

# LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

DECEMBER 17, 1951

FIVE CENTS

**Chain Case: A New World Scandal**

... page 3

**Socialism and Religious Freedom**

... page 4

In this issue:

**STUDENT SOCIALIST**

**A Four-Page Student-Youth Section**

## A First-Aid Cure for Tax-Corruption Scandal: JAIL THE BIG-BUSINESS BRIBERS TOO!

By HAL DRAPER

The corruption scandal centering in the Internal Revenue Bureau may have more to do with the election of the next president, we are told, than the government's war policy or its labor and wage-freeze policy. We don't belittle the deep concern of the people with such a damning exposure of dishonest government officials. On the contrary, they are right to be angry and resentful enough to throw out of their positions of trust the scoundrels who squeezed the little man while they sold the power of government to moneyed profiteers.

Let the anger of the people fall on *all* the rascals.

The little rascals have been cleaned out. These are the tax collectors and tax-bureau officials who have already been dismissed, and may be faced with prosecution. So far the clean-up, such

as it has been, has reached as far as an assistant attorney general, the almost-preposterous bumbler Theron Lamar Caudle, whose testimony before the House investigating committee not only raises the question of what jail he belongs in but of how such an incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial mushhead—even if he had been an honest man—could have been appointed to a post of high responsibility.

If three-quarters of the generally accepted testimony is half true, these culprits have stolen from our pockets to line their own. No one need moralize on their fate or drop even a pitying tear for sorely tempted men. We doubt whether they will be permitted to starve by a grateful clientele.

*But nothing is going to be changed thereby.*

**We venture to say that part of the people's**

**rage at these recurrent scandals is that they know—or feel—this.**

They may even, as the Republicans hope, be angry enough to throw the Democratic Party out of Washington in 1952 and install its competitors in the famous two-party system, since the latter have not had a decent chance to get corrupted in national office since 1933. It's been a long time since the Teapot Dome scandal; and what if the present GOP national chairman, Gabrielson, did not have the elementary decency—and discretion—to resign for the good of the party even when his fingers were caught in the RFC till? Provided the present stink lasts, and with the help of God and the Dewey-Republican gerrymander in New York, they may still get their chance at the real money.

*But nothing is going to be changed thereby.*

(Continued on page 2)

## UAW Heads Call Union Conference To Deal with Auto Unemployment

By WALTER JASON

DETROIT, Dec. 9—The staggering total of 191,000 unemployed in the Detroit area alone was predicted by competent officials this past week as inevitable by next May, with widespread unemployment throughout the rest of the state also growing.

And this acute economic situation, which is affecting all businessmen, especially the small neighborhood shops, as well as the unemployed, finally brought some action along union and governmental agency fronts.

Unquestionably, the sharp editorial in the *Detroit News* this last week, directed against Harry S. Truman and the Democratic Party, had some effect in the sudden championing of the unemployed by Senator Blair Moody, Governor G. Mennen Williams, Senator Homer Ferguson and Mayor Albert Cobo.

And the United Auto Workers (CIO) has called an emergency conference of 800 local union presidents in Washington in January to deal with this problem on a national level.

What the *Detroit News* did, as a means of turning the resentment of the unemployed against the Democratic Party-labor union tie-up here, was to quote from President Truman's speech in Detroit last summer, when the city already had 70,000 unemployed.

President Truman promised: "I don't propose to let the working-

man of Detroit suffer from any unemployment that can be avoided. I didn't propose to let their know-how, which is one of our greatest national assets, be wasted by unemployment in the middle of a defense program."

### BEGAN TO HOP

The *Detroit News* points out that Truman has the responsibility for the defense program, and that the least he could do was return from the sunshine of Florida and make a demand on Congress for emergency funds to increase unemployment compensation payments for the unemployed!

No sooner did this editorial appear than everybody began to hop around. Every politician is promising to do something. It remains to be seen how much is done and how soon.

The *Detroit News* editorial doesn't really reflect the newspaper's concern for the unemployed as much as it does for its advertisers, who must be plenty worried about the decline in business activity in this area, and the bleak prospects for the coming year.

It also reflects a shrewd Republican maneuver to hang the Democrats on this acute political issue in the 1952 elections. After all, the

Senator Ferguson can yell loudly for a "Marshall plan for Michigan," while the Moodys and Reuthers stick by the State Department line of Europe first! The politicians are becoming quite conscious of the dynamite in this question in Michigan at least in 1952.

### HEAT'S ON

No sooner did Mayor Cobo, for example, announce that he was going to Washington Monday to try to get some "WPA projects" for Detroit than Governor Williams held conferences with union and auto industry leaders here, and announced he's going to Washington Monday too.

The action of the Reuther leadership in calling this conference in Washington is a half-way measure designed to take some of the heat off the union leadership and put it on Washington. Certainly one of the main demands of this conference will be to ask Congress to increase unemployment-compensation funds. The

(Continued on page 2)

## Churchill Says Bevan Is Right!

By GORDON HASKELL

Seldom in the course of political history has it been vouchsafed to a man to have his predictions so quickly and completely borne out as have been Aneurin Bevan's in the dispute over British rearmament. The support which he and his group received from the ranks of the Labor Party was no doubt his most gratifying vindication. But when even his most bitter enemy, Winston Churchill, is forced to admit, in the House of Commons and before the world, that on this question Bevan was right as against the whole pack of his traducers on both sides of the Atlantic, the wheel has made its full turn.

Churchill's admission was characteristically tinged with venom. When asked by Bevan in the course of the debate on the armament program whether the Conservative government had not reached the conclusion that the program would have

to be somewhat delayed, Churchill replied:

"I am giving him [Bevan] honorable mention in dispatches for having—it appears by accident, perhaps, not from the best of motives—happened to be right."

### HE TOLD 'EM

What Bevan and his comrades were specifically right about was that Britain could not stand the burden of a 4,700,000,000 pound armament budget without drastically lowering the standard of living of the people, cutting deeply into the social services built up by the Labor government, and wrecking her economy. When they saw the budget prepared by their own government, they were so convinced that it was impossible of fulfillment and that the attempt to carry it out would be disastrous that they preferred to resign from their ministerial posts in the government than to

(Continued on page 2)

### New York Symposium

#### HOW TO FIGHT STALINISM

Speakers:

**MAX SHACHTMAN**  
National Chairman, ISL

**PROF. GEORGE S. COUNTS**  
of Columbia University

Thursday evening, January 10

Place to be announced. Auspices Labor Action Forum

# JAIL THE BIG-BUSINESS BRIBERS TOO — —

(Continued on page 2)

**The new crew of sorely tempted men will take over the tax posts and probably even be careful. Now that Truman is back from Key West, he may even decide to reach the heights attained by the unfortunate Coolidge and throw a cabinet member to the wolves — Attorney General McGrath.**

After all, McGrath (according to Caudle) approved Caudle's acceptance of a \$5000 "commission" from a man involved in a tax-indictment case. It was McGrath's predecessor, Tom Clark, who had committed the greater crime of appointing this Caudle in the first place, not to speak of Clark's admission of taking a friendly joy ride with a manufacturer whose tax returns were under the lens. Clark, to be sure, is now one of the robed Nine who guard the democratic morals of the nation; but in spite of his towering stature as a jurist, he is no doubt even now nervously pacing up and down, up and down—under his bed.

So McGrath may be fired; or Clark, who cannot be fired, may suddenly become incurably ill. *But nothing is going to be changed thereby.*

## McKINNEY CLEAN-UP

The new Democratic national chairman, Frank McKinney, is being advised from all quarters that the Fair Deal must appoint a bipartisan clean-up squad, and he is letting it be understood that some spectacular honest-government move will be made. We suppose it will, even if its impact will be somewhat muffled by the disclosure that McKinney himself, who is so anxious to clean up the government, knew how to clean up a \$68,000 profit for himself from a notorious purchaser of government influence.

It will be a spectacle indeed. *But nothing is going to be changed thereby.*

We have a proposal to make on what a government can and must do if it wishes to clean up a running sore, and not merely hush up a scandal.

It is a very simple and elementary first step, and not very radical. Not very radical, that is, for any administration which is not only personally honest itself (in the very limited sense of not taking open bribes) but which also puts honest government ahead of fear or favor of moneyed interests.

It is simply to crack down on the rascals behind the rascals.

For it is a crime to suborn a public official. And the record that has been spread before us reveals not only little vermin in the government offices who allowed themselves to make a fast buck but also the names and addresses of the business interests who waved the money and minks under their noses.

Perhaps the most amazing part of the scandal is the way in which the press, Republican and Demo-

cratic, has invited the people to wax furiously indignant at the first set of malefactors while only mentioning the others incidentally as if they were merely the Facts of Life.

## ROLLCALL

If, in the public eye at least, a prima-facie case has been made out against Caudle and Company, then by the same evidence here is a partial roll call of a few other interesting figures:

- The Gulf Coast Tobacco Company of Mobile, whose tax case Caudle is suspected of trying to fix. It is a 68-to-1 chance (McKinney odds) that Caudle didn't do it for love.

- Troy Whitehead, the North Carolina manufacturer who scorned to let the Department of Justice's tax investigation stand in the way of his hospitality to Tom Clark.

- Carmen d'Agostino, wine merchant, who paid for Caudle's European junket and "lent" him \$2000 without a note, the only visible result of the trip being that Caudle "got a good insight on the Communist situation in Italy."

- Major Joseph Kingsley, president of the Norfolk & Southern Railroad, who liked Caudle's company at the Kentucky Derby.

- The Empire Ordnance Company, whose relations with Democratic Chairman McKinney were perfectly legal, says McKinney.

- Howard Nutt, a Detroit war contractor, who had \$343,000 in delinquencies written off for a \$71,000 settlement in 1943.

- And no one believes that these are the only names known to the investigators.

## HONEST WORK FOR FBI

But, it may be properly objected, there is no legal proof that any of these upstanding businessmen committed an act of bribery which could be pinned on them in court. That may well be, at present. After all, some of the men whose job it would be to look into such proof are the men in the dock themselves!

But is the Department of Justice, before or after being "cleaned up" in the spectacular manner which is promised, going to lift two fingers to go after these men—not to speak of whatever bigger fry have not yet been publicly mentioned?

Is it really possible that a whole brace of government officials can be properly canned for accepting bribes without even the FBI, the G-men, the T-men and J. Edgar Hoover himself being able to find the slightest evidence of who did it? That is enough to shake the faith of a nation of moviegoers in Hollywood's, as well as Walter Winchell's, representations of the uncanny infallibility of the Law-breakers' Nemesis.

## SOMETHING TO SELL

Or is it possible that the Department of Justice cannot spare the manpower now devoted to organizing stoolpigeons, anti-red drives, subversive lists, enforcement of the McCarran Act against visiting discoverers of penicillin, and the general defense of the American Way of Life against the infiltration of civil liberties?

We don't claim that a crack-down on the big-business bribers

will be a cure for the problem of corruption in government. We only claim that however necessary it is to start by "turning out the rascals" in government, this is only a temporary cover-up as long as the government does not also strike at the source of corruption.

For big-scale corruption of government officials is not fixed by "human nature." It exists as a society-wide problem because it is in the interests of one section of that society to corrupt the government. It exists because this present profit system of ours is built on the principle that it is the legitimate aim of the profit-maker to line his own pocket at

the expense of the community.

A crackdown on the big-business bribers, as well as the bribe-takers, is only a first-aid cure in a society where relatively poorly paid government officials have been taught to admire the "captains of industry" who made their own way to fatter bank accounts, not by devotion to "ideals of public trust," but by a "hard-headed" cut-throat scramble for the loosest dollar lying around.

In a country where the operation of a major party machine is itself a big business like all the other important sectors of society, the realistic leaders of the party machines do not expect their big

check-writers to contribute to the party's expenses out of starry-eyed ideological conviction. The American Way demands: *Have you got something to sell?*

Theron Lamar Caudle had something to sell.

The Democratic or Republican party in power has something to sell.

The buyers are also those who own and control the whole economy.

It is only the small fry who sell it over the counter for cash or mink coats, the Caudle way. But they sell it to the same class.

*Crack down on the rascals on the other side of the counter!*

# Churchill and Bevan — —

(Continued from page 1)

be a party to such a blind economic and political course.

Bevan realized full well that the pace of rearmament would be disastrous not only to Britain but to Western Europe as well. In his speech to Commons explaining his resignation from the cabinet he stated: "The fact is that the Western world has embarked upon a campaign of arms production and upon a scale of arms production so quickly and of such an extent that the foundations of political liberty and parliamentary democracy will not be able to sustain the shock. Now, this is a very grave matter."

At the time he and his friends were denounced in unmeasured terms by the Tories and almost the whole British and American press. The kindest thing said of his position was that it sounded just like that of the Stalinists. The American press particularly pointed to him as the human embodiment of what a vicious thing "doctrinaire socialism" and "demagoguery" can be.

## SOBERED UP

Since that time, just about nine months have passed. During these nine months the hard realities of the economic and political situation in Britain and Western Europe have had a sobering effect on all but the blindest American chauvinists. In a dispatch from Paris in the New York Times for December 9, Harold Callender describes the two "extreme" views on European rearmament as follows:

"An extreme view, sometimes heard in the United States, is that Europeans are not exerting themselves much and ought to rearm at a far greater rate, as the United States is doing. Another extreme view, that formulated by Aneurin Bevan in England and shared more or less by members of the Harriman committee, is that the United States is pushing Europe too hard and that while trying to grow strong in terms of armaments Europe may undermine its internal economic stability and therewith its standard of living and its social and political stability."

(The Harriman committee referred to here is the Temporary Council Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, otherwise known as the "Wise Men" of the Nato. Thus it appears that even the "Wise Men" are on this question . . . "Bevanites"!)

## TO SLOW DOWN

It is evident that the Churchill government is going to slow down the armament program, or at the very least is going to demand that the United States furnish a considerable part of the funds necessary to carry it out. The class in-

stincts and social outlook of the Tories make it possible for them to try to carry out the armament scheme at the cost of drastically cutting the standard of living of the British workers. But their political instincts rebel strongly against it. They have not yet so lost contact with reality as to insist on committing political suicide.

Further, Churchill is in a relatively favorable position when it comes either to cutting the arms budget or to demanding that the American government help finance it. Events have clearly demonstrated that there is no other possibility. And it is not likely that anyone on either side of the ocean (with the exception, perhaps, of the political paranoiac who runs the Chicago Tribune) will denounce Churchill as a near-Stalinist.

## ATTLEE'S CASE

From this, a valuable political lesson can be learned. Bevan could urge cutting the military budget, and if given the power, could have acted in line with his convictions. Churchill can do the same. But Attlee and the right-wing leadership of the Labor Party in Britain which he represents could not and did not. Why is this?

Bevan proceeded from the domestic needs of the British working people. He perceived that the armament budget was in flat contradiction to these needs and to the aspirations of the people who form the core as well as those who give mass support to the Labor Party. Although his views on the whole range of issues in British foreign policy have narrow limitations, he understood at least that a socialist domestic and foreign policy could not be followed if Britain continued to subordinate herself to the policies dictated by the government of the capitalist United States. He believed, further, that in this conviction he would be backed by a large section of the British working class, even perhaps a majority, and in any event he was willing to stake his political future on this belief.

Churchill also has a basis for independent action, though within much narrower limits. First there is his great personal pres-

tige among American business and government circles. Secondly, he knows that in deciding to cut the arms budget, his motives will not be seriously questioned, and in fact that everything possible will be done on this side of the Atlantic to bolster his prestige rather than to diminish it. Just as Bevan relied on the support of the working class, so Churchill knows he can rely on the support of the capitalist class, both at home and abroad, almost regardless of the course he may pursue. And finally there was, to be sure, the irrefutable logic of the economic situation of Britain as it stood at the time he came to power.

But Attlee, like most men who seek to stand in the middle of the national and international class struggle, found himself trying to put across a policy which, in a time of crisis, was doomed in advance. His base, like Bevan's, is the British working class. But he had ceased to rely on it, and neither he nor his colleagues in the government were able any longer to understand its needs and desires. Having ceased to stand firmly on his base, he was forced to seek another force for political support. More and more he tended to rely on the American government as that force, particularly in foreign affairs.

On occasion, it is true, the voice of his own people was raised so loudly that even he could not fail to understand it (example: his hurried trip to Washington when Truman told the press that the American government had considered use of the atom bomb in Korea). But the more he came to rely on America, the less capable his government was of conducting an independent policy, either at home or abroad. Hence their yielding to American insistence on the size of the armament program, and their perseverance in their course in the face of political disaffection and impending economic disaster.

Churchill will no doubt get the agreement of the American government, or at least its tolerance, in cutting British arms expenditures. But the political victory goes to Bevan and his supporters in the Labor Party.

# UAW Conference — —

(Continued from page 1)

action of the Flint unionists, in holding a mass meeting of the unemployed and putting Moody and Williams on the spot, has already begun that kind of campaign in Michigan. One state senator has agreed to introduce legislation at the regular session of the state legislature in January to boost the unemployment-payment benefits, extend them, and eliminate the costly waiting-week period.

The Flint unionists talked about

motor caravans to Lansing, the state capital, and presumably to Washington also. In face of this kind of program from his opposition (most of the Flint unionists spearheading the drive to aid the unemployed are anti-Reuther) the top leadership of the UAW-CIO has started to move.

They must also have heard about how popular the Stellato program leaflets are in many shops where they are being distributed, including previous Reuther strongholds.

## You're Invited

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



## LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

Vol. 15, No. 51

December 17, 1951

Published weekly by the Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York City 11, N. Y. Send all communications to general editorial and business offices of LABOR ACTION at that address. Telephone: WATKINS 4-4222.

Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months. (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canada and Foreign.) Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.

Editor: HAL DRAPER

Assistant Editors: MARY BELL, GORDON HASKELL, BEN HALL  
Business Manager: L. G. SMITH Asst. Business Mgr.: SAM FELIX

Opinions and policies expressed in the course of signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

# Exclusion of Penicillin Discoverer Creates World Scandal for U.S.

By MEL HACKER

The blind fear of ideas by the United States government has again erupted in an international scandal. "Non-political" scholars and scientists, as well as Stalinists, have time and again without explanation been denied visas to enter or leave the United States. Many have simply been declared "inadmissible" under the Internal Security Act of 1950, the infamous McCarran Bill.

Most recently, Dr. Ernest P. Chain, Nobel prize-winning biochemist who helped develop penicillin, was refused entrance into the country for unexplained "security" reasons. Last spring the World Health Organization formally requested the State Department to permit Dr. Chain to consult with chemists here on the possibilities of stimulating research abroad in the development of penicillin, streptomycin and other new drugs. Last week Chain was to attend a meeting of the American Committee of the Weizmann Institute of Science.

## IRON CURTAIN—HERE

In a letter Dr. Chain describes himself as "no more Communist than Acheson," adding that his visa application might have been denied because of a mission that he made to Czechoslovakia on behalf of the World Health Organization to restore a penicillin plant in that country. This denial of civil liberties will ultimately be detrimental to the United States "because no country, not even the United States, can develop its science in isolation."

A friend of Chain's speculated that his exclusion might have stemmed from the fact that Kurt Eisner, assassinated president of the short-lived Bavarian Soviet of 1919 had been related to Chain or his mother's side. Other sources suggested that pharmaceutical interests in the United States who resented Chain's public attacks on them for the way they had ex-

ploited penicillin might have inspired the action.

Such speculation on the reasoning of the powers that have built America's Iron Curtain are unresolvable. The fact is that there are no specific charges against Dr. Chain. The right to be confronted with charges, the right to full and public hearings with cross-examination and rebuttal, have been tyrannically denied by the State Department's Division of Passports.

## DISTRUSTED BY WORLD

This denial of travel rights has seriously affected international cooperation between scientists of the United States and those of other nations. It has produced an-

other ripple in the stream of world distrust and hatred of the United States for its ignoble imperialism and war preparations. Indeed the New York Times has stated that "influential circles in the capitals of Western Europe have begun to react cynically to United States' pronouncements on intellectual freedom and exchange of persons. . . ."

High State Department officials are therefore calling for "liberalization" of the McCarran Act, it is announced. That is not enough. It is the entire act that must go, together with its monstrous provisions for concentration camps and "subversive" registration, and not merely one provision which is especially embarrassing to U. S. pretensions to "democracy."

## UNSOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Rackets in some sections of the medical profession are getting so out of hand that the American College of Surgeons—their national organization—issued a strong condemnation and warning to its members.

One of the schemes is fee-splitting—a kickback by surgeons to physicians who send them patients.

Another is "ghost surgery." In this gimmick, the patient believes that his own physician performs the operation; but actually, after the patient is under ether, another

surgeon secretly takes over. The fee is split, of course.

Other practices condemned were those in which a physician secretly receives regular pay from a clinic for referring patients; gets a kickback from companies for prescribing devices or medicines made by the firms; charges unreasonably high fees.

If one tenth of these surgical abuses or similar ones took place under a socialized-medicine setup, the AMA doctors' trust propagandists and their ilk would be cutting up all over the place.

## THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY on the HOME FRONT

### The Pall of Fear in Education: N.Y. Gag Steamrolled Through

By MEL HACKER

The campaign of intimidation against New York school teachers reached new depths this week when the Board of Education voted unanimously for Superintendent of Schools Jansen's resolution to dismiss teachers who are found to be members of the Communist Party or any other "subversive" group.

New York State's Feinberg Law already provides a close authoritarian check on New York teachers with annual reports on each and every teacher and inquiries into their backgrounds, including questioning of their former employers and associates.

The Jansen proposal goes beyond this thought-control law. Not only present but "past membership may be taken into account with other circumstances of the individual in considering whether a teacher or other employee is disqualified." Further, if there was any reason to believe that an employee is or ever has been engaged in "an illegal or conspiratorial act" the superintendent shall inquire "as to such participation and the extent thereto."

These proposals really provide Superintendent Jansen with absolute powers over the present and past lives of New York City teachers. Any accusations put them in the dock unless and until they can establish their innocence. They must humble themselves before Jansen without benefit of public and impartial hearings. While American overseas propaganda "crusades for freedom," the U. S. passes police-state measures to frighten its citizens and intellectual workers into thought-compliance.

At the Board of Education meeting Jansen's resolution was listed as fifth on the calendar for this public meeting but was held over until its very end. A maximum crowd waited quietly as the other 69 items were dealt with.

Maximilian Moss, president of the Board of Education, then announced that the Board of Education had voted unanimously for the Jansen resolution. He refused to hear any opposition speakers to the proposal. According to a report in the New York Times, amidst cries of protest that the board's action was "undemocratic" and a "Pearl Harbor" for the teachers, "Mr. Moss acting quickly, rapped his gavel and announced almost inaudibly that the meeting was over. The board members were out of the hall before the audience realized it and the protests continued. The police finally dispersed the demonstration and cleared the hall."

## KILPATRICK

The celebration in New York of the 80th birthday of Dr. William Heard Kilpatrick turned into a tremendous demonstration of support for a school system which is public and democratic, and of opposition to all attempts to undermine it. Present also was Willard Goslin, who was ousted as Pasadena's superintendent of schools in part because he brought Kilpatrick to his faculty as consultant.

Attendance was large and enthusiastic at sessions sponsored by the American Education Fellowship, which has been attacked not only by Fulton Lewis Jr. and similar apologists from the extreme right but even by a few liberals who bemoan its reluctance to go along with the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers in their recent restrictions on academic freedom.

## STUDENT MORALS

All the locks on campus buildings and offices at Washington University in St. Louis have been changed in an attempt to frustrate a student ring that has been using a master key to obtain examination data. Revelations of

## LONDON LETTER

# The Bevan Movement Needs Organization

LONDON, Dec. 5—There may be some misconceptions in the U. S. of some aspects of the situation in the Labor Party since the American press, maliciously or unconsciously, distorts the developments that take place here. This has been particularly true of the Bevan movement.

For one thing, the Bevanites are not an organized mass movement in basic conflict with the official leadership of the Labor Party, as other centrist movements have developed. Quite the contrary; the Bevan movement has at no time left its position of confining the strictly organizational struggle to the top ranks of the party.

The Bevan group consists of 24 Labor MPs and has one magazine, the *Tribune*. Through the columns of the *Tribune*, the Bevan group has managed to gain very considerable mass support for itself. But it would be quite wrong to believe that (for example) the Bevanites' victory at the Labor Party Conference that preceded the general election was systematically organized. No systematic campaigning for the Bevan line was carried out at all by any of the Labor MPs in the Bevan group. Its victory at this conference was therefore of more significance than might have appeared at first sight. Despite the fact

that Bevan limited his fight to writing for the *Tribune*, he was able to secure a spontaneous and enthusiastic response at that conference.

## BEVANITES ON RUSSIA

Recently, in the House of Commons, the Bevan group has shown its hand on a number of issues. The group wisely refrained from participating in the party elections to the parliamentary front bench of the opposition. It also voted against the Japanese peace treaty. We fear, however, that Bevan did not dissociate himself from the reactionary objections to the treaty among the 80 Labor MPs—many from the Lancashire cotton areas—who abstained on the treaty because British exports would be hampered by competition from cheap Japanese goods. [See last week's London Letter on this point—Ed.]

There is another aspect of the Bevan group which is worth bearing in mind: its rather confused attitude on the question of Russia. Although Bevan himself is absolutely anti-Stalinist, some of his lieutenants are extremely dangerous. Tom Driberg, for instance, his second-in-command, is one of the most astute fellow travelers in the Labor Party. And even Ian Mikardo saw nothing wrong in "signing the phony "Stockholm peace petition."

The Research Department of Transport House [Labor Party headquarters] and the Fabian Society have published a number of excellent pamphlets that will be useful for Labor Party militants and, of course, for socialists abroad who are interested in the problems of British socialism. These have been on a variety of topics—workers' control, monopolies, foreign policy, rearmament, etc. One of the tasks of the socialists in the Labor Party is to bring these questions, which are being discussed and written about at the tops of the party, to the attention of every serious member of the party in his ward, trade-union branch, and League of Youth.

Already there are signs that the party is moving to the left. That will be reinforced by taking an active and constructive attitude to the problems that face the Labor Party in opposition.

Interested? For information about the

## INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

Write to 114 W. 14th Street  
New York 11, N. Y.

## SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER!

Books and Pamphlets  
by Leon Trotsky  
The Lesson of Spain ..... .25  
Marxism in the U. S. .... .35  
tion ..... \$3.50  
Fascism, What It Is,  
How to Fight It ..... .15  
The Permanent Revolution  
The New Course ..... 1.50  
Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay ..... .25  
ALL FOR ONLY \$5.00  
Labor Action Book Service  
114 W. 14th St.  
New York 11, N. Y.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Received from the New American Library, publishers of Mentor and Signet pocket books, publication date December 12:

ON UNDERSTANDING SCIENCE, by James B. Conant. Revised lectures on the teaching of scientific method. A Mentor book, 144 pages, 35 cents.

SOLDIER'S PAY, by William Faulkner. A Signet book, 224 pages, 25 cents.

THE INVADERS, by Stuart Engstrand. A Signet book, 160 pages, 25 cents.

THE HEART OF A MAN, by Georges Simenon. A Signet book, 168 pages, 25 cents.

## NAM Head Condemns Flannel Nightgowns As Un-American

"American businessmen are about as effective as a chorus girl in a flannel nightgown when trying to sell free enterprise to the American people."

That moan of distress came from William H. Ruffin, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, speaking before a businessmen's conference in Florida.

"Untold Americans," he lamented further "believe American business is an enemy of the people's welfare."

It is hard for him to understand why this should be so when, after all, the NAM fights against social legislation and for lower taxes on capital only in the interests of the very littlest of little people themselves.

# Editorials

## Socialism and Religious Freedom

Socialism stands for religious freedom as a part of full democratic rights, at the same time that it stands for full separation of church and state. It is worth illustrating this again in connection with the Stepinac case, because its point is directed both against the totalitarian regimes which suppress religious freedom (as they suppress all democratic rights) and against the Catholic hierarchy which so often yells for religious freedom as a cover for exercising quite unspiritual political powers.

For us the present point to be discussed with regard to the issues in the Stepinac case is not whether Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia is or is not guilty of the political crimes charged against him. We hold no brief for him. The Catholic hierarchy, in more than one country, has shown itself quite willing to collaborate with the deepest-dyed reactionaries and fascists in order to ensure a government which will give its own interests more than their due, and there is little that is beyond them in furtherance of this policy.

The facts in an individual case (guilt-by-association is not to be applied even to members of the Catholic hierarchy) have to be determined by a democratic trial; and while this is quite impossible under a totalitarian regime, an archbishop is no worse off than the mass of people—who do not have the protective pressure of Rome behind them besides.

As long as the Yugoslav government maintained that it was punishing Stepinac for legally defined crimes against the law, the critics' issue was that of an individual's rights before the law. It is the Yugoslav government itself which has now put the issue on another basis.

It has released Stepinac from jail—as a concession to Western pressure, as everyone knows—but whatever its considerations and motives, the man has been freed. But it now has assumed the responsibility of decreeing that Stepinac can no longer function as archbishop.

This is a policy which has nothing in common with socialism but which is characteristic of totalitarianism. Precisely because socialism stands for separation of church and state, it opposes not only

any attempts of the church to obtain special privileges in the state but also any attempt by the state to dictate its affairs to the church.

The power to remove an officer of the church is also the power to appoint him, or to determine who he shall be. This, of course, is exactly the power which Moscow has established in the course of its Stalinist totalitarianization: the "coordination" of the church as another controlled agency of the state. The Russian ruling class can find religion as useful an opiate as any other ruling class, provided the church institutions are as much under its thumb as every other form of organized association. There is no part of the world where the separation of church and state is as non-existent as in Stalinland.

The socialist view of religious freedom is perfectly clear. It is that a church has exactly the same democratic rights and obligations as every other form of association, no more and no less. Freedom of worship is not a special right; it is no more and no less than freedom of speech and assembly, with their accompanying civil liberties. A socialist government made up exclusively of atheists could no more abridge the right of worship and church assembly, etc., than any other legitimate exercise of these rights for educational or propaganda purposes with which the socialists do not agree. Socialists need have no fear of such a policy since, in a rational society of peace and plenty, religious institutions would have a job cut out for them to demonstrate that they can still retain their hold over men's minds.

Such a real test of the validity of religion can, in fact, take place *only* under a socialist democracy—where religious faith can no longer be a consolation for society's failures. Believers who do not fear this test of democracy have no reason to look on socialism as an enemy of religion. Either religious ideas will wither away, as Marxists predict; or, as Christian socialists maintain, a "true Christian spirit" will become possible for the first time. Marxists will teach their views, but the function of the socialist *government* is to create the conditions under which men can decide freely.

## WORLD POLITICS

### WASHINGTON'S \$100 MILLION SUBVERSIVE PROGRAM

By BERNARD CRAMER

There's much ado about the \$100,000,000 which Congress voted to promote subversive operations behind the Iron Curtain. There's one aspect of the rub-a-dub-dub that we can't get excited about. That is the mutual charges—Moscow vs. Washington—of bad faith and hypocrisy.

Both sides, on this point, are on exceedingly strong grounds. The Russian protest, for example, made to Washington and to the UN, pointed out that such activities are contrary to the agreement under which the U. S. (F. D. Roosevelt, to be exact) consented to recognize Russia. At that time, it may be remembered, the U. S. exacted from the Kremlin its agreement, on paper, against subversive activities in the U. S., and vice versa. Washington demanded this very righteously and indignantly, with suitable choruses in the press about the monstrosity of such operations.

If Congress has now more or less openly voted to finance such "monstrous" business, or if the administration has been doing what it can along the same lines without publicity even before this, we have only a very routine illustration of official hypocrisy.

The Russians' indignant protest, of course, was made only after

Vishinsky had laughed himself to sleep once again.

More interesting than this comedy of shocked protests is the question of what the U. S. thinks it can do with the subversive \$100 million. LABOR ACTION has previously discussed the "foment-revolution-in-Russia" schools of thought in and around Washington and their futility. Not very long ago a special coordinating committee under Gordon Gray was set up by Truman to plan and coordinate its "propaganda war." It has had the usual difficulties on the bureaucratic plane of trying to coordinate different government agencies, but this is not its main difficulty.

The main problem before American propaganda in the cold war is what it has to say—and whether it has anything to say—to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. It can talk about "democracy" all it wants but as long as its propaganda for democracy translates itself as propaganda for capitalism, the peoples under the Kremlin heel are not going to get enthusiastically subversive for the sake of pulling America's chestnuts out of the fire.

#### FOR REAL DEMOCRACY

This has been underlined by reports of Harvard's Russian Research Center on interviews with refugees from Russia (made in Germany). On the question which interests us here—attitude toward capitalism—there can be little doubt that the refugees are not adequately representative of a full cross-section of the Russian people who hate the Stalin regime. There is an inevitable self-selection among those individuals who flee the country or refuse to return both in the political nature of their attitude and in social status. But we mention this to indicate only that a full cross-section would be even more strongly weighted in the very same direction that is indicated by the replies of the refugees.

The summary (N. Y. Times magazine, Nov. 25) of the refugees' prevailing views by the center's directors shows them to be firmly anti-capitalist:

"On the economic level, they would have the government own and control heavy industry, railroads, all means of communication and all natural resources. Despite their experiences with the Soviet system they feel that under ideal conditions a planned economy would be better than an unplanned one. . . .

"As for government ownership of industry, the feeling is both that this is a more efficient and desirable arrangement and also that the people of the USSR have constructed this new industrial system with their own sweat and therefore should retain ownership. An army officer who would abolish the collective farms would yet retain nationalization of plants and factories. He said: 'They are nationalized now and the factories belong to the workers—but the government gets all the profit from them.' . . ."

(In the group interviewed, *land* collectivization was mostly opposed, but it is not at all certain that even this would be true for a country-wide cross-section. In any case, it raises different questions.)

In other words, the peoples of Russia do not want to return to capitalism. They want democracy indeed—democratic control and benefit from the planned and nationalized economy. Or, as we might put it, they want a nationalized economy which *really* belongs to the workers, not to the ruling bureaucracy. It will take more than \$100 million to convince them to swallow capitalism along with the "democratic" propaganda, especially propaganda by a government which proposes to cram its "democracy" down their throats with an atom bomb—at the side of General Franco, Chiang Kai-shek, Konrad Adenauer, Churchill and Rhee.

## ISL Program — in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a world-wide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

## YOU and SCIENCE

### SPRINKLING HOLY WATER ON SCIENCE

By PHILIP COBEN

There is no doubt that if the present pope, Pius XII, fails to go down in church history, it will not be his own fault. Ambition is highly enough regarded by our world but for all we know it may be looked down upon as a feature of the papal personality; and we do not wish to charge a successor of St. Peter even with a venial sin. Therefore we only note that Pius XII has already done more than enough to win a high place for himself in eternity. He has had miraculous visions, as the press reported recently, and so an indispensable condition has been met for his own canonization by a subsequent holder of the apostolic chair. He has properly denounced birth control, thereby pushing the powers of darkness and Beelzebub deeper into the pit. And most recently, a couple of weeks ago, he triumphantly announced that the existence of God has been proved all over again by modern science, thereby in the best contemporary image of statesmanship establishing the peaceful coexistence of religion and science, revelation and reason.

What is most impressive about the pope's lecture on popular science is the deft manner in which he bases his conclusions on the fact that science has so thoroughly demonstrated the "mutability" of all things—that is, the constant change, evolution, and transformation of the world. Heretics and other children of darkness may recall a time when theologians based arguments for the existence of God on the immutability of at least certain things, especially when a man named Darwin was getting started in the world; but flexibility is not to be condemned, especially when it is just as easy, after all, to prove the existence of God from the mutability of the universe as from its immutability.

As the pontiff explains it, the constant changefulness of the universe proves the existence of the Eternal Immutible One because "Just as in a picture done in chiaroscuro, the figures stand out on a background of darkness, and only in this way achieve the full effect of form and life, so also the image of the Eternal Immutible Being emerges clear and resplendent" from the "immense torrent" of universal mutability, so that the scientist can find "rest in that cry of truth with which God defines Himself 'I am who am' . . ." (That's the press translation for Exodus 3, 14.)

The scientist who does not wish to find "rest" from his unceasing search for truth is clearly at a disadvantage before the more fortunate members of the Pontifical Academy who are given a hitching post for a universe-in-flux which itself gives out no such convenient hitching posts.

It also makes it possible for the pontifical scientists to do something which others cannot do—and this is indisputably a virtue. They can make an argument such as the following (which the pope quotes in his address), and it is obviously one that would be quite beyond the ability of more earthbound scientists. Behold the miracle which this Sir Edmund Whittaker performs with language:

" . . . there was a time, some nine or ten billion years ago, prior to which the cosmos, if it existed, existed in a form totally different from anything we know and this form constitutes the very last limit of science. We refer to it, perhaps not improperly, as creation."

Since the universe then existed in a form totally different from anything we know, it follows it was then . . . created. The vistas for human reason which this open up are immense. For example, one might say:

"Sir Edmund's pontifical reasoning is so different from anything we know under the name of logic that we can, perhaps not improperly, refer to it as stultification."

But, after all, the pontiff himself says in his speech that revelation is superior to science or philosophy; and therefore Sir Edmund Whittaker may still perhaps not improperly be referred to as a scientist—at least the very prevalent type of scientist who spends five or six days a week on unmasking the Unknown and only the seventh day of the week on worshipping it.

#### Subscribers — Attention!

Check your NAME—ADDRESS—CITY—ZONE—STATE appearing on the upper left-hand corner of page one.

If there are any mistakes or if anything is left out of the address, especially the ZONE NUMBER, cut out your name and address and mail it to us with the corrections clearly printed.

15-51

If this number appears at the bottom of your address, your subscription expires with this issue.

RENEW NOW!