what should otherwise be puzzling: namely, why Cole's appeal to socialists appears in the *Nation*, which is not any kind of socialist organ. The answer is, of course, that what the *Nation* is, is one of the (unofficial) organs of the non-CP Stalinoids in this country, to whom its line caters.

Periodically fermenting notions of "we've got to organize ourselves somehow" spring up in their ranks, and get discussed in the *Sweezy-Huberman Monthly Review*, or the *National Guardian*, or the *Nation*, or that new addition to and edition of this ragtag of Stalinoid apologists that goes under the masthead of the *American Socialist*. "Let's get together," they tell themselves, never failing to clothe this profound thought in language about over-all "socialist" unity. Their Golden Age is the popular-front period which preceded the Hitler-Stalin Pact, which they look back to as the glorious past.

Cole's voice comes out of these serried ranks, which in England cluster inside the Labor Party rather than in the discredited CP, and form one of the cancers eating the guts out of Bevanism.

NEXT WEEK IN L. A.

Our 6th Annual  
Special Pamphlet-Issue:

Socialism  
and the  
Working Class

# The 'New Left' — —

(Continued from page 6)

Instead, he writes: "it must never be forgotten that the majority of conscious and active elements of the French working class have effectively placed their confidence in the CP. Without the assistance of these elements no policy of the Left is conceivable in this country, and from this point of view it is true that the attitude toward the Communist alliance represents a decisive criterion."

Martinet is both right and wrong. An effective policy on the left cannot be implemented in France without the workers that now follow the Stalinist party. On the other hand, an effective policy on the left, that is a socialist policy based on independence from both power blocs, can under no circumstances be implemented while these workers still follow the Stalinist party.

The task before every independent socialist tendency is therefore to win these workers from the Stalinist party by offering an alternative of genuine independent action, with independent aims and, whenever possible, independent organizations.

Instead, Martinet is caught in a vicious circle: he apologizes for the Stalinists on the grounds that large sections of the working class support them, while this situation only shows that those sections of the working class are not yet fully conscious of their class aims. Martinet's position is at once demagogical and opportunist, and would lead him, in other countries and other times, to support Peronist, reformist or fascist trade-union leaderships.

Sharing the basic premises of Stalinist politics, he naturally agrees with Billoux that the New Left cannot give rise to "another" proletarian party. If it isn't to be a party, what is it?

"A complex phenomenon corresponding to a situation dominated by imperatives of international politics... a grouping which foreshadows, to a certain extent, the assembly of popular forces which the events require..." In shorter terms, a bridge to the middle-class and to the reformist bureaucracy on a neutralist program.

## NOT ALLIES BUT AGENTS

This, however, was too much even for some of Gilles Martinet's comrades of the New Left. Probably fearing that another "defense" like Martinet's was going to hasten the demise of the new organization, Ducaroy, among others, protested in *Le Libérateur*:

"We cannot completely agree with [Martinet] when he seeks to define the present and future New Left as a sort of organic alliance of working-class and middle-class elements... We affirm, moreover, that [our] program addresses

## The UE's Friend

Dealing with the Communist-dominated United Electrical Workers is "extremely beneficial" to employers, in the words of management.

That was what a Sonotone Corp. officer said in a memorandum to all production supervisors at the firm's plants at Elmsford and White Plains, N. Y.

"My own position and that of the company is that we cannot agree with, nor do we sponsor the UE union for ideological reasons," Sonotone's vice Pres. J. J. Christophel wrote.

"Nevertheless, we must not be unmindful of the economic interests of the Sonotone Corporation which must supersede our personal likes and dislikes.

"I believe that in the present weakened position of the UE, it is advantageous for the company to continue to deal with them until such time as the government takes the action now contemplated.

"In our conferences with them recently, we feel we again have a way to lay off and discharge employees with a minimum of risk.

"We have reached certain understandings as to the negotiations in the event the UE wins this election and the UE has promised to get behind the incentive system immediately after the election so that we get 130 per cent production. You can understand that such an arrangement is extremely beneficial to Sonotone Corp.

"In view of the foregoing, we urge our supervisors NOT TO DISCOURAGE ANY employe from voting for the UE in the election next Tuesday."

A reproduction of the memo appeared in a recent issue of the *IUE-CIO News*, the paper of the CIO Electrical Workers.

—CIO News

itself to the working class and to all elements in the other classes which are in solidarity with the working class, and to those elements alone... If we have a genuinely socialist program, our base will be composed of wage workers or won't exist... What kind of Marxist conception supports this long-term alliance between workers and middle classes in an organization miraculously provided with a socialist program, as Martinet would have it, and why does he believe that the New Left cannot produce another proletarian party? As far as I am concerned, I believe that the New Left will produce such a party or will remain an association without perspectives...

Even Gilles Martinet's complacency is jarred by the brutality of the Stalinist hack Billoux as he forbids the New Left to mention the colonial question. He asks: "Why doesn't François Billoux want us to gain the confidence of the colonial peoples? Why does he want us to throw away our weapons at the very time when we are playing a close and difficult game against the neo-colonialists?"

The answer on this score, as on others, is simple, and Martinet knows it: the perpetual fear of the Stalinist leadership to be "outflanked on the Left," that is, the fear of a genuine socialist program and the fear of any organization that looks like it might effectively present a genuine socialist program to the CP's audience.

This is why the CP does not want allies, no matter how loyal; instead it wants agents. This is why the CP will never accept the New Left as the socialist organization many would like to build. No matter how servile the protestations of loyalty by Gilles Martinet, the New Left will face the irreconcilable hostility of the CP leadership at the slightest show of independence.

## THREAT

Billoux's reference to the PSU is an unmistakable warning. The PSU, a pro-Stalinist socialist group, was broken by the CP as soon as it reached 3000 members, and was forced to take cover in the Union Progressiste to survive at all. The occasion for the purge of the PSU was a slight show of independence on the Yugoslav question. This is what will happen to you, Billoux is saying, if you don't submit to our political control.

The consequences of this situation have long been clear to independent socialists, but experience shows that they must be repeated over and over again: the condition of any independent policy on the left, of any independence from both war camps, is a hard, uncompromising struggle also against the Stalinist leadership, demonstrating on every occasion that it is "a current in, but not of, the working-class," an influence based on alien class interests.

In France this struggle is particularly difficult since there is no solid organizational point of leverage to conduct it from, and since it has often to be carried out in organizations led by Stalinists, such as the CGT.

It is easier, therefore, to demagogically proclaim the CP to be "the most representative organization of the working class" and to include it in one's future "Popular Front." But to do this, one must close one's eyes to a consistent tradition of betrayals and, doing this, expose one's organization and the working class as a whole to costly disasters.

# Young Socialist CHALLENGE

(Continued from page 5)

'solve' social problems." Wilson suggests, on the basis of this, "that a reformist zeal is essential to keep a neophyte interested long enough for him to be intrigued by a more scientific attraction."

The pattern, he suggests, goes something like this:

The young boy becomes aware of human ills, is discouraged or outraged by the irrational and self-defeating behavior of both the individual and society, is stirred by a sense of injustice and is "infected with an 'alarm bell in the night' ideology—something must be done about these things right away." So he studies for answers. At first he is optimistic, but then, as time passes, he becomes sophisticated, sees that social change is complicated, that our knowledge of human and social behavior is scarce and inexact, and decides that "the serious scholarly pursuit of verified knowledge is more far-reaching in its consequences than most of the 'activist' alternatives." Finally he becomes disenchanted with the idea of reform altogether, and enchanted with the idea of scientific seeking of truth. And thus at last (hurrah!) his motivation to learn has been transformed from "a pragmatic zest in the interest of rebuilding the universe to a commitment to science for science's sake."

## DETACHED MINDS

The validity of this description of a certain type of student development is considerable, even if it is overly generalized. For the description is more or less accurate depending upon the nature and climate of the rest of society. When American political life is more enervating and propelling, a considerable section of these "scientists" will drift out of this pattern, as they did during the 1930s and again after World War II.

That is, it is not a general law of life, even of intellectual life, but rather it is an accurate description of the "intelligentsia" today. Likewise, by the way, the extent of the "reforming zeal" which exists today among the young "neophytes" is questionable. For our dull, monotonous and uninspired political climate affects the adolescent too. (And in view of Dr. Wilson's thesis one wonders where the new supply of social scientists will come from.)

But despite these objections it is a relatively accurate picture of a whole segment of the "best" of today's college students. And what stands out in this study above all else is the prejudices of the Social Science Research Council and Dr. Wilson—prejudices which are at the heart of the problem.

For there is no doubt on which side they stand, as between reform or scientific detachment. While they give one the name of naïveté and one sophistication, this is not really the issue. For they never pose the very obvious third alternative—"sophisticated reform," or, in other words, "sophisticated" political activity.

They do not suggest, in fact, the possibility of a harmony between the activities of the "scientist" who observes and the "activist" who is involved. They do not even suggest that such detachment is, in the long run, a prerequisite for sophisticated action. Rather activity per se is defined by the author as naïve, and detachment per se as sophisticated.

## ACADEMIC MODEL

The youth who is described and applauded in this study first sidetracks activity in the interest of more academic study for the purpose of becoming a more effective and less naïve political. But soon, lo and behold, he loses all interest in action and becomes interested in his studies for their own sweet sake.

The end result? You can find this sophisticated student in any classroom and in every youth organization and in every campus coffee shop. He is the one who never signs petitions—"must examine this question more thoroughly first," "things are much more complex than you people realize," etc.; he never

gets indignant, he has no political passion—"let us not get so excited, after all there must be a reason for it," etc.

In short, while he is willing to discuss the complexities, and even sometimes willing to learn, he constitutionally never knows enough to act with impulsion, indignation and fervor. He never "concludes"—even temporarily. "Nothing is simple, everything is complex" becomes a formula for rationalizing inactivity, for never becoming involved too deeply in anything but himself.

Yet in the end, strangely, he makes the most naïve and simple political choices (for, like it or not, everyone in some way or other makes "choices"). And this is probably not so strange after all. For it is essentially a naïve idea to start with, the idea that "science" can be a substitute for values. Science is a tool, and when it is divorced from means, actions and goals it becomes, for all its jargon, a static and sterile one.

Thus we have on one hand the growing ranks of "business school" types who shun "pure or basic" research, and choose instead the road of activity in the world of self-advancement. And on the other hand there are those who shut themselves up in the world of "pure or basic" research and shun the concept of activity.

## DISJUNCTION

While they sound like opposites they have much in common. For each begins by divorcing values and goals from his framework of action. Each begins by shunning the concept of social responsibility. Each ends by distrusting social change and distrusting the bringers of social change—the working class, mankind, "the people."

And these American youths will get no genuine and meaningful political ideology from any amount of preaching by the Seligmans, or by such as Sidney Hook, or Peter Viereck (see *Conservatism Revisited*), or Clarence Randall (see *A Creed for Free Enterprise*). The best that their type can produce is a kind of muddled lesser-evilmism and do-goodism. The worst is the hypocritical, cynical political manipulator.

Today, the clear-sighted and sensitive individual who decides to maintain personal dignity must begin by throwing overboard the dominant values and perspectives of the world around him; he must be willing to face the fact that the society which offers him so relatively much today is a society without a future—a society living on the bones of others—a society sick and diseased. He must face the fact, that amazing fact, that the future belongs to either socialism or Stalinism, and that in reality he is every day choosing between these two.

We live in an Alice-in-Wonderland world, for this fact—that the future lies between totalitarian collectivism and democratic socialism—sounds unreal and irrelevant in the intellectual fantasia which has been created in America by the spokesmen of the "old world."

## FRENCH SP YOUTH HOLD CONVENTION

By A. GIACOMETTI

PARIS, Apr. 14—Since the expulsion of its important revolutionary wing in the post-war period, the SP youth has been a shadow of its former self, even though it has been able to pick up some strength since 1949. Its positions nevertheless have some significance as indicative of trends in the SP as a whole.

At its recent National Conference in Toulouse (April 9-11) the SP youth took the following positions:

On the international level, it advocates a "policy of closer cooperation between East and West," the prohibition of atomic explosions, "control of armament," and a reduction of military service to 15 months in all countries.

In the colonies, the conference demanded that the government put a stop to the repression in North Africa.

On the internal level, the following demands were put forward: defense of the lay state which is being "dangerously threatened by clericalism"; a series of reforms in the educational system; the creation of a Ministry of Youth connected with the Ministry of Education; co-education on all levels; freedom of contraception; legalization of abortions; priority to young couples for obtaining housing facilities, and construction of "housing for young people."

**THE BENDING CROSS**  
A BIOGRAPHY OF  
**EUGENE V. DEBS**  
by  
**Ray Ginger**  
**Now, while they last only \$1.00**  
Order from:  
**Labor Action Book Service**  
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

**WEEK by WEEK . . .**  
**LABOR ACTION** screens and analyzes the week's news, discusses the current problems of labor and socialism, gives you information you can't find anywhere else.  
**A sub is only \$2 a year!**

# What the Stalinists Got Out of Bandung —

(Continued from page 1)

Kai-shek's or the Peiping government's legal claims to Formosa.

The American government's reply was exactly what could have been expected. They said they would meet with China's Stalinist government only if Chiang's representatives were a party to the conference, and only after China had demonstrated good faith prior to such a meeting. Chiang's representative in Washington said that his government would never meet to negotiate with the Stalinists. In short, to a Stalinist offer to do just what Dulles had said should be done, the State Department replied by placing conditions which would obviously make the meeting impossible.

Big international victory for the Chinese Stalinists; big international exposure of the fact that the American government fears conferences more than possible shooting wars—all manufactured not in the arsenal of super-clever Stalinist trickery, but right in Washington, D. C.

[As we go to press, Dulles has had to make a flipflop on the State Department stand and withdraw the condition of Chiang's presence at a meeting to discuss cease-fire with the Stalinists.—Ed.]

Aside from this crusher (Washington's diplomatic ribs were cracked not by a thundering propaganda speech, but merely by the offer of a cool embrace), the American government got off fairly lightly. That, at least, is the impression unanimously conveyed by the American press coverage of the conference.

Every anti-Stalinist utterance was blown up into a big event for American consumption, while the attacks on capitalist colonialism were played down in a tone of that's-to-be-expected-from-these-oversensitive-colored-peoples. This was indeed an example of reporting which

might not quite meet the standards of a totalitarian propaganda ministry, but would come pretty close to it.

The obvious slanting of American press reporting should not obscure the importance of the fact that Stalinism and Stalinist imperialism were attacked at the Bandung conference. It would have been a tragedy indeed if no one at this gathering had pointed the accusing finger at the Stalinist war camp, as well as at capitalist imperialism.

It remains a tragedy that this absolutely essential task was left, for the most part, to representatives of governments either directly in the virtual pay of American interests, or so closely tied up to the American war camp that their charges and claims were bound to make the least possible impression at the conference. Yet the response they got (unless in addition to distortion the representatives of the free American press engaged in a bit of outright invention) indicates how widespread and deep is the uneasiness and fear of Stalinism among the governments of Africa and Asia.

## PLENTY OF BUTTER

The Chinese Stalinist reaction to the attacks made on Stalinist imperialism was a masterpiece of diplomacy. Chou En-lai presented a picture of the great power as a "good neighbor" which should turn the whole Latin American section of the State Department green with envy, if they have the capacity to understand why they should be envious.

Chou did not bluster. He did not threaten openly or indirectly. He did not try to twist the arms of some weak governments to silence them or to get them to attack his attackers.

He smiled, spoke softly and sweetly of differences of opinion and government structure to which all, the mighty as well as the small, are entitled. He attacked the SEATO pact, but welcomed the assurances of Pakistan that although they belong to the pact they regard it solely as a defensive alliance and would not support the United States in any aggressive war.

Butter would not melt in his mouth. He deprecated the tendency of big nations, or their nationals, to look down on and ignore the interest of small nations, and publicly asked the delegates to bring to his attention any instance in which his government or any of its representatives may have treated a small nation in any way other than as equals.

All of this cost Chou nothing, for there were no concrete, immediate issues before the conference to be settled which might have involved the power position of the Chinese Stalinists. He was talking not primarily to the governmental delegates present, but to the peoples of Asia and Africa. What an absolutely devastating propaganda contrast between his official attitude and behavior and that of the American government which waves bundles of dollars in one hand, atom bombs in the other, and talks about how the "Asian mind" is only influenced by firmness backed by force!

## ECHO FROM PAKISTAN

The impact of Chou's work at the conference plus the Chou-Dulles exchange on negotiations was seen in massive form right after the end of the conference, when Prime Minister Mohammed Ali of Pakistan gave a press interview in which he virtually presented himself as Chou's broker, if not spokesman, for the purposes of achieving a Formosa settlement.

This may not impress those Americans who look on all Asians, or indeed all foreigners, as being automatically suspect of anti-Americanism; but the Pakistani leader, it happens, is one of the only two government heads on the Asian continent who had been willing to get into SEATO, after all the pressure that Washington was capable of. Pakistan has been a grateful recipient of U. S. arms. For the sake of cultivating ties with Pakistan, the U. S. has alienated much friendliness in India, where even pro-Americans thought that too much aid and comfort was being given to the more reactionary half of the Indian subcontinent. If the U. S. has any facsimile of a "friend" on the Asian continent, outside of the military dictators and semi-fascists of Thailand, it is Pakistan.

It is this Pakistan whose prime minister told the press on Monday after the conference that Chou "showed every desire for a peaceful settlement," repeated Chou's feeling that the State Department reply was a "rebuff"; and reported that Chou had offered a solution to the problem of what should be done about Chiang that "to me seemed quite reasonable," though he declined to say what

this reasonable proposition was. In general, Mohammed Ali gave the impression that he was quite convinced of Chou's bona-fides and hoped that Washington would act half as reasonably.

The degree of Chou's success will only become apparent in time. All that diplomacy can do, he did. Yet it is clear that the biggest impression was made not by his manner, but by the apparent readiness of his government to negotiate over the Formosa Strait, his demand that the Korean struggle be settled by the parties at interest, in short, by a posture which implies peace rather than war.

## NEHRU DEFLATES

One of the most striking aspects of the Bandung conference was the deflation of Nehru's neutralism as a unique and positive policy for the underprivileged nations of Africa and Asia.

From the beginning Nehru attempted to run the conference in such a way that it would only express neutralist attitudes. This was the real meaning of his high-handed attempt to prevent the delegates from making speeches on the floor.

He knew that if such speeches were permitted, the cold-war issues which are wracking Africa and Asia as much as the rest of the world would be bound to get an airing at the conference. If all conflict could be confined to closed sessions, and the world would-only hear of the vague platitudes for peace and co-operation of the welcoming speeches and the final resolutions, the appearance could be created of a great bloc of nations working in harmony, divorced from the strife of the world-embracing cold war.

But the best-laid plans of this world-renowned democrat were thwarted by the insistence of the small powers that their voice be heard at the conference. "No one pays much attention to us in world councils," one of their representatives said. "If we can't speak up here, where will our voice be heard?"

The significance of Nehru's defeat on the procedural question was not so much that the small powers rebelled against this high-handed attempt to still their voice at the conference. What happened was that most of the delegations felt that if the conference was confined to topics and approaches acceptable from a neutralist point of view, nothing of significance would happen.

Nehru's neutralism only has meaning as an attempt to keep his country and others from final commitment to either war camp. Though it can play a certain role in the cold war, it has no capacity to end the cold war because it cannot undermine the foundations of either of the war blocs. Its purely negative character comes to the fore the moment there is something more involved than denouncing the bellicosity of one or both sides in the struggle.

## OPPORTUNITY

At this conference, for instance, in addition to denouncing Western colonialism, there was a golden opportunity to put the Chinese Stalinists on the spot, and to deal them a series of political blows before the whole world. Capitalist imperialism is so discredited in the Africa-Asia area that it takes neither courage nor intelligence to kick it around, especially at a gathering confined to African and Asian governments.

But the Chinese Stalinists were there in the flesh. The conference adopted a dozen resolutions dealing with freedom, peace, human dignity and the like. The most telling blow that could have been struck at the war camps by Nehru or U Nu or any of the others would have been to call the Chinese Stalinists to account publicly for the suppression of all non-Stalinist parties in their country, and for their totalitarian regime in general. That would have upset the appearance of harmony which is so dear to the neutralist heart, but it would have struck a blow for human freedom and peace by undermining popular illusions about one of the war camps.

To sum up: The Bandung conference once more underlined the hostility of the majority of the world's peoples to the imperialism of the American war camp. It expressed their fear and hatred of any policies which might involve the world in another war. It gave the Stalinists a magnificent opportunity to put the American government on the spot over Quemoy and Matsu which they exploited to the full. It exposed the basic emptiness of Nehru's neutralism and the "Third Force" idea of establishing a bloc of countries outside the two war camps not on the basis of a militant, progressive social program, but simply of neutrality.

## 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!

## Jim Crow Front — —

(Continued from page 3)

Thirty-four of the Negroes were executed on murder charges, 8 on charges of rape. Only one white man was executed for rape. Ten of the total 43 Negroes executed were under 20 years old. Seven of these were among Georgia's 11 . . . four charged with murder, three with rape.

Since 1930 when present government records were started, 1,806 Negroes have been executed, while the number of whites is only 1,518. Out of these, only 38 whites have been executed for rape—as opposed to three hundred and forty-two Negroes! Of these, all but seven were killed in the South, where "rape," when a Negro male is involved, is an extremely flexible word.

## For a Crusade

At a recent Anti-Discrimination Conference, in Atlanta, Ga., the United Packinghouse Workers (CIO) called for an all-out "Crusade for Democracy in the South."

The conference, sponsored by the UPW-CIO's Districts 8 and 9, and attended by approximately 150 delegates representing more than 15,000 workers in thirteen Southern states, was held on the campus of Atlanta University.

Both Ralph Helstein, national president of UPW-CIO, and A. T. Stephens, vice president, struck at Southern officialdom's opposition to school desegregation.

Helstein termed Georgia Griffin's opposition a "plantation-type sell-out of not only Negro citizens but of all white and Negro citizens in the South." Stating that the organized strength of his union would be thrown into the fight to end all segregation and discrimination, he declared "desegregation is the only method that can provide adequate schooling for both white and Negro children."

Stephens pushed the proposal that the merged AFL-CIO establish a fund of not less than \$10,000,000 for the "Crusade," which would be aimed at abolition of state and local segregation laws, poll taxes and other unfair voting restrictions, establishment of strong FEPC laws, and the outlawing of discrimination and segregation in all public places, institutions and facilities.

Backing the U. S. Supreme Court's stand, the conference outlined a community-level "Committee for Equality in Schools." Opposing the widespread hiring and wage discrimination practised in the South, the conference emphasized the union's anti-discrimination clause, which all employers having contracts with the union must sign.

## 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

## 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