

# LABOR ACTION

EX-COMMUNISTS AND SOCIALISM  
REFLECTIONS ON AN ARTICLE BY JOHN GATES

... page 7

The Attorney General's 100 Days

... page 2

Juvenile Delinquency and New Slums

... page 3

APRIL 21, 1958

TEN CENTS

## SPOTLIGHT

### Four Thousand Unemployed Demonstrate at Lansing

Chartered buses brought more than 4,000 jobless workers to Lansing, Mich., state capital on April 8. They rallied at the Civic Auditorium on call of the state AFL-CIO Council to demand action from the legislature on behalf of the unemployed. In all Michigan, 450,000 are without jobs. In Detroit alone, 265,000. "Never before," reported the *Michigan AFL-CIO News*, "had a union conference brought that many people to the Capitol, not from as many different regions of the state." But it was more than a "conference," it was a demonstration, a demonstration of the fact that unionized workers in the home state of the UAW do not intend to sit by in silent despair.

(In New York, the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union announced that it was calling a mass rally in Washington on April 29. It expects to bring 1,500 delegates to the nation's capital, the biggest rally in the union's history.)

In Michigan, the unions' demands were, for the moment, modest. They emphasize the need to extend and improve unemployment compensation payments. It was not difficult for Democratic state legislators and for Democratic Governor Mennen Williams to express their sympathy for so urgent a proposal. At best, it would be a stopgap. Michigan's auto workers are the victim of a double crisis; on top of the nation-wide depression, thousands of auto workers have permanently lost their jobs in sweeping technological changes that have turned the auto industry topsy-turvy.

Later, their demands may become more thoroughgoing; the big, rich auto corporations should pay the social and financial costs of technological change. If the union cannot persuade them with economic power, it has political power. Meanwhile, the unemployed ask only for temporary assistance.

### FLED IN HASTE

In Michigan, Republicans control the state legislature. And they fled in haste before the unions' mass delegation which had intended to present their proposals to the legislators. On the morning of the demonstration, the Legislature hurriedly assembled for ten minutes; voted to recess until 8 P.M. when the unemployed workers were scheduled to be safely home. "Close the doors and keep the people out," was the order given to the sergeant at arms of the State Capitol. Most of the Republican state senators went over to the swank Lansing Country Club as guests of Hiram Todd, Chrysler lobbyist.

But Republican State Chairman Lawrence Lindemer chose to accept an invitation to speak at the union rally. Reading from prepared notes, he told 4,000 employed unionists, "My information is that the savings of the American people are at an all-time high. Many of the elements of this recession are strictly psychological." In the uproar that followed, Mr. Lindemer was compelled to discard a half page of his text. It would have included the following priceless bit of encouraging news to men whose regular pay has stopped: "People are soaking money away rather than spending it."

In *Ford Facts*, published by Local 600,

Paul Boatin gives this advice, "The United States Congress and the Michigan State Legislature have been in session for four months, but not one single step has been taken to help those laid off. . . . They have done nothing and it's time we woke them up with large demonstrations that will tie up traffic in every major unemployed center. The least we can do in Detroit is to put a ring around the Water Board Building where registrations for Federal surplus foods are being handled."

### Arbitrator Orders Re-Instatement of Two Who Defied Senate Probe

An arbitrator's decision recently reversed the discharge of two employees of RCA Communications, Inc., who on First Amendment grounds refused to answer questions about their alleged former Communist Party associations before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The men, Salvatore A. Testa, a radio operator, and Howard V. Trautman, an operating technician, have been reinstated with full back pay.

Both men testified at the June, 1957 hearings that they never had engaged in espionage or sabotage, and they answered the committee's questions concerning the

(Continued on page 6)

## Government Dawdles; Economy Submarines

By GORDON HASKELL

One of the most striking aspects of the recession is the sluggishness of governmental reaction to it. We are now in the eighth month of the downturn. It is at least four months since it became clear that even if the most optimistic official predictions were realized, widespread suffering would result before it was over from expiration of unemployment compensation and other income-cutting factors. While the Democrats have talked bigger than the Republicans, and have even got a couple of bills of a general (even if long term) anti-recessionary character through Congress, their effort has produced a lot of noise, and very little else.

For a decade and a half of war and armament-induced prosperity, the people running the government have been told and have told each other that whatever ailed the capitalist system in this country in the 1930s had been cured, eliminated, and banned forever. Built-in stabilizers, shock-absorbers, cushions and vitalizers had made depressions a thing of the past, though some cyclical variations were still to be expected. Inflation was the bogey of the era, and aside from that it was just a matter of sitting back and watching the economy zoom into outer space. Over and above all the institutional safeguards which had been built into the sys-

tem, there was, we were told, the increased knowledge, understanding and hence ability to act on the part of economists and government officials, which guaranteed us against any really unpleasant surprises.

### SUBMARINE?

Of course, the built-in stabilizers and cushions are actually there, specially the enormous military expenditures, the vast government bureaucracy, and the whopping national debt. It is all of these, and particularly the giant military sector which keep the American economy from dropping right through the floor and through the basement too. But what some of the liberal economists are now beginning to worry about is this: the stabilizers may work, but what they may do is to stabilize the economy like a submarine, all trimmed up, but ten fathoms below

(Turn to last page)

## A Discussion of GEORGE KENNAN'S BBC Lectures A New Mood in Foreign Policy

By SAM BOTTONE

It may very well be that the development of George Kennan's ideas about the cold war will be considered the mirror of the political mood in Western Europe and the United States of the past decade. In 1947, as the author of the famous "X" article in *Foreign Affairs* expounding the containment doctrine, Kennan expressed the main political and strategic lines of Washington's reaction to the growing Communist power in East Europe. At the same time it was a reflection of the mood of the time—that in some way, the Stalinist wave of the future must be stopped, and it could only be done by relying on the economic and military power of the U. S.

While this has remained the basic policy of the American government, the events of the past ten years have begun to erode its validity in the minds of many who formerly were its warmest advocates. The Korean War seemed to have strengthened almost every detail of the military emphasis of U. S. foreign policy, but events since then have moved in the other direction.

The development of the H-bomb and missile warfare, the recognition of Russia's industrial power as demonstrated in the Sputniks, and the open demonstration

of the people's hostility to Communist rule in East Europe have all played a part in creating a new political mood in Western Europe and to a lesser extent in the U. S.

### NEW CLIMATE

The popularity and influence of George Kennan's lecture series over the BBC last fall contributed to and was the result of the new climate of opinion. This mood has been a reaction to the new missile technology and the danger of radioactive fallout in the most immediate sense. But it has also been the aftermath of ten years of the cold war with increasing armaments and the destructive power of these arms.

Where is all of this leading? Is there a way out of what seems to be the obvious failure of Western policy to resolve the cold war in any way but through a

nuclear war? These questions or a political mood which embodies them have been seeping down into the body politic of Western Europe, undermining the military strategy upon which U. S. foreign policy rests.

The important thing about the Kennan lectures, published as "Russia, the Atom and the West" (Harpers), is that they are the expression of this political and psychological change. Whether he desired it or not, Kennan's proposals, most usually associated around the idea of a disengagement of Russian and U. S. troops from Central Europe, go a long way toward completely undermining the assumptions upon which U. S. foreign policy has rested for the past decade in the cold war. This is the reason for the vitriolic attack upon Kennan by Dean Acheson last January.

It is this aspect of Kennan's book, and not the internal logic, consistency or completeness with which he argues for disengagement which has to be emphasized. Equally important with the political arguments is the understanding and expression of the aspirations of a people who have lost confidence in the crackpot realism of politicians and diplomats.

Part of the extraordinary European response to the lecture series is related

(Turn to last page)

## LABORSCOPE

## "LABOR'S DAILY" FOLDS

*Labor's Daily* has finally been compelled to suspend publication after six years. It had been established as an experiment in 1952 by the International Typographical Union not as the usual trade union house organ but as a medium of reporting all the news of interest to union members. Its editorial policy coincided in the main with the official policy of the AFL-CIO but the paper maintained a degree of independence from its own sponsor (ITU) and from the official labor movement that was unusual.

The American labor movement publishes literally thousands of papers and magazines. But *Labor's Daily* was just about the only important national publication to give more than the canned official news. It printed stories of disputes and debates among prominent labor officials that were carefully kept from the public. It told the story of rank and file and oppositional groups in various unions, local and international. It was particularly sensitive to violations of civil liberties. It was highly critical of both major political parties and on occasion editorialized for the formation of a new party.

A daily paper is expensive, especially when it is not financed from advertising. Finally, the burden became too great for the ITU and the Typographers appealed to the unions of the AFL-CIO to share the burden in some way. They offered to turn the paper over to any combination of AFL-CIO unions. As the day of its demise neared, messages of condolence continued to pour in. But the labor movement let it die. That, sad to say, is typical of our trade union movement. It cannot tolerate that simple measure of intellectual freedom symbolized by *Labor's Daily*. Until it does, it will have no labor press worthy of the name but only official printed matter periodically distributed on patient paper in the form of newspapers. The socialist movement in America now is woefully weak and poor; with all its weakness, we suspect, it has the capacity here to do what the powerful union movement has not.

## STEVENSON ON H-BOMB

Scrupulously careful readers of *Solidarity*, official UAW weekly, will notice this little item on page 7 of its April 14 issue. "Once upon a time (like 1956) there was a man named Adlai Stevenson who suggested we ought to knock off those H-bomb tests . . . how come he never was president?" Its hard to remember whether Stevenson ever said anything so definite or any subject but that was a long time ago. Right now, however, reminiscences are not so important. A world-wide movement has begun in protest against continuing the tests; and many organizations, many countries are represented, including our own. A picket line at the UN in New York organized by pacifists received national support and world-wide attention. Prominent scientists are speaking out with firmness and without fear.

And from our labor movement? The best we can find, so far, is that obscure item in *Solidarity*.

## FLUBS SECOND CHANCE

Robert D. Leiter, College of the City of New York, recently published a scholarly book on the Teamsters Union. It was written before the McClellan hearings and hardly touched upon the spectacular charges against the union's leaders. It seemed like a dirty trick for current events to play upon a diligent author. But Mr. Leiter got a second chance. At the end of January he was invited to address Teamsters Local 688 in St. Louis. The first half of his address, reprinted in the latest issue of the local's paper, remains aloof from the ways of crooks and racketeers. The second half will be published later. We shall see if current events can catch up with historical research.

The New York "Post" Carries an Article on:  
The ISL vs. the "Subversive List"

The April 14 issue of the New York *Post* carried a full double-column story by Washington columnist William V. Shannon on the Independent Socialist League's fight against the attorney general's "List of Subversive Organizations."

After quoting "The Mikado's" song on the "little list" Shannon begins:

"For more than ten years, the American government has had a little list, the attorney general's list of subversive organizations, drawn up by the head of the Justice Department acting as jury, judge and lord high executioner. If a long legal fight on behalf of the Independent Socialist League is successful, the list's importance may soon decline sharply or it may even disappear. It is safe to say that it never will be missed. . . ."

"The Workers Defense League and attorney Joseph Rauh, working without fee, have fought the ISL's battle since 1948 as a matter of civil liberties principles. Hearing officer Edward Morrissey has recommended the ISL's petition [to be de-listed] be denied. If [Attorney General] Rogers reverses this finding, it will represent the first time the government has conceded the arbitrary nature of the original list. If Rogers upholds Morrissey's recommendation, it will lay the basis for a direct and promising challenge of the entire list in the courts."

After describing the origins of the "subversive list" "as a private memorandum devised by security officials in the Justice Department" during World War II, Shannon goes on to say that it became officially established in Truman's executive order setting up the federal loyalty program eleven years ago.

"The once-confidential list," Shannon continues, "thus began its career as the master blacklist, publicly printed and officially sanctioned, the basis for the many other private and public blacklists that soon flourished, the source of the subsequent spiral of guilt by association."

"The Justice Department followed no formal administrative or legal procedures in placing organizations on the list. Whatever investigations were undertaken were entirely confidential and unknown, to the organizations involved. Nor were there any procedures an organization

BLP EXECUTIVE FROWNS ON  
"VICTORY FOR SOCIALISM"

The reorganization of the Victory For Socialism (VFS) group in the British Labor Party described by our London correspondent in the March 10 issue of *LABOR ACTION* has encountered strong resistance from the National Executive Committee of the BLP. Although no text of the position taken by the Executive is as yet available, it appears that they have attempted to proscriber such organized association as would be involved in forming local branches and holding national conferences of the VFS.

In a full-page article in the March 7 issue of *Tribune* entitled "Freedom Must Mean More Than A Charter For Hermits," editor Michael Foot attacks the Executive's decision without describing its exact terms, and argues forcefully for the right, nay the need, for organized, responsible opposition to exist in any democratic socialist movement. His article gives no hint, however, on just how the VFS leadership proposes to respond to the action of the Executive.

We hope to be able to give our readers a full report on this development by our London correspondent at an early date.

New York  
Independent Socialist Forum  
Friday, April 25  
THE ITU: A CASE STUDY  
IN TRADE UNION DEMOCRACY

Speaker: Emanuel Gellman  
Editorial Board: DISSENT

8:30 p.m. at L. A. Hall, 114 West 14 Street, N.Y.C.

could use to get off the list. There was no opportunity for self-defense and no appeal."

The rest of Shannon's article is taken up with a thumbnail sketch of the fight the ISL and the Workers Defense League have been carrying on against the list since 1948, a fight of which readers of *LABOR ACTION* have been kept informed in detail through the years. His article concludes as follows:

"For the defense, the league marshaled Norman Thomas, Harry Fleischman, the former national secretary of the Socialist Party; Daniel Bell of *Fortune*, and

Dwight McDonald. These knowledgeable veterans of radicalism's ancient scrimmage duly informed hearing officer Morrissey that Max Shachtman and his associates did not, in their ideological purity, advocate the use of force except in the unlikely event that they came to power, legally and the capitalists resisted them.

"Morrissey does not appear to have been able to make heads or tails of these disputes among litterateurs and ideologues. He simply found for the government and let Marx and Engels go hang. "The next move is up to Rogers."

## One Hundred Days

One hundred days ago, on January 10, 1958, Attorney General William P. Rogers received the final briefs in the Independent Socialist League's fight to get off the "List of Subversive Organizations." One hundred days have passed during which the ISL, its members, and the readers of its press continue to be subject to the legal disabilities, harassments and blacklisting which the List imposes on all its victims.

We are patient. We have learned to be very patient. For it is now almost ten years, a full decade, since we sought to initiate proceedings and asked for a hearing on the List. A full decade in which we and our friends, our legal aid of the Workers Defense League and our attorneys, have been pressing by every means available to us to bring the matter to a conclusion in the Department of Justice; or if we cannot prevail there, to bring it to the courts after we have "exhausted our legal remedies" with the attorney General. While we have pushed and pressed with countless letters and telegrams, responded with alacrity to every demand made of us or opportunity offered us to present our case, we have been confronted with the ultimate defense of a bureaucracy acting outside the law: delay, procrastination, inaction, postponement, and obstruction.

Here is an abbreviated time-schedule of the ISL's proceedings against the "Subversive List."

- First formal letter written Attorney General Tom Clark demanding a hearing on the ISL's inclusion on the List, July 20, 1948.
- After a dozen letters, protests, demands, the ISL is granted an "informal meeting" with representatives of the Department of Justice, January 1951, two years and six months later.
- Despite promises of a review of the case given at this "meeting," the Department refuses to act on the case. Again letters, telegrams, protests. Eisenhower replaces Truman in the White House. The ISL is now dealing with the fourth attorney general since it started its appeal. Finally, a new Executive Order is issued covering the loyalty and security program. Under Supreme Court pressure, the new order contains provisions for formal procedures by which organizations on the list can contest their listing. It is now April 1953, two years and three months since the ISL's "meeting" at the Justice Department, and four years and nine months since its fight began.
- The ISL files formal notice protesting its listing and demanding a hearing under the new procedures, April 1953.
- The Justice Department furnishes the ISL with "Grounds and Interrogatories." For the first time the organization is told why it is on the list. It is now July 1953.
- The ISL sends the Justice Department its formal reply to the "Grounds and Interrogatories," and requests a hearing, September 1953.
- The first formal hearing granted any organization on the "Subversive List" begins on July 25, 1955, one year and ten months after the ISL had filed its replies.

## IT IS NOW SEVEN YEARS SINCE THE ISL FIRST STARTED ITS CASE.

- After one day of formal hearing, the ISL's attorney's Joseph Rauh and Ike Groner, goaded by the arbitrary and prejudiced rulings of Hearing Examiner Morrissey, file a motion to disqualify him. The hearing is adjourned pending receipt of the Attorney General's ruling.
- Attorney General Herbert Brownell hands down final decision denying the motion of disqualification on September 2, 1955. The ISL is ready to resume the hearings immediately. Repeatedly requests hearing examiner to set a date for resumption of the hearings.
- Hearings before Morrissey finally resume in May, 1956, eight months after Brownell's ruling.
- Hearings end in July, 1956. The government attorneys present their "Proposed Findings of Fact" to Hearing Examiner Morrissey in September and the ISL's attorneys file their proposed findings in December of the same year.
- Hearing Examiner Edward Morrissey hands down a Recommended Decision finding against the ISL in December 1957, one year after he had received the final briefs on the case. Two years and five months have gone by since the hearing first opened. Four years and three months have gone by since the ISL answered the government's "charges," and demanded a hearing on them.

## NINE YEARS AND FIVE MONTHS HAVE GONE BY SINCE THE ISL FIRST STARTED ITS CASE.

- The ISL is refused oral argument on Morrissey's "recommended decision" by the attorney general. On January 10, 1958 its attorneys file their final argument in the case ("Exceptions and Brief") with Attorney General Rogers, and request an early and just decision.

It is now one hundred days since then. It is almost a decade since our fight began. How much longer will we have to wait for the "speedy justice" which is the constitutional right of every citizen?

A Review of a Series by Harrison Salisbury in the New York "Times"

# THE SHAME OF THE CITIES

## Juvenile Delinquency Is Nurtured by Our New Slums

By M. OPPENHEIMER

Many New Yorkers have the feeling, when they see the massive new public low-rent housing projects, that slums are a thing of the past. In reality, the horror and deprivation of slum-dwelling has only been shut up behind the new walls of brick and steel. One family out of twenty in New York now live in these income-segregated ghettos, including 2,000 of the city's 20,000 "multiproblem" families—those from which 75 per cent of all delinquency comes. Many are Puerto Ricans, whose family structure has been upset by an economy in which the wife, often working in the needle trades, makes more than the husband, a janitor or helper in a restaurant, thus overturning the traditional stability of their family. Living conditions, where a family of seven or nine often lives in four rooms, are intolerable—children have no privacy and are forced into the streets to seek security from a rootless and drifting, homeless life, in the "booping," or fighting, street gang.

This is the story as told by Harrison E. Salisbury of the *New York Times* in a series of seven articles beginning March 24 and now available in re-print form (price 10 cents) from the *Times*. It is a well-written, comprehensive documentation of the cruellest aspects of the social system in which we live.

It is the story of the "shook-up," upset, disturbed generation of juveniles which affects every stratum of capitalist society.

### H. N. Brailsford

H. N. Brailsford, British socialist journalist and man of letters, has died recently at the age of 84. Much of his time was devoted to attacking imperialism, in such works as *The War of Steel and Gold*, *Rebel India and Property or Peace*.

Brailsford's devotion to socialist democracy is perhaps most strongly underlined by his attitude during the famous Moscow Trials. Here is the way Michael Foot describes it in a tribute to Brailsford in *Tribune* for March 28:

"Almost the entire Left in Britain was passionately eager to be pro-Stalin. Brailsford himself had written tens of thousands of words in defense of the Russian Revolution.

"The moment was not inviting for anyone to step out of line. Spain was afire, and the flame might soon engulf all Europe. Militant socialism moved to the tramp of the International Brigade. How deeply did the Left crave to give the benefit of all the doubts to Moscow!

"But Brailsford would not be budged from allegiance to his principles. He had been the friend of many of the traitors and wreckers. He would not betray them and the finest ideals of the Revolution itself.

"One begins by suppressing Mensheviks; one ends by suppressing Trotsky," he wrote. Week by week in *Reynolds* (and long before Orwell and Koestler) he swam against the stream, and today the socialist defense of freedom which he asserted so boldly is being debated with convulsive potentialities in Warsaw and most other Communist cities.

"A socialism which did not embrace freedom as its most precious possession was for him no real socialism at all. In him, the best (and only the best) of the liberal heritage became inextricably intertwined with the ruthless exposure of capitalist economics."

but which is found in its most extreme and dangerous form in slum areas, whether open slums or the new slums behind comforting exteriors.

There are 75 to 100 fighting, or "bopping" gangs in New York City, "youth's last-ditch answer to adult pressures and conflicts." *West-Side Story* to the contrary notwithstanding, the gang is pitiful, tragic and dangerous. It is based not on race but on geography, and is organized on military lines for self-defense and offence against other gangs. The security of the gang in a world of alleys and slums which leaves the neutral-defenseless makes gang membership almost imperative. Week-end evenings and summer nights are critical periods, although alliances seek to secure long periods of "cools," or truces which are altogether too much reminiscent of the adult world of which gangs become a bitter mirror.

### HARD CORE PROBLEM

The hard core of the gang problem is the low-rent housing project. Admission is controlled by income level, so that able, rising families which could create some kind of stable social fabric are forced to move out to make room for families who, increasingly, are on relief. The project becomes a catch-all for every kind of social problem. Even the traditional ghetto, Salisbury points out, had a social structure, but here the very erection of the project has torn out all the traditional social institutions which might have provided some kind of stability for the slum family. The patterns of life break down, the kids form gangs to compensate. And, out on the street, which is in reality both the only healthy place to be and at the same time a residence which can be maintained by the individual juvenile only at the price of gang membership, there are the police, who order the gang to move on, "often with the encouragement of night sticks." Instances of police brutality come up time and again in the Salisbury series.

But the evils of the housing project-slum are often compounded by well-meaning but shortsighted "public policies." If a youth gets into police trouble, the family must leave the project. Where are they to go on wages inadequate to pay regular rents? They are deprived of their homes, miserable as they are! "Dumping problem families into the streets," states Salisbury, "is not exactly a progressive approach to the solution of social problems."

The breakdown of the formal machinery of law enforcement often leads, in slums, to an idealization of violence and of the capacity of an individual to take care of himself. Dislike of the law, particularly among proletarian families, is reflected in their children, where the culture of the group simply does not regard as "crimes" many acts which respectable society so condemns. But punishment is meted out all the same for what is held to be acceptable conduct by those who are punished.

### SWIFT RETRIBUTION

The resulting state of mind can be imagined, and retribution is swift to follow. Chaos in the schools is one such kind of retribution, for the "shook-up" children develop erratic, unpredictable and dangerous reactions. "They reflect the adults and the world they live in," one educator is quoted as saying. "People have less to hold on to. What can they believe in? We live in an era of violence and speed. . . ." Another stated,

"We try to make them act the way we don't . . . the kids have eyes. They see that ultimately individuals and nations use force to solve their problems. We tell them about the old-fashioned virtues. But we do not practice them in private life, community life or in foreign relations."

In this situation of broken families, where church stands aside and police and courts are regarded as the enemy, the school is still the only place, outside of the gang, in which the child can have a home. But gang youngsters are not ordinarily good students; third and fourth grade skills in the adolescent gang member are typical. Many are chronic truants and many others are dumped into one vocational or the special schools numbered "600" and "700." (The "700s" were hastily set up to provide for students suspended by Superintendent William Jansen in February.)

Even those regularly attending school suffer a number of handicaps. The schools often are old, with out-dated facilities. Many are on two-and three-shift bases, so that a truant officer never knows if a particular youngster ought to be in or out of school at a particular hour. When kids come out of school they want to run and play—but there is no place for them to go.

### BACK TO THE GANG

When Jansen dumped some 900 youngsters into the streets, his order was bitterly opposed by many teachers—it may have improved individual classroom discipline, but, as one school executive said, "Society is just deferring the payment on its debt. . . . Kicking the kids into the streets creates wolf packs." For the "shook-up" youngster, as Salisbury aptly points out, suspension, or exile to the streets, means back to the gang.

Many schools, of course, do a good job. But even here a long-term pattern of segregation on a racial basis is developing, for the school system is not energetic in setting up districts so that integration will result; often it is content to let segregation develop naturally as the housing pattern changes. It must be pointed out in fairness, however, that even this is not true everywhere; the instance of the integrated school in which children are familiarized with the African heritage of one of the groups there is only a single example which is not entirely an exception. The work of many Settlement Houses, local clergymen and private social agencies, as well as that of such city groups as the Juvenile Delinquency Evaluation Project and the Youth Board workers should also not be underestimated; but in a period where city and state funds are already decreasing as a result of the recession (a phenomenon which Salisbury has not considered), while the need for these services will increase by the same token, more rather than less trouble is to be expected.

In one of the richest cities in the world, possessing vast resources, the cause for the problem is seen partly by Salisbury as one of apathy "in the war-disoriented, prosperity-tranquilized last ten years. Much work has had to be done by a few local individuals. But, by contrast, Police Commissioner Kennedy wishes to limit the police to law-enforcement rather than delinquency prevention, the present task of his Juvenile Aid Bureau. This, according to many critics, would simply build in permanently a regard by the youth of the police as his natural enemy.

Many other more progressive changes have been advocated. One is that the income requirements for the low-cost public housing projects be more flexible so that a mixture of residents would be insured; another is an active program of race relations and community activities to reduce conflicts; another is to raise family standards by active social work techniques, and the encouragement

of tenant organizations. Pay increases for teachers and social workers so that they do not have to hold two jobs to make ends meet is another proposal.

### NO OVER-ALL PROBLEM

But critics point out that the city still lacks a real, overall program. Overburdened public and private facilities are so busy protecting their vested interests that they lose sight of the overall goal, the good of the child and of society. "Conflict, confusion, overlapping authority are the order of the day," as Salisbury puts it. Another authority has stated that the real problem is "hypocritical bureaucracy, protective of its kingdom, ready to use bullying, black-mailing or any other weapon to maintain the status quo. The real jungle is in the offices of the bureaucrats, not on the streets to which we consign the youngsters."

The whole picture which Salisbury gives us is one which emphasizes Schweitzer's conviction that "modern man is lost in the mass in a way which is without precedent in history," as the *Times* puts it. A fundamental conflict where the contradictions within the present society have led to a real division between bourgeois culture, which venerates a morality which it does not practice, has led to the creation of vast "jungles" of what might be called "sub-proletarian" cultures that accept the material goals of bourgeois culture but see no means to achieve them consistent with bourgeois morality—and so develop their own morality, that of the gang.

The society has made it impossible, particularly on the thin borderline between recession and depression, for vast numbers of people to achieve the aims which the society proclaims with the means which it preaches but does not afford them. The result: alienation, rejection of bourgeois means, a desperate search for security. For many youngsters this can only be found in the juvenile gang, that mirror of adult society.

In *West-Side Story* Doc, an old dentist, tells his teen-age gang that "you kids are making this a lousy world." The kids agree, but add, "that's the way we found it."

### FRENCH OFFICE PICKETED OVER ALGERIAN FREEDOM

The French Tourist Office, an agency of the French government, was picketed in New York City on April 12th in protest of French action in Algeria. The picket line was called by the Student Committee for Algerian Freedom, an ad hoc group, and was supported by the Young Socialist League and the Libertarian League.

"Silence is Complicity" was the main slogan appearing on the thousands of leaflets that were distributed to explain the meaning of the picket line. "We are not a silent generation," the Committee's leaflet stated, "we proclaim that these planes and bombs, this money that is used to make America a symbol of support for tyranny, they are not ours, they do not represent us. . . . We protested Russian tyranny in Hungary; shall we ignore French tyranny in Algeria?"

The Student Committee in its press release completely disassociated themselves from Guy Mollet. They said: "We have nothing in common with such socialism, for we recognize that the right of democratic self-determination—in Algeria as well as in Budapest—must be a principled cause of the radical and socialist movements."

The police department limited the line to 15 persons at a time, because of the congested nature of the area, and so the 35 picketeers rotated walking on the line.

Although a number of individuals passing the picket line quite vocally defended the French in Algeria (including a few French people), others thought the pickets were right in their views (again including some French people). The picket line was met by a mixed reception, but overall it appeared to this observer that the crowd sympathized with the line.

M.M.S.

A DISCUSSION ARTICLE

# The Relevance of Leninism

This article appears as part of the discussion "of all questions relating to the reconstruction and re-unification of the socialist movement in the United States" which was inaugurated in the columns of Labor Action in our February 10 issue. Articles submitted as part of this discussion must not exceed 1200 words.

While the LABOR ACTION staff is free to enter this discussion on the same basis as others, it will not be the policy of the editorial board to comment on or reply to articles, regardless of how much we may disagree with them.—Ed.

By GORDON HASKELL

Some two months ago, LABOR ACTION announced that it was formally opening its pages to a "discussion of all questions relating to the reconstruction and re-unification of the socialist movement in the United States." The first two contributions received and printed in this discussion dealt primarily with Leninism, the Russian Revolution, and related problems.

This may not be the most auspicious possible beginning of a discussion of the problems which confront socialists in 1958 in the United States. It bespeaks, perhaps, a serious concern among socialists that in addressing themselves to the problems of their present and their future they do not neglect to relate themselves properly to the past of socialism as a world movement. Such a concern is quite proper, and indeed indispensable to the construction of a serious and healthy socialist movement . . . but. But only if it is given its appropriate weight as a factor in the education of socialists, not as a political issue among them. And further, only if the past of the world socialist movement, including the Russian Revolution, is recognized as only one part of the past which needs to be learned from, another large part consisting, for American socialists, of the history of American society as a whole.

## BOURGEOIS PSYCHOLOGY

In the April 7 issue of LABOR ACTION, William Stanley states that "the corruption of the Social Democratic movements over the years and the Stalinization of the Communist parties as well can be explained only by the same psychological factor—the bourgeois psychology of the leaders. . . . The fact is that there have been numerous revolutionary situations over the years, but there have not been men of Lenin's calibre in a position to take advantage of them."

I would not seek to deny that the socialist movement can do better with great leaders than without them. But it is hard to see why, if one attributes past failures to "bourgeois psychology," one should stop with the leaders. Surely one cannot content that in the past fifty years of turmoil, upheaval and struggle there was only one instance in which the socialist workers, who presumably lack "bourgeois psychology," were able to throw up a single leader whose political psychology approximated their own to a sufficient degree (Lenin). Whatever faults Kamenev, Zinoviev and Bukharin may have had, it is doubtful whether socialists in the future can pin their hopes on finding men to lead them who will be more thoroughly socialists than they were.

## TOO MUCH LENINISM?

They were limited, of course, by their place and time, and by the experience of the socialist movement up to that time. We have an enormous advantage: the historical experience of the past forty years. It is only to the extent that we have been able to assimilate and learn from that vast historical experience that we can hope to be better men, from the point of view of the construction of a sounder movement and the winning of a more durable victory, than they were.

David Ross, in the February 10 issue of LABOR ACTION appears to be concerned lest socialists today, and perhaps particularly the socialist in the Independent

Socialist League, carry with them too much of a burden of Leninism. He argues that Lenin himself ended up by presiding over an authoritarian one-party state, and that even his theoretical ideas about the socialist state to be found in *State and Revolution* were disorienting because they were "alien to a consideration of formal democratic-national institutions."

It would be impossible to attempt to discuss Ross' description of Lenin's role and ideas in this article, and for my money, it is unnecessary to do so. For the real question, in the context of the subject we are discussing seems to me to be this: exactly what is the relationship of the ISL to Leninism? That is, to what extent can a better grasp of Lenin's historical role enhance the ISL's contribution to the reconstruction of the socialist movement in America?

If we were a Russian organization, there would be no question of the importance of this historical question. As a matter of fact, there is ample evidence that Russian oppositionists tend in many cases to adopt the slogan "back to Lenin" as a symbol of their political orientation. And since in no other country has "Leninism" been more abused and distorted out of all recognition, it is quite understandable that they should designate themselves as "original Leninists" so as to make it clear that they have nothing in common with the latter day "Leninists" such as Stalin and Khrushchev. Though Ross might argue that the Russian oppositionists would do better to drop all reference to Lenin, it is plain that the problem must necessarily look somewhat different to them than it does to us.

## NOT IN ISL

For our part, I think it would be impossible to find a single instance, in the near-decade of the ISL's existence, in which it has referred to itself as an organization based on the principles of Leninism, or as the formula more usually went in earlier days "on the principles of Marxism, as stated and developed by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky" (at times Luxemborg and Debs were thrown in for good measure). To be sure, such references did occur in the earlier days of the Workers Party, and more frequently even in the Socialist Workers Party before the bulk of the present leadership of the ISL separated from it in 1940.

The fact is that the ISL did not abandon this mode of describing itself because of inattention, or due to legal pressures. In the old days the formula was used as a method of marking off the general historic tendency of our movement from other historic tendencies, such as the Stalinists and the Social Democracy. By the end of World War II, however, it was no longer possible to consider the lines of division which had been created during and right after World War I as the decisive ones. We were urging our co-thinkers in Europe to join and work loyally in the Social Democracy. And not differences over Leninism, but a whole series of concrete issues and struggles put a vast gulf between us and all aspects of Stalinism. The farther we got from the problems, struggles, and dividing lines of Lenin's time, the clearer it became that he, and his views, could not be a guide, even if a general one, to our politics.

It will, of course, be perfectly legitimate, and perhaps in its proper context, very fruitful, to continue to discuss the role and ideas of Lenin and of the Russian Revolution. But unless someone with a following is proposing that the socialist movement in the United States be reconstructed and re-united on "Leninist" lines or principles (however such a person might propose to interpret those terms), it is hard to see in what way a discussion of these matters can vitally affect the problem which we have set ourselves.

**SCREEN the NEWS with Labor Action**  
A sub. is \$2 a year—

## Readers of Labor Action Take the Floor

### MORE ON LENINISM

To the Editors:

William Stanley's "On Socialist Consciousness" (LABOR ACTION, April 7) does not meet the issues raised in my February 10 discussion article "In the Spirit of Leninism?"

One point made in my article was that most democrats must look with justifiable suspicion upon those who today insist upon calling themselves Leninists. "Lenin's role and ideas during his last period have not fallen into historical obscurity. Leninism today must still include the ideology of its last undemocratic development." My article referred to the reluctant authoritarianism in practice and ideology of the Bolsheviks under Lenin toward the end of his regime. The article did not, as Stanley seems to think, invoke this later authoritarianism as the explanation for the degeneration of the Russian revolution from the very beginning.

The second major point of my article was that the vast complexity of modern society requires as direct a popular control as possible over the very top levels

of the state. I advocated direct national elections through proportional representation, as well as workers councils at the factory and local levels. Socialists in America should advocate some form of national elections under which workers can vote directly for those who will represent them in a national congress. Stanley's misinterpretation is evident when he states that "Ross' organizational solution in no sense goes beyond Leninism"; apparently he did not notice the word "direct," which I meant literally. Leninism virtually makes a principle of an indirect process of representation which always begins with an election to some local council. Members of the next higher council are elected in turn by these local delegates.

Lastly, my statement that Leninism neglected and was alien to a consideration of the problems of formal, national democracy cannot be answered with the reply that the All-Russian Congress of Soviets was (for a time) a democratic national institution.

David Ross

### BOOKS AND IDEAS

## Education of a Stalinist

CHILD OF THE REVOLUTION by Wolfgang Leonhard, Henry Regnery Co., 428 pages, \$6.50.

This is a fascinating account of life in Russia by a German who went there as a boy in the early thirties, and left after World War II. The author has sought to reproduce the feelings and thoughts of a young Stalinist rather than to analyze his experience from the perspective of hindsight. Though the treatment is strictly autobiographical, much of general interest and value about social attitudes, political practices and problems under Stalinism is brought to light.

Though his mother was sent to a concentration camp during the great purges, Leonhard was trained at the special Comintern school, and finally returned to Germany with Ulbricht group of the National Committee for a Free Germany. He participated in the reorganization of political life in East Germany, the founding of the Socialist Unity Party (SED), and its thorough Stalinization. After a period of growing doubts, he finally broke with Stalinism when Tito's Yugoslavia was thrown out of the Cominform. He fled to Belgrade, where he worked for two years. He is now at Oxford, in England.

As far as one can judge from the last section of the book, Leonhard's current views are those of a Titoist of more or less liberal leanings. In Tito's Yugoslavia he sees the kind of "democracy" which is indispensable to socialism. A more detailed and precise evaluation of Stalinism as a social system is promised by the author in a book on which he is now working.

Among the most striking assertions made by Leonhard is that the typical bourgeois propaganda directed at Stalinism had virtually no influence on him or

on other Stalinist officials whom he found were secretly in opposition to the regime or many of its policies. Such material was furnished students in the higher party schools, and was made readily available to the middle and higher officials of the regime. Strictly prohibited, however, was any literature directed against the regime from a Marxist point of view. This applied, of course, to the writings of Trotsky and the Trotskyists, and later of the Titoists. Everyone was expected to denounce them without ever having read them. One of the turning points in Leonhard's own development came when he chanced to get hold of a copy of the old *Militant* with a basic article by Trotsky in it (he was sorting out the archives of the American section of the Comintern at the time.)

Another striking point is the almost total isolation of the middle and upper layers of the bureaucracy from any contact with the population at large. They live together, vacation together, work together, eat together and travel together. Their knowledge of what the people of their own country are thinking comes at best through prepared intelligence reports, such as they receive on the political moods in foreign lands. Their way of life isolates them as much if not more than does that of any other ruling class in the world.

Further, the political structure of the regime isolates them from the thought even of the mass of the bureaucracy. Party conferences or conferences of government officials are briefing sessions at which the tops tell the rest what the line is. Reports from the field are confined to discussions of how the line is being carried out, difficulties encountered, etc. Occasional attempts of individual bureaucrats to bring up problems which run counter to the notions of the top leaders are squelched, and people who persist in such attempts soon are dumped from the ruling group.

If Leonhard's picture is fairly accurate, and there is no reason to doubt it, this ruling class guarantees that it will receive abrupt and unpleasant surprises from its subjects. And in its hour of trial, it will find less loyalty among its own members than any ruling class which has gone down before it.

G. K. H.

### LABOR ACTION '18' YEAR

April 21, 1958 Vol. 22, No. 8  
Published every other week by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone WATKINS 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter July 26, 1957 under the act of March 3, 1879.—Subscription: \$2 a year; \$1 for 6 months.—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: GORDON HASKELL  
Assoc. Editor: HERMAN BENSON  
Business Manager: MRS. STALK  
Editorial Board: GORDON HASKELL, MAX MARTIN, HERMAN BENSON, SAM BOTTONE

### FUND DRIVE BOX SCORE

	Quota	Paid	%
Cleveland .....	150	\$110	73
Chicago .....	2000	1188	59
Pittsburgh .....	175	90	51
Bay Area .....	\$ 500	250	50
Seattle .....	150	70	47
Detroit .....	450	210	47
New York .....	3800	1726	46
Buffalo .....	150	30	20
Newark .....	450	74	16
Philadelphia .....	200	20	10
National Office .....	1150	95	9
Los Angeles .....	650	0	0
Oregon .....	50	0	0
Reading .....	50	0	0
Streator .....	25	0	0
Mass. ....	25	0	0
<b>TOTAL .....</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>\$3863</b>	<b>38</b>

# Young Socialist CHALLENGE

April 21, 1958

Edited and Published by the YOUNG SOCIALIST LEAGUE

TEN CENTS

## Chinese Students Take Lead In Bold Fight for Democracy

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

During the tumultuous days of criticism throughout China which followed upon Mao's speech of February, 1957, and in the period of vicious repression against "rightists" (i.e. anyone who spoke up), the students played an important role. In part, this has already been documented by *Challenge*. But now, thanks to the editors of magazine *Saturn*, we are able to develop an even fuller picture of what went on and of the particular place in these events of the students.

A central focus of much of the student activity were the wall newspapers in the various colleges and universities. An official dispatch (from the New China News Agency) told of how the campaign developed at the University of Peking. On May 19, 1957, the first posters appeared. By that evening, the assistant secretary of the Party Committee declared that putting up various views was "not a good way to develop the rectification campaign." But the students didn't stop. According to one report, more than five hundred posters had been put up by May 22.

### PICKS UP MOMENTUM

At first, these happenings were greeted by the regime. Thus it is that our initial information comes from official sources which boast of the University carrying on its "revolutionary traditions." But then the campaign began to pick up momentum. Student clubs were organized: "The Society of a Hundred Flowers," "The Voice of the Lower Class," "The Free Tribunal." At almost every point, the demand was the same, for an extension of democracy, for an end to censorship, for freedom of the press.

Soon the movement began to spread. It reached Tsinghua University, the People's University, the Teacher's Training College, the School of Mines, the Russian Language Institute. In each case, there were "democratic walls," and student groups formed for political discussion. By the time the movement came to Hanyang (as *Challenge* has reported) it erupted into a full-scale strike of eight hundred students—the strike leaders were later executed. At Nanking University slogans were raised such as "Let us fight for democratic freedom!" and "The special privileges of the Communist Party and the Communist Youth League must be abolished!"

Some of the student statements in this period are extremely revealing of the awareness of the young people of the fundamental aspects of the regime. In Shenyang, two young instructors commented on the collectivization of the land: "The co-operative movement was launched with a heavy barrage of propaganda. In reality, it was launched too soon. It is not true that the peasants joined the co-operatives knowingly and willingly. In fact the majority were forced to join. This explains why the personnel of co-operatives are inadequately trained and mediocre, why they operate in the midst of confusion and disorder, why they are so over-staffed and why their members seem so little eager to work."

### EXPOSED NERVE

This statement must have touched an exposed nerve in the regime. For these difficulties have been stated, hinted at, discussed, by the government itself. It will be remembered that in Mao's speech the Communist dictator spoke of those who argue that the collectives "have no superior qualities." The criticism from Shenyang, coming after the speech, was an expression of precisely this point of view.

But some of the comments went even deeper. One of the most notable was that of Lin Hsi-ling, a fourth year student at the Law School of the University of Peking. No one could accuse her of having been an old reactionary. As a young girl, she had served for four years in the Chinese Red Army, and later, she had published an essay on Balzac and Tolstoy in the *Literary Gazette*. At twenty-one, she had already established herself as an activist and intellectual. In her statement (made on May 23, 1957), Lin Hsi-ling said, "True socialism is highly democratic, but the socialism we have before us is not democratic. To my mind it is a form of socialism based on feudalism. We should not be satisfied with the Party's rectification campaign, with paltry reforms and the scant concessions made to the people."

"We must look within our socialist system in its present state to find the roots

of those three evils: bureaucracy, subjectivism and sectarianism. . . . Neither China nor the Soviet Union has yet done away with class distinctions. . . . I propose that drastic steps be taken to revolutionize completely the existing social system. I do not approve of reformism. What we need is a drastic change, a complete transformation. . . .

"During the campaign to eliminate counter-revolutionaries, the Party unjustly extended the repression to include innocent persons. The case of Liang Tsi-hua is an example. He is now a student at Peit University in Peking. Before the Liberation he was an adversary of both Chiang Kai-shek and the Americans and was arrested ten times by the Koumintang. But after the Liberation, Liang Tsi-hua was unjustly imprisoned and tortured! . . . As a result of his imprisonment and tortures, he contracted a nervous disorder. And still his case is not completely settled. . . .

"During the campaign to eliminate counter-revolutionaries, 720,000 persons were unjustly convicted. . . . In China, there is no freedom of the press. . . . The Communist Party has replaced the government. . . . In 1956, I went from Peking to Yumen and saw workers strike with my own eyes."

Thus, the voice of a revolutionary student. Understandably, Chinese totalitarianism could not countenance such open criticism. The great movement for "rectification" was shattered by the vicious police action against "rightists"—against all who took seriously Mao's invitation to criticize. The voice of the students, their wall newspapers, their clubs, was temporarily stilled. And yet, not before we could glimpse the importance of the student movement in the changes which will come in China. For here, indeed, is a center of criticism, a center which is dedicated to democracy and to the democratization of power in Chinese society—to socialism.

### "MAY FOURTH MOVEMENT"

This happened last May. And as we now approach a new May, we might remember an earlier Chinese student movement which shook the world: the "May 4th Movement" of 1919. This campaign was set off by the agreement among the Allies at the end of World War I to side with Japan—and to go back on all the brave, Wilsonian promises which had been directed to China. The gigantic movement which was set off by the students literally began a revolution in China. It involved a cultural over-turn, a period of intense debate and discussion, the beginning of the revolutionary movement which was to be betrayed by Stalin and the Comintern in the late twenties.

The May Movement of 1957 faced a much more ruthless foe than the western imperialism of 1919: it was confronted by the power of totalitarian Communism. And yet, in its brief life, it proved that the revolutionary tradition has survived among the Chinese students; even under Communism, that we shall hear from them again, perhaps in a movement as far reaching as that of May 4, 1919.

## YSL Fund Drive in Danger; Give!

By SY LANDY

The 1958 Young Socialist League Fund Drive is scheduled to end on May 8, 1958. With the drive more than half over, the returns have been decidedly poor in comparison with the expected total.

The YSL set \$1450 as its goal, because of its expanded activities and the generally high demand for our speakers, literature, and educational materials—all of which costs money. The high morale of our membership in general plus the heartening increase in membership indicates that the quotas can assuredly be made.

Most units and organizing committees have written to say that they will fulfill their original estimates but need more time to do so. A few areas with relatively high quotas have indicated that they may not reach their goals, what with the recession and the level of unemployment.

### A GLANCE

A glance at the accompanying table will indicate the returns. As is obvious, the necessity for an increase in the remittances by the various areas is an absolute must, and all units will have to re-

double their efforts to get the money in as soon as possible. Our unit may wait, but our creditors will not.

The National Office of the YSL has projected several pamphlets which it is unable to produce for lack of money. Recently we issued a 4-page special issue of *Challenge*, the "Defense of Man." Practically every area reported that the issue is being received avidly by students and youth in their locales. Because we were, for monetary reasons, unable to afford a large run, we could not meet the demand.

Two editions of the basic pamphlet "What is the YSL" have been exhausted in the last few months and a third badly needed reprint awaits funds before it can be produced.

Several successful tours have been completed since the beginning of the drive but the major ones are yet to come, and these too necessitate funds. We could go

on and on describing our needs and only scratch the surface.

The young socialist movement stands on the brink of a new resurgence; the thaw on the campus, while not huge, has proved that the acceptance of socialist ideas is growing. Our speakers get large audiences; our units grow by leaps and bounds; our role in helping to achieve democratic socialist unity on both the adult and youth scenes increases every moment. We hope that the YSL membership, our friends and sympathizers help us reach new people and fight for the progressive causes we hold in common.

Therefore the National Office of the Young Socialist League urgently requests to its membership and friends that they send us as much money as they can possibly spare. No amount is too large nor too small. Make checks payable to Sy Landy and send them to YSL, 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

### WHAT'S THE SCORE ?

	Quota	Rec'd
New York	\$ 620	\$234.50
Pittsburgh	50	21.00
Chicago	140	120.00
Philadelphia	25	27.00
Albuquerque	35	5.00
Los Angeles	50	—
Bay Area	125	35.00
Seattle	75	15.00
Buffalo	25	10.00
New Haven	60	30.00
Westchester	10	3.00
Albany	35	—
At Large & N.O.	205	11.00
(Incl. Cleveland, Boston, St. Louis, Denver, etc.)		
Total	\$1450	511.50

## New York Student SANE Institute

"Youth Faces the Nuclear Age" will be the theme of the city-wide Institute on Saturday, May 10, sponsored by the New York Students Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

The Institute Committee has planned for a keynote speech in the morning to be followed in the afternoon by approximately 10 panels covering three major areas: Science, Education and International Affairs. Total expected attendance at the all-day session should reach 250 from at least 15 colleges and high schools.

The N. Y. Students Committee and its member campus groups have been working closely with the adult New York Committee which has just completed its APPEAL FOR SANITY WEEK, including major rallies around the metropoli-

tan area and a letter-writing campaign to Senators Ives and Javits.

Columbia University, City College, New York University, Brooklyn College, Cooper Union, Hunter, and Queens College are schools where Student Sane Committees have either been organized or are in the process of being formed.

### CORRECTION

In the last issue of *Challenge* it was reported that over "100 colleges and highschools were represented at the N. Y. Students Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy initial city-wide meeting." This was a typographical error. The correct number was "over 10."

# East Bay Residents Demonstrate Against Nuclear Testing Danger

By GEORGE R. MacKENZIE

Berkeley, Calif., April 8

Recent concern with and demonstrations against nuclear tests were reflected by activities in the East Bay over this last weekend with YSLers participating on both days. Arising out of the discovery that the rainfall of the previous weekends contained critical amounts of fallout, an Emergency Bay Area Fallout Committee drew up a leaflet which outlined the extent of the danger. The leaflet pointed out that the generalized policy of secrecy by the AEC had prevented announcement of this hazard to public safety, and that the State Department of Public Health had no continuous program of monitoring food supplies. It concluded by urging the public to ask for more funds for the Health Department for this purpose and to work for the cessation of nuclear tests. The leaflets were distributed at various places in Berkeley on Saturday. Responses were generally friendly and indicated an attitude of concern.

On Sunday some 250 persons gathered for a protest demonstration sponsored by the Northern California Committee for the Abolition of Nuclear Tests. Demonstrators marched from the rallying point for about a mile to the area of the University of California campus, distributing both the leaflets used the day before and leaflets explaining the demonstration. Placards were carried bearing such slogans as "No Contamination Without Representation," "Thou Shall Not Kill," "End the Rain of Terror," and "Peace Talk Instead of Eniwetok." A car with a public address system accompanied the demonstrators, explaining the recent fallout danger in the Bay Area and the dangers of bomb tests generally, describing other demonstrations which have occurred recently.

## POLICE BLOCK MARCH

Upon arriving at the campus, the marchers were transported by cars to an area back of the UC Football stadium. From there it was originally planned to march to the Radiation Laboratory to stage the demonstration. However, the demonstrators were halted by university police who stated that the recent heavy rains had created slides which made passage to the Rad Lab impossible. Suspensions were aroused when a truck was allowed to pass through, though it is possible the truck's destination lay short of the alleged slides.

The plans to reach the Rad Lab thwarted, the demonstrators remained in the area behind the stadium where they were given a pep talk, plans for future activities were announced, and a collection was taken. Then they marched from this area for another mile into downtown Berkeley.

When they reached downtown Berkeley, the marchers were driven to downtown Oakland, where they formed a picket line and marched back and forth in front of the AEC office, passing out leaflets and singing "We Shall Not Be Moved" and "Down by the River Side." Their spirits were not daunted when the rain which had been threatening all afternoon finally materialized. The demonstration continued for about half an hour in the rain before it was finally broken up and the afternoon's proceedings ended.

## ENCOURAGING

The afternoon's events gave some modest but tangible reasons for encouragement. Response to the demonstrations was generally either neutral or friendly. Reactions of vituperative hostility, encountered with such regularity in recent years by radical demonstrations, occurred only occasionally.

While the demonstration may not have been numerically large in comparison with its counterparts in other areas, it compares favorably with protest movements which have occurred in this area in recent times. The number of photographers on hand to immortalize the occasion would have done credit to any visiting dignitary. Their presence and purpose were generally realized by the demonstrators, who, however displayed a willingness to carry on despite threats to their personal security, in refreshing contrast to the widespread timidity which has prevailed for so many years.

Of interest also was the working together of two elements which have tended in the past to exist in isolation from and frequently in hostility toward each other: religious and pacifist groups on the one hand and radicals of various persuasions on the other. Perhaps the undercurrent of difference was most noticeable in the differing attitudes toward how to deal with the university police in the incident described above. Otherwise such differing attitudes were noteworthy chiefly for their absence, as all those participating gave themselves to the afternoon's activities with a oneness of purpose.

# Skilled Trades Revolt Still Bedevils UAW

By JACK WILSON

Detroit, Mich.

The revolt of the skilled trades is increasing enormously the difficulties of the 1958 wage and contract negotiations between the United Auto Workers and the Big Three of the industry, General Motors, Ford and Chrysler.

There are over 60 petitions before the National Labor Relations Board signed by UAW skilled workers in many strategic plants which seek an election to determine which union shall represent them. These petitions were secured by either the Society of Skilled Trades or the Federation of Skilled workers.

Until the legal questions involved are solved by NLRB decisions, the UAW cannot bargain for the skilled trades in the plants from which the petitions came.

## RAMIFICATIONS

The ramifications of this development have dismayed both corporation and union negotiators. The breadth and scope of the revolt also came as quite a surprise to both of them; the corporations which once seemed to be encouraging the revolt against the UAW now are caught in a maze of entanglements for which pat answers are not easy to find.

For a clear picture of the situation it is necessary to recall that in 1955 the Big Three thought they had given the UAW a big package when the Supplementary Unemployment Benefits were started, and other fringe benefits improved. When Carl Stellato, Ford Local 600 president, went to the ranks with that package he honestly hailed it as a real victory. He was shocked at the boos, and then the revolt in the form of a wildcat strike that took place in the Rouge plant mainly among the skilled workers. General Motors and Chrysler saw a similar experience. In all cases, the dissatisfaction was primarily among the skilled workers who preferred a raise to any SUB which they felt wouldn't benefit them.

A new group called the Society of Skilled Trades mushroomed out of this situation, which the UAW leaders didn't take seriously. When a delegation of loyal UAW skilled workers met with the International Executive Board to demand separate contracts, more representation and other skilled trades desires, they were harshly rebuffed. The Tool and Die Council paper was even suppressed for an issue because it carried this program.

## MORE TALKING POINTS

The bureaucratic pressure, not only failed to end the dissatisfaction but provided the dissidents with more talking points against the UAW program. This became so obvious that at the April 1957 convention of the UAW, the top leaders did an about face and adopted the skilled trades demands, after considerable debate at the sessions since many production workers did not see what was fully involved.

Unfortunately, the new look of the UAW in the skilled trades field didn't end the crisis. Working almost underground, the Society of Skilled Trades signed up UAW members, and now has its claims before the NLRB.

Any objective study of the situation forces one to conclude that seldom has a revolt been more successful in changing the bargaining structure of a union. At the same time to continue the pressure on the top leadership of the UAW by signing up for the Society is a form of insanity as well as dual unionism. It tends to pit production workers against the skilled trades, and it creates a veritable state of anarchy in labor relations.

Among the many dilemmas that arise are these: If the UAW bargains an acceptable package for its production workers, and those skilled workers whom it still represents, the independent skilled unions may well upset the whole applecart by shutting down key plants demanding more than the UAW obtained. If the whole skilled trades issue becomes involved in court battles, perhaps no contracts will be signed, or can be signed. The UAW and the corporations operate in a vacuum in that

case. If the UAW obtains a good, big gain for its skilled workers as a means of destroying the influence of the Society of Skilled Trades which would still have to negotiate its own contracts when it won NLRB elections, then the production workers might revolt since they would feel that the skilled workers got a better deal at their expense.

A long time ago, when they gave up the dream of keeping their workers unorganized, the top brass in the auto industry decided that dealing with one responsible union had advantages over dealing with a large number of them. The present situation is an illustration of the point. But the revolt of the skilled trades workers in the UAW and elsewhere also shows that industrial unions will have to find ways of diversifying their structures and making them more flexible. And in the process they may have to teach the captains of industry that to avoid the trials and uncertainties of multiple negotiations and settlements, they will have to give their skilled workers a little more, not at the expense of the production workers, but in addition to what the latter get.

## Okinawa Self-Rule Urged

"Full self-government" for Okinawa, restricted only by the interests of military security, has been urged by the American Civil Liberties Union.

The civil liberties organization, in protesting the Defense Department's "military interference" in the affairs of Okinawa, during a recent election in the city of Naha, made public an exchange of letters between Roger N. Baldwin, its international work adviser, and General Charles K. Gailey, head of the Department's Civil Affairs Division.

In his letter, Baldwin asserted that the American military commander in Okinawa, General James E. Moore, had changed the rules governing the Naha City Council to assure the ouster of a mayor opposed to the military. "The present half-way measures under which partial self-government is operating under complete authority of the military gives rise to confusion and grievances," Baldwin wrote.

## REPLY

General Gailey contended in his letter that the High Commissioner, "far from violating the principles of democracy, ended on the contrary, a situation which had permitted a willful minority arbitrarily to distort the very essence of democratic maxims." He explained that the ousted mayor's supporters remained persistently absent from the meetings of the Assembly, for the purpose of obstructing the will of the majority to remove the Mayor from office. The presence of two-thirds of the members was required for a removal vote.

Only after two months of such obstruction of the democratic principle of majority rule, General Gailey wrote, and after being petitioned by the press, the Assembly majority, and several respected democratic organizations, did the Commissioner act and modify the rule. He made it possible to vote an ouster with an ample majority of the members present.

This, Mr. Baldwin argued, did not change the fact that (1) military orders changed the law under which the ouster was accomplished, and (2) domination by the military over the civilian government of the city of Naha constitutes a violation of democratic principles.

From *ACLU Bulletin*

# SPOTLIGHT

(Continued from page 1)

nature of their employment at RCA and their knowledge of RCA facilities. However, they refused to answer questions concerning their "beliefs, expressions or associations," relying on the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Watkins case and maintaining that such questioning constituted an interference with their rights under the First Amendment. They did not invoke the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination.

After conclusion of the committee's hearings, RCA suspended Trautman and Testa, in accordance with a general company policy providing for a 60-day suspension without loss of basic pay, of any employee who refused to testify fully in congressional hearings. This is to be followed by dismissal, if full testimony was not forthcoming during the suspension period. Prior to their discharge, both Trautman and Testa had been employed by RCA for more than 20 years in areas designated as non-sensitive by the Defense Department. Neither man's record indicated that he had ever tampered or otherwise attempted to interfere with any of RCA's facilities or that either had divulged or attempted to divulge the contents, substance or purport of any message to any unauthorized person.

The question submitted to arbitrator Sam Harris was whether there was cause,

within the meaning of the agreement between RCA and Local 10 of the American Communications Association, for the discharge.

Arbitrator Harris, said that he felt that the true test under a contract of the type involved was "whether a reasonable man taking into account all relevant circumstances, would find sufficient justification in the conduct of the employee to warrant discharge." Applying that test, he did not find cause for the discharges. He found nothing in the record to support the company's other contentions, emphasizing especially that the anticipated harm to RCA's business because of adverse publicity did not result.

On the issue of national security, Harris found the record "barren of authentic reliable evidence of conduct on the part of Trautman and Testa, which would indicate that they constituted a threat." Citing the U.S. Supreme Court decisions in the Koningsberg and Slochower cases, he said that even though projected against a background of alleged past membership in the Communist Party, refusal on constitutional grounds to answer questions before a Senate committee "does not, without more, provide an adequate basis for concluding that they are disloyal and a threat to the security of RCA and the nation."

From *ACLU Bulletin*

REFLECTIONS ON AN ARTICLE BY JOHN GATES

# The Ex-Communists and the Renewal of American Socialism

By H. W. BENSON

Within a few years, thousands have left the Communist Party; together with other tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of sympathizers and friends, they seem to have melted away as a political force leaving the CP itself nothing but a sectarian shell dominated by the Stalinist-minded Fosterites and allies. What, meanwhile, has happened to the ex-Communists? And what is their state of mind? It is impossible to make any generalization with assurance but a clue to their evolution can be discovered in the March issue of *The Progressive*, a special issue on "The Russians and Ourselves" which includes contributions by Howard Fast and John Gates.

Fast's comments are a reprint of his TV interview with Martin Agronsky shortly after his break with the CP and consequently add nothing essentially new to what he has already written in his book and in his articles. In a personalized account of how he broke with the party, Fast expresses a deep revulsion at the dictatorship in Russia and underlines his own dedication to democracy and socialism. Beyond that, important as it is, he does not enter into the discussion of the future of socialism in the United States and perspectives for ex-Communists. Doubtless, there are many who share his view but who have neither the inclination nor the possibility of expressing it in public. They, we can assume, have no idea of what to do in any organized fashion but are determined to stand for democracy.

## A PLACE FOR EX-CPERS

John Gates, in his article "The Failure of Communism in America," recounts his own past in the party and at the same time looks toward the future of socialism in the United States, without presuming to outline any elaborate perspective for himself or for others. He is concerned with one question in detail, and here he pursues the same objective as he did in his series in the *New York Post*: He is anxious to find, or to claim, a place for the ex-Communist within the liberal, radical, democratic and socialist movements and tendencies of our time. It is a perfectly understandable, and legitimate, objective. Apart from the political line of the CP and of its role as an organization, the tens of thousands who joined it were attracted because they sought democracy and socialism however distorted their image became and however devious the path seemed to them.

It was a paradox and a tragedy that they could be led to support and sustain a terrible anti-socialist dictatorship. But at last, they were driven out of the CP because they realized, in the end, that it had betrayed the very ideals they sought within it. It is not necessarily true of all; some have doubtless abandoned all ideals to join the ranks of the cynics and sneerers who scoff at the very possibility of socialism and freedom. But many remained dedicated to socialism; it required a long time and shattering events to convince them that the road to socialism was not through the CP or through totalitarian dictatorship.

But so it happened. And now, those who have broken with the CP because they want to work for democracy, peace and socialism must seek an outlet for their ideals without the undignified recantations and humiliating confessions that they remember so well from Stalinism. So far, we have no reason to look for a quarrel with Gates.

Gates writes principally of the CP but he comments briefly on the failure of socialism generally in the United States. "All [socialist groups] are out of joint with the American people, although for different reasons. The fault, I believe, lies not with the people but with the socialist movements. They all require a good look at themselves, their theories and programs and need to make big changes to help bring about a mass American socialist movement." And, as one "tentative idea" he suggests, "America needs a mass radical movement. I use the term 'radical' advisedly—first, because we need to get closer to the root of matters; secondly, because radicalism is a more embracing concept than socialism. Few Americans as yet believe in socialism, but many are interested in fundamental reforms that fall short of socialism but are necessary for its achievement."

Surely, everyone has made mistakes. On that, we remain on safe ground. The nature of these mistakes and the degree to which they contributed to the failures of socialism—these questions will be debated and discussed for a long time. So, too, policies, programs, changes, evaluation and reevaluation will occupy the attention

of any intellectually alert and politically effective movement. Above all, socialism must be properly related to all radical movements. There are, by the way, movements of this type already in existence. The CIO was one; there is the ADA, the Liberal Party; the AFL-CIO. Everything is relative and in the context of the American scene these are the radicals with a mass following.

## WHAT DO WE DO NOW?

Perhaps Gates is right that a new radical movement of some kind will come. In that case, the socialist movement will have to find its proper place within it. Socialism must not be separated from any mass radical movement. Nevertheless, we hope that it will always remain a distinctive current. In any case, what do we do now? The problem today is to find the most effective way of building the socialist movement and for that, to examine the position of every socialist tendency and the relations among them. And, in this, where do the ex-Communists stand and where do they belong?

Gates was one of the top leaders of the CP; his resignation was a big blow to it and a political act of the greatest significance, coming as it did after a dispute that necessarily raised issues of the most basic consequence to socialism. During the fight inside the CP, he and his followers spoke up with some passion. In the *Progressive* article he reviews the struggle in the CP, and some of the issues and ideas around which it revolved.

He relates that the successes in Russia had "blinded us to its errors and crimes." And at a meeting of the party national committee, "This Soviet intervention in Hungary, I found myself saying, is a crime, a crime it will take us years to overcome, I cried out, 'For the first time in all my years in the Party, I feel ashamed of the name Communist.'" He is ready to be "critical of the failure of these [Communist] countries to achieve political democracy" and he sees now that "Political Democracy does not come automatically with the transfer of production from private to public ownership—a fact which I and many others were late in appreciating. Power can be abused; tyrannies can arise in planned societies; and eternal vigilance is the price of liberty for socialism too." (Like others who have left the CP he has not yet faced up to this question: how, where there is tyranny can you speak of "public" ownership? Is socialism impossible without democracy?)

He assesses his stand inside the CP and its 1956 program as follows: "The changes were so fundamental that if carried out the Communist Party would no longer be a Communist Party in the traditional sense but something altogether different." It is fair then to say that Gates is truly an ex-Communist; he stands for "something altogether different." But the question then arises for him and those who think like him; how do you distinguish yourself from the various socialist groups and tendencies that already exist?

## IMPLIED CRITICISM

Gates does not pretend to reply, "After 27 years of dogmatic adherence to the Communist Party, I do not profess to have the answers. I feel the need to think, to study, to listen to others, to discuss and debate. I am in no haste to join or form something new." But Gates does offer an implied criticism of various socialist groups; and it is here that we get an inkling of his own views:

"A revitalized socialist movement must not only clarify its relations with the broader movements of the workers and others. It must also reexamine its relations with the Communist-led countries. If American Communists have been blinded by admiration, other socialists have been

blinded by hate. Those obsessed with hostility to the Communist countries as their chief reason for existence lack independence just as much as do the Communists and, however unwittingly, help sustain the cold war and domestic witchhunts."

It is painful to read it—and terribly disappointing—but there it is. Presumably, the various socialist groups have been "blinded by hate" and "obsessed with hostility"; while Gates is not. His attitude here is undoubtedly shared by many ex-Communists who imagine that Socialists are "anti-Soviet" and prefer nothing more than denouncing Russia.

## HOLDOVER FROM THE PAST

But this is all an ironic holdover from the past. The underlying basis for the opinion has been actually discarded but the conclusion that derived from it remains. In other words it is nothing more than a pure prejudice, at best. What, for example, is the actual meaning of "anti-Soviet"? If it presumably refers to those who would like to see capitalism restored in Russia, it would be hard to find socialists of any type who propose it, except perhaps among candidates for a mental institution. Does it apply to those who might call for a war on Russia? Who suggests that? There remain only those who would adjust their own policy in every respect to U.S. foreign policy, seeing in the military might of America the only bulwark against Russia. There are some who hold such views but only a small and dwindling circle.

Gates realizes that "tyrannies can arise in planned societies." There is no question that a majority of socialists in the United States believe that such a tyranny has risen inside Russia and they speak out against it vigorously and publicly. No one is idiotic enough to contend that the basis for building a strong socialist movement in the United States is attacking injustice in Russia. Socialists concentrate in the main on the fight for democracy and socialism here and devote themselves to the problems of America. But at the same time, it is our obligation to speak out against injustice everywhere, in the United States and in Algiers as well as in Russia. The question is: does a vigorous and public opposition to dictatorship in Russia make a socialist "anti-Soviet," "blinded by hate," "obsessed by hostility"?

When he was still in the Communist Party, Gates found it possible to criticize Russian policy as criminal without helping to sustain the cold war, even in the face of Fosterite charges that his friends were helping the witchhunt. And, presumably, he is able to do the same outside the party. Are we entitled to say publicly now what Gates and his supporters said then inside the party? Or, do we somehow become "anti-Soviet"?

Consider it from another angle. At one time in recent history, Socialists denounced the Moscow Trials as monstrous frameups; they protested against the execution of the Bundists, Ehrlich and Alter; they cried out against Stalinist terror; they tried to arouse world opinion against the extermination of whole nationalities. There were few Communists who believed at the time that these charges were anything more than lies.

It is understandable, then, that they must have assumed that Socialists were nothing but fanatical, even perverted, "anti-Soviet" elements, obsessed by hostility. But those times are gone. Now, we know that even the wildest charges of Stalin's enemies fell far short of the awful truth: it is that knowledge which has destroyed the American Communist Party and driven the vast majority of its membership toward democracy. It was nothing more than the same knowledge acquired earlier, not blind hatred, that turned most Socialists into vocal opponents of the Russian ruling regime.

## ALL FOR DEMOCRACY NOW

We are all for democracy now and that is a good thing. But will it come in Communist countries as a dispensation from the rulers above to the masses below; will it come through an internal evolution of the regimes themselves toward freedom, a little more with each passing year? Gates is not quite ready to say; in any case, he essays no clear statement in the *Progressive*. But we think it fair to say that such are his leanings. If so, he shares a view accepted by many others in the world socialist movement.

Or, will democracy come through the struggle of the people against their regimes? Such is our own view. This has nothing to do with being "anti-Soviet"; it has nothing to do with stimulating the cold war or provoking antagonisms among the nations. Only a madman would want a new war. But this is what we believe because we have no confidence in the ruling classes anywhere—capitalist or Communist and because as socialists we look toward the workers, the students, the democrats. There has been evaluation and reevaluation and we have done our share of examining the past in order to prepare for the future. But in this respect, we find no need to alter our opinion, except perhaps to make it clearer and to implant it deeper in our own consciousness.

No one should demand that John Gates and the ex-Communists for whom he speaks have a completely rounded-out point of view. They have come a long way in a short while under the impact of stunning events. And it is not necessary, of course, that their views become completely consistent, let alone that they coincide completely with our own or with those of other existing socialist tendencies before they can find a fruitful place in a renewed democratic socialist movement. But the cause of socialist renewal will hardly be served by insistence on their part that other socialists renounce their opposition to the dictatorial regime in Russia.

## NEW YORK CITY ISL AND YSL May Day Celebration

Friday Evening, May 2 8:30 P.M.

Adelphi Hall 74 5th Ave. (Near 14th St.)

Enjoy Once Again

THE YSL PLAYERS

SINGING . . . BUFFET REFRESHMENT . . . DANCING

Brief Greetings By

MAX SHACHTMAN

Contribution \$1.50

YSL 75c

# Government Sits on Hands—

(Continued from page 1)

the surface. That is the meaning of the growing number of predictions that even recovery will leave the American economy with a pool of unemployment much larger than anything we have known since World War II.

**But what about the famous "know-how" in recession-fighting which was acquired by economists, businessmen and government officials, presumably during the '30s? Like everything else under capitalism when things begin to go wrong, its distribution is arbitrary, capricious and unbalanced. The people with the knowledge don't have the power to implement it, and the people with the power don't understand either what has gone wrong or what to do about it.**

This is not a slander. The fact is that out of the welter of theories about what has gone wrong, and of the weight to be attributed to various factors, one theory is emerging as the dominant dogma of the business world. That is that toward the middle or end of last year, for reasons which are none too clear, people simply stopped spending their money, and began to hoard it. The answer to the recession? Get the spending by individuals going again!

## POCKET MONEY

Here is a key passage from the General Electric Company's *Public and Employee Relations News*: "disposable personal income in the U. S. reached its peak in the third quarter of 1957, sometime after the appearance of the first signals of the recession that was soon to materialize. It is clear, then, that recessions don't start because people have too little purchasing power, but, instead, because they do not choose to spend what purchasing power they have. As every battle-scarred salesman knows, there is an important distinction between money in the pocket and money over the counter." (Emphasis in the original.)

**But why did people suddenly decide not to spend their money? On that both GE and many of its co-thinkers are a little vague. When you look carefully, it boils down to one thing. Too high wages. Yes, that is what they mean. Unions forced wages up too high. Employers had to raise prices. Prices got too high for consumers who decided they would rather sock it away in the bank than buy.**

On April 18, the U. S. *News and World Report* spelled it out in its "Newsgram" for the busy executive:

"You see, a simple situation accounts for many present-day troubles.

"The situation is this: *In unions* are about 15 million workers. *Not in unions* are about 47 million workers. *Organized workers* for the last 12 years have enjoyed an annual merry-go-round of pay raises that were followed by price increases. *Unorganized workers*—from farmers to white-collar people to self-employed—trailed along, often not able to keep up.

"*The joy ride ended* when the general public no longer could borrow or beg enough to buy all the high-priced products factory workers turned out." (Emphasis in original.)

## BORROW OR BEG

The only variation here from the standard theme is the admission that to keep on buying all that could be produced the "general public" had to "borrow or beg." Though this was no doubt intended as a literary flourish, it expresses an important truth about what had kept consumer purchases as high as they were for the past few years: borrowing, installment buying.

**But once the recession had got under way, what to do about it? Some of the economists who have latched on to the line of reasoning described above give fairly involved answers. But by the time it trickles down to the man in the street, say a fellow by the name of Dwight Eisenhower, it all gets highly simplified. Thus at his press conference on April 9:**

**Question:** Mr. President, I would like to ask you a question about what people should do to make the recession recede.

**Answer:** Buy.

Q. But what?

A. Anything. . . . Look here, once America just buys the things it wants our people, our manufacturers, will be busy making those things.

## RECESSION DEEPENS

The recession deepens. The number of unemployed climbs above six million. The number who have exhausted their unemployment compensation "cushion" grows weekly. Business failures reach a post-war high. Relief loads in the cities grow faster each week. Mortgage foreclosures increase. One out of every seven Negro workers is unemployed. One out of seven workers under 24 is unemployed.

**Despite wage increases here and there, weekly wages in industry continue to drop due to cutting out all overtime pay and increasing numbers of the employed on short work weeks. Unemployment among white-collar workers begins to show up on an increasing scale. Opening wage offers for such workers as stenographers and secretaries are down \$10 per week in a couple of months. Installment repayments are running ahead of new installment buying.**

Marriages are running eight per cent below a year ago, off about 120,000 on an annual basis. The birth-rate has stopped rising. And increasingly one reads in the papers: those sad, recession items about

fathers and mothers, driven beyond the last boundary of hopelessness and desperation, taking their own lives and those of their little ones rather than continuing in such misery.

## HIGH WAGES

But the businessmen's economists say: high wages did it. And the president, while announcing that he has now decided to hold off on anything as drastic as a tax cut tells everyone that the answer to the recession is: "Buy."

The amazing thing is that in the last few weeks, just when all predictions of a bottoming out of the recession this spring proved wrong, earlier tendency of the administration to speak in terms of a tax cut and other relatively quick-acting anti-recession measures have given way to a definite "wait longer and see more" attitude.

**Instead of taking action to relieve the distress of the unemployed on a massive scale, and to increase purchasing power at the bottom as quickly as possible, government and business spokesmen give themselves over to talk about "the basic soundness of our economy," and warnings against any action now which might increase the danger of inflation later.**

True, the Democrats as a whole seem less impressed by the dogmas of the businessmen and their economists than the

Republicans. But the fact is that the various measures thus far passed by the Democratic-dominated Congress either are routine pieces of legislation which would probably have been enacted even without the recession (debt-limit rise; price supports for farm goods; increased military expenditures), or are measures such as public works authorizations which at most can exercise only a long-range effect.

## LABOR MOVEMENT

And where is the labor movement, and their economists with their know-how on how to keep afloat the economic system to which they swear allegiance at every ceremonial occasion. They are raising their voices, and they are urging their programs for quick, massive government intervention. But they stand in the wings while the action takes place on the stage where others speak the lines. For in this growing emergency it is not their spokesmen, representatives and co-thinkers who run the Democratic Party in Congress, in the state legislatures, or even in the municipal councils.

At the present crucial moment the political instrument is lacking with which to implement the economic program of the American labor movement and the workers of the country whom it represents.

# George Kennan's Lectures—

(Continued from page 1)

to the moving way in which Kennan responded to the problem of Europe:

"If the experience of this century has taught us anything, it is that the long-term effects of modern war are by no means governed just by the formal outcome of the struggle in terms of victory or defeat. Modern war is not just an instrument of policy. It is an experience in itself. It does things to him who practices it, irrespective of whether he wins or loses.

**"Can we really suppose that poor old Europe, so deeply and insidiously weakened by the ulterior effects of the two previous wars of this century, could stand another and even more horrible ordeal of this nature? Let us by all means think once not just in the mathematics of destructions—not just in these grisly equations of probable military casualties—let us rather think of people as they are; of the limits of their strength, their hope, their capacity for suffering, their capacity of believing in the future.**

"And let us ask ourselves in all seriousness how much worth saving is going to be saved if war now rages for the third time in a half-century over the face of Europe, and this time in a form more destructive than anything known before."

## BALANCE OF TERROR

Europe responded also to the way he formulated the psychological attitudes accompanying the balance of terror:

"... what sort of a life is it to which these devotees of the weapons race would see us condemned? The technological realities of this competition are constantly changing from month to month and from year to year. Are we to flee like haunted creatures from one defensive device to another, each more costly and humiliating than the one before, cowering underground one day, breaking up our cities the next, attempting to surround ourselves with elaborate electronic shields on the third, concerned only to prolong the length of our lives while sacrificing all the values for which it might be worth while to live at all?

"If I thought that this was the best the future held for us, I should be tempted to join those who say, 'Let us divest ourselves of this weapon altogether; let us stake our safety on God's grace and our own good consciences and on that measure of common sense and humanity which even our adversaries possess; but then let us at least walk like men, with our heads up, so long as we are permitted to walk at all.'"

**It is from attitudes such as these that Kennan went on to analyze Western policy, and some of its cherished assumptions.**

**For this effort he has been met in this country with the charge that he is politically naive, has a poor understanding of economic and military matters, is poorly informed on nuclear strategy, and presented his disengagement proposal with mystical impression, and by implication, played into Russian hands.**

In arranging for a new approach, Kennan challenges the assumption that Russia is primarily a military threat. Instead he would define it as political and military, with the emphasis on the former. From this he concludes that what is needed is less concern with the grand strategy of the NATO alliance than with a political solution which will free Europe from the rigid restriction on its will and freedom imposed by both military occupations.

## QUESTIONABLE

The fault of U. S. policy is that it "continues to rest on certain questionable assumptions and habits of thought: on an overrating of the likelihood of a Soviet effort to invade Western Europe, on an exaggeration of the value of the satellite armies as possible instruments of a Soviet offensive policy, on a failure to take into account all the implications of the ballistic missile; and on a serious underestimation of the advantages to Western security to be derived from a Soviet military withdrawal from Central and Eastern Europe. I wonder how the military implication of a general withdrawal would appear if these distortions were removed."

The problem in Kennan's presentation of the case for disengagement, is that he leaves the impression that such a disengagement can be negotiated if only the Kremlin is given proper safeguards for its security interests. He vacillates between the view that a *quid pro quo* can be worked out having as its object removing East Europe as a source of military rivalry between the U. S. and Russia; and the recognition that the withdrawal of Russian troops under any circumstances would have serious consequences on Stalinist rule not only in East Europe but in Russia itself.

Another way of posing the problem flows from the positive case which can be made as to consequences of a Russian withdrawal—the disintegration of Communist power in East Europe and the regaining of political freedom by these oppressed peoples. But once this has been stated, the question arises as to how it will be possible to get the Kremlin to agree to a proposal whose only consequence can be a disastrous political defeat.

To emphasize, as Kennan does, that

Moscow may well be satisfied with the removal of U. S. troops from Europe is to ignore the bigger issue that is involved. It is that the removal of the Kremlin's power in East Europe is not just a military set-back, but it threatens the social existence of Communist society.

**Hans Morgenthau, no enthusiast of Kennan's ideas, writing in the March issue of *Commentary* went to the core of the weakness of the disengagement-through-negotiations position when he said that "the decisive argument against 'disengagement' is not that it is appeasement of the Soviet Union, but—quite to the contrary—that it expects a political and military sacrifice from the Soviet Union which it is impossible for her to make in the present circumstances."**

If then it is correct that the withdrawal of Russian armies from East Europe can only have the most adverse effects upon the political and social stability of Communist rule, and is therefore un-negotiable; and if it is also correct that Russia is not waiting for the first opportunity to invade Western Europe upon the withdrawal of U. S. troops since it knows that this would mean the beginning of World War III, then it would follow that the only alternative is, not the continuation of the Acheson-Dulles foreign policy, but unilateral withdrawal of U. S. troops from Western Europe.

## TERRIBLE PRICE

Such a political initiative will do far more to undermine the Kremlin's power than almost any other conceivable action by the U. S. The only justification which Moscow has had for its military occupation of the satellites has been the presence of U. S. troops on the continent. During the hectic days of the Polish October, Gomulka had to promise the Polish people that when U. S. troops leave Germany, he will take up with the Russian government the departure of its troops from Poland.

There can be no guarantees that a unilateral withdrawal will automatically or immediately lead to a Russian withdrawal. What it can do in the immediate sense is to make the Kremlin pay a terrible political price for every day of its continued occupation which will now be stripped of any kind of justification. There is no place in the world where the Communist parties will not be weakened if not finished off as effective political instruments. And who can calculate the effect it will have inside Russia itself, strengthening those who are seeking genuine democratization and who are questioning the justification of the monolithic rule of the Communist Party?